



Evaluation report: Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in The Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region

By Migration Policy Institute and Axiom Monitoring and Evaluation

Lawrence Huang, Steva Nyawade, Amina Ahmed, Camille Le Coz, and David Guillemois

August 2023

Table of Contents

I. Executive summary	6
II. Context and background	12
A. Programme summary	13
III. Evaluation background, approach, and methodology	14
A. Evaluation approach and methodology	15
B. Evaluation norms, standards, and limitations	16
IV. Relevance	17
A. Intervention logic	19
B. Stakeholder engagement	20
C. Relevance to IGAD and Member States	22
V. Coherence	23
A. Global frameworks	23
B. Internal and external coherence	24
VI. Effectiveness	26
A. Activity Implementation	26
B. Challenges and success factors	53
VII. Efficiency	56
VIII. Sustainability	58
IX. Impact	62
X. Global Compact for Migration	65
A. Guiding principles	66
XI. Conclusions	69
XII. Recommendations	71
XIII. Annexes	78
A. Most Significant Change	78
B. Success stories	81
C. List of Stakeholders Interviewed	83
D. Desk review materials reviewed	85
E. Evaluation matrix	86

Table of Tables

Table 1: Pillar I Results Framework	29
Table 2: Pillar II Results Framework	34
Table 3: Pillar III Results Framework	38
Table 4: Pillar IV Results Framework	41
Table 5: Awareness raising channels and processes	45
Table 6: Green economy activities implemented in Somalia	48
Table 7: Green economy activities implemented in Kenya	50
Table 8: Green economy activities implemented in Ethiopia.....	52

Abbreviations

BMM	Better Migration Management
BoLTE	Amhara Bureau of Labour, Training and Enterprise
BPDO	Beza Posterity Development Organization
CFA	Country Forum Association
CIMA	Chartered Management Accountant
CIPD	Country Integrated Development Plan
CPA	Charcoal Producer Association
CSC	Community Selection Committee
DOECC	Directorate of Environment and Climate Change
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EUTF	European Union Emergency Trust Fund
FMPT	Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD Region
FMU	Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD Region
GCM	Global Compact for Migration
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HACDA	Horn of Africa Community Development Action
HMCCC	Human Mobility in the Context of Climate Change
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction and Application Centre
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration

KEFRI	Kenya Forest Research Institute
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
KII	Key Informant Interview
LOKADO	Lotus Kenya Action for Development Organization
MCAs	Members of the County Assembly
MDCC	Migration, Disasters, and Climate Change
M-MPTF	Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund
MoLS	Ministry of Labour and Skills
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPI	Migration Policy Institute
MPs	Members of Parliament
NCM	National Coordination Mechanism on Migration
NCM	National Coordination Mechanisms
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PDD	Platform on Disaster Displacement
PSA	Public Service Announcement
PUNO	Participating UN Agencies
SIYB	Start and Improve Your Business
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
TOT	Trainers of Trainers
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNHCR	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

I. Executive summary

The Joint Programme "Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region" - briefly, Migration, Disasters, and Climate Change (MDCC) was the first initiative funded via the Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (M-MPTF) in the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) region. It ran from February 2021 to August 2023 and sought to respond to the pressing challenges at the crossroad of climate change and human mobility in East Africa. Specifically, the programme's objective was to contribute to facilitating pathways for regular migration in the IGAD region and minimizing displacement risk in the context of disasters, climate change, and environmental degradation, in line with the vision and guiding principles of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM).

The IGAD region is highly vulnerable to climate change and variability, including natural hazards, and experiences significant migration and displacement in these contexts. MDCC responded to these challenges by generating new data on displacement risk in the context of key natural hazards, such as floods and cyclones, as well as by supporting greater policy coherence through the inclusion of human mobility considerations in local and national policies (e.g., green economy, climate adaptation, and disaster related policies), and engaging local residents in policymaking. MDCC also improved policymakers' preparedness to respond to cross-border displacement in disaster contexts, and worked in targeted communities in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia to strengthen the green economy, support entrepreneurship and skills development, and improve migrants' access to labour markets. The programme closely engaged community leaders, women and youth groups, local residents, civil society organizations, as well as private sector actors, local authorities, workers' and employers' organizations, academia, diaspora members, the National Coordination Mechanisms on Migration, and UN networks on Migration.

With a budget of USD 2.15 million, MDCC was organized across four pillars: data and knowledge (I); national and regional policy frameworks (II); disaster displacement preparedness (III); and regular migration pathways (IV). Four United Nations (UN) agencies came together to implement the initiative: the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) hosted under the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS), and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Key regional partners were IGAD and the IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC), while the CIMA Research Foundation was the implementing partner for Pillar I data activities. UN agencies contracted local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to roll out the pilot projects under Pillar IV: Beza Posterity Development Organization (BPDO) in Ethiopia, Horn of Africa Community Development Action (HACDA) in Somalia, and Lotus Kenya Action for Development Organization (LOKADO) in Kenya.

This final external evaluation sought to answer the question: "How well did the programme perform towards enhancing the implementation of the GCM while aligning with the GCM principles?" It was conducted by the Migration Policy Institute and Axiom Monitoring and Evaluation between March 20 and August 18, 2023, using a non-experimental design with remote and in-person data collection with 55 key informants. The evaluation assessed MDCC across six criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness,

efficiency, impact, and sustainability), as well as its alignment with GCM guiding principles. The full evaluation questions are available in Annex D.

Key Results

In general, stakeholders expressed high or moderate satisfaction with MDCC activities. MDCC made a clear contribution to important regional priorities, by contributing to IGAD's Regional Migration Policy and the IGAD Protocol on the Free Movement of Persons. The programme made a positive impact on the understanding of migration and climate challenges, particularly among policymakers and targeted communities in Kenya, Ethiopia, and Somalia. Activities also enhanced access to labour markets and sustainable livelihoods, and improved local, national, and regional policies, knowledge, as well as preparedness for disasters and climate events.

Pillar I of MDCC aimed to enhance governments' access to quality data on disaster displacement risk and human mobility, by developing a decision-making model and risk profiles for sudden-onset hazards including floods and cyclones, as well as building capacities within IGAD. While the programme made substantial progress and ICPAC was satisfied with their improved access to displacement data, it did not completely meet the scope of the outcome level indicator for which data was available. However, all but one output level indicator was achieved. Working closely with the IGAD Climate Prediction and Application Centre (ICPAC), MDCC developed the models and risk profiles and shared them with relevant policymakers at regional workshops and conferences such as the Greater Horn of Africa Climate Outlook Forum (GHACOF), although it did not also develop early warning scenarios as targeted. In the last months of the programme, the team was in the process of integrating these deliverables throughout ICPAC's databases and services for future use by IGAD and Member States. In parallel, the programme worked to build capacities on data and human mobility related to climate change and disasters with a series of training sessions for ICPAC and IGAD Member States. These efforts were greatly enhanced by the recruitment of a Mobility Analyst within ICPAC. Indeed, this person developed an Action Plan to help the centre incorporate mobility into its institutional and coordination structures (including beyond the end of MDCC).

Pillar II sought to improve the inclusion of human mobility considerations in the context of disasters, climate change, and environmental degradation across relevant policy areas in Kenya and Somalia. To do this, MDCC conducted Climate Change and Disaster related policy reviews in the respective countries to identify gaps and policy recommendations, and then conducted pilot projects with local communities to validate the recommendations and collect feedback from local communities to further inform and enhance the inclusivity of policymaking. MDCC also strengthened the capacities of policymakers and community stakeholders on the migration, environment, and climate change nexus. While the programme achieved its output targets and policymakers reported their satisfaction with the capacity enhancement activities, the outcome targets were not fully met, with achievements recorded at national level and local county level in Kenya but not in Somalia.

In the two countries, IOM conducted a full review of climate and disaster related policies to assess to what extent human mobility considerations were integrated. This initial analysis guided the interventions at national and local level. In Kenya, MDCC provided technical assistance and capacity enhancement for

the development of two Turkana sub-county climate change adaptation action plans and one county integrated development plan. The programme also supported the revision of Kenya's GCM implementation plan and its national Climate Change Adaptation Plan. Besides, the team organized trainings for ward-level climate change committees and local and national authorities, so they are well prepared to implement these new policies. In Somalia, the policy review indicated climate and disaster policies already included references to human mobility, particularly displacement, thus there was less need for policy support. Also, fully achieving MDCC's targets of incorporating human mobility elements in different policies or GCM implementation plan was not feasible due to election turnover, and (compared to Kenya) insecurity, and the absence of a coordination structure for the GCM. Still, MDCC organized a series of workshops with national policymakers, which alongside its pilot project (under Pillar IV) helped raise awareness and knowledge of green economy, migration and displacement, and climate change policy needs among national government officials. Somalia has initiated plans to design a new national policy related to climate change and human mobility, although how this will develop remains to be seen.

Pillar III worked to improve preparedness for cross-border disaster displacement, by developing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) on admission and stay in cross-border disaster displacement situations in two border regions in Kenya-Ethiopia and Kenya-Uganda. Through the design and dissemination of the SOPs, the programme engaged with a wide range of local and national government officials, as well as local civil society actors in a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach. As with other MDCC activities, mobility restrictions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic incurred delays in the initial phase of this pillar. As a result, the programme timeline was compressed, and the team ran out of time to secure government and IGAD formal endorsement of the SOPs before August 2023. Although not specifically part of the programme objectives, such validation is important to ensure the uptake of the SOPs, and activities are underway to secure their formal adoption. Still, in the last months of the programme, the team managed to organize a sensitization workshop in each country (Kenya, Ethiopia, and Uganda) to introduce national and local authorities to the SOPs. MDCC also held two simulation exercises in each border region to test and validate the SOPs, and participants reported high levels of satisfaction with how they were conducted. After these exercises, the SOPs were revised to reflect feedback, including through a workshop with a joint technical working group composed of heads of delegations from participating countries. Under Pillar III, the programme achieved outcome indicator targets and all but one output indicator target.

Pillar IV of MDCC focused on enhancing safe and regular migration pathways and access to protection services, as well as improving access to green jobs and sustainable livelihoods in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. Under enhancing pathways, activities included an awareness-raising campaign in South Wollo Zone, Amhara region, Ethiopia and a research study by UNHCR. The awareness raising campaign demonstrated significant reach in promoting safe, orderly migration, and worker rights. The campaign encompassed print media, radio, street drama, and peer education. This approach was estimated to have reached three million people through radio and 7,100 through street drama and peer education. MDCC trained educators and facilitators to conduct group community conversations and peer-to-peer sessions. These activities were identified as yielding the most impact due to their face-to-face nature allowing for locals such as returnees, elders, and young students to engage in meaningful discussions. Furthermore,

UNHCR commissioned a study that delivered recommendations to establish a regional protection framework on human mobility in the context of climate change, to better coordinate to enhance climate resilience and protection responses, and to strengthen national capacities on protection. This initiative was hampered by a series of challenges stemming from COVID-19 mobility restrictions and identifying a consultant with the requisite expertise. Overall, the achievement of outcome targets related to enhancing pathways and protection could not be determined with the available data at the time of evaluation. Still, local authorities and community members interviewed in Ethiopia were of the perception that the awareness raising activities contributed to the promotion of safe migration practices and the protection of the rights of migrant workers.

Other activities under Pillar IV focused on improving sustainable livelihoods and green jobs for climate-affected communities. Two pilot projects, in Turkana County, Kenya and Mogadishu, Somalia, were designed to pilot and validate green economy interventions based on a policy study and community consultations. MDCC conducted a regional policy review of green economy and related policies including case studies for Kenya and Somalia, and then held validation workshops and community consultations in both countries. The pilot projects were launched based on those consultations. In Mogadishu, Somalia, HACDA employed a variety of skills and livelihood interventions – conducting markets and needs assessment, vocational training on solar and waste management – for 90 people, apprenticeships with private sector, establishing collectives, diaspora mentorship, and environmental awareness campaigns for local communities. This initiative generated positive outcomes, and trainees and government officials expressed satisfaction with the interventions. They reported the creation of sustainable livelihoods and employment opportunities, validating viable green economy sectors recommendations from the policy review. Local community members recommended scaling up interventions on resilience and adaptive capacities to the adverse impacts of climate change.

In Turkana County, Kenya, LOKADO undertook a range of activities across different locations. In Nawountous, they renovated and solarized a borehole and animal watering point, established a climate-smart agriculture farm, and provided vegetable and fruit seeds/seedlings. Business training was also conducted. In Namon, LOKADO established an agroforestry and vegetable production plot. They installed 500-liter tanks for farm water supply and constructed an office and storage building, along with two-door latrines for improved hygiene. By December 2022, a total of 60,000 trees, vegetables, and fruit seedlings had been produced, in addition to providing business training. Additionally, in Nalapatui and Loreng villages, LOKADO conducted two rangeland management training sessions and awareness raising activities with both refugee and host communities. Stakeholders were mostly neutral with their satisfaction with the interventions. The environmental awareness sessions, agroforestry and climate-smart agriculture interventions were well-received, reflecting increased knowledge among participants on vegetable farming and tree planting, and local community members have positive perceptions on livelihood diversification in the context of climate change. However, planned pasture re-seeding under rangeland management faced challenges due to drought conditions, prompting the project to adapt activities to focus on locating additional water points, and the distribution of vegetable seeds, and shade nets to support agricultural resilience. Participants validated the recommendation to invest in these green economy sectors, while noting the need to better reflect on local conditions (i.e., availability of water) in the future.

In Ethiopia, the third pilot project relied on a comprehensive market system analysis to identify and promote green job creation in three value chains within the South Wollo Zone. With its implementing partner BPDO, ILO used established methodologies to conduct the initial assessment, leading to the selection of three value chains: renewable energy, small ruminant fattening, and mung bean production. This analysis fed into a workshop with local authorities, social partners, private sector, academia, and other civil society actors to validate the value chain selection and develop intervention models in each value chain, identifying opportunities for and constraints on growth, key stakeholders, and potential activities. Next, MDCC piloted activities based on the intervention models in each value chain, supporting 120 young individuals and aspiring entrepreneurs with entrepreneurship and core skills training. These training sessions, held in two rounds in Kombolcha town, used the ILO tool Start and Improve your Business (SIYB), which incorporated both practical business theories and green practices. The stakeholders interviewed unanimously welcomed the project's interventions. Post-training support in the form of mentorship and financial linkages further bolstered the pilot (which included the establishment of goat fattening businesses and development of business plans by some of the training attendants). In total, 105 businesses were established. Separately, MDCC also planned a larger sensitization training on the green economy and sustainable and environmentally responsible business practices, but due to local security conditions, the training only reached 100 participants rather than the targeted 250.

Across the four pillars, there is a strong sense of ownership and interest in sustaining and expanding MDCC activities in the future, including in the targeted communities in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. Local authorities were particularly engaged in the pilot projects. For instance, in Ethiopia, Kebele platforms and task forces planned to continue activities by providing refresher trainings, while Woreda offices intend to support monitoring efforts. In Somalia, district authorities are closely following the newly established businesses and sought additional support for their needs. In Kenya, the Turkana County government embraced the County Climate Change Action Plan, incorporating climate and mobility issues into its County Integrated Development Plan. They even allocated a portion of the development budget for climate change initiatives. Similarly, IGAD and ICPAC demonstrated strong ownership over MDCC activities and have plans to continue working on this topic, for instance by formally endorsing the SOPs or continuing to invest in displacement data at ICPAC.

Regarding implementation and coordination, MDCC was designed to leverage the comparative advantages of each PUNO. There were initial challenges associated with setting up financial cooperation arrangements, recruiting consultants, and adjusting programme locations, but these difficulties were tackled throughout the programme. Two no-cost extensions were granted (for around six additional months), but this is not unusual for M-MPTF programmes. PUNOs and other partners also mobilized additional sources of funding to achieve, or maximize, MDCC's impacts. Thus, ICPAC, IGAD, and UNHCR relied on separate funding sources to implement activities and finalize deliverables. On the one hand, this indicates the budget allocated to MDCC could have been larger to fully achieve its objectives. On the other hand, this also reflects strong commitment from these partners to invest other resources in these activities.

Finally, MDCC was the first climate-focused programme funded by the M-MPTF, the funding instrument of the GCM. Thus, the programme contributed to GCM implementation, primarily working toward

objectives one ('collect and utilize accurate and disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policies'), two ('minimize the adverse drivers and structural factors that compel people to leave their country of origin'), and five ('enhance availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration').¹ It also aligned with GCM's guiding principles such as the human right based approach (e.g., including rights protection in the MDCC awareness raising campaign). In turn, MDCC ensured gender mainstreaming in the local initiatives, actively involving women in decision-making processes and economic empowerment activities. It did not, however, include activities directly working to promote gender equality. The programme team also deployed specific efforts to engage a wide range of government officials at the national and local level, as well as civil society and private sector organizations in different activities. Overall, the programme demonstrated a strong commitment to improving migration governance and standing for whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches.

Recommendations

In the past three years, MDCC has offered proof of concept for programming related to migration, disasters, and climate change in the IGAD region. Many of the activities show promise for scaling up if future interventions incorporate lessons learnt and best practices from this experience. There is also a demand to build on MDCC's four pillars and replicate these approaches across the region. Five main recommendations to enhance GCM implementation have emerged from this evaluation:

- 1) **Relating to Pillar I:** ICPAC could integrate MDCC displacement data into its data services and explore opportunities to gather additional data on other hazards, issues, and contexts. This would ensure the sustainability of the data collection exercise, make it more easily available to stakeholders, and meet the demand for data in the region. Such activities could be conducted alongside building out more internal capacity and knowledge on displacement, which would require support either from UN Organizations or other partners.
- 2) **Relating to Pillar II:** The IGAD Member States could develop or revise national policies related to disasters, climate change, and migration. This could be done through targeted policy support from the UN Organizations' PUNOs to each interested Member State, with policy reviews, technical assistance, and capacity enhancement, and taking into consideration labour mobility and other related topics. This is particularly needed where national governments lack expertise or strong governance mechanisms on climate change and migration. Although tailored interventions to support each Member State are needed, they could be complemented by both local projects to support sub-national policy development and regional programming to provide opportunities for Member States to exchange on the latest policy developments, to encourage cross-fertilization and peer support.
- 3) **Relating to Pillar III:** IGAD and the Member States could formally endorse the standard operating procedures for cross-border disaster displacement, support their operationalization, and monitor how they fare in future cross-border disaster displacement contexts. If they prove

¹ MDCC also contributed to a set of other GCM objectives, such as objective 6 (facilitate fair and ethical recruitment and safeguard conditions that ensure decent work).

effective, they could be replicated in other contexts with the support of the UN Organizations , continuing to abide by a whole-of-society, whole-of-government approach.

- 4) **Relating to Pillar IV:** IGAD Member States and the PUNOs could scale up local interventions related to migrants' access to labour markets, sustainable livelihoods, and the green economy, promoting a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all. Promising pilot interventions in Ethiopia (e.g., ruminant fattening), Kenya (e.g., livelihood diversification), and Somalia (e.g., skills development and employment access) could be replicated and scaled. Supporting these interventions in other contexts could replicate either the more resource-intensive but comprehensive market systems analysis approach to develop intervention models, or analyse green economy policies and needs to understand local needs.
- 5) **Regarding the funding mechanisms and programme design:** UN organizations and the M-MPTF could explore long-term programming, to allow more time for interventions to be completed and disseminated. MDCC's joint programme approach was effective and could be replicated, building on each PUNO's comparative advantages. Key to the success of this first phase was the existence of, strong coordination mechanisms. The next phase of MDCC could also explore ways to provide direct funds to IGAD, ICPAC, and Member States as appropriate, rather than channelled through the PUNOs. This would make a major difference in terms of buy-in for these partners, although it would also need to be closely monitored. All stakeholders should continue working to implement the GCM and align with its guiding principles. In particular, PUNOs could design activities specifically aimed to promote gender equality. They could also build on the successes of the whole-of-government, whole-of-society approach and identify other government, civil society, and private sector partners to engage.

II. Context and background

Member States of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) are among the most vulnerable to climate variability and change. The IGAD region covers an expansive area of 5.2 million square kilometres and includes Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Uganda. Within this region, there is a diverse range of climates and landscapes. Over the past five decades, severe droughts, floods, earthquakes, cyclones, landslides, tsunamis, wildfires, and high winds have played significant roles in causing widespread displacement. The region also experiences slow-onset (gradual) effects of climate change, such as a severe lack of available water, unpredictable rainfall patterns, rising sea levels, and environmental degradation. The economies of IGAD Member States rely heavily on natural resources and agriculture, with more than 80 percent of the labour force being engaged in agriculture.² This reflects high reliance on a sector that is particularly susceptible to harmful environmental conditions.

Disasters and the adverse impacts of climate change directly and indirectly trigger individuals across the region to leave their places of origin. These drivers are expected to intensify in the future within IGAD. Member States face challenges in addressing human mobility in this nexus, prompting a need to develop new policies and tools. This includes enhancing climate change adaptation and resilience-building, adopting

² ICPAC, [IGAD Regional Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan](#) (2023-2030). (IGAD, 2022), 3.

integrated approaches to disaster risk reduction (DRR), establishing regular pathways to migration, and implementing measures to support decent work and livelihoods.³

A. Programme summary

The Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (M-MPTF) of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) has funded the Joint Programme “Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region”, also called Migration, Disasters and Climate Change (MDCC). MDCC is a collaborative effort involving IGAD Member States, the IGAD Secretariat including IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC), Participating UN Agencies (PUNOs), and other partners. The programme was designed and implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) as the convening agency, the International Labour Organization (ILO) as the technical co-lead, the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) hosted under the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), and the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR).

The main objective of the programme was to contribute to facilitating pathways for regular migration in the IGAD region and minimizing displacement risk in the context of climate change, environmental degradation, and disasters, aligned with the vision and guiding principles of the GCM.⁴ The programme encompasses a range of actions primarily aiming to advance GCM objectives 1 (data), 2 (adverse drivers), 5 (regular pathways), as well as a wider set of GCM objectives including objective 6 (fair and ethical recruitment and decent work). MDCC also contributes to the implementation of other international agreements such as Target 10.7 of Sustainable Development Goal 10 and Target 8.8 of SDG 8, the 2015 Paris Climate Change Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. Furthermore, the programme worked towards implementing the IGAD Free Movement of Persons Protocol, which was adopted by the IGAD Council of Ministers in June 2021. Article 16 of this Protocol specifically urges Member States to facilitate the entry and stay of individuals who are compelled to move due to disasters. In doing so, the programme aimed to enhance Member States' preparedness capacity, operational response, and regional as well as bilateral cooperation in addressing cross-border displacement resulting from disasters.⁵

MDCC was formally launched on February 18, 2021, and ran until August 18, 2023, with a total budget of USD 2,150,000. The geographical scope of the programme covered the IGAD region, including Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Uganda. Local community interventions took place in Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia. MDCC is comprised of four pillars, namely (I) data and knowledge, (II)

³ Lena Brenn, Noora Mäkelä, Eleonora Panizza, Ahmed Amdihun, and Roberto Rudari, [Developing partnerships in the IGAD region](#) (Forced Migration Review, 2022)

⁴ IOM, “[Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region](#)”, updated July 21, 2023.

⁵ Lena Brenn, Noora Mäkelä, Eleonora Panizza, Ahmed Amdihun, and Roberto Rudari, [Developing partnerships in the IGAD region](#) (Forced Migration Review, 2022)

national and regional policy frameworks, (III) disaster displacement preparedness, and (IV) regular migration pathways. The work under these pillars sought to achieve five outcomes:

- 1) Enhancing access to quality data and evidence on disaster displacement risk and other forms of human mobility;
- 2) Including human mobility considerations in the context of disasters, climate change, and environmental degradation across relevant policy areas;
- 3) Improving preparedness and operational readiness to respond to cross-border disaster displacement;
- 4) Providing enhanced pathways for regular migration and access to protection services for migrants affected by the adverse impacts of disasters and climate change;
- 5) Boosting access to sustainable livelihood and green job opportunities that prevent displacement and forced migration in climate and disaster-affected areas.

III. Evaluation background, approach, and methodology

The final external evaluation, led by the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) and Axiom ME, aimed to assess the achieved intermediate results of the programme. It sought to evaluate whether the MDCC outcomes have effectively supported its objectives while also identifying good practices and lessons learnt. By providing specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely (SMART) recommendations, the evaluation aimed to identify opportunities for further GCM implementation. The recommendations were tailored to ensure their use by relevant stakeholders, including participating UN organizations and partners. As the first M-MPTF funded programme on climate, the evaluation placed particular emphasis on the programme's alignment with GCM's goals and guiding principles, particularly objectives 1, 2, and 5, as well as guiding principles on human rights, gender responsiveness, child sensitivity, the whole of government, whole of society, and people-centred approaches.

The evaluation covered the full duration of the programme from February 18, 2021, to August 18, 2023. It encompassed work under each MDCC pillar, with special attention to Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia where local interventions were carried out. The evaluation was initiated on March 20, 2023, and concluded on August 18.

As a user-focused evaluation, the intended audience of this evaluation are the M-MPTF Steering Committee and its Fund Management Unit (FMU), the Joint Programme's Steering Committee and Technical Working Group (TWG), national and local governments, PUNOs, migrant and local communities, and general audiences. The programme steering committee, technical working group, and PUNOs as core users of the evaluation were engaged through regular communication, key informant interviews (KIIs), and tailored follow-ups. The M-MPTF Fund Management Unit were engaged during the evaluation through a KII to understand their expectations, concerns, and specific needs related to the evaluation.

National and local authorities were vital in assessing most evaluation questions and engaged through KIIs. These KIIs included the evaluation team explaining the evaluation's goal of understanding how the programme has achieved their priorities and policies, encouraging them to transparently share ongoing concerns or priorities where a potential second phase of the programme could offer support. The abovementioned stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide input to recommendations in two dedicated workshops, organized on July 27 and August 14, 2023.

Migrants and affected communities, as essential users of the evaluation, were engaged through KIIs to ensure their needs and expectations are met, and to hold the evaluation team and programme accountable. Enumerators were trained to explain the evaluation's purpose and provide opportunities for community members to follow up with the evaluation team or programme if they wish to remain engaged.

A. Evaluation approach and methodology

The final external evaluation sought to answer the question: "How well did the programme perform towards enhancing the implementation of the GCM while aligning with the GCM principles?" The evaluation assessed the relevance of the programme to its stakeholders, coherence of all the activities that were conducted, effectiveness in achieving programme outcomes and efficiency in managing the programme. The evaluation also assessed, to a lesser extent, the programme's impact and sustainability. The guiding principles of GCM, particularly human rights, gender responsiveness, child sensitivity, the whole of government, whole of society, and people-centred approaches, were also examined, to identify effective practices and opportunities for further implementation of these principles across the programme cycle.

This non-experimental evaluation relied on qualitative methods using a desk review, interviews, and a case-study approach to assess the programme's performance in line with the GCM. The desk review included external materials and an exhaustive list of all available programme materials, with a particular focus on key documents such as interim and annual reports, programme monitoring documents, steering committee and TWG meeting notes, financial reporting, documentation on capacity strengthening and sensitization workshops, concept notes, terms of reference, and deliverables from consultants and implementing partners (see Annex C).

The evaluation team conducted 55 interviews with individuals who have been involved in the programme (see Annex A). At the national and regional level, the team interviewed 22 respondents through semi-structured virtual KIIs, such as national government focal points, key programme officials, representatives from IGAD, ICPAC, as well as implementing and external partners.

At the local level, the evaluation team conducted 27 KIIs with local authorities, UN project staff in the field, implementing partner staff, and migrant and affected community stakeholders, and 6 case study interviews specifically with migrant and affected community stakeholders in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. This approach allowed for an open exploration of the projects from the perspective and interests of the stakeholders, generating valuable data on individual experiences that was incorporated and emphasized in the evaluation report.

The selection of informants followed a purposive sampling approach, where the evaluation team intentionally selected stakeholders based on specific characteristics required for the sample. For this evaluation, these characteristics for inclusion were direct participation and knowledge of project activities in the different pillars; technical expertise on the subject matter (particularly for key experts and government representatives); and availability of stakeholders. Participants who were not directly involved in the project were excluded based on the established criteria. A list of stakeholders provided by the programme officials served as the basis for conducting this selection process. While not representative, the data collection was sampled to adhere to best practices for consent and research ethics. For the local pilot projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia, interviewees from the local community stakeholders were selected to ensure adequate gender representation.

The qualitative data analysis for this evaluation employed a thematic analysis approach. In this approach, analysis categories were determined by the evaluation questions and project indicators derived from the programme's logical framework. An evaluation matrix was developed, identifying specific thematic areas for analysis. This matrix ensured comprehensive coverage of key themes by sorting, consolidating, and extracting data from relevant stakeholders and different datasets. The qualitative analysis was reported based on each evaluation criterion, disaggregated as much as possible by gender, location, and project type. The findings were cross-referenced and verified through a triangulation approach, comparing KIIs across various stakeholders and exploring any points of similarity or divergence. This involved carefully scrutinizing the data analysis, reviewing the findings, and assessing the recommendations to ensure they met the established quality control criteria.

To ensure sensitivity to local cultural contexts, the evaluation team in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia consisted of in-country members. Local enumerators, who shared language, ethnicities, and gender identities with migrant and affected community stakeholders, were recruited from Axiom ME's network of local partners when needed. The team leveraged the expertise and insights of local implementing partners and country-based programme officials to understand the specific contexts, taking into account the diversity within these countries. Lessons learned from previous monitoring efforts, such as after-action reviews, were incorporated into the evaluation methodologies and expanded upon, particularly in Turkana County.

B. Evaluation norms, standards, and limitations

The evaluation followed IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG (UN Evaluation Group) Norms and Standards for evaluations, and ethical guidelines provided by MPI and Axiom ME. Written consent was obtained from all key informants who participated in the data collection through a respondent consent form. This form clearly outlined the purpose of the evaluation and emphasized that participation was voluntary. The researchers explained the contents of the consent form to each interviewee at the beginning of the interview.

MPI and Axiom ME followed each of the 13 principles within IOM's Data Protection Principles and upheld the ten general UNEG norms in conducting the evaluation, adhering to the associated standards. These norms included internationally agreed principles, goals, and targets; utility; credibility; independence;

impartiality; ethics; transparency; human rights and gender equality; national evaluation capacities; and professionalism. Four institutional norms (enabling environment, evaluation policy, responsibility for the evaluation function, and evaluation use and follow up) were reflected in management and governance of Axiom ME and MPI, who ensured accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making in conducting the evaluation.

In addition, enumerators in Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia received virtual training prior to field data collection, covering the background and purpose of the evaluation, data collection protocols including privacy and confidentiality, consent procedures, and key concepts on migration and climate change. Ethical considerations and informant safety measures were implemented during field data collection, including:

- Upholding the principle of "Do no Harm" and prioritized gender equity and social inclusion by actively involving culturally sensitive women and youth in the evaluation process.
- Making clear to informants that their participation in the exercise was entirely voluntary, and they were under no obligation to take part. It was emphasized that choosing not to participate would have no negative consequences for them.
- Obtaining informed consent from each informant, ensuring that they understood the purpose of the evaluation and their rights. Participants were also assured that their identities would remain anonymous, and their responses would be treated with confidentiality.

This evaluation may be subject to potential biases, such as selection bias, recall bias, and unobservable differences between the implementing countries, which could have affected the outcomes and conclusions of the study. To mitigate these limitations, the evaluation team implemented several strategies, such as adopting multiple data sources, employing standardized evaluation tools, and ensuring the involvement of diverse perspectives within the evaluation team to minimize biases.

The evaluation focused on immediate and intermediate outcomes, which limited the assessment of long-term impacts, potentially providing an incomplete understanding of the sustained and lasting changes resulting from the programme. Moreover, the measurement of intermediate outcomes can be subjective. This may potentially overlook some profound changes captured in, for example, impact evaluations, that utilize a wider range of indicators and data sources. However, as a mitigation effort the evaluators included storytelling as a method of data collection to provide a wider and more nuanced understanding of the programme in the community. Also, the evaluation began before programme activities had ended, and given the pilot nature of the programme, focused on its relevance and effectiveness with less focus on its impact and sustainability.

The sudden political changes in Sudan meant that this evaluation was unable to engage Sudanese government stakeholders in the data collection. Finally, some government focal points had limited knowledge about the programme, particularly in countries where the programme was not substantially engaged. This may have, to an extent, impacted the relevance of available data.

IV. Relevance

Issues of disasters, climate change, and human mobility are central within the IGAD region and are increasingly priorities of national and regional authorities. Given the challenges these issues pose for societies and economies in East Africa (see I.), all relevant stakeholders acknowledge the need for programming that addresses this nexus. This was the most pressing at local level, where local authorities and communities involved in the programme pilot projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia faced various climate-related challenges and asked for support.

At regional level, MDCC proved highly relevant to regional policies and guidelines, most directly to the IGAD Protocol on the Free Movement of Persons, and its Article 16 on disaster displacement. Pillar III (SOPs for cross-border disaster displacement) directly worked to operationalize Article 16, based on a request from IGAD. These SOPs aim to help Member States prepare for and better manage admission and stay in the context of cross-border disaster displacement, in line with the IGAD Protocol.

At the national level, there was strong demand for support on topics related to migration, disasters, and climate change among national governments. MDCC aimed to enhance policy coherence on migration, disasters and climate change nexus by providing evidence through policy reviews, capacity enhancement and policy development with local communities.

At the local level, the programme was well-received in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. Community members, and local authorities found it relevant because it addressed climate change impacts and encouraged communities to plan for climate-related risks.⁶

In Turkana, Kenya, climate change was a challenge as pastoralist communities move due to water and pasture shortages, often leading to social tensions and leaving women and children vulnerable. The programme was particularly relevant in this context as it addressed these challenges through the promotion of agricultural skills, livelihood diversification, and environment conservation,⁷ as well as enhancing local capacities and knowledge on climate adaptation through trainings on the green economy, agroforestry, and climate-smart agriculture.

In Amhara, Ethiopia, the programme was relevant due to environmental challenges caused by moisture stress, drought, and economic issues such as low productivity and high unemployment rates. These challenges drove irregular youth migration. Awareness campaigns and livelihood interventions addressed protection risks and helped to diversify livelihoods.⁸

In Mogadishu, Somalia, communities with displaced populations faced floods, droughts, pollution from plastic waste, and livelihood losses. The program responded with training in renewable energy and waste management, creating employment and environmental benefits. It empowered internally displaced persons (IDPs) with sustainable energy access, economic prospects, and climate resilience, benefiting both the IDPs and Mogadishu's long-term development.⁹

⁶ KII, implementing partner, LOKADO; KII, programme official, Somalia; KII, local authority, Ethiopia.

⁷ KII, programme official, Kenya.

⁸ KII, implementing partner, BPDO.

⁹ KII, implementing partner, HACDA.

A. Intervention logic

Do programme activities support the achievement of the intended outputs? Was the programme aligned so that outcomes have a realistic link to achieving its overall objective? Is the theory of change logically constructed, based on a strong evidence base?

While most outputs within the MDCC programme's logical framework were connected to the outcomes and objectives, that was not systematically the case for outcomes 2 and 4. On the one hand, activities with ICPAC developing disaster displacement risk profiles and agent-based models clearly aimed to enhance access to data and evidence (outcome 1). Developing and testing standard operating procedures (SOPs) directly aimed to contribute to preparedness and readiness to respond to cross-border disaster displacement (outcome 3). And the livelihoods, value chain, and business development interventions across the three pilot projects were expected to support sustainable livelihood and green economy opportunities (outcome 5).

On the other hand, outcome 2 was less directly supported by programme activities, although MDCC interventions still contributed towards the outcome ('national governments include human mobility across relevant policy areas'). The activities aimed to develop recommendations for policy development and enhance national government capacities, and achieved significant results in Kenya (see below), including additional policy and action plan development at the county and sub-county level not counted towards the outcome 2 targets (since the targets were national level). But the intervention was unlikely to be achieved in Somalia, which for instance lacked a GCM coordination structures or implementation plan, making it difficult to achieve the MDCC's target of revising Somalia's GCM implementation plan to include disaster displacement and human mobility. This may have called for a revision of the results matrix as activities progressed in Somalia.

Similarly, achieving outcome 4 was further outside MDCC's scope of influence ('migrants have enhanced pathways for regular migration and access to protection services'), although the programme's activities were well-designed. While outcomes are not expected to directly result from programme interventions alone, there is a clearer logic to how the programme's design more strongly influences the achievement of outcomes 1, 3, and 5. Activities under outcome 4 included UNHCR's study on protection instruments in the region and ILO's information campaign to raise awareness on regular pathways and the risks of irregular migration. This outcome was difficult to achieve given that access to pathways depends on their very existence (which, in turn, depends on national governments). MDCC focused its actions on more indirect leverages, with activities to ensure information about pathways is available to interested stakeholders, and to increase awareness among some communities.

The programme aimed to contribute to facilitating regular pathways and minimizing displacement risk. Activities across multiple pillars, especially the pilot projects, were designed to minimize 'displacement risk in the context of climate change, environmental degradation, and disasters.' For instance, UNHCR and ILO's activities under outcome 4, IGAD and the PDD's efforts to operationalize the IGAD Free Movement Protocol by developing SOPs for cross-border disaster displacement, and efforts to improve

migrants' access to livelihoods and labour markets, all align with the objective of 'facilitating pathways for regular migration in the IGAD region'.

B. Stakeholder engagement

Which stakeholders were engaged during the programme's inception, and which were not included? How were stakeholders consulted, and were the methods to consult these stakeholders adapted to their profile?

The programme engaged IGAD and ICPAC from the programme's conceptualization phase. The initial idea for MDCC came from conversations between programme officials and IGAD, at the endorsement of the Free Movement Protocol in February 2020. Similarly, ICPAC reported they were consulted from the beginning of the programme, in what they called a "very democratic space" to identify key gaps.¹⁰ These initial consultations were informal discussions among IGAD Secretariat, ICPAC, and the PUNOs at HQ level, which were facilitated by the pre-existing relationships among these actors and came together quickly to develop a concept note for the M-MPTF.

However, Member States were not directly involved right at the beginning of MDCC design (that is before MDCC was funded and activities were planned specifically in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia).¹¹ The MDCC concept note for the M-MPTF was developed quickly, so the priority was establishing partners among PUNOs and IGAD (which was deemed to be the appropriate conduit to the Member States), with the aim to flesh out this engagement with Member States once the programme was funded. Although a programme official shared they would have liked to pull in the Member States at an earlier stage, others noted that since the Member States did not receive direct funding,¹² there were few reasonable options to engage them in the initial conceptualization phase. While it would have been difficult to substantially engage all Member States before MDCC was funded, there is no evidence that these efforts were prioritized.

Even once the programme was funded, Member States could have been more systematically engaged, given the strong demand for programming on this topic. Only the governments of Somalia, Kenya, and Ethiopia, where local interventions took place, submitted official letters of support for the programme (with the letter from Ethiopia only covering specific local intervention, rather than the entire programme). This was due to the programme design, which was regional and aimed to pilot activities, so it focused most deeply on a few countries and engaged the rest of the Member States through regional workshops and visibility events. This helped in some contexts (e.g., in Kenya), but came with the trade-off that other governments (e.g., Djibouti or South Sudan) reported low levels of awareness about broader MDCC activities.

¹⁰ KII, programme stakeholder, ICPAC.

¹¹ KII, programme official, regional. KIIs, government, national.

¹² KII, programme official, regional.

Similarly, local authorities and migrant communities, while engaged before the specific local interventions took place, were not engaged during the overall programme conceptualization phase. MDCC officials noted their regional approach, thus, PUNOs engaged regional institutions first, while remaining aware of the situation at the community levels through their country specific work.¹³

To what extent did these inputs shape the programme design? Which inputs were not reflected in the programme design? Were these stakeholders regularly consulted during programme implementation and in case of any changes?

Regionally, the priorities of IGAD and ICPAC were central in shaping programme design across pillars. For instance, Pillar I supports ICPAC's data services and capacities, pillar II builds on IGAD's policy research, and pillars III and IV support the IGAD Protocol on Free Movement of Persons and labour mobility priorities. IGAD/ICPAC were also co-chairs of the programme steering committee (with IOM and ILO as the other co-chairs and the secretaries). IGAD served as an important conduit to the Member States, organizing the regional dialogue which introduced the programme and helped to identify countries in which to pilot activities. However, given the constraints of the M-MPTF (which funds UN organizations rather than governments), IGAD and ICPAC received funding once channelled through the UN organizations, rather than directly. IGAD's desire for direct funding and additional funding to expand staff capacity in the IGAD Secretariat for this project was not fulfilled given fiscal constraints (although ICPAC did recruit a mobility analyst and staff funded through other programmes at the IGAD secretariat were strongly engaged in this programme).

Nationally, Member States shaped the programme's activities when directly relevant to the country. For instance, the three countries chosen to pilot the SOPs under Pillar III were decided in a regional workshop for Member States, selecting three countries with national coordination mechanisms in varying stages of development. While not included directly in the MDCC's management and overall steering, all Member States were included at multiple points through implementation during regional exchanges and trainings, as well as in shaping the three local pilot projects under Pillar IV.

Locally, the design of the pilot projects was informed by policy analyses (in Kenya and Somalia) and a market systems analysis (in Ethiopia), all in close collaboration with local authorities, local communities, and local NGOs, among others. In Kenya, stakeholders included the County Government of Turkana, host community, and refugees.¹⁴ In Somalia, District officials were engaged in the establishment of the Community Selection Committee which involved community leaders, Women Associations, and Youth groups who identified project participants including IDPs and host community members. This process was facilitated by HACDA, a local NGO.¹⁵ In Ethiopia, the programme collaborated closely with the Amhara Regional government (Bureau of Finance and Economy) and signed agreements with the Regional Bureau of Labor and Skills outlining roles, responsibilities, and modes of engagement. This included strong engagement at the district level. Furthermore, the community in Kalu Woreda actively participated in

¹³ KII, programme official, regional.

¹⁴ IOM, MDCC concept note, Turkana. CCAPs- Turkana.

¹⁵ KII, programme official, Kenya; KII, programme official, Somalia.

project implementation through activities like community conversations, awareness creation, and livelihood training.¹⁶

“The selection criteria of project beneficiaries were set and validated with stakeholders and approved by ILO. Beneficiary kebeles were selected with the criteria of trends of migration, climate change vulnerability index, green job modality enabling condition, distance to microfinance, and access to polytechnics, and based on these criteria out of 36 kebeles 10 were selected.” - KII, implementing partner, BPDO

C. Relevance to IGAD and Member States

To which policies and priorities of the IGAD and its Member States, including those related to environmental human mobility does this programme contribute? How were the programme elements designed to specifically contribute to these priorities? What other policies could have been considered?

A key MDCC-related policy for IGAD was IGAD’s Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, which triggered the very first conversations about developing a multi-agency programme on disaster and climate mobility in the region. Pillar III was designed to clearly support the operationalization of Article 16 of this Protocol, on cross-border disaster displacement. Similarly, the topic of climate and migration was an IGAD priority, particularly as it relates to freedom of movement and transhumance.¹⁷ However, climate change and its intersections with labour migration was less of a priority within IGAD’s migration agenda: labour migration is a priority addressed through many other programmes, but its links with climate change were less pressing than the Protocol on Free Movement.¹⁸

“We have the RCP [Regional Consultative Process] where every year we compile to talk about one specific issue on migration. In 2018 we had it on climate and got clear recommendations from Member States and were able to say that this is also coming from the request of the Member States. Not just because someone in a specific position was thinking about it but because the Member States wanted it.” – KII, programme stakeholder

Also at the regional level, the programme supported ICPAC’s work and priorities, adding on ICPAC’s existing comparative advantage in data, early warning, and predictive modelling on climate and weather events in the region.

The programme was designed to contribute to regional priorities first, and although it supports national priorities, it was not designed based on specific national policies. In part, this is because policies in the region do not always integrate climate change, disasters, and human mobility. One exception is the design of pilot projects in Kenya and Somalia, which were based on a review of climate change, disasters and green economy policies in each country and were designed to pilot recommendations from this review. Government stakeholders in Ethiopia specifically noted links with the Ministry of Labor and Skills’ green

¹⁶ KII, implementing partner, BPDO.

¹⁷ For instance, these issues were highlighted in the IGAD Migration Action Plan to operationalize the IGAD Regional Migration Policy, Under Strategic Priority 10.

¹⁸ KII, programme official, regional.

legacy initiative and priorities around youth employment; and Kenya noted that the programme aligned well with the national coordination mechanism's priorities on climate and migration.

V. Coherence

MDCC can point to specific and significant contributions to regional and global frameworks, as well as partnerships and synergies with other programmes in the region. These synergies have been impactful—they led, for instance, to coordinated interventions around data and research and avoided duplication. While there could have been more done to enhance coherence with other programming, there was a clear commitment to coordinate with key partner programmes and to align closely with regional priorities and frameworks.

A. Global frameworks

Which frameworks were considered in the programme's inception, and which were not? Which activities specifically contribute to these frameworks? Are there any activities which conflict with or hinder progress towards any international framework?

While the programme has primarily aimed to contribute to the implementation of the GCM (addressed in IX. below), it also aligned with a range of other global frameworks.

The two other main global frameworks connected to MDCC were the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement, as well as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.¹⁹ For instance, MDCC held a side event at Africa Climate Week 2021 and 2022, as well as Conference of Parties (COP) 27 and frequently cites UNFCCC processes and agreements in its visibility, research, and other materials, including an IOM report on green economy policies developed in partnership with the UNFCCC supported Regional Collaboration Centre in Kampala. The programme is also supporting and coordinating with the Task Force on Displacement under the auspices of the UNFCCC. Similarly, MDCC officials noted that activities under Pillar I contribute to the Sendai Framework's second target (substantially reduce the number of people affected globally) through its work on disaster displacement.

MDCC also addressed objectives under the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR). Thus, MDCC uses the concept of 'human mobility' rather than migration, to encompass the spectrum of mobility in the context of disasters and climate change and all related protection issues. In particular, UNHCR's study on protection and displacement in East Africa addresses GCR issues directly, although it represents only a small component of MDCC. This study also refers to the Organization of African Unity Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, although this is also a minor element.

¹⁹ These are the global frameworks highlighted most centrally in the programme document.

Finally, MDCC contributed to the Sustainable Development Goals (targets 8.8 on labour rights, 10.7 on migration policies, and 13.1 on climate resilience), as well as ILO's just transition guidelines²⁰, through its activities on policy development, awareness raising, and labour market interventions. SDG targets 13.1 and 8.8 are listed in the programme document, and MDCC officials noted the alignment to the SDGs and ILO guidelines, and although they were less central frameworks for programme design, MDCC organized a side event in the Africa Regional Forum on Sustainable Development 2022. There are no reported activities implemented in conflict with any of these global frameworks.

B. Internal and external coherence

What other interventions are being carried out by programme agencies and partners? How were other interventions mapped, and which synergies were explicitly sought during the programme implementation? What specific synergies do programme officials see as particularly promising, is this view shared by the partners carrying out the other interventions? What potential is there for scale-up?

Ensuring MDCC activities were complementary with other programmes in the region was a priority from the conceptualization phase. MDCC staff conducted an informal mapping of other actors working on similar topics to identify potential synergies and concerted efforts were deployed to ensure coordination with these other initiatives.

Across Pillar I, the main relevant programme was [‘Human Mobility in the Context of Climate Change’](#) (HMCCC), which was implemented by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. Stakeholders from GIZ, the PDD, and ICPAC all felt their cooperation had proved very effective. Importantly, the programmes consulted with each other before launching activities. HMCCC started earlier and worked with ICPAC to model drought-induced displacement. To complement, MDCC then selected floods and cyclones as the target hazards for its risk profiles. Both programmes included a capacity building component (and, for example, held joint regional dialogues and presentations when appropriate) and coordinated to support ICPAC's data services such as the East Africa Hazards Watch. This also allowed for the best use of resources given the two programmes could not have alone answered all of ICPAC's needs. Efforts are underway to integrate the two datasets into IGAD's systems, but they are based on different methodologies, which posed some challenges in terms of consolidation. This was due, however, to the fact that different methods are best suited to each hazard, and this issue should easily be resolved.

MDCC collaborated with other partners, such as the UNFCCC's Regional Collaboration Centre in Kampala, which supported IOM's regional study on integrating human mobility into green economy policies. Such collaboration brought together the Centre's knowledge of UNFCCC-related policies such as National Adaptation Plans, with IOM's knowledge on mobility. This was, however, a targeted, small-scale intervention, so there is potential to explore further collaboration.

²⁰ ILO, [Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all](#) (2015)

MDCC also encouraged synergies with a range of other programmes managed by PUNOs and IGAD:

- [‘Building Regional and National Capacities for Improved Migration Governance in the IGAD Region’](#): This Swiss-funded programme supports strengthened cooperation and coordination on migration management at the national and regional level in IGAD. One of the three outcome areas of this programme focused on increased preparedness in preventing and responding to disaster and climate related displacement. As part of this programme, a staff member was seconded to the IGAD Secretariat as disaster displacement adviser and became the key focal point for MDCC. This was critical as without this focal person (whose position was not directly funded by MDCC), collaboration could have been difficult. The Swiss programme also supported the establishment of national coordination mechanisms on migration in IGAD Member States, which were key focal points at the national level for MDCC. Funds from the Swiss programme were used multiple times to complement MDCC activities, for instance to co-organize a multi-day capacity enhancement workshop and to develop SOPs on disaster displacement.
- [‘Better Migration Management’](#) (BMM): BMM is funded by the EUTF and Germany, and supports national authorities and institutions to improve migration management and address human trafficking in the region. While MDCC does not focus on trafficking, there are complementarities. BMM conducted a mapping of migration policies assessing references to climate change, while MDCC conducted a mapping of climate change and disaster related policies referencing human mobility, therefore ensuring both policy fields are fully mapped. This technical level cooperation involved giving inputs into each other’s studies, and there is evidence of effective integration of climate into the BMM report and of migration into the MDCC’s, reflecting strong coherence. Similarly, MDCC’s sensitization workshop in Naivasha, Kenya for its cross-border displacement SOPs (under Pillar III) was conducted by IOM in collaboration with and as support for the preparation for the next phase of BMM.
- [‘Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD Region’](#) (FMPT): This ILO²¹ project, financed by the EU Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF), aims to facilitate the implementation of the IGAD Protocol on Free Movement and improve regular migration pathways, supporting labour mobility in the IGAD region. FMPT focuses on knowledge and evidence generation; strengthening the capacity of key labour market actors; promoting a right-based approach to labour migration governance; enhancing tripartism and social dialogue; and skilling and employment. There are clear synergies between the two initiatives as MDCC pilot initiatives in Somalia and Ethiopia also relate to labour migration and governance; MDCC labour market assessments and green economy policies and its activities under Pillar III to support Article 16 of the IGAD Protocol are complementary to FMPT’s work to support its adoption and ratification. These two programmes were careful to avoid duplication of activities and coordinated well (FMPT staff were closely

²¹ ILO noted other relevant programmes in the region, such as their FAIRWAY programme on migration corridors from East Africa to the Arab States, or the Better Regional Migration Management (BRMM) Project. However, these complementarities have not led to concrete changes in the design or the implementation of the MDCC programme, simply because of different focuses of the programmes (e.g., the FAIRWAY programme works on inter-regional migration).

involved in overseeing MDCC activities). Importantly, the policy brief on climate change, labour markets and migration in the IGAD region²² conducted under the FMPT project was a key reference document to shape interventions under outcome 5.

PUNOs also built on other internal expertise and experience. For instance, UNHCR's study on protection and climate displacement draws on and cites multiple previous studies by UNHCR, PDD, and IOM. Similarly, the PDD's noted that their extensive experience developing SOPs for cross-border disaster displacement in the Americas was critical for effective implementation in IGAD.

As a pilot initiative and the first working on this specific nexus at the regional level, MDCCs' strongest complementarities are with regional programming related to migration. This led to concrete examples of good practices, and similar efforts could have proved successful in collaborating with other types of programming. While there were no reported duplications, this does mean that other types of programming, particularly climate-focused programming, such as the [IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative](#) (IDDRISI) or the work of [IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development](#),²³ and national-level initiatives. For instance, these programmes were not highlighted as synergies in MDCC programme proposals, documents, and reports. This is not necessarily a problem, but it may offer an opportunity for future programming to focus more specifically on mapping other types of programming implemented by actors other than MDCC's PUNOs, to look for potential similar complementarities.

VI. Effectiveness

The evaluation assessed effectiveness of the MDCC programme by examining its achievement against the targets of its logical framework, considering external and internal factors that influenced outcomes, and gauging stakeholder reach and satisfaction. Most of the outcome and output targets were met. Despite some challenges, such as elections in Kenya and Somalia, conflict in Amhara, Ethiopia, ongoing drought in the IGAD region, and the recruitment of qualified consultants for research studies, these issues had minimal impact on project effectiveness. Overall, a majority of the intended stakeholders were reached and expressed satisfaction with the results, while also offering feedback for improvement.

A. Activity Implementation

Were all targets reached according to the log frame? Was the log frame target for stakeholders reached?

²² ILO, [Policy brief: the interaction between climate change, labour markets and migration in the IGAD region](#) (2022)

²³ As such, FMPT, which has no direct focus on climate lists GIZ's support to IDDRISI in its summary of relevant programming from other actors in the region. The European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Stability and Addressing the Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa, [Towards Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD region](#) (action fiche).

MDCC was able to reach, and sometimes exceed, the number of stakeholders targeted for its activities, and largely implemented the activities as designed. This section outlines the programme's progress towards achieving outcome and output-level indicators for each pillar, utilizing the programme monitoring data:

- Pillar I: one outcome indicator was not fully reached (MDCC did not develop early warning scenarios as planned, but it did expand the scale of future scenarios), and the other lacked data to be assessed. Six out of seven output indicators were reached (the number of training sessions was not reached, but the scope of each training session was larger than initially planned).
- Pillar II: both outcome indicators were not reached, but all three output indicators were reached. The programme did not reach its outcome targets for enhancing national policies and GCM implementation plans in Somalia while it did so in Kenya. In addition, MDCC supported policy making at the local county level in Kenya (which is not captured in these indicators).
- Pillar III: both outcome indicators were reached, and all but one output indicators were reached. The programme developed fewer SOPs than targeted, but was able to test them and get the input from the Member States on a final draft document to secure their endorsement and validation.
- Pillar IV, outcome IV: both outcome indicators lack data (and could not be assessed), and all four output indicators were reached.
- Pillar IV, outcome V: one out of two outcome indicators were reached, and seven out of eight output indicators were reached. Communities generally expressed satisfaction with consultations and activities, but the targeted number for a sensitization training was not reached.

PILLAR I: DATA AND KNOWLEDGE

Table 1: Pillar I results framework²⁴

Results Reporting Framework					
Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Cumulative Results Y1-Y3	Remarks
Outcome 1 National Governments in the IGAD region have enhanced access to quality data and evidence on disaster displacement risk and on other forms of human mobility	Outcome Indicator 1a Satisfaction on the scenarios (future and early warnings) availed by the project on drivers and risks of human mobility and displacement in the context of climate variability and change, disaggregated by gender, age, agency	No	Key stakeholders demonstrate satisfaction on the scenarios availed by the project on drivers and risks of human mobility and displacement in the context of climate variability and change	N/A	Monitoring data to be collected. Available data from the evaluation report indicates that ICPAC stakeholders are satisfied, but more data collection with national stakeholders would be needed to assess this indicator in full.
	Outcome Indicator 1b # of a) future scenarios b) early warning scenarios including information about expected displacement produced by ICPAC and distributed to National Governments in the IGAD region	a) 0 b) 0	a) 4 (1 on 1 st year and 3 on the second) b) 4 (1 on 1 st year and 3 on the second)	a) 8 future scenarios (1 cyclone displacement risk profile scenario for Somalia and 7 national flood displacement risk scenarios developed in the regional flood profile)	Number of future scenarios surpassed, but these have not been operationalized into early warning scenarios.
Output 1.1 Methodologies and models to assess disaster displacement risk are available for IGAD, ICPAC, Member State Governments and other relevant stakeholders	Output Indicator 1.1a Disaster displacement risk model for different types of hazards available (to be utilized in early warning systems/operational/policy decision-making), disaggregated by hazard (slow onset/rapid onset)	No	Yes	Yes	Disaster displacement risk models developed for cyclones (Somalia) and floods (region). Flood Displacement risk profile and cyclone displacement risk has been published into ICPAC Geoportal and is available and accessible to Member States.

²⁴ Cumulative results achieved retrieved from Migration MPTF Annual Progress report, 31 March 2023.

					Data transfer to ICPAC has been finalized.
Output 1.2 A decision-making model and relevant data collected in the IGAD Region are available and interoperable	Output Indicator 1.2a Decision-support tool available for ICPAC	No	Yes	Yes	Decision-making tool developed and shared with ICPAC during the capacity development mission on 13–15 March 2023. Data transfer to ICPAC has been finalized.
	Output Indicator 1.2b # of policies, investments and responses incorporated in the model	0	5	5	Decision-making tool developed and shared with ICPAC during the capacity development mission on 13–15 March 2023. Comparative report looking at 5 different policies and investments, including different combinations thereof, produced.
	Output Indicator 1.2c Presentations demonstrating the impact of different policies, investments and responses to targeted audiences (in policy forums)	0	Yes (5 policy discussions)	8	GHACOF 60, 61, 62 2 Capacity-building workshops first in October 2022 and the second in March 2023 GIZ-IDMC workshop Regional MDCC workshop in March 2023.
Output 1.3 IGAD and ICPAC have enhanced capacities on the links between migration, displacement, climate change, disasters and environmental degradation	Output indicator 1.3a A plan of action for including human mobility within ICPAC and stakeholder coordination structures during and beyond the project is drafted by ICPAC ‘Mobility expert’ staff member supported by the project	No	Yes	Yes	Action plan and workplan created and shared by ICPAC Mobility Analyst.
	Output indicator 1.3b # of training sessions for ICPAC on human mobility data, the humanitarian architecture and the processes involved in the use of data in emergency response and preparedness	0	4	3	1 Regional workshop with IGAD and ICPAC in August 2022; 2 workshops with CIMA in October 2022 and March 2023. Several meetings (one physical in January 2023, and online ones) with ICPAC on how to

					incorporate IOM DTM data to ICPAC portals/products.
	Output indicator 1.3c % of trained ICPAC staff report improved knowledge on human mobility data in the humanitarian context, disaggregated by gender, age	0%	75%	100%	All respondents reported improved knowledge on human mobility data, after the workshop in August 2022

Key:

	Achievement cannot be determined
	Incomplete achievement
	Fully achieved

Pillar I focused on enhancing displacement and disaster data and capacities at ICPAC, the core tool for IGAD Member States and other stakeholders to anticipate and respond to climate and disaster events. This Pillar involved developing two disaster displacement risk profiles (cyclones in Somalia and floods at the regional level, including a country breakdown); drafting one decision-making model simulating displacement behaviours in the context of flood displacement across five different policy areas; and capacity enhancement for IGAD and ICPAC on climate change, disasters, and human mobility. To support this, MDCC recruited a mobility analyst embedded within ICPAC, and who developed an Action Plan on human mobility to support implementation of MDCC activities under Pillar I. Where data is available, MDCC achieved almost all its targets under this Pillar, except for the number of early warning scenarios and the coaching programme for ICPAC.

Under outputs 1.1 and 1.2, MDCC developed two disaster displacement risk profiles and one decision-making model, through its technical partners CIMA Foundation. These profiles were presented at six workshops and are in the process of being integrated into ICPAC's existing databases. These risk profiles generate future disaster displacement scenarios at the national and regional level, but this does not include the early warning scenarios targeted under outcome 1.b, which are typically more immediate and operational in nature. This reflects the complexity of developing these profiles and scenarios, as there was not the time or resources to develop operationalized early warning scenarios on top of the risk profiles. Also, it is worth noting that the risk profiles have not been fully socialized across governments, and at least three national government respondents were not aware these profiles had been developed. Moreover, while not directly in the results framework, MDCC planned to fully integrate these risk profiles and data across ICPAC's databases. While much progress has been made to include displacement sections in ICPAC's data portals, this is still ongoing (e.g., to integrate displacement into ICPAC's East Africa Hazard Watch) both because this had to wait until the MDCC's data and models were finalized and because the MDCC budget does not cover the staffing needed to find a web developer for this work, requiring ICPAC to pull in other budget sources.

Finally, MDCC did not meet its indicator 1.3b of four capacity strengthening training sessions as part of a coaching program for ICPAC, although this reflects a revision in the design of MDCC activities based on a needs assessment which found that IGAD Member States also needed to be involved in this capacity enhancement. Thus, the programme held one three-day regional workshop (which included both ICPAC and IGAD Member States) and two more targeted workshops run by CIMA Research Foundation for ICPAC. The regional workshop involved IGAD, ICPAC, and Member States, and drew on MDCC and resources from the Swiss-funded programme, "Building Regional and National Capacities for Improved Migration Governance in the IGAD Region," and it covered climate, disasters, human mobility, and data. The two other workshops were tailored more specifically to ICPAC technical specialists and covered modelling disaster displacement risk, probabilistic risk, and the agent-based model (for the decision-making model) developed under MDCC.

The participants consistently reported high satisfaction with the training sessions, and ICPAC staff were strongly engaged in MDCC and enthusiastic about continuing to build on the data and skills developed under this programme. Although the number of training sessions did not meet the target, the regional workshop involved many participants beyond ICPAC. MDCC has also held two separate consultations

between ICPAC and the IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) team to explore how DTM data could be included into ICPAC products. However, these activities were not a full DTM coaching program for ICPAC, as initially designed, and the broader scope of these capacity enhancement activities came with the trade-off that the targeted support for ICPAC was reduced. ICPAC's ability to continue to work on displacement thus relies heavily on the Mobility Analyst, rather than a wide range of ICPAC staff fully capacitated on this issue. This is not a significant challenge now, since the Mobility Analyst will continue working at ICPAC and there is strong buy-in among ICPAC leadership, but this is a missed opportunity to fully tailor capacity strengthening to ICPAC alone.

PILLAR II: NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Table 2: Pillar II results framework²⁵

Results Framework					
Results	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Cumulative Results Y1-Y3	Remarks
Outcome 2 National Governments in the IGAD region have included human mobility considerations in the context of disasters, climate change and environmental degradation across relevant policy areas	Outcome Indicator 2a # of national policies (legislation, policy, strategy) amended or developed to become migrant-inclusive and/or address disaster displacement	0	1 in Kenya and 1 in Somalia	1	Kenya: 1 National policy being revised in 2023; 2 sub-county Climate Change Adaptation Action plans; 1 County development plan. Note the Kenya policy is still being developed.
	Outcome Indicator 2b # of Governments who demonstrate plans to include disaster displacement and human mobility considerations in GCM National Implementation plans	0	1 in Kenya and 1 in Somalia	1	Revision of Kenya GCM implementation Action plan for 2023-2026 includes consideration of disaster displacement and climate change. No GCM Implementation plan in Somalia.
Output 2.1 National Governments and IGAD have evidence & enhanced capacities to include human mobility considerations, including the specific vulnerabilities of women and children, in national and regional policies, strategies and action plans that pertain to migration, climate change and disaster	Output Indicator 2.1a # of stakeholders trained on human mobility, in the context of disasters, climate change and environmental degradation, disaggregated by gender, age, type of stakeholder and country	0	10 (5 male, 5 female) government officers	111 (31 females and 80 males)	111 (31 females and 80 males) – - training in June 2022 in Nairobi (2 pax males), - training in August 2022 in Turkana. (64 pax 21 females and 43 males) - training in August 2022 in Mombasa (IOM-ICPAC) (24 pax 4 females and 20 males) + new trainings in August 2023 for 10 (NCM) and 10 (Turkana + Baringo and West Pokot Counties) pax
	Output Indicator 2.1b	0	2	2	1 in Kenya and 1 in Somalia

²⁵ Cumulative results achieved retrieved from Migration MPTF Annual Progress report, 31 March 2023

	Policy/strategy assessment with recommendations validated by CSO/migrants available				
	Output Indicator 2.1c # of forums where validation exercise evidence is discussed, disaggregated by type of a forum	0	2	4	After Action review with the local communities in Kenya and Somalia; and policy workshop with local and national level authorities (2023).

Key:

	Incomplete achievement
	Fully achieved

This second Pillar aimed to enhance the inclusivity of policymaking frameworks by assessing the comprehensiveness of existing policy responses in relation to human mobility, environment, and climate change; conducting inclusive validation exercises; and enhancing policymakers' capacities to understand and respond to relevant policy issues. MDCC achieved its output targets and even overachieved for indicators 2.1a and 2.1c but did not reach all of its outcome targets as achievements have only been recorded for Kenya.

At the regional level, MDCC organized a workshop "Human Mobility and Regular Migration Pathways in Changing Climate – Regional Workshop"²⁶ in March 2023 as a forum to enhance dialogue and partnerships amongst regional stakeholders, including IGAD Member States and implementing organizations., and other relevant stakeholders A representative from South Sudan noted that the workshop in Nairobi was insightful and enhanced his knowledge on green jobs and the importance of labour in regularizing migration.²⁷

At the national level, the programme did not meet its targets in Somalia. Part of this is due to the policy and institutional context in Somalia, which lacks the structures to create a GCM implementation plan (targeted under Outcome 2.b). While the MDCC's policy review in Somalia found that key environment and climate change policies include mobility, it also found that references were inadequate and mostly to displacement triggered by climate emergencies, so it recommended further efforts towards policy coherence. Unlike on Kenya (see below), authorities did not request local-level policy support or a similar targeted capacity enhancement. However, other challenges also made this policy development in Somalia difficult. Somalia's elections triggered a change in key personnel in MDCC's partner, the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change (DOECC) under the Office of the Prime Minister. MDCC successfully engaged the new personnel to ensure their buy-in, but this still caused delays and challenges to strengthen capacities and shaping policy development. So, while the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change reported their initial discussions on developing a law related to climate change, disasters, and migration, this was not directly linked to MDCC activities.²⁸ The government is clearly willing to use their knowledge acquired under MDCC to start developing these activities, but given the normal delays in policy development as governments change, this has not yet occurred.

In Kenya, MDCC supported not only the enhancement of the national Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan and the GCM Implementation Plan, but also the development of local policies (which are not measured in the outcome-level indicators). Thus, both the national level NCM and the local authorities were engaged under this pillar²⁹ to validate policy recommendations and actually turn these recommendations into revised or new policies. This is evidenced in multiple trainings and workshops for the NCM, county government, and ward officials throughout the programme. One workshop was also conducted for Trainers of Trainers (TOTs) where Turkana County officials were trained on how to develop concept notes and proposals with the objective to cascade the knowledge to Ward climate

²⁶ Concept note, MDCC regional workshop on Human mobility in a changing climate in the IGAD region.

²⁷ KII, government, South Sudan.

²⁸ KII, government, Somalia.

²⁹ Annual Report - Migration MPTF, 31 March 2023.

change committees.³⁰ The training was for 3 days, and 64 county officials (21 women and 43 men) were trained.³¹ As a result of the ToT training, a county ward official stated that:

“We have competent climate change committees. They understand their roles and are active now. They helped develop the climate change action plan and can now link livestock, water, and climate change. In effect, they [climate change committees] developed adaptation and resilience actions which were included in the county action plans. These are the same people who are going to form the county climate change forum.” – KII, local authority, Kenya.

This local approach is also sustainable given that the climate change committees are embedded within the Turkana County environment policy under the Turkana County Climate Change Act 2021.³²

There is clear demand for further policy support, reflected both in the success in Kenya and the ongoing interest (if not actual policy change in Somalia), as well as KIIs with other Member States officials who uniformly expressed an understanding of the need to develop such policies and plans on migration, displacement, climate change, and disaster risk reduction. For instance, one stakeholder in Uganda shared their hopes that their revised GCM Implementation Plan will effectively mainstream climate.³³ MDCC was able to support significant policy development in Kenya at the local and national level, and future programming could explore similar opportunities in other Member States.

³⁰ KII, local authority, Kenya.

³¹ Annual Report - Migration MPTF, 31 March 2023.

³² KII, local authority, Kenya.

³³ KII, government, Uganda.

PILLAR III: DISASTER DISPLACEMENT PREPAREDNESS

Table 3: Pillar III results framework³⁴

Results Reporting Framework					
Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Cumulative Results Y1-Y3	Notes
Outcome 3 National Governments in the IGAD region and IGAD have enhanced their preparedness and operational readiness to respond to cross border disaster displacement	Outcome Indicator 3a Perceptions from Key Stakeholders on improved coordination for better preparedness and responses regarding disaster displacement, disaggregated by gender, age, agency	No	Perceptions from Key Stakeholders validate improved coordination for better preparedness and responses regarding disaster displacement	Yes	86% of participants reporting improved coordination following the simulation exercises in Moyale (3-5 May) and Mbale (9-11 May).
	Outcome Indicator 3b Key stakeholders report ability to utilize the newly established SOPs in a disaster context at the end of the project, disaggregated by gender, age, agency	n/a	Most of the key informants report ability to use SOPs	Yes	96.25 % (Women: Yes: 100%; Men: Yes: 92.5%) of participants reporting ability to utilise the SOPs following the simulation exercises in Moyale (3-5 May) and Mbale (9-11 May).
Output 3.1 National Governments and Local Authorities in the IGAD region have skills, tools and capacity to prepare for cross-border disaster displacement	Output Indicator 3.1a # of people consulted and trained on the SOP drafting, disaggregated by gender, age, agency/Institution	0	At least 3 participants from each IGAD member country participated in workshops	94 (16 females and 78 males)	Based on participants of the sensitization workshop in Naivasha, Kenya on 16-18 January 2023 and workshops in Ethiopia and Uganda in March 2023.
	Output Indicator 3.1b # of countries consulted	0	7 IGAD Countries Consulted	7	Regional workshop in Mombasa in August 2022. In addition, Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia engaged through

³⁴ Cumulative results achieved retrieved from Migration MPTF Annual Progress report, 31 March 2023.

					sensitisation workshops in 2023.
	Output Indicator 3.1c Draft SOP developed as basis for the simulation exercise (s)	No	Yes	Yes	For Kenya-Uganda and Kenya-Ethiopia.
	Output Indicator 3.1d # of SOPs (Country-specific and Regional), inclusive of gender and protection concerns, available and disseminated for National Governments in the IGAD region	0	At least 3	2	Only two developed (Kenya-Uganda and Kenya-Ethiopia).
Output 3.2 Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) on admission and stay have been put to practice and tested in simulation exercises	Output Indicator 3.2a # of people participated in simulation exercise, disaggregated by gender, age, agency, type	0	At least 30 participants from two countries	103 (24 females and 79 males)	Based on participants of the simulation exercises in Moyale (3-5 May) and Mbale (9-11 May).
	Output Indicator 3.2b # of agencies/institutions from each country participated in simulation exercise	0	At least 7 agencies/entities from each country	65 participants	Based on participants of the simulation exercises in Moyale (3-5 May) and Mbale (9-11 May).
	Output Indicator 3.2c Policy recommendations on gap areas and areas for improvement to prepare for cross-border disaster- displacement	No	Yes	Yes	The activity reports of the preparedness workshops and simulation exercises highlight 14+ gap areas and recommendations for further work in the region. Further data for this output indicator may be collected following a planned technical workshop with selected government focal points at the beginning of August.

Key:

	Incomplete achievement
	Fully achieved

Under Pillar III, MDCC developed two SOPs on admissions and stay for cross-border disaster displacement, conducted three preparedness workshops with national governments, and ran two binational simulation exercises to test these SOPs. The funding under this Pillar was channelled from the PDD to IGAD under a grant support agreement. The programme achieved most targets under this outcome, although it only developed two SOPs (rather than the target of two cross-border SOPs and one regional SOP). The aim for a regional SOP was dropped because of the challenges in ensuring it was appropriate for the wide diversity of border contexts in the region and that all Member States were fully bought in.

Under output 3.1, two SOPs were developed, in the three countries (Kenya-Uganda and Kenya-Ethiopia border zones) that expressed interest in a regional workshop held in August 2022. Three national workshops were held (one in each country), bringing together a wide-ranging set of national and local government agencies, as well as some civil society representatives to introduce key concepts related to humanitarian border management, climate mobility, and disaster displacement. These preparedness workshops also sought feedback on the zero-draft SOPs ahead of the simulation exercises.

The SOPs covered entry and reception, registration and stay, and assisted return or extension of stay. Each document outlines the relevant policy and hazard context in each country and the roles and responsibilities of the specific government agencies on each side of the border, before identifying specific steps and sub-steps for each stage of the process. The specific steps are almost identical in each SOP, with different government agencies identified as relevant.

Under output 3.2, these two SOPs were tested in two cross-border simulation exercises. 103 participants participated across the three-day table-top simulation exercises, which built participants' knowledge about the disaster and displacement contexts and sensitized them to the SOPs and their roles and responsibilities during such cross-border disaster displacement situations. The feedback from the simulation exercises was highly positive, with negative or neutral feedback very rare. The vast majority of participants reported they could now use their new knowledge skills. Output 3.2c was in part reached through an initial study on 'Policies, Laws and Practices on Admission and Stay in Disaster and Climate Change Contexts in the IGAD Region: A case study of Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda' written by a consultant for IGAD, which includes regional-level policy recommendations. By the end of this programme, MDCC had organized an additional technical workshop to finalize the SOPs and discuss capacity needs for their implementation, and it aims to secure formal endorsement and final validation at IGAD and Member State level in the future (this final validation would be supported by MDCC PUNOs, but would fall outside the timeframe and budget of this programme).

PILLAR IV: REGULAR MIGRATION PATHWAYS

Table 4: Pillar IV results framework³⁵

Results Reporting Framework					
Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Cumulative Results Y1-Y3	Notes
Outcome 4 Migrants affected by the adverse impacts of disasters and climate change in the IGAD region have enhanced pathways for regular migration and access to protection services in accordance with international, regional and domestic law	Outcome Indicator 4a % of beneficiaries reporting that the information campaigns influenced their migration decisions, disaggregated by gender, age	0	50%	N/A	Full data is being collected by PUNOs.
	Outcome Indicator 4b % of key stakeholders who demonstrate understanding of the interrelationship between protection and displacement, disaggregated by gender, age, agency	0	75%	N/A	Full data is being collected by PUNOs.
Output 4.1 Migrants and affected communities have improved knowledge about their rights and obligations under national laws and procedures including available forms of protection	Output Indicator 4.1a # of campaigns implemented, disaggregated by type of a campaign	0	3 campaigns (as direct delivery of the project + spontaneous campaigns by PUNOs & local partners using the materials)	3	Campaign activities are completed and report is planned to be produced and shared before the end of the project period.
	Output Indicator 4.1b # of people reached through campaigns, disaggregated by gender, age and type of a campaign	0	Number of direct beneficiaries reach 300-indirect beneficiaries - extended audience on a 1 to 5 basis – 1500. Sensitization materials in local languages Mixed types of campaigns and channels	7,100 (2,899 females and 4,201 males)	7,100 (2,899 women and 4,201 men) direct stakeholders and 35,500 indirect stakeholders. Due to use of multiple awareness approaches i.e., community conversations, peer to peer educations, street drama, and posters.

³⁵ Cumulative results achieved retrieved from Migration MPTF Annual Progress report, 31 March 2023

			(radio, affiche, brochures)		
Output 4.2 National Governments and Local Authorities in the IGAD region have strengthened guidance, tools and capacities on the application of International and Regional Refugee law and other protection instruments in the context of disasters and issues of climate change and mobility in the IGAD Region	Output Indicator 4.2a Study report available	No	Yes	Yes	Published/launched in May 2023.
	Output Indicator 4.2b Concrete and actionable recommendations for Governments and other stakeholders documented and shared	No	Yes	Yes	Workshop in Garissa, Kenya in July 2023.
Outcome 5 Migrants and climate affected communities have improved access to sustainable livelihood and green job opportunities that prevent displacement and forced migration in climate and disaster affected areas in the IGAD region	Outcome Indicator 5a Perceptions from key stakeholders on improved sustainable livelihoods/green job/green entrepreneurship opportunities in the community, disaggregated by gender, age, type of stakeholder, project location	n/a	Most perceptions support	Perceptions support in Kenya and Somalia	Kenya: Perceptions support that the programme improved – fully or partially, sustainable livelihood or green job opportunities. Somalia: Perceptions support that intervention - providing training and skills development in green job sectors - enhances durable solutions to the loss of livelihoods from climate change effects. Ethiopia: N/A
	Outcome Indicator 5b % of community leaders, non-migrant community members and migrants who report being satisfied with the environmental initiatives and durable solutions implemented under the project, disaggregated by gender, age	n/a	60%	59% in Kenya and Somalia	Kenya: Some respondents (17%) were fully satisfied while most (57%) reported 'neutral' satisfaction with the interventions.

					<p>Somalia: 100% Community members, local authorities and students reported being satisfied with the skills development component.</p> <p>Ethiopia: N/A</p>
<p>Output 5.1 Migrant communities affected by the adverse impacts of climate change in the IGAD region contribute to green economy policy development</p>	<p>Output Indicator 5.1a Policy/strategy assessment with recommendations validated by CSO /migrants available</p>	0	2	2	Regional Green Economy policy review study with case studies in Kenya and Somalia with viable green economy activities identified and pilot projects conducted validating the recommendations.
	<p>Output Indicator 5.1b # of forums where validation exercise evidence is discussed, disaggregated by type of a forum</p>	0	2	4	After Action review with the local communities in Kenya and Somalia; and policy workshop with local and national level authorities (2023).
<p>Output 5.2 Evidence available on how to support local labour markets and green entrepreneurship in climate change and disaster-prone areas in the IGAD region</p>	<p>Output Indicator 5.2a Rapid assessment report available</p>	No	Yes	Yes	Assessment report is available and ready for publication.
	<p>Output Indicator 5.2b # of persons sensitized on sustainable and environmentally responsible business practices, disaggregated by gender, age, agency</p>	0	250 direct beneficiaries	100	A 3-day, 2 round training workshop was organized in Dessie, Ethiopia from July 31 st to August 5 th , 2023, with 50 participants in each round.
	<p>Output Indicator 5.2c # of forums where intervention models are discussed by stakeholders</p>	0	3 (sectoral) forums organized	3	Validation and stakeholder consultation workshop on November 28, 2022; Intervention model design and validation workshop on 21—22 February, 2023; Field level stakeholder consultation on 27 June 2023

Output 5.3 Green jobs, enterprises and value-chain intervention models for employment generation and skills development designed and implemented in the IGAD region	Output Indicator 5.3a Value-chain intervention models available and agreed with key stakeholders	No	Yes	Yes	Three value chain intervention models (in the renewable energy, small ruminant fattening, and mung bean production value chains) developed based on market systems analysis and stakeholder consultations.
	Output Indicator 5.3b # of workers and entrepreneurs trained, disaggregated by gender, age, type of training	0	120 (40 per training)	120 (64 females and 56 males)	The training was divided into 2 parts, Start Your Business and Improve Your Business. First round (start your green business) training was provided to 120 (64 women and 56 men) who were divided into 3 cohorts of 40 per session. and 2 nd round (improve your green business) was offered to 105 participants who were identified as being able to establish their own business.
	Output Indicator 5.3c % of workers and entrepreneurs trained report improved skills in green jobs and enterprises, disaggregated by gender, age	0	65%	94%	Post training evaluation showed that 60% of participants had excellent level of improved knowledge, and 34% had good level of improved knowledge.

Key:

	Achievement cannot be determined
	Incomplete achievement
	Fully achieved

Pillar IV covered an awareness raising campaign and research on protection policies, as well as research on the green economy and analysis of market systems which informed local level pilot projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia aimed at enhancing regular migration pathways and supporting access to sustainable livelihoods. These were represented under outcomes 4 and 5.

Outcome 4

At the time of the evaluation, the level of completion of outcome 4 targets (see table 4) could not be determined as they were pending data collection by ILO and UNHCR.³⁶

All the targets under output indicator 4.1 were achieved. Output 4.1 entailed the undertaking of awareness raising campaigns on safe, regular, and orderly migration, on the rights of migrant workers, and on available protection services for migrant workers in Kalu Woreda, South Wollo Zone, Ethiopia. In partnership with BPDO, MDCC used various communication channels for awareness raising, including print media, mass media (radio), street drama, and peer educators. The process was consultative with a range of stakeholders involved including the Ministry of Labour and Skills (MoLS), Amhara Region Bureau of Labor, Training and Enterprise (BoLTE), workers interested in opportunities abroad and returnees, and radio journalists.³⁷ Often more stakeholders were included than initially targeted, as was the case with the local consultative forum held in Kombolcha to validate campaign priorities, materials, and ensure campaign rollout. The stakeholders included university representatives, media agencies, Technical and Vocational Education and Training' (TVET) institutions, labour agents, zonal and woreda government stakeholder offices, and village/Kebele administration.³⁸

Table 5: Awareness raising channels and processes³⁹

Awareness raising in Ethiopia	
Print media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design of initial messages was undertaken by ILO and Beza and presented to stakeholders. 2,000 leaflets, 200 posters, and 4 billboards were printed and were distributed at community conversations, street drama for community and community gathering places in 10 kebeles (marketplaces, schools, community service places, cooperatives, and 10 kebele offices). Billboards were posted by the roadside, community transit ways, and community crowded places.
Mass media (Radio)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Public Service Announcement (PSA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aired on Dessie FM Radio because it covers a wider area. The radio agreement was for six months, to air programmes two days (Saturday and Tuesday) per week for 30 minutes a day. The times were: Saturday from 7:30-8:00 and Tuesday 11:30 -12:00 local time. An assessment by Dessie FM, showed that more than 3 million people tuned into ILO supported programmes (PSA, live call, interviews and documentary).

³⁶ KII, programme official, Ethiopia.

³⁷ MPTF Annual progress report, March 2023.

³⁸ KII, implementing partner, BPDO; KII, programme official, Ethiopia; MPTF annual progress report, March 2023.

³⁹ Ibid.

	<p>2. Documentary The documentary was a case story of a migrant returnee, and focused on the risks of irregular migration and regular ways to migrate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The story was recorded by the journalists and transmitted through the radio. The documentary was aired once in two months within the 6-month radio agreement. <p>3. Expert interview and a live community call</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experts from Wollo University and other stakeholders were interviewed on safe, orderly, and regular migration, migrant rights, protection mechanisms, where and who provides the services, goals and objectives of the project, and other related topics. Community members called and asked questions regarding issues of migration and climate change, and responses were provided by the experts through the radio. The question-and-answer programme was conducted twice (2 episodes).
Street drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project conducted four street dramas at community gatherings and marketplaces in project kebeles (Harbu, Gerba and Degan), two times each. Gerba proved a sensitive area to hold this action, as it is an area of departure and part of a known irregular migration pathway. During the event, some spectators started throwing stones to disturb the drama. Community leaders could not, however, conclude whether this was specifically against the event, or more a reaction to organizing such cultural event during a fasting period.
Peer education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The peer educators facilitated discussions, set discussion schedules, and developed action plans. The peer educators were trained for three days in Kombolcha town in December 2022. The training was provided based on the peer education guidelines and focused on causes of regular and irregular migration, the rights and obligations of migrants, life skills, facilitation and communication skills, resource mobilization, and developing action plans on how to undertake awareness sessions to influence others to follow regular migration pathways. 30 community conversation session facilitators (19 women and 11 men) and 10 women peer-to-peer educators were chosen to undertake community conversations and peer-to-peer sessions. Peer education was conducted once every two weeks for two hours in four rounds.

Table 5 shows that ILO took a comprehensive approach to awareness raising utilizing diverse channels to gain a wider reach of community members (3 million through radio and 7100 through street drama and peer conversations). Feedback from stakeholders interviewed indicated that there was some disruption experienced in the street drama, as stones were thrown at attendants:

"During the street drama event, there was throwing of stones at the drama place to disturb the event. We asked the community elders why the stone was thrown at the event. The elders told us they suspect they were opposing the music at fasting time or there are many traffickers in this area and maybe they opposed the event. After that we decided to change the date to another day." KII – Implementing partner, Ethiopia

Stakeholders identified peer education and community conversations as the most effective awareness raising approaches and catalysts for change. This is because they were conducted in direct contact with the participants, allowing for questions and discussions sessions, thus facilitating exchange of experiences and lessons.⁴⁰ According to one participant, the peer education and community conversations approach enabled the transfer of knowledge between community members easily, even in the absence of project staff.⁴¹ Local authority representatives were also of a similar view and noted that they developed interest in the approach and scaled it to 468 kebeles in the region to improve community awareness on employment opportunity.⁴²

Output 4.2 related to a study commissioned by UNHCR on protection frameworks and coordination mechanisms in the IGAD region related to climate change, disasters, and human mobility. The study was successfully delivered, based on civil society consultations and a workshop to sensitize these recommendations took place in Kenya. There were, however, multiple challenges in delivering this study. Identifying a consultant with the requisite regional expertise and knowledge of protection frameworks proved difficult, and the study's research methodology also had to adapt to COVID-19, which meant that travel was impossible. As a result, activities were delayed and even over-budget, forcing UNHCR to pull in other staff (not funded by MDCC) to complete the study. Still, the report reflects the whole-of-society principle as it drew on a civil society workshop, and it offers concrete recommendations that could support future programming.

Outcome 5

Outcome 5 focused on improved access to sustainable livelihoods and green jobs for climate-affected migrants and host communities. The overall outcome targets could not be determined pending data analysis of data being collected by ILO in Ethiopia (the available data in Kenya and Somalia indicate targets were achieved or *just* under-achieved). The findings indicated that output 5.1, and output 5.3 activities targets were fully achieved, while output 5.2 activities targets were partially achieved, as one training did not reach the full number of participants targeted (see *table 4*).

Output 5.1 aimed to ensure the contribution of migrant communities towards the development of green economy policy. This was implemented through a policy review approach, validation workshops, and pilot projects in Kenya and Somalia. IOM together with the UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre Kampala conducted a study on "Integration of human mobility in green economy and related policies in the IGAD region," which was presented in various workshops and forums including in the Migration Week ahead of the International Migration Review Forum (IMRF), a side event for the Africa Regional Forum on

⁴⁰ KIIs, Implementing partner and ILO, Ethiopia.

⁴¹ KII, Beneficiary, Kalu, Ethiopia.

⁴² KIIs, Local Authorities, Kalu, Ethiopia.

Sustainable Development 2022; Africa Climate Week 2022; in two workshops organized by the PUNOs; and in an article published in Migration Policy Practice Vol. XII, Number 1, February 2023, p. 31.

The study results were also discussed with local governments and communities in Kenya and Somalia, and the pilot projects were designed based on the studies' recommendations. Community members and stakeholders noted that their inputs were taken into consideration during implementation of these pilot activities. In Somalia, multiple stakeholders (IOM, HACDA, IDP community leaders, women's associations, youth groups, and religious elders) formed the Community Selection Committee (CSC) which engaged in the selection process of the project participants in the target locations of Hamar-Jajab and Deynile.⁴³ Similarly in Kenya, county administrative offices and national representatives at the local level (Chiefs) led the selection criteria and in an open forum where women, men, youth, and community leaders were also engaged.

These projects validated the green economy sector policy study, based on a community-centred approach and with the active involvement of migrant communities. Interviewed community members, for instance, welcomed the pilot projects in their respective countries, felt engaged during the design stage of the pilot projects, agreed generally with the green economy sectors in which MDCC piloted interventions based on the policy study (while noting areas for improvement, see below).

Tables 6 and 7 outline the projects piloted due to community consultations. These activities were implemented by local NGOs in Somalia and Kenya, namely HACDA and LOKADO.

Table 6: Green economy activities implemented in Somalia⁴⁴

Green economy pilot activities implemented in Somalia	
Skills development and apprenticeship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The skills development and apprenticeship programme provided technical skills to training participants in the areas of solar panel maintenance and repair, waste management, and plastic recycling, for the purpose of enhancing their employability. • HACDA provided three months of skill training to 90 students (44 Females and 46 Males). 47 were trained in plastic recycling and waste management. 43 students were trained in the maintenance and repair of solar systems. • Students were provided with an allowance of \$200 per person per month. • 36 (13 Females and 23 Males) of the trained students benefited from paid apprenticeship programme, and they were connected to seven companies. • 54 (28 Females and 26 Males) of the trained students started collective businesses.
Diaspora mentorship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One diaspora mentor was hired by IOM focusing on renewable energy, waste management, and plastic recycling.

⁴³ KII, programme official, Somalia.

⁴⁴ KII, programme official, Somalia; KII, implementing partner, HACDA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diaspora mentorship activities facilitated the transfer of technical knowledge and skills from diaspora mentors to local stakeholders, particularly supporting the female participants. • The mentorship lasted two months.
Connecting with private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team conducted a markets and needs analysis utilizing ILO guidelines, and a mapping exercise to identify relevant private sector organizations involved in renewable energy, waste management, and plastic recycling in Somalia. • A Career Expo event was held during to connect the trainees to private and public companies in the green economy industry. 17 private and public companies participated in the event. • Stakeholders were linked to 7 companies in the city to get experience and employment opportunities; some of the companies were BECO; Blue Sky; Solar Department of BRA; Adani Solar Company; Ifi Waste Management; Hygiene Department of BRA; Somalia Plastic Solutions
Collective businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This opportunity was offered to successful graduands of the skills and development training. • Those willing to establish collective businesses were supported with a start-up kit worth \$3600 - \$4200 per group. and follow up support towards procurement process, business registration, drafting of a business plan, market their business and engage with potential companies as suppliers.
Environment awareness and community clean ups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants in the training gained knowledge and skills related to waste segregation, recycling, and disposal techniques. • Three community clean up campaigns were held per district, and some of beneficiaries' groups then established clean up companies.

The pilot project in Somalia demonstrates that this suite of skills development and other employability interventions can empower migrant communities to meet green economy needs and secure enterprises and livelihoods. The diaspora aspect used in Somalia also promoted international knowledge transfer and expertise to local communities. Overall, the piloted projects demonstrate a comprehensive and inclusive approach to addressing the challenges posed by climate change, while also fostering economic opportunities within migrant communities. It underscores the importance of community involvement, skills development, mentorship, private sector collaboration, and environmental awareness in achieving its objectives.

In Somalia, the stakeholders interviewed were satisfied with MDCC interventions. The multi-faceted approach of combining skills training, cash allowance, career fair/ linkages with the industry, and mentorship provided a strong foundation in which sustainable livelihoods can be achieved. This was reflected by the strong support from the trainees:

“I am completely satisfied with the outcomes of the project's interventions because the project has created sustainable livelihoods through the provision of trainings in which the targeted beneficiaries gained skills, the provision of monthly cash transfers during the training periods, and the protection of the environment and

promotion of community awareness via clean-up campaigns and community awareness sessions.” - KII, beneficiary, Somalia

“Now, I am working with a Mogadishu solar system cleaning company thanks to the project, as well as a small electronic shop that invested in the project. These are the employment opportunity changes made by the project for me.” - KII, beneficiary, Somalia

Table 7: Green economy activities implemented in Kenya

Green economy pilot activities implemented in Kenya⁴⁵	
Agroforestry production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Hectare for agroforestry production plot was established in Namon village, including infrastructure improvements (water, storage building, latrines). • Nursery supervisor and attendants were identified through a community meeting. • Partners conducted a 6-day training between 19–30 August 2022 to 12 (8 females and 4 males) people. The training focused on necessary knowledge and rightful skills required in establishing and managing a planned tree nursery. In addition, an income generation training was conducted. • 60,000 tree, vegetable and fruit seedlings were produced by the end of December 2022, and 57,000 were distributed to the local communities who have since planted.
Rangeland management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners conducted two trainings on rangeland management between 19 and 24 September 2022. 50 (24 females and 26 males) participants were from Nalapatui and Loreng villages. • Between 10 and 12 January 2023, partners conducted three awareness creation sessions on rangeland management on pasture grazing fields during dry periods along the migratory routes in Nakitongo, Nalapatui and Oropoi. In total, 225 agro-pastoralist community members (126 females and 99 males) participated.
Climate-smart agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A climate-smart agriculture farm was established in Nawountos village. • Partners conducted a 3-day training in October 25– 27 2022 on climate smart agriculture and dry land technologies including how to use the installed farming equipment and facilities, crop production skills and technologies for 37 (23 females and 14 males) participants. In addition, an income generation training was conducted. • The project together with the community identified farming land. Partners distributed seeds for fruit and vegetables that were planted.

⁴⁵ MPTF annual progress report, March 2023; KII, programme beneficiary, Kenya.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water infrastructure was supported to facilitate climate smart agriculture. This included the rehabilitation of boreholes, installation of solar panels, water tanks, animal water dispenser, and piping to the farms to support fruit and vegetables farming.
<p>Awareness raising activities or community meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness raising sessions on environmental preservation were conducted in Kakuma town, Pelekech, and Kalobeyei locations hosting refugees. • Seven public meetings occurred between November 1 and 4 2022 and January 4 and 5 2023. • 287 (165 females and 122 males) people were directly reached. • Participants were made aware of the adverse impacts of climate change, the importance of planting trees, and ways to ensure a clean environment. • Participants were urged to plant more trees, undertake clean-ups around their homestead, and be careful about hygiene.

The green economy activities in Kenya were multifaceted, addressing environmental preservation, sustainable agriculture, reforestation, and community engagement. These efforts were designed to empower local communities with the skills and resources necessary to combat climate change, promote sustainability, and enhance overall environmental awareness and conservation and responding to climatic challenges faced in Turkana.

In Kenya, the stakeholders were moderately satisfied with MDCC activities, and this depended on the activity implemented. The climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry farms establishment in Namon and Nawountos improved sustainability of livelihoods of the community, especially women. It was found that the communities are more receptive towards diversifying their livelihood and believe that once water is available, they all can effectively practice farming which will break the cycle of displacement due to climate change.

“We also rely and benefit from the vegetables and we no longer migrate with our livestock. A lot of problems that we were experiencing have been solved by us not migrating with our livestock, for example, migrating from here to another place to look for pasture for the livestock as a result of depending on pastoralism as the only source of livelihood.” - Case study, stakeholder, Kenya

There was positive feedback from the environmental awareness sessions, indicating enhanced knowledge.

“I learned that trees are life from the awareness-raising sessions on the importance of planting trees and tree cover. Trees provide us with oxygen and shade, they have medicinal values, and also most of the trees protect vegetation cover preventing them from direct destruction of sunlight.” - KII, stakeholder, Kenya

There was some dissatisfaction linked to rangeland management activities because of the drought conditions that coincided with pilot project implementation. This limited the potential of outputs as

pasture reseeding was halted, depending on the rains.⁴⁶ In response, IOM and LOKADO reallocated the funds towards the distribution of vegetable seeds and shade nets for vegetable gardens upon the request of stakeholders in Namon and Nawountos and provided support to water infrastructure that could better improve irrigation of gardens and livestock hydration.⁴⁷

“The development of water infrastructure worked but not to our expectations. We expected to get maximum water supply from the source. It should have had more taps to reduce the time spent fetching water. There was a lot of time wasted as many people went there to irrigate the vegetables, but we had to queue for the water. We also expected piping will pass through the village and go up to the school because water challenges are also experienced at the school.” - KII, stakeholder, Kenya

Output 5.2 activities were implemented in Ethiopia and findings showed that they were partially achieved. ILO conducted a market system analysis on green jobs and entrepreneurship opportunities in South Wollo Zone, Kalu Woreda to identify value chains that offer potential for green job creation in the district.⁴⁸ ILO’s analysis methodology built on three main guides: ‘Market Systems Analysis for Decent Work: A User-friendly Guide’, ‘Sector Selection and Rapid Market Assessment for Addressing Environmental Sustainability in Value Chain Development’ and ‘Environmental Sustainability in Market Systems and Value Chain Development for Decent Work.’ ILO first identified value chains with the highest potential to provide green job creation and employment opportunities. The value chains were then assessed in depth using several criteria, including relevance of the value chain to the target group_(for example in terms of skills and educational background of the target group), environmental outcomes, potential for job creation and entrepreneurship opportunities, and the feasibility to stimulate change. The rigorous process identified three value chains, namely renewable energy (solar products and improved cookstoves), small ruminant fattening, and mung bean production.⁴⁹

Table 8: Green economy activities implemented in Ethiopia

Green economy activities implemented in Ethiopia	
Market systems analysis and sector intervention model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on a robust market system analysis, the project identified 3 value chains: renewable energy (solar products and improved cookstoves), small ruminant fattening, and mung bean production • 3 multistakeholder forums were held to formulate interventions models in each value chain
Entrepreneurship training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project provided two rounds of training. • In the first round, 120 youths and entrepreneurs were provided with Starting your Business (SYB) training for 5 days.

⁴⁶ KII, Implementing partner, IOM, Kenya.

⁴⁷ Virtual follow up interview, Implementing partner, IOM, Kenya.

⁴⁸ ILO, Market System Analysis on Green Jobs and Entrepreneurship Opportunities in Disaster and Climate. Change Affected Areas of South Wollo Zone, Kalu Woreda, 2022.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second round was on Improving Your Business (IYB), a five-day training for 105 youths from the first-round training who were able to start businesses. • 94% of training participants reported improved skills in green jobs
--	---

In a second step, the project developed value chain intervention models to propose potential activities that support inclusive and sustainable growth in the three value chains. The project held three multistakeholder forums to develop and validate these models bringing together local government representatives, potential migrants, returnees, community representatives and social partners. Local government representatives noted that the identified intervention models were climate friendly, could generate income in a short period of time, and require small initial capital.⁵⁰ In addition to the validation workshops, a training on sustainable and environmentally responsible business practices was conducted for 100 people, but the target of 250 participants was not met because the activities were halted due to increased conflict in Amhara.⁵¹

Next, the project implemented a range of skilling and business development activities based on these intervention models. 120 youth and entrepreneurs were provided with business training, and 94% of training participants reported improved skills in green jobs. The entrepreneurship training used the ILO tool Start/Improve Your Business (SIYB) translated into Amharic. The training was undertaken in two rounds in Kombolcha town for participants drawn from the ten project kebeles and focused on the three identified value chains. The first round was on Starting your Business (SYB), a five day training for 120 youths, and the second round was on Improving Your Business (IYB), a five day training for 105 youths from the first-round training who were identified as having potential to establish businesses. The training focused on how to generate business ideas, goal setting, challenges and opportunities, business plan preparation, marketing strategy, customer identification, competitors, and how to improve your business and resources. The training also embedded green aspects such as composting, vegetable gardening, and other related works. Participants in SIYB training perceived the sessions as useful to their livelihood endeavours. They stated:

“I attended the start and improve your business (SIYB) two-round training provided for 10 days at Kombolcha town. The trainings have been very important and improved my knowledge and attitude to business. I have a business plan but still have not implemented the plan. I will implement and follow the plan in the future. The SIYB training improved my knowledge in business plan preparation, how to handle customers, how to conduct a market assessment, improve business, reduce costs, motivation to start business, and how to run a business.” - KII, SIYB training participant, Ethiopia

“The project provided me with SIYB training, and it was memorable for me and important to my life. The training was interesting and important to start my business. I started a small business, which gives me access to

⁵⁰ KII, Local Authority, BoLTE.

⁵¹ KII, Implementing partner, ILO, Ethiopia.

livelihoods. I started goat fattening after the training and I had 3,5000 birr startup capital and now scaled it up to 5,5000 birr within three months. The training helped me to record the costs and minimize expenses.” - KII, SIYB training participant, Ethiopia

The positive feedback from those who received training can be attributed to the ILO processes. According to ILO staff, the market system assessment considers contextual opportunities and strengths.⁵² Thus, the identified intervention models align well with market opportunities and the participants’ educational and skills profiles. As a follow-up to the SIYB training, post-training support was provided, including support through a mentorship programme and linkages to financing opportunities. Although trainees received some financial support and start-up capital, through ILO and its partnership with local financial institutions, some reported delays and issues in receiving the funding. Nonetheless, feedback from interviewed stakeholders showed that some were able to start businesses, particularly in small ruminant farming.

B. Challenges and success factors

Did the proposed activities take place in a timely manner? What were the main challenges experienced during the implementation? Were these challenges expected risks?

MDCC faced significant delays, which required two no-cost extensions. The first extension, requested on June 29, 2022, for three months (from February to May 18, 2023) was requested to “ensure effective and efficient administration and recruitment of the external evaluator/organization” and to “allow partners to also finalize interventions which, in the first year of the programme suffered from delays.” The second extension, requested on May 2, 2023, for three months (from May 18 to August 18, 2023) was requested to finalize programme activities (particularly under Pillar III and Pillar IV in Ethiopia) and the evaluation.

Altogether, MDCC required six additional months beyond the initial timeframe, but other M-MPTF programmes faced similar delays (in the first round of funding), so this was not a major concern for the donor. Reasons for these delays include:

External factors:

- *Security conditions and COVID-19:* Activities in Ethiopia were delayed by six months due to the conflict in the North (i.e., offices that were closed, interrupted services provision by NGOs), and security conditions in Somalia also caused small delays. COVID-19 also restricted when and where programme officials could move, both to meet with each other in person and to the local pilot projects. These factors were identified in the risk management plan and led to adaptation in the programme design in Ethiopia, where security conditions prompted the programme to change target locations.⁵³
- *Disasters in target location:* During the pilot project in Turkana, Kenya, MDCC distributed seedlings but due to the lack of rainfall and drought conditions, pasture reseeding had to be re-

⁵² KII, ILO, Ethiopia.

⁵³ KII, programme official, regional.

programmed.⁵⁴ This risk was anticipated in the risk management plan, but mitigation measures did not succeed in tackling the issue.

- *Turnover in local and national authorities:* In Turkana, the change in officers at the County offices, meant IOM had to train new incoming officers on aspects of human mobility given that is a new concept to many people at the county offices.⁵⁵ In Somalia, elections led to change in key national government personnel, again requiring IOM to engage the government to ensure their continued buy-in, which they did successfully but caused delays. This risk had been anticipated in the risk management plan, with the mitigation measure to ‘tolerate the risk.’ The impacts of staff turnover, however, did not prevent activities from taking place, but required efforts to engage new officers.

Internal factors:

- *Initial financial agreements:* MDCC’s funding was approved by the M-MPTF Steering Committee in an exceptionally quick process, meaning it was approved earlier than expected. Because additional resources become unexpectedly available, the M-MPTF held an extraordinary meeting in January 2021 to approve the programme, whereas the earliest expected decision date was June.⁵⁶ While this was an exceptional case, it meant PUNOs were not prepared to recruit staff to launch the full programme in the timeliest fashion possible. Moreover, because donor funds were dispersed so quickly, PUNOs had not prepared administrative arrangements to manage the funds with partners (e.g., grant support agreements with IGAD and ICPAC).
- *Approvals when activities changed:* The design of multiple activities changed throughout the course of the programme, to adapt to new local situations. When these changes had substantial budget implications, they had to be approved by the M-MPTF Steering Committee, which does not meet regularly, which was time-consuming although not a significant challenge.
- *Recruiting competent consultants:* Heavy administrative burdens in recruiting processes caused significant delays, with one recruitment process taking as much as nine months. Moreover, identifying consultants with the needed expertise was difficult, because this thematic topic remains new and the expertise on specific sub-topics (e.g., on the intersection of this nexus with protection mechanisms) is not easily available. This caused both delays, and also meant that certain consultants (although certainly not all) were not able to deliver high-quality products and their work had to be revised by the programme.
- *Securing approvals (Sudan):* One discrete issue was securing approval from Sudan’s Humanitarian Aid Commission to collect data in Sudan for the decision-making model, which caused approximately a three-month delay.⁵⁷

Many of these challenges were anticipated in MDCC risk management plan, but internal challenges had not been identified. For example, all stakeholders knew the M-MPTF could not directly fund IGAD,

⁵⁴ KII, beneficiary, Kenya.

⁵⁵ KII, programme official, Kenya.

⁵⁶ This meant that the M-MPTF Funds Management Unit met its goals of quickly dispersing funds as funds were dispersed by March 4 2021.

⁵⁷ KII, implementing partner, CIMA Research Foundation.

ICPAC, or other partners, meaning they could have anticipated the types of support agreements needed. Most of these challenges were resolved over time (e.g., COVID-19 measures), through dedicated mitigation measures (e.g., engaging new officials post-election), working to facilitate funding arrangements as quickly as possible, or pulling in internal staff capacity to support consultant’s work).

What influenced the implementation of activities?

MDCC relied on a set of success factors ranging from the programme design through to its implementation.

Capacity and coordination

At the regional level, having the buy-in and dedicated capacity at ICPAC and IGAD was essential. The mobility analyst at ICPAC was critical to closely coordinate with PUNOs and implementing partners, while the dedicated capacity in the IGAD Secretariat (not funded through the MDCC programme) was also essential.⁵⁸ However, this capacity relied on leveraging funding from other sources.

Similarly, close coordination and a sense of positive collaboration among the technical working group of MDCC was critical to ensuring all elements of the programme went ahead. Most often this involved co-creating terms of references, and reviewing each other’s deliverables and progress of implementation. Having a dedicated staff member at IOM to coordinate the programme was highly effective at facilitating the collaboration.

“That could only happen because there was trust. This whole concept of partnerships and working together can work very, very well when there is trust in terms of sharing resources and minimizing the use of resourcing and costs of programming.” – KII, MDCC official

This collaboration was also important with the implementing partners. Selecting trusted and reliable implementing partners was key. For instance, CIMA Research Foundation had been working on similar topics for years, including with IGAD, and came trusted through the programme’s networks, meaning they were able to hit the ground running with ICPAC and PDD. This was especially important because, the PDD itself did not have extensive experience working on displacement data and risk profiles. Similarly, the partnership with the Regional Collaboration Centre under Pillar IV was effective because of the Centre’s dedicated expertise and role support governments on climate policies related to the UNFCCC.

Strong coordination in local pilots in Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia

As stated in previous sections, the programme employed a robust stakeholder engagement approach in the implementation of activities. At the local level, successes of the pilot projects were mainly attributed to consultations and collaboration with multiple stakeholders.

In Ethiopia, ILO and BPDO pursued strong collaboration with local level stakeholders including the regional administration, community leaders, community members (see “Relevance”). Also, the novelty of the climate change and migration concepts as well as the community approach of MDCC was interesting

⁵⁸ When this staff member left on temporary leave, this caused delays.

to the communities thus, implementing partners were able to productively engage with stakeholders.⁵⁹ Another key collaborator was the TWG and frequent meetings were key to resolving many of the implementation challenges. For instance, the initial proposed project location was in Kobo area which was closer to the north which had ongoing conflict. ILO consulted with TWG for a change in location and developed selection criteria which identified Kalu Woreda.⁶⁰ Overall, the technical expertise of ILO regarding climate change and promotion towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, labour migration governance, and market-based approaches to support green jobs conveyed confidence to the stakeholders.

In Kenya, having a well-established national coordination mechanism on migration, with a focal point dedicated to climate issues, was an important factor making local and national engagement a success. In Turkana, it was noted that there was an increased coordination among area implementing partners through the Climate Change and Environment TWG, who provided support through meetings on implementation progress, and providing guidance. Furthermore, the community was willing to gain knowledge and embrace the new concepts on livelihood diversification and environment sustainability. In Somalia, the involvement of the office of the prime minister through the DOECC office, the district offices, and community involvement in identifying specific challenges and requirements related to renewable energy, waste management, and plastic recycling prior to project initiation supported the tailoring the training activities to address the most pressing needs of the local context.⁶¹ Also, inclusion subject matter experts provided valuable guidance, mentorship, and technical support to the training participants.⁶²

It was evident that at the local level, strong collaboration between the programme and relevant stakeholders contributed to the success of the pilot projects. These partnership and consultations enabled the programme to leverage different expertise and abilities to achieve its objectives.

VII. Efficiency

The programme required two extensions, for seven months total. Delays were due to a mix of external challenges (see above) and internal factors. Still, these extensions are not unusual within the joint programming funded by the M-MPTF. Throughout implementation, MDCC drew on synergies and other sources of funding in order to implement some activities and maximize its impacts. One key reason the programme budget was able to efficiently use its resources was due to the PDD's funding model, which allowed it to channel almost all of its funding to ICPAC and IGAD rather than overhead or staffing costs. This was essential in ensuring the buy-in of regional partners and moving forward with activities.

Was the programme set up to feasibly and optimally use the available resources?

⁵⁹ KII, programme official, Ethiopia.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² KII, Implementing partner, IOM, Somalia.

Overall, the programme was designed to efficiently leverage the available funding and resources. MDCC's initial timeframe was, however, tight, and the pandemic added to this difficulty. Still, the programme design was appropriate, as "it identify(d) and builds on complementarities and *brought* together the added value of its partners in addressing complex development challenges."⁶³ Thus, MDCC brought together four PUNOs, with a clear delineation of responsibility for different pillars, outcomes, and activities, as well as strong coordination mechanisms to ensure efficient implementation.⁶⁴

First, the financial arrangement was constrained by M-MPTF rules, but the programme found creative solutions to ensure funding also directly benefited local partners. Indeed, M-MPTF funding could only go to PUNOs, while it was critical for IGAD and ICPAC to receive support to ensure their buy-in and sense of an equal partnership with IOM, ILO, PDD, and UNHCR. PDD managed to fund its staff time through a separate budget and as a result, channelled almost all its M-MPTF funding to IGAD and ICPAC through grant support agreements. While this added an extra step to designing the funding arrangements, it was critical to ensuring IGAD and ICPAC were truly partners within MDCC.

Second, the MDCC's initial two-year timeframe was not realistic with all its activities under the four pillars. Some activities experienced external challenges such as the restrictions resulting from the pandemic and insecurity but still, a number of delays were also to be foreseen in the design phase. For instance, given the novel and complex nature of the topics covered under MDCC, identifying local partners and research experts proved particularly challenging and took more time than had initially been envisioned. These delays had broader ramifications given the phased approach of several MDCC pillars – where policy research and market systems analysis were due to inform the design of pilot projects and technical assistance.

Were any adjustments to the proposed budgets and timeline required during programme implementation? How did the programme mitigate effectiveness delays, monitor funding burn rates, and remain within budget? What specific mechanisms were in place to ensure programme was implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner?

The programme was implemented with some delays, but within budget. The programme received two no-cost extensions, which was common for M-MPTF funded programmes. Adjustments were made to move budget between line items, but without overall budget implications. Near the end of the programme, PUNOs worked to ensure that unused budget lines were repurposed, for instance by redirected budget for Pillar III activities on policy recommendations to a technical workshop to finalise the SOPs and discuss policy recommendations for their implementation.⁶⁵ The flexibility to make these line-item changes, and

⁶³ Guidance note on Joint Programmes.

⁶⁴ Including financial cooperation: e.g., all PUNOs shared the costs of recruiting the Mobility Analyst at ICPAC. MDCC's budget was split among the PUNOs, including IOM (USD 943,870), ILO (USD 622,180), UNOPS/PDD (USD 483,950), and UNHCR (USD 100,000). Of the total budget, IOM (32%), ILO (20%), and UNHCR (50%) used some proportion of their funding for staff and other personnel. Across MDCC's five outcomes, the largest cost was outcome 5 (USD 547,653), followed by outcome 1 (USD 391,792), outcome 2 (USD 262,260), outcome 3 (202,290), and outcome 4 (124,458).

⁶⁵ KII, programme official, regional.

the strong collaboration among PUNOs (including offering financial or staff support to each other) helped ensure the efficient use of resources.

The most significant budget adjustments occurred when MDCC switched from its initial proposal (i.e., to pilot projects directly through PUNOs) to contracting implementing partners for this work, which involved shifting significant budget amounts across categories. This revision happened early in the programme and did not have an impact on the overall budget.

Finally, some MDCC activities were supplemented by other funding, leveraging synergies to enhance implementation while reflecting the limitations of its pilot nature and limited funding. At ICPAC, the funding to integrate the displacement data into its other data services does not come from MDCC, while IGAD combined MDCC funding with funding from other programmes to implement some activities such as the sensitization workshops under Pillar III. Drawing on this complementary funding allowed regional partners to enhance or sustain MDCC activities. UNHCR, however, was forced to pull in internal resources to finalise its study under Pillar IV, as MDCC budget was spent on a consultant's deliverable that eventually needed more work to finalize.

VIII. Sustainability

Local, national, and regional partners are highly aware of the challenges related to disasters, climate change, and migration, and generally committed to continued working on these issues. By the end of the programme, there are specific activities that already fully handed over to MDCC partners. For instance, the displacement data gathered is being integrated into ICPAC's data services, and IGAD is working towards formal endorsement of the SOPs. In Ethiopia, local partners intend to replicate community peer conversations and support further skills training; in Somalia, some stakeholders have continued their businesses after the pilot project ended; and in Kenya, local committees are trained on the policies developed and intend to look for ways to implement them. However, there is a need for further support from PUNOs in order to ensure all activities are sustained. For example, community members in Kenya face drought conditions that require more assistance in order to use pasture seeding and other techniques. Similarly, multiple governments are interested in further policy support but reported a need for funding, data, and support to do this.

Did the programme in general and its specific components have an exit strategy? Are there specific plans to sustain livelihood interventions and maintain the infrastructure put in place after the programme?

MDCC teams began discussing a phase 2 and an exit strategy midway through the initial two-year implementation and developed a concept note outlining a potential phase 2. This included discussions at the programme's Steering Committee, where there were specific discussions on sustainability and scaling up by June 2022.⁶⁶ All PUNOs, IGAD, and ICPAC agree that a second phase (or other similar programming) is needed as MDCC was a pilot initiative.

⁶⁶ Steering Committee NFF, June 29, 2022.

Regarding local interventions in Somalia, Kenya, and Ethiopia, the evaluation found that MDCC has actively involved local communities and stakeholders in the activities. This includes engaging them in the decision-making process, seeking communities and stakeholder input and feedback, and promoting ownership of the local initiatives. By fostering ownership and participation, MDCC promoted the likelihood of long-term sustainability.⁶⁷

“The project promoted local ownership project results through facilitation of thorough engagement with the community and local authorities who will ensure the utilization of project results in the long term” - KII, local authority, Somalia

In these communities, the training and capacity building activities proved sustainable as they imparted knowledge and skills that are useful and necessary to improve livelihoods. In Mogadishu, for instance, KIIs with migrant affected communities found that plastic recycling and waste management training was particularly valuable for these respondents who felt that the training equipped them with the necessary knowledge on recycling techniques and sustainable business practices. Some community members set up waste management and plastic recycling companies which collect plastic waste from the community and sells it to recycling companies in Mogadishu. The project also linked a stakeholder to a solar company which was still operating at the time of the evaluation.⁶⁸

“I am able to continue with my business or employment after the project ends, because the project taught me skills such as solar panel maintenance and repair, which I am using with the Mogadishu solar system cleaning company connected to me as part of the apprenticeship programme, as well as provided me with \$200 [monthly allowance which I used] to open a shop where I sell simple electronic items. So, now that the project has concluded, I can resume my work and my business.” - KII, beneficiary, Somalia

District authorities are conducting observations of the established businesses created through the project and they are looking for other IPs to support these businesses in Somalia with any other needs they may require.

Despite being satisfied with the knowledge gained from trainings and awareness raising efforts in Turkana, there were some challenges regarding sustainability which stem from the unavailability of water, initial limited provision of seeds, and tree planting in the target villages in Turkana. Some of the participants confirmed that they cannot continue MDCC activities particularly in the seed distribution provided by LOKADO and IOM, which was not itself sufficient for sustainability of these activities. Where MDCC assisted with water infrastructure (in Nawountos village), there were concerns raised by local community members regarding the lack of capital to buy seeds, and inability to most efficiently use water infrastructure through better piping connection⁶⁹.

Noting the above concerns in Turkana, MDCC still made efforts to ensure sustainability in various ways such as training of county government officials in migration and climate change to ensure that they take

⁶⁷ KII, implementing partner, HACDA.

⁶⁸ KII, beneficiary, Somalia.

⁶⁹ KII, all beneficiaries, Kenya.

an active role in reviewing and implementing sub-county climate change adaptation action plans. The establishment of the Ward Climate Change Committees, linked to the county development plans provides a mechanism where grassroots inputs can be expressed and addressed at the local governance level. Ensuring that the nursery supervisors are capacitated (like in Namon and Nawuontos) on weed control, climate smart agriculture, tree planting may also help them produce their own seedlings and sell them to the community as well as use their knowledge to extend the project in their communities. Actions were also taken to remedy the challenges caused by drought season. MDCC worked to procure additional seedlings and shade nets, and to rehabilitate water infrastructure to enhance the availability of water to farmers and livestock was supported.⁷⁰

Local authorities in Ethiopia are confident that they can sustain certain aspects of the pilot project outputs. As part of its exit strategy, ILO promoted community ownership by strengthening stakeholder engagement in the projects. The regional bureau (BoITE) and woreda level structures were involved in the implementation of activities throughout the project life by chairing the project steering committee. As such they are aware of the activities and results of the project and are ready to sustain the activities such as community conversations and school peer interventions. In particular, there are already activities to replicate some awareness-raising activities more broadly in the region. Furthermore, it was indicated by the Kalu woreda labour and training office that Kebele level platforms and task forces are in place and will continue supporting activities by providing refresher training for those that were trained by the project while Woreda offices will support the monitoring of implemented activities.

Are there specific plans in place to continue using the policies/SOPs and knowledge products developed, or continue to implement learnings from capacity strengthening?

At the regional and national level, activities under Pillars I and III have a clear need for continued implementation. Under MDCC, the SOPs have not been fully adopted and operationalized, but since they have been tested in the simulation exercises, there is a need and indeed desire for further support to implement the SOPs and replicate them across the region.

“During GHACOF 64 in Ethiopia ... some delegates questioned the motivation behind Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia’s involvement in developing the SOPs. They expressed the need for replication in other areas, particularly as climate change significantly affects Somalia. It is essential to establish a common approach for addressing the needs of people displaced by disasters across different regions. So, we aim to replicate these SOPs in areas such as Kenya-Somalia, Somalia-Ethiopia... among others.” – KII, government, Kenya

Similarly, the agent-based model and displacement risk profiles now exist on paper but require further work to fully integrate them into ICPAC’s portals. ICPAC has indicated their strong willingness to build on MDCC, notably with plans to retain the Mobility Analyst after the programme and by using other budget sources to already begin integrating MDCC’s data into its portals.

⁷⁰ KII, implementing partner, LOKADO.

“On Pillar III, we had all these engagements, we created expectations for operationalizing SOPs... Same for Pillar I, we’re starting to integrate [displacement risk profiles and decision-making model] into the portals, but this takes time, and we need more of a strategy to do this” – KII, programme official, regional

Under Pillar II, local and national authorities in Kenya are working toward implementing revised policies, and Somalia is in the early stages of planning a potential national policy on climate and mobility issues. In Kenya, the Turkana County government supported and will launch the Sub-county Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan supported by IOM, which is ensuring this is part of the County Integrated Development Plan (CIPD). Additionally, the Climate Change Act 2021 has established that the county, Turkana County allocates 2% of development budget for climate change adaptation and mitigation. The county is receiving other funds from partners like the World Bank and its Financing Locally-Led Climate Action (FLLoCA) which could sustain and build on the MDCC.⁷¹ The national GCM implementation plan has been revised and has dedicated staff capacity within the NCM to support implementation, although further resources are needed to deliver on the implementation plan.

Somalia is in the early stages of considering new policies, and other IGAD Member States have expressed clear need for policy development related to migration, disasters, climate change, and related issues. Although government stakeholder reports an increased understanding of migration, disasters, and climate change issues, which national policies are prioritized, how they are drafted, and whether they are adopted are complex questions well outside the scope of this programme, so while there are opportunities to sustain and replicate Pillar II activities, these are dependent on other factors.

At the national level, all government representatives expressed a desire to work on disasters, climate change, and human mobility topics and identified a range of priorities. In Ethiopia, government representatives identified the lack of data on migration and displacement flows as a key need and the Ministry of Labor and Skills identified as future priorities awareness raising on climate change and migration; green jobs and skills training; and start-up support for green jobs.

However, a common bottleneck is a lack of policy frameworks on displacement and migration governance (e.g., as noted in Ethiopia, which is now working on a migration policy), or policy coherence among disasters, climate change, and migration policies. Some of these policies are under development, but there is an opportunity for further support the development and/or implementation on these frameworks, including related topics such as labour market and employment policies. Another challenge is around funding, as national governments repeatedly reported that they both needed to directly access funding to implement their activities, and that they would need to be full and equal partners in future programming. Indeed, the Kenya NCM was highly engaged in MDCC could prove a useful partner in sustaining activities in Kenya and planning future phases, but even in this highly engaged country, the national government was not involved across all relevant programme pillars. Relatedly, IGAD and ICPAC are committed to working on these issues going forward, particularly on Pillars I and III where they were both engaged, but both

⁷¹ KII, Local Authority, Turkana, Kenya.

noted their projectized funding structure and the need for funding and equal partnerships to continue this work.

UNHCR's report under Pillar IV has been completed and shared and serves as a tool for future advocacy and research, but the limited scope of this activity means that it is unclear how it will be used across IGAD Member States.

IX. Impact

A full accounting of the impact of all MDCC activities is outside the scope of this evaluation, given the available data and since the evaluation occurred while the programme was still wrapping up activities. However, the available data indicate some positive examples of impact across multiple pillars of work, particularly regarding the enhanced understanding of climate, disasters, and migration issues among community and government stakeholders, the improved green livelihoods for some community members, and the progress in enhancing local and national policies in Kenya and operationalizing the IGAD Protocol on Free Movement.

What was the impact of capacity strengthening, data and modelling, policy and plan development, and knowledge management activities on IGAD MS capacities and policies related to disasters, climate change, and human mobility?

Improvements in awareness and knowledge amongst communities

While it is too early to determine the impact of MDCC, there are some positive effects stemming from the interventions in Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia. One key impact noted across all the countries is that migrant and associated communities expressed improvements in their knowledge regarding migration and climate challenges and how to respond to them within their communities. In Ethiopia, for instance, this came up because of climate change awareness sessions where stakeholders received messages on the risks and dangers of irregular migration for youth, whereas in Turkana, migrant affected communities interviewed explained that they now see the importance of tree planting and have the urge to plant more trees. In Mogadishu, communities were educated about climate change through awareness sessions and clean-up campaigns and stakeholders had positive perception about their ability to maintain their environment because of the new knowledge.⁷² Furthermore, awareness raising activities helped change perceptions amongst local communities regarding pathways to legal migration. For example, one of the community members interviewed decided against migration after taking part in awareness raising sessions where experiences of irregular migration and challenges were shared by returnees from Saudi Arabia. As such, MDCC's efforts in awareness raising have shown ability to influence change.

Improved livelihoods

MDCC interventions have improved livelihoods for migrant and associated communities particularly with the pilot projects in Somalia and Ethiopia. In Mogadishu, the programme has empowered trainees by

⁷² KII, beneficiary, Ethiopia; KII, beneficiary, Somalia.

providing them with valuable skills and knowledge in renewable energy and waste management. Through the training activities, community members have become active participants in sustainable development and environmental conservation efforts. They have gained the capacity to maintain and repair solar panels, manage waste effectively, and contribute to plastic recycling initiatives. This empowerment has not only improved their livelihoods but has also created a sense of ownership and pride in taking care of their environment.⁷³ One example of this are the beneficiaries of plastic recycling and waste management training creating their own company and achieving financial independence through operating their own business. Additionally, the training on renewable energy, coupled with apprenticeship and financial support ensured that some trainees could open small businesses.

In Ethiopia, the evaluation found that SIYB training from ILO equipped the participants with business knowledge in the areas of business planning, market assessment, and bookkeeping. The training coupled with value chain identified through the market assessment helped the creation of green businesses such as goat fattening.⁷⁴ The market system analysis provides a great basis for further supporting green job creation in the identified value chains. Building on the pilot, gaps and need for additional support have become clear, such as support to strengthen financial literacy and to access finance opportunities/loans and the need for additional mentorship programmes. Considering that these were pilots; they provide an opportunity for scaling up while supporting identified gaps.

In the project target locations in Turkana, impacts varied depending on the pilot project implemented. In the communities where tree planting and vegetable gardens were introduced, people are benefiting and enjoying a variety of fruits that they can consume or sell if in surplus to obtain some income. MDCC has enhanced the access to vegetables within close proximity to their communities,⁷⁵ and the neem tree is used by the communities for its medicinal properties. Furthermore, communities consume fruits like papaya, which they perceive is improving nutrition in the community.⁷⁶ There has also been a change of perception from the pastoralist communities in Turkana who are willing to diversify their livelihood.

Policy, planning, and capacity development

At the local level, the project assisted in the mainstreaming of human mobility, gender, and safe and orderly migration into the Turkana sub-county climate change adaptation action plans. Government officials in Turkana are aware it will take time to see changes and that the changes are dependent on the implementation of action plans.⁷⁷ According to the Turkana government, MDCC had an impact in making the government recognise the issue of human mobility among the pastoralist communities. The pastoralists move from one place to another, and identifying and differentiating locations of sharable

⁷³ KII, implementing partner, HACDA.

⁷⁴ KII, beneficiary, Ethiopia.

⁷⁵ KII, implementing partner, LOKADO.

⁷⁶ KII, beneficiary, Kenya.

⁷⁷ KII, local authority, Kenya.

resources to migratory routes is an important action, which if implemented, could have a significant impact on resource-based conflict and promote peace.⁷⁸

At the national and regional level, the SOPs developed under Pillar III are an important step towards implementing Article 16 of the IGAD Protocol on Free Movement of Persons and, if implemented and scaled, could make a substantial impact. But the SOPs are still in an early stage and the impact is yet to be realized. Moreover, MDCC officials point to a heightened awareness of climate, disaster, and mobility issues among IGAD focal points and government officials. While this has not yet translated into substantial national policy changes, they gave examples of specific officials who have become more interested in the topic and who could, in the future, be further supported and capacitated to eventually affect policy change.

“There are two sets of actors that have been operating in silos, mobility and climate change. And in this programme we have seen efforts to bring them together to bring to a common goal. It’s a very recent phenomenon and that is one positive. Now I know that we have focal points in this thematic area in the region, I know from these workshops that we can compare and form a regional approach.” – KII, government, Kenya

Similarly, ICPAC and IOM both noted that while policy discussions on climate and migration have long been siloed, MDCC’s workshops and dialogues have been able to bring in different sectors. The modelling and data capacities enhanced at ICPAC are significant (and are better operationalized than the SOPs), and since ICPAC’s seasonal climate outlooks and participation at GHACOF’s gives it a captive audience of policymakers looking to use its data, the MDCC partnership with ICPAC is likely to prove impactful (if ICPAC is able to systematically integrate the MDCC data and models, and scale them).

“When I started attending the GHACOFs I realized there were no UN agencies going to the GHACOFs, and I realized that mobility in general was not mentioned in the GHACOFs... When they’re discussing the weather forecasts for the next three months and what the potential impacts could be on the country, there was never mentioned a number of people moving... the GHACOFs, because these are meetings of 200 technocrats of IGAD MS and beyond, so it was a fantastic forum in which to really make people more aware of the impact of climate change on human mobility, and to factor these in their early warning and preparedness actions.” – KII, programme official, regional

Have any policies or plans been developed that could continue to support GCM implementation? How have IGAD MS and other stakeholders been sensitized and capacitated to implement the GCM?

The Global Compact for Migration is a driving force of this programme (see below) and forms a core element of the programme capacity strengthening activities. However, there is only one concrete example of the programme supporting GCM implementation plans, in Kenya:

“The programme has “100% supported our national efforts in the implementation of the GCM. As I told you, objective 2 and 5, addressing adverse drivers, developing clear pathways, it’s very critical for us... and 23 because it’s about partnership, they are being actualized. Now we have our action plan... and in 2024 and 2025 we will

⁷⁸ KII, local authority, Kenya.

do our national reviews, and there will be a regional review, a continental one and in 2026 an international. This programme allowed us to meet our commitments.” - KII, government, Kenya

The fact that Kenya has taken on such clear leadership on this topic likely stems from the fact that the country has one of the strongest national coordination mechanisms on migration, is one of two countries in the region that is a GCM Champion Country and has a dedicated focal point for this thematic. Other countries in this region, while participating in workshops and capacity enhancement workshops that cover the GCM, have not seen such changes. Of the three IGAD Member States that submitted voluntary reviews on the GCM in 2022 (Kenya, Ethiopia, and Djibouti), none integrated climate change or disasters beyond superficial references within their analysis of their migration context or policy context,⁷⁹ and although it is too early to know whether this will be done in the future, government stakeholders in Uganda indicated their interest in integrating climate into their future GCM national implementation plan.

X. Global Compact for Migration

What specific adaptations in programme design were made to ensure alignment with GCM principles? Which specific activities and outputs can be directly linked to GCM principles? Are there any examples of activities or approaches that contravene GCM principles?

The programme was aligned with the GCM and its guiding principles. This was highlighted across all deliverables and visibility materials, including participating at the International Migration Review Forum of the GCM. This was the M-MPTF first programme funded on climate, although programmes have already been funded and the M-MPTF Steering Committee has twice noted its particular attention to proposals on climate and migration.⁸⁰

MDCC contributed to the implementation of the GCM, a global blueprint that takes a 360-degree approach. Thus, most elements of sound migration management and governance can be linked to the GCM objectives and principles and without specific global indicators for the GCM, it is difficult to assess how much each activity or programme specifically contributes to its implementation. As per its initial documentation, the MDCC priority GCM objectives are Objectives 1, 2, and 5, although a host of other objectives are relevant, such as Objective 3 (access to information), 6 (fair and ethical recruitment), 7 (address vulnerabilities), 11 (manage borders), 18 (skills development), and 23 (international cooperation).

- Objective 1 (data): the entirety of Pillar I supports Objective 1 of the GCM, and specifically paragraph 17f on strengthening regional centres of research on migration.
- Objective 2 (adverse drivers): much of the programme could relate to minimizing adverse drivers, in particular through the policy developments in Kenya and the pilot projects, the disaster displacement profiles and decision-making model (if used to support anticipatory action or better rebuilding). In particular, the programme linked to GCM paragraph 18h (strengthen humanitarian

⁷⁹ See United Nations, [Voluntary GCM Review](#).

⁸⁰ See M-MPTF, [Migration Environment and Climate Change](#).

and development collaboration to ensure resilience and coping capacities) and paragraphs 18i-l on disaster and climate change resilience strategies, preparedness, and response.

- Objective 5 (regular pathways): The programme specifically responds to GCM paragraphs 21g (develop practices for admissions due to sudden-onset disasters), which it addresses through Pillar III activities on the SOPs, 21e (Promote effective skills-matching in the national economy) addressed through the skills development programmes, and 21h (strengthen solutions for migrants forced to leave their countries due to slow-onset disasters), which it addresses through UNHCR’s study on protection options in the regional context. These interventions do not directly affect the availability of pathways, but they provide evidence on, raise awareness of, and develop skills for people to access them, thus indirectly enhancing the availability and accessibility of migration pathways in the region.

A. Guiding principles

Did the programme directly benefit migrants and affected communities, and were they fully engaged before, during, and after programme activities (people-centred)? Were all relevant government ministries at local, regional, and national levels fully engaged throughout the project cycle (whole-of-government)? Were private sector and civil society groups fully engaged throughout the project cycle (whole-of-society)?

According to the programme stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation, the activities aligned with GCM principles in the programme activities and at the local, national, and regional levels (see also section III.B on stakeholder engagement).

The programme took a whole-of-government, whole-of-society approach to implementing the pilot projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia (see also Section III). In Kenya, they included the NCM in the national government (which is cross-ministry), the state Department of Migration, and the Turkana County government (as well as ward climate change committees, which were capacitated to support the development of action plans for their respective wards).⁸¹ In Somalia, the implementing partners collaborated closely with representatives from both federal and local government agencies responsible for energy and waste management⁸² throughout the programme’s design and implementation phases. This close collaboration ensured that the training activities were in line with the government’s priorities and policies.⁸³ Similarly, in Ethiopia, it was reported that the programme aligned with government priorities and aimed to raise community awareness about green practices such as sustainable land use, composting, traffic control, and discouraging irregular migration.⁸⁴ The community actively participated in implementing these green initiatives at the household level, and a wide range of partners were involved in validating the intervention models and/or the awareness raising materials, including banks, local authorities

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² KII, programme official, Somalia.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ KII, implementing partner, BPDO.

across multiple departments, the media, academia, the private sector, community members, and social partners.⁸⁵ Indeed, according to the national government, *“The programme engaged stakeholders, especially at the local level, and I am happy with that.”*⁸⁶

At the national and regional level, the programme made specific changes to better engage the whole-of-government and whole-of-society. Under pillar III, the sensitization workshops and simulation exercises of the SOPs aimed to include all relevant agencies within national and local authorities: In Kenya, the sensitization workshop included 27 government stakeholders across at least nine government agencies. Although they did miss some agencies (stakeholders in Uganda noted the need for better representation from the Ministry of Health),⁸⁷ this clear effort to involve multiple ministries, and indeed to involve civil society in the simulation exercises, reflects a broader trend across programme activities of engaging multiple ministries within the same national government. For instance, in Somalia, IOM revised its implementation strategy to conduct a policy review in partnership with the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change, rather than conducting the review independently, to enhance government ownership. Similarly, conducting the simulation exercises in the border zones was noted as a good practice to ensure local authorities and practitioners could be involved.

The programme managed to engage different stakeholders in the design, implementation, and monitoring phases of the programme. The programme decided to shift away from its initial proposal of having the PUNO’s country team pilot projects, to recruiting local NGOs as IPs, in part on the grounds of better achieving the whole-of-society principle.⁸⁸ In Kenya, stakeholders were involved in coordination meeting, starting from the inception meeting, where they were informed about the programme and allocated community land. Chiefs and supervisors recruited stakeholders and managed programme activities on behalf of the community.⁸⁹ In Mogadishu, Somalia, HACDA identified a wide range of stakeholders to join consultations and workshops to share their inputs and recommendations⁹⁰. This involved various groups such as local communities, government agencies, NGOs, private sector organizations, waste management facilities, and individuals in renewable energy and waste management sectors.⁹¹ In Ethiopia, government representatives, kebele and woreda government bodies, community representatives, and returnees participated in the programme’s launching workshop.⁹² The community actively participated in programme implementation through activities like community conversations, awareness creation, and livelihood training.⁹³

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ KII, government, Ethiopia.

⁸⁷ KII, government, Uganda.

⁸⁸ KII, programme official, regional.

⁸⁹ KII, programme official, Kenya.

⁹⁰ KII, programme official, Somalia.

⁹¹ KII, programme official, Somalia.

⁹² KII, implementing partner, BPDO.

⁹³ KII, implementing partner, BPDO.

Were human rights respected throughout programme activities, and what activities specifically promoted rights (human rights)? Were women included in the programme whenever possible and was monitoring data gender disaggregated to ensure this (gender responsiveness)? Were any children directly involved as programme stakeholders, and if so, were there clear child protection plans in place (child-sensitive)?

The programme conducted national human rights analyses before implementation to identify human rights concerns, and no human rights issues were raised to programme officials during implementation. ILO's activities in Ethiopia, specifically the awareness raising activities, also included materials promoting labour and human rights.

Children were not direct stakeholders in any programme activities, aside from a very superficial engagement under Pillar I where the data was disaggregated by household composition to identify potential behavioural changes with age and family makeup.⁹⁴

The programme was scored a Project Gender Marker Score of 2 out of 3, meaning it supported the empowerment of women and girls as a “significant objective.”⁹⁵ Although the programme did not include activities solely or specifically aimed at promoting gender equality, and reported no budget reserved for “direct action on gender equality,”⁹⁶ it instead mainstreamed gender across multiple pillars of work. At times, MDCC had difficulty in identifying women to participate in capacity enhancement or regional dialogues. Nonetheless, activities under Pillar I and III integrated a gender dimension (data collection was gender disaggregated, and the simulation exercises of the SOPs included sexual and gender-based violence scenarios). The programme results framework disaggregated appropriate data by gender, including in the local interventions, although not all monitoring outcome-level data has been reported so a full accounting of the programme's stakeholders by gender cannot be done.

At the local level, in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia, the programme implemented measures to address the challenges faced by men and women in the community. The interventions were informed by assessments which identified gender as a crucial issue in climate change. Women and children were found to be the most vulnerable in the respective project sites. To address these gaps, the programme aimed to mainstream gender, for instance into climate change action plans⁹⁷ for gender parity in its participants and stakeholders⁹⁸ Kenya and Ethiopia surpassed this target as women were reported to be more than 50% of the participants. Somalia managed to ensure 45% participation of women which is below the programme recommended target, but a positive outcome considering that Somalia is a male dominant culture. The high reach of women in Kenya is attributed to the fact that women remain the primary agents

⁹⁴ KII, implementing partner, CIMA Research Foundation.

⁹⁵ Score 3 projects “have gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls as the primary or principal objective;” Score 2 projects “have gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls as a significant objective;” and Score 1 project “contribute in some way to gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls, but not significantly (less than 15% of budget).” Programme document, revision 2022.

⁹⁶ Programme document, revision 2022, Annex D3.

⁹⁷ KII, local authority, Kenya.

⁹⁸ KII, local authority, Kenya.

managing households. For instance, they are responsible for maintaining the house when men and boys cross the borders. Thus, women were encouraged to join and participate in community committees that seek to resolve daily challenges experienced within the communities. As a result, there was a positive trend of increased participation of women in various committees, such as the Community Forum Association (CFA) and the Charcoal Producer Association (CPA).⁹⁹

Was the management structure reflective of a whole-of-society approach, gender-responsiveness, and international cooperation?

The programme's management structure was not particularly reflective of a whole-of-society or people-centred approach, since the Steering Committee was only the senior management of the PUNOs, IGAD, and ICPAC. The small steering committee could have allowed for more nimble and free-flowing exchanges, but this excluded the national governments and stakeholders within society. In general, the management structure was gender-responsive and engaged IGAD closely, reflecting the guiding principle on international cooperation.

XI. Conclusions

The Joint Programme "Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region" tackled pressing issues related to disasters, climate change, and human mobility across the IGAD region. IGAD, Member States and other stakeholders all recognize these are critical regional challenges, and MDCC has provided proof of concept on a regional and comprehensive approach, in line with the GCM. The programme was highly relevant to regional priorities and IGAD policies, and met the needs of national and local stakeholders. It was also aligned with the GCM, other regional and global frameworks, and complemented related programmes across the region.

- Pillar I has enhanced knowledge and data through a strong partnership with ICPAC, the IGAD regional climate centre. MDCC recruited a Mobility Analyst at ICPAC, enhanced ICPAC capacities on mobility, and developed risk profiles and a model on disaster displacement in the region, although it did not also develop early warning scenarios as targeted. The programme also expanded the scope of its capacity strengthening activities to include IGAD Member States. Doing so, MDCC answered a pressing demand from many government, but that means there is still a need to provide tailored training for ICPAC staff. There are also opportunities for future interventions that enhance mobility data and for integrating these data into ICPAC's systems.
- Pillar II strengthened the capacities and knowledge of local and national government stakeholders across the region and took an inclusive approach to policy development by validating policy recommendations with local communities. In Kenya, it supported the revision of two national policies and plans, as well as local planning in Turkana County. MDCC delivered beyond its initial goals in Kenya, because the government had strong commitment and capacities on climate and migration issues. However, in Somalia, MDCC's policy review noted that existing climate and

⁹⁹ KII, local authority, Kenya.

disaster policies included references to displacement, thus there was less demand for policy support. Combined with election-related turnover and the lack of an existing GCM coordination structures and implementation plan, this mean MDCC did not reach its targets in Somalia. However, through the evidence provided, the government stakeholders now have evidence to utilize in policymaking. IGAD Member States report their enhanced knowledge on these issues, and many are interested or already discussing policy development and planning. As such, there are opportunities to further support policy coherence on human mobility, disasters, and climate change in the region, at regional, national, and sub-national level.

- Pillar III strengthened preparedness for cross-border disaster displacement, while contributing to the operationalization of Article 16 of the IGAD Protocol on the Free Movement of Persons. MDCC developed and tested two SOPs for admission and stay in cross-border disaster displacement situations in two border regions in Kenya and Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda. The programme did not manage, however, to develop a third SOP as was initially planned. These two SOPs were developed in whole-of-society, whole-of-government approaches, and there are efforts underway to secure their formal endorsement by IGAD.
- Pillar IV encompassed a range of initiatives aimed at enhancing sustainable livelihoods and regular migration pathways across Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia through pilot projects. Outcome 4 showcased the reach of awareness-raising campaigns, employing diverse mediums to enhance knowledge on regular migration pathways and workers' rights. The campaigns demonstrated a wide influence, with millions of community members reached. Community conversations emerged as a particularly effective tool for fostering change due to the direct contact with local residents. Outcome 5 under Pillar IV focused on improving sustainable livelihoods and green jobs. The initiative was shaped by the thorough engagement of migrant communities, who were consulted in validating the green economy sectors targeted for intervention based on MDCC's studies. Interventions were designed based on research on the green economy (in Somalia and Kenya) and a thorough market systems analysis (in Ethiopia),¹⁰⁰ as well as stakeholders' feedback. In Somalia and Kenya, local NGOs played pivotal roles in driving project implementation, yielding positive outcomes through skill development especially in Somalia, environmental awareness, and community consultations. In Turkana, however, more support and water availability were needed for rangeland management interventions to take hold, prompting MDCC to enhance activities on climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry and to procure more seedlings, enhance water access, and further capacity local stakeholders. In Ethiopia, ILO's analysis successfully identified of value chains offering potential to promote green job creation, while entrepreneurship training allowed them to build on these opportunities and support new businesses. Despite challenges stemming from conflicts and drought conditions, the combined efforts under Pillar IV have paved the way for new livelihoods, community engagement, and strengthened resilience in the face of climate and migration challenges across the region.

¹⁰⁰ This allowed the identification of intervention models, that have been validated by local stakeholders, to promote green job creation.

From all accounts, there is strong interest in replicating and scaling up MDCC activities. Local community members perceived these the pilot project as important, and the active involvement of local communities and authorities, as well as training, awareness-raising, and capacity enhancement activities promoted a sense of ownership and promoted long-term sustainability. Some community members have established businesses and secured employment, enabling them to maintain livelihoods after MDCC's end. There are, however, demands for PUNOs and the implementing partners to continue to provide support, for instance in Turkana County. Nonetheless, in Kenya, the Turkana County Government has embraced its County Climate Change Action Plan, supported by IOM, which allocated a portion of its budget for climate change initiatives. In Ethiopia, local authorities are already replicating peer education elements of the awareness raising campaign across other kebeles in the region, and plan to provide further skills training opportunities. In Somalia, district authorities are observing and seeking support for the businesses established through the project. Regionally, ICPAC is integrating displacement data into its data services and IGAD and the Member States are working to endorse the SOPs developed.

MDCC faced a number of challenges, which included: delays due to security conditions; COVID-19 and associated mobility restrictions; turnover in local and national authorities; disasters which changed conditions in the communities targeted by the pilot projects; as well as delays setting up internal financial procedures and recruiting staff and external partners. Nonetheless, stakeholders largely offered positive feedback, with some areas of moderate satisfaction. Implementation was most effective when there was strong capacity within local and national authorities and community buy-in. MDCC also benefited from effective coordination and technical capacity among PUNOs. And although the programme asked for two no-cost extensions, MDCC implemented activities in a timely fashion.

The programme successfully aligned with the guiding principles of the GCM and addressed its objectives related to data, drivers, and regular pathways, as well as other objectives such as decent work. Gender was mainstreamed, especially in the pilot projects where women were engaged as stakeholders in consultations and empowered in training, capacity enhancement, and livelihood interventions. The programme did not, however, include a specific gender component or activity whose primary aim was to promote gender equality, and this could be an area of development in future programmes. The MDCC's whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach was effective, and could be built upon to engage even more ministries, social partners, and civil society actors, including within the management structure of the programme. Overall, MDCC demonstrated a commitment to improving regional and national migration governance and contributed to positive changes in knowledge, behaviour, and livelihoods within the communities it served.

XII. Recommendations

MDCC piloted a wide range of activities and approaches, resulting in lessons learned and recommendations for future programming. The evaluation finds that there is a strong demand and opportunity for future programming on the issues related to the nexus of disasters, climate change, and migration in the IGAD region. The recommendations below apply to varying degrees for all programming related to climate, disasters, and migration (especially in the IGAD region); any joint-UN programming (especially joint programming funded by the M-MPTF in line with the GCM); any regional programming

on migration; and on occasion, future phases of MDCC. The recommendations are structured around MDCC's four pillars, followed by recommendations related to the programme's broader design and structure and other cross-cutting issues:

Pillar I: Data and Knowledge

The programme made strong progress under Pillar I, with opportunities for replication and scale up:

- **Integrate MDCC's data into ICPAC's systems (ICPAC):** In the short term and as has already begun, ICPAC should finish integrating MDCC's data (and indeed other available data from IOM's DTM team) into its East Africa Hazard Watch and beyond.
- **Continue to build ICPAC's internal capacity on migration and displacement (ICPAC, IOM):** In the short to medium term, there is a need for further capacity strengthening tailored to ICPAC to ensure displacement issues are well understood and can be addressed across teams, with the assistance of the Mobility Analyst and IOM. These efforts have already started under MDCC, with a regional workshop that benefited ICPAC and IGAD Member States. This, however, was less specifically tailored to ICPAC and its data services, and in the future, the DTM IOM team could provide further tailored training for its staff more targeted towards technical data issues of operationalizing displacement data (e.g., DTM data) within ICPAC's systems, building on efforts started during the programme. Such efforts are essential for ICPAC turning into a key player on displacement issues in the region.
- **Replicate disaster displacement risk profiles or pursue other avenues to gather similar data in the region (ICPAC, IOM, PDD):** In the medium to long term, there is a strong need for data, as evidenced by the interest in these profiles when presented to national and regional stakeholders. Throughout the region, there continues to be data gaps in terms of their thematic coverage (e.g., types of hazards, climate impacts, and intersections with other topics such as livelihoods); the geographical scope of the data; and how they are disseminated (both to be as timely as possible and sensitized across more stakeholders). This could be addressed in a future phase of MDCC, or as exemplified in the collaboration with GIZ's 'Human Mobility in the Context of Climate Change' programme, by supporting and collaborating with others working on displacement data in the region. PDD and IOM could support this work, although there may be a benefit for IOM to lead if the DTM methodology continues to be a fruitful avenue for collaboration with ICPAC.

Pillar II: National and Regional Policy Frameworks

Activities under Pillar II were very promising in Kenya and show how technical support can lead to productive outcomes with a strong ownership of national authorities. The demand from national stakeholders in other countries indicates there are further opportunities on this topic:

- **Further support policy development in the region (IGAD, PUNOs):** In the short term, the PUNOs and IGAD could engage Member States to identify priority gaps and partners motivated by strengthening national policies. There are multiple avenues to do this, through IGAD and PUNOs' country offices, or regional dialogues such as the IGAD Regional Consultative

Process (RCPs), GHACOFs or discussions under the Kampala Ministerial Declaration on Migration, Environment and Climate Change. While IOM would be suited to lead this work given their work under Pillar II and its expertise in this policy area, as well as its role in the Regional Ministerial Forum on Migration (RMFM) for East and Horn of Africa, which is RCP to promote a united approach to safe, regular, and humane labour migration among states in the East and Horn of Arica (EHOA) region. Other PUNOs could also step in depending on the themes and their networks. For example, ILO could provide support to integrate labour mobility aspects in alignment with international labour standards or also assist governments to ensure policy coherence among migration, climate change and employment policies so that a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all is promoted in collaboration with social partners. This support would be most effective where national partners are fully bought-in and have the capacities and governance structures to develop and implement policies (as in Kenya). Another way forward could be the promotion of peer-to-peer learning, with tailored support from the PUNOs to Member States and regional exchanges.¹⁰¹

- **Follow whole-of-government, whole-of-society approaches (PUNOs):** In the medium term, programming could consider replicating the MDCC approach tested in Kenya, supporting capacities and policy development at local and national level, and testing policy recommendations with community stakeholders. This approach worked well in Kenya, both because it was highly inclusive and because the local and national authorities were invested in policy enhancement. Replicating this approach could be considered across Member States, since engaging all levels of government, different ministries, social partners and civil society actors proved to be a critical success factor.
- **Invest in policy-oriented research with a plan for operationalizing recommendations (PUNOs):** (*this recommendation also applies to other Pillars*) In the medium term, more policy research will be needed covering different themes and geographies. MDCC has shown how this research is essential for policy advocacy and inform technical assistance. These assessments need to be completed early during programming cycles to ensure they can be disseminated and recommendations can be implemented. Given how new this field is, PUNOs should plan sufficient time to identify adequate profiles for consultants, and a pool of experts they can mobilize in the future could be constituted (e.g., building on the recently established Climate Mobility Africa Research Network).
- **Support policy, planning, and community engagement at sub-national level (PUNOs):** In the long term, programming could be designed to support not just national, but local policies. Pillar II focused on national policies, but already made significant progress in county and ward-level planning in Kenya, reflecting opportunities for further work on sub-national policies. One way forward is to support local authorities and to develop or empower community climate change committees (or support their establishment). In Turkana County, Kenya, for

¹⁰¹ The project '[Coopération régionale des politiques migratoires](#)' (CRPM) in North and West Africa, funded by the French Development Agency and implemented by Expertise France, could be a source of inspiration for this type of exchange.

instance, these local actors are well aware of climate and mobility-related issues but lacked the resources to develop policies and initiatives to address them. MDCC addressed this specific need and allowed for these local actors to drive the policy development process.

Pillar III: Disaster Displacement Preparedness

Progress under Pillar III can inform recommendations for future programming:

- **Explore opportunities to endorse the existing SOPs (IGAD, IGAD Member States, PDD):** In the short term, as has already begun, the SOPs need to be formally validated. In the medium term, all relevant stakeholders could work towards ensuring their implementation by the relevant governments.
- **Monitor and test how the existing SOPs are operationalized in future disasters (IGAD, IGAD Member States, PDD, local stakeholders):** In the medium term, the SOPs could be operationalized in future disasters and there will need to be an assessment to see what worked and what could be improved. This could be done by national governments and local stakeholders, or with the PDD and IGAD, either through a light touch community consultation or a more formal evaluation (depending on resources and capacities).
- **Identify partners to replicate the SOPs (IGAD, IGAD Member States, PDD):** In the medium term, there is interest among Member States in replicating these SOPs (and this demand would presumably increase if they prove effective during future disasters). These SOPs could be replicated, potentially in border regions where binational relations are strong and where there are risks of future disasters, and likely alongside similar efforts to test them through simulation exercises.
- **Follow whole-of-government, whole-of-society approaches (IGAD, IGAD Member States, PDD):** In the medium term, future SOPs and simulation exercises could replicate and even enhance the MDCC's strong whole-of-government, whole-of-society approach, looking for other Ministries (e.g., health) and additional local community stakeholders to include.
- **Develop SOPs earlier during programming cycles (IGAD, IGAD Member States, PDD):** In future interventions, SOPs could be developed earlier during a programme's implementation period to allow time for them to be formally endorsed before the end of the activities. In the MDCC's case, the SOPs are expected to be formally endorsed in the coming months, but this depends on IGAD's ability to continue these activities (without funding from the MDCC).

Pillar IV: Regular Migration Pathways

Feedback and achievements from the pilot projects provide key lessons and recommendations for future programming:

- **Support the scale-up of the green economy pilot projects that showed potential for supporting sustainable livelihood in the medium term (PUNOs, governments):** The pilot nature of the green economy projects meant that only a small number of people participated

in these activities. But now that these approaches have been probed, the most successful activities could be scaled up. Specifically, in the three countries targeted by the pilot projects:

- *Ethiopia*: Farmers engaged in small ruminant fattening could be further supported to grow their business. So far, the assistance provided by ILO through the market systems assessment coupled with SIYB training has enabled some to engage in the sector. Additional assistance could involve linkages to access finance and government extension services that could enable more trainees to start or grow their ventures, to ensure they are set up for success in the long-term. Working with sector partners as mentors, employers, and consulted stakeholders also proved helpful, and could be leveraged to scale up green economy activities and awareness raising.
 - *Kenya*: Vegetable gardens have the potential to offer sustainable livelihoods. However, access to water has proved a major difficulty in the pilot. In the future, this type of activity needs to be designed in coordination with irrigation methods.
 - *Somalia*: The approach to supporting livelihoods and the selection of sectors worked well in Mogadishu and could be expanded, although current security conditions make replication elsewhere in Somalia uncertain and similar approaches in other regions would require a new market system analysis. Nonetheless, the pilot participants have achieved some level of self-sufficiency as they started recycling businesses or managed to secure employment. Future programming could support new, potentially larger cohorts with a similar approach.
- **Enhance knowledge sharing between implementing partners to best leverage their strengths (PUNOs and other implementing partners)**: IOM and ILO have tools that are valuable and reflect their technical expertise. In identifying green sectors/value chains that communities could engage in to derive livelihoods, IOM's instrument excels in identifying viable green sector opportunities through policy reviews, markets needs assessment and stakeholder consultations, but it does not deeply analyse value chains. In turn, ILO's approach is more comprehensive in that it identifies value chains that present potential for green job creation as well as environmental sustainability and climate resilience. It also analyses supporting functions, rules, and constraints of the respective value chains to propose intervention models that respond to the needs of the market and the target group. However, it is more resource intensive to deploy. Both approaches have value and could be used based on the context and the resources available.
 - **Engage local authorities to support awareness sessions (PUNO and local government)**: In the medium term, local authorities can engage in scaling up activities such as awareness campaigns. This was the case in Ethiopia, where the local authority scaled up the awareness sessions to include more kebeles than were set for piloting because they found the peer education and community approach effective in discussing regular migration pathways and livelihood opportunities. Strong buy-in and engagement with local authorities from developing the awareness raising materials, to implementation, proved important to setting them up to continue these activities after MDCC ended.

Programme design

Outside these specific thematic activities, future interventions could consider these broader recommendations in terms of programme design:

- **Explore longer-term programming (M-MPTF, PUNOs):** Programmes such as MDCC are highly technical (e.g., related to developing data and integrating into ICPAC's services) and multi-stage (e.g., commissioning policy studies, conducting community consultations, and then piloting local projects). Therefore, they would benefit from a longer time frame. On the one hand, M-MPTF could consider the need for longer programming cycles. There may, however, be trade-offs given the limited M-MPTF funding available. On the other hand, PUNOs could further reflect on how to approach other donors to fund longer interventions, especially when they build on a pilot such as MDCC.
- **Explore how to improve advanced planning of budget and financial agreements (M-MPTF, PUNOs):** The M-MPTF and PUNOs could review how joint programming budgets are dispersed, to explore whether better guidance or communication could improve initial financial planning. In MDCC's case, the unexpectedly quick approval and dispersal of funds from the M-MPTF caused delays in the first months after the launch. Although this were exceptional circumstances, it is important to monitor such processes across other M-MPTF programming to check for and prevent similar circumstances going forward.
- **Explore direct funding of regional partners (PUNOs, IGAD):** Future programming not funded by the M-MPTF could consider how to directly fund regional partners and stakeholders. While MDCC was able to transfer funding from the PUNOs to IGAD and ICPAC under Pillars I and III—a good practice—this was not the preferred set-up. Direct funding may not be possible in all situations, but it would ensure stronger buy-in within IGAD and potentially allow for more efficient and effective implementation.
- **Identify opportunities for joint UN programming (M-MPTF, PUNOs):** MDCC exemplified the value of joint UN programming, and such efforts could be replicated and expanded. This joint approach, with close coordination across agencies, was a key success factor for the MDCC. Different PUNOs could be brought in based on their specific comparative advantages, expertise, and capacities in each country, and different grouping of PUNOs could be explored for different types of related programmes moving forward

Cross-cutting issues

Cross-cutting recommendations, largely related to the implementation of the GCM, include:

- **Build on the GCM as a framework for future programming (M-MPTF, PUNOs):** The objectives and guiding principles for the GCM provide shared goals and outline agreed upon considerations around gender, child-sensitive, or whole-of-government and whole-of-society engagement that are useful when developing a new programme.
- **Explore interventions specific to promoting gender equality (M-MPTF, PUNOs):** Future programming could explore how to further promote gender equality. Under MDCC, gender was mainstreamed and women were stakeholders throughout and benefited from pilot projects interventions, with few issues on gender dynamics (e.g., some capacity enhancement

workshops did not achieve gender parity). However, there was no dedicated budget to promoting gender equality, or dedicated activities specifically and intentionally on this issue. In the future, programmes could invest in such initiatives, for instance through support to gender-sensitive policymaking, deep dives in the SOPs on gender issues, or activities that target gender inequality dynamics more directly in the pilot projects, depending on the context. This is particularly pressing given the gendered impacts of climate change and migration.

- **Consider opportunities to better engage national governments, social partners, and civil society across all pillars of work (PUNOs, IGAD Member States):** Programming could consider to more comprehensively engage the IGAD Member States and the whole of society. MDCC was able to effectively engage stakeholders on specific pillars, but as a regional programme piloting new approaches, the primary partner (e.g., on the Steering Committee) was IGAD. Future initiatives could consider both whether to include the Member States, social partners, and civil society within the management structure of the programme and look for ways to enhance their ownership (i.e., already in the design phase).

XIII. Annexes

A. Most Significant Change

Title of story	Single mother of four establishes a recycling business in Mogadishu.
Who was involved and what took place?	A single mother who received training on waste management and plastic recycling, provided with market linkages, and established a company called "Deegaan Scrap Plastic Company,"
What change took place?	A woman, and a single mother is now self-employed and self-reliant. She can operate a profitable venture that has improved her livelihood opportunity and now she is able to support her family.
Why is story significant?	Through this intervention, "I became someone who is capable of treating her children well in terms of their wellbeing, education, and accessibility to other basic needs. In this regard, the project significantly improved my essence of having at least necessities for my humble family."
Lessons learned / recommendations for the wider program	If one is supported with appropriate inputs, sustainable livelihood can be achieved. Furthermore, it shows that livelihood activities require the use of multiple inputs to create change,

Title of story	A returnee doubles her livestock after business training in Amhara
Who was involved and what took place?	A woman returnee from Saudi Arabia who attended the "start your business" and "improve your business" by ILO in Kombolcha, Amhara. started goat breeding with 2 goats and started recording the costs of feed and medication.
What change took place?	She was able to grasp the concepts of the training and apply them successful to double her livestock. Now she has 4 goats and is working towards having a large-scale goat-fattening farm in her kebele as the current price of fattening goats and the demand are high. As a result of the training, she became business savvy and is aware of the market situation of the sector.
Why is story significant?	"I got start your and improve your business training which has significant changes in my knowledge on how to run a business and motivated me to start business. I was

	interested in Goat production. The training helped me to conduct the cost benefit analysis. Previously, I had no knowledge on how to record expenses spent for feed, medication, labour and other costs.”
Lessons learned / recommendations for the wider program	It is beneficial for project partners to identify stakeholder interests and skills, and then enhance them to truly capacitate them. It is recommended that skills of stakeholders are assessed so that project can implement relevant and target support in capacity building.

Title of story	A project stakeholder becomes an employer in Mogadishu
Who was involved and what took place?	A man from Hamra-Jajab who participated in a three-month plastic recycling and waste management training program, which taught him about the environmental impact of plastic pollution and waste management techniques.
What change took place?	“After taking this training, my life has really changed. Me and the other five participants started a business with the help of skills we acquired from the training, and this was an employment opportunity and source of income for me.”
Why is story significant?	The story shows how project supported livelihood ventures can scale to support the community.
Lessons learned / recommendations for the wider program	Long term training and support results in better livelihood outcomes. Training of stakeholders who intend to engage in livelihood activities should be longer.

Title of story	Vegetable gardens influencing the uptake of farming in Turkana.
Who was involved and what took place?	A former livestock keeper, and currently a nursery attendant. The project provided him with the necessary skills to plant trees, learn about different vegetable varieties, and adapt to the climate.
What change took place?	He was mostly involved in the kitchen gardens, which involved planting and growing vegetables as well as trees. Him and his family now rely on vegetables for food and income, and the use of vegetable planting has reduced migration incidences.
Why is story significant?	“Growing vegetables had the most significant change in my life because we depend on the vegetables for food. You know, we all need food to survive. The vegetables have been of much help because we pluck it from the

	farm and cook for household consumption and I sell the surplus vegetable and I use the money to buy books for my child, and to take him to hospital when he falls ill.”
Lessons learned / recommendations for the wider program	Training and practical application of the skills can influence adoption of new ways. The project should ensure that in each livelihood activity, practical application of course materials are supported.

B. Success stories

Kenya Case Study: The Story of Ruth

Ruth, a 56-year-old married refugee, had to migrate from Sudan to Turkana in Kenya due to the war. Some vehicles came to help the immigrants and drove them to the Nadapal village in South Sudan, near the border of Kenya, where the villagers provided them with clothes to cover themselves.

According to Ruth, the community faced strong winds and disease, which led to the need to plant trees. They were trained on the importance of trees, which are vital for preserving the environment and creating conducive climatic conditions and can be medicinal. She was provided with 10 trees, and mango and pawpaw seeds. The pawpaws yielded fruit and began selling one pawpaw for 500 shillings.

"The project has helped me achieve my goals because I now know the importance of trees for today and future generations. I promise that IOM will find many trees planted when they return to Turkana and that the community will work to ensure they meet the vision IOM had."

Her future goal is to ensure that her family had plenty of trees, plant fruit trees, and advocate for vegetable farming as an income source. She believes that they were taught valuable skills regarding tree planting and noted that the community will continue applying these skills to plant more trees.

Ethiopia Case Study: The Story of Yonas

Yonas, is a 24-year-old man from a family of four. He became the head of his family when his father died in 2008. As a result, he dropped out of school in grade 9. He decided to go to Saudi Arabia through Yemen, where he was arrested and sent to prison until he was deported to Ethiopia.

He tried agriculture but the land was not productive due to soil degradation and drought. Then he began goat breeding and struggled to expand his goat production to earn more money. Two months ago, he attended the "Start and Improve Your Business" training provided by the project. He was recommended by the Kebele Administration and invited to participate in the "Green Job Economy" activities. Yonas attended the training and learned that he should minimise production costs and prepare a business plan for goat fattening.

"The first round of training was very helpful on how to start a business, prepare a business plan, and use cost registration to minimise unwanted expenses. During the second round, "Improve Your Business Training" was provided for 5 days in Kombolcha town. It also improved my knowledge of how to run my business, reduce unnecessary costs, record costs, and evaluate the profit and loss of the business. The two-round training was the most memorable turning point of my life."

Also, the community learned to mobilise to maintain the natural resources and take preventive measures against climate change. Moreover, Yonas hopes the project will provide him with the initial capital to start goat fattening, as his family has farmland to feed and shelter the animals.

C. List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Person	Gender	Location	Position	Date
Noora Mäkelä	Woman	Kenya	Programme official	26/5/2023 & 13/7/2023
Isabelle Kronisch	Woman	Algeria	Programme official	30/5/2023
Timo Schmidt	Man	Switzerland	Programme official	23/5/2023
Markus Topp	Man	Nigeria	Programme official	30/5/2023
Reiko Matsuyama	Woman	Switzerland	Stakeholder (M-MPTF)	2/6/2023
Ahmed Amdihun	Man	Kenya	Stakeholder (ICPAC)	6/6/2023
Mohamed Omar	Man	Kenya	Stakeholder (ICPAC)	6/6/2023
Roberto Rudari	Man	Italy	Implementing partner (CIMA)	16/6/2023
Lena Brenn	Woman	Djibouti/Switzerland	Stakeholder (IGAD)	14/6/2023
Mahdi Abdi Osman	Man	Djibouti	Government	20/6/2023
Kaho Yamaguchi	Woman	Kenya	Programme official	21/3/2023
Lisa Lim Ah Ken	Woman	Kenya	Programme official	22/6/2023
Akol Dut	Man	South Sudan	Government	23/6/2023
Eyasu Kelemie	Man	Ethiopia	Government	26/6/2023
Dagmawi Teferi Tadesse	Man	Ethiopia	Government	28/6/2023
George Mwachiro	Man	Kenya	Government	6/7/2023
Abokor Abdi	Man	Djibouti	Partner (GIZ)	10/7/2023
Jyri Jäntti	Man	Uganda	Stakeholder (RCC)	17/7/2023
Peggie Ayesiga	Woman	Uganda	Government	19/7/2023
Said Mohamed Ali	Man	Somalia	Government	18/7/2023
Atle Solberg	Man	Switzerland	Programme official	21/7/2023
Biruhalem Kassa Gebremeskel	Man	Ethiopia	Programme Official	10/7/2023
Awoke, Zemene	Man	Ethiopia	Local Authority	11/7/2023
Mohamed Adem Seid	Man	Ethiopia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	29/06/2023
Mohamed Ebrahim Seid	Man	Ethiopia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	03/07/2023
Lubaba Mohamed Dawud	Man	Ethiopia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	04/07/2023
Halima Ahimed Sani	Woman	Ethiopia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	30/06/2023
Aminet Ahimed Endiris	Woman	Ethiopia	Returnee	29/06/2023
Adem Yimam Ahimed	Man	Ethiopia	Returnee	26/06/2023

Aminet Ahimed Yimer	Woman	Ethiopia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	30/06/2023
Simachew Wubeshet Tirusew	Man	Ethiopia	BPDO	5/07/2023
Mekonen Nuriye Yimer	Man	Ethiopia	Local Authority	6/07/2023
Hudda Nyadwela	Woman	Kenya	Refugee	4/07/2023
Josphat Emerdir	Man	Kenya	Host community member	4/07/2023
Mbula Peguy	Man	Kenya	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	2/07/2023
Kika Ngakani	Woman	Kenya	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	4/07/2023
Akodi Nadiyo Ayom	Woman	Kenya	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	6/07/2023
Adapal Ebei	Woman	Kenya	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	30/06/2023
Margaret Akal Kaliba	Woman	Kenya	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	30/06/2023
Khadija Ali	Woman	Kenya	IP	29/06/2023
Joseph Imutoh	Man	Kenya	IP	1/04/2023
Clement Nadio	Woman	Kenya	Local Authority	29/06/2023
Samuel Ekarani	Man	Kenya	Local Authority	2/07/2023
Nor Abdi Guled	Man	Somalia	Host community member	25/06/2023
Ilhan Omar Abdi	Woman	Somalia	IDP	25/06/2023
Deqo Ali Ahmed Gacal	Woman	Somalia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	22/06/2023
Abdullahi Mohamud Mohamed	Man	Somalia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	22/06/2023
Mohamud Ali Husein	Man	Somalia	Local Authority	25/06/2023
Yasin Dahir Osman Abdullahi	Man	Somalia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	22/06/2023
Zamzam Abdullahi Ahmed Mohamed	Woman	Somalia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	22/06/2023
Fahmo Ahmed Mohamed Cosoble	Woman	Somalia	Stakeholder (Beneficiary)	22/06/2023
Mohamed Abdirahman Mohamed Adow	Man	Somalia	IP	22/06/2023
Hamza Osman	Man	Somalia	IP	25/06/2023
Numan Dahir Ali	Man	Somalia	Local Authority	25/06/2023

D. Desk review materials reviewed

Programme materials

- Programme documents: proposal documents (MDCC JP Document, budget revisions), Technical Working Group ToR, Steering Committee ToR, proposals sent by implementing partners
- Programme reporting: Annual Reports for 2021 and 2022, midterm update for 2021 and interim update for 2022
- Meeting minutes: Steering Committee (x4) and joint programme meeting notes (x30), review ongoing
- Monitoring: All monitoring documents, including for instance the MDCC MEL plan, after-action annual reviews, baseline surveys, and results monitoring matrix from LOKADO
- Materials from implementing partnerships: two concept notes & one inception report
- Letters of agreement with government partners (Somalia, and two ministries in Kenya)
- Human rights situational assessments (x5 countries)
- Financial materials: grant support agreements;
- Activity documents under pillars: Including action plans, activity reports, interim reports, final reports, summary reports, workshop PPTs and reports, training materials, awareness raising materials, and consultant final reports – ongoing
- M-MPTF guidance note and manual

Communication materials

- Programme webpage, including Newsletters, event reports, stories
- M-MPTF webpage for the programme
- FMR article
- Migration Policy Practice article
- PDD article on the programme
- Infosheets: programme, and key achievements and deliverables

Final deliverables

- Cyclone Displacement Risk Profile
- Flood Displacement Risk Profile
- Decision-making model comparative report (draft)
- Kenya CCAAP (Turkana North and Kibish)
- Kenya CCAP (Turkana West)
- Policy Review/Analysis of Human Mobility in the National and County Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Frameworks in Kenya
- Study on Environmental Migration in Climate Change Policy in Somalia
- Draft standard operating procedures (Ethiopia-Kenya and Kenya-Uganda)

- Desk review: Policies, Laws and Practices on Admission and Stay in Disaster and Climate Change Contexts in the IGAD Region
- Human Mobility and Climate Change in the IGAD Region: A Case Study in the Shared Border Regions of Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia
- Study summary report: Integration of Human Mobility in Green Economy and Related Policies in the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Region
- A Market System Analysis on Green Jobs and Entrepreneurship Opportunities in Disaster and Climate Change Affected Areas of South Wollo Zone, Kalu Woreda
- ICPAC action plan

Other research and resource materials (from the provided desk review materials and beyond)

- Protocol on Free Movement of Persons in the IGAD Region
- Assessing the link between Climate, Migration, Conflict and Violence in IGAD States (Koren, 2022)
- Regional and national migration policies in East and Horn of Africa (IOM)
- Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation and Development Policies and their Consideration of Disaster Displacement and Human Mobility in the IGAD Region (Nyandiko & Freeman, 2020)
- The Interaction between Climate Change, Labour Markets and Migration in the IGAD Region: Empirical study in Djibouti, Ethiopia and Uganda (Hammerstad, Norrington-Davies, Rabinowitz, 2021)
- Report on the Regional and National Migration Policies in East and Horn of Africa (IOM)
- The State of Migration in East and Horn of Africa Report 2022 (IOM, 2023)
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report 2022
- Challenges and opportunities of climate change: The case of East Africa (Ndung'u & Azomahou, 2023)
- African Shifts: The Africa Climate Mobility Initiative Report (2022)
- Climate and Migration in East and the Horn of Africa: Spatial Analysis of Migrants' Flows Data (IOM, 2021)
- Policy brief: the interactions between climate change, labour markets and migration in the IGAD region (ILO, 2022)
- Labour Migration and Human Mobility: Human mobility and labour migration related to climate change in a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all (ILO, 2022)

E. Evaluation matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation questions
---------------------	----------------------

Relevance	<p>Were the project activities and outputs well designed, valid and consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?</p> <p>To what extent different stakeholders, particularly migrants and affected communities were engaged in the design of the programme interventions?</p> <p>To what extent did the activities and outputs take into account the policies and priorities of the IGAD and its Members states?</p>
Coherence	<p>To what extent was the intervention consistent with international frameworks, particularly the GCM, but also the Paris Agreement, Sendai Framework, Nansen Initiative and the ILO Just Transition Guidelines among others?</p> <p>Do synergies exist with other interventions in the IGAD region carried out by intervention partners, and other actors? If yes, how these could be scaled up in phase II?</p>
Effectiveness	<p>Have the outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?</p> <p>What were the major factors, internal and external, influencing the achievement of the intervention's desired outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent were the relevant stakeholders reached as expected, and are they satisfied with the results of the interventions?</p>
Efficiency	<p>How well were the resources (funds, expertise and time) being converted into results?</p> <p>Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way (time and fund) and to the planned scope?</p>
Sustainability	<p>Do IGAD and its Member States (national/local levels) have any plans and/or structures to continue making use of the services/products produced?</p> <p>To what extent were the IGAD Member States and other relevant stakeholders engaged in the interventions?</p> <p>Which components of the programme should be scaled up to enhance sustainability?</p>
Impact	<p>What significant change(s) does the intervention bring or is expected to bring for IGAD MS on GCM implementation, whether positive or negative, intended or unintended?</p>
GCM principles (Human Rights/ Gender responsive/	<p>Were the project activities and outputs well designed, valid and consistent with the GCM principles?</p>

<p>Child Sensitive/ Whole of Government/ Whole of Society/ People- Centered)</p>	<p>To what extent was the intervention consistent with international frameworks, particularly the GCM?</p> <p>To what extent the interventions incorporated the GCM principles, and advanced the enjoyment of human rights by relevant rights-holders; gender equality and empowerment of women and girls; and children’s rights and meeting their needs?</p> <p>To what extent were the GCM principles (Human Rights / Gender responsive / Child Sensitive/ Whole of Government / Whole of Society / People Centered) incorporated into the project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring and reporting)?</p> <p>To what extent did the programme management structure reflect and align with these GCM guiding principles?</p> <p>Are there lessons learned and/or good practices that can be identified?</p> <p>Which components of the programme should be scaled up to enhance advancement of the GCM principles?</p>
--	--