

KNOWING WHAT WORKS



# Corporate Strategy Evaluation – Displacement and Migration

Corporate Strategy Evaluation – Short Report  
Conducted by external evaluators commissioned by GIZ

## Publication details

As a federal enterprise, GIZ supports the German Government in achieving its objectives in the field of international cooperation for sustainable development.

The Evaluation Unit at GIZ reports directly to the Management Board and is separate from the company's operational business. This organisational structure underpins the unit's independence. The Evaluation Unit is mandated to generate evidence-based results and recommendations in order to facilitate decision-making and to provide credible proof and increase the transparency of results.

The evaluation was conducted and the evaluation report prepared by external evaluators commissioned by the Evaluation Unit. All opinions and assessments expressed in the report are those of the evaluators. GIZ has prepared a statement on the results and a management response to the recommendations.

### Evaluators:

Dr Katrin Kinzelbach and Julian Lehmann (GPPI); Alexander Carius and Lukas Rüttinger (adelphi); Victoria Rietig (independent consultant)

### Authors:

Dr Katrin Kinzelbach, Julian Lehmann, Alexander Carius, Lukas Rüttinger, Victoria Rietig

### Consulting:

Global Public Policy Institute	adelphi consult
Reinhardstr. 7	Alt-Moabit 91
10117 Berlin	10559 Berlin
Germany	Germany
T: +49 30 275 959 750	T: +49 30 89000680
E: <a href="mailto:info@gppi.net">info@gppi.net</a>	E: <a href="mailto:office@adelphi.de">office@adelphi.de</a>
I: <a href="http://www.gppi.net">www.gppi.net</a>	I: <a href="http://www.adelphi.de">www.adelphi.de</a>

### Concept design, coordination and management

Dr Annette Backhaus, GIZ Evaluation Unit, Head of Corporate Strategy Evaluations Section

Simon Freund, GIZ Evaluation Unit, senior specialist

Lennart Bendfeldt-Huthmann, GIZ Evaluation Unit, specialist

Dr Vera Hundt, GIZ Evaluation Unit, specialist

### Responsible:

Dr Ricardo Gomez, GIZ, Director of GIZ Evaluation Unit

### Published by:

Deutsche Gesellschaft für  
Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

### Registered offices

Bonn and Eschborn

Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 36 + 40  
53113 Bonn

T +49 228 4460 0

F +49 228 4460 1766

E [evaluierung@giz.de](mailto:evaluierung@giz.de)

I [www.giz.de/evaluierung](http://www.giz.de/evaluierung)

[www.youtube.com/user/GIZonlineTV](https://www.youtube.com/user/GIZonlineTV)

[www.facebook.com/gizprofile](https://www.facebook.com/gizprofile)

[https://twitter.com/giz\\_gmbh](https://twitter.com/giz_gmbh)

### Design and layout:

DITHO Design GmbH, Cologne

### Printing and Distribution:

GIZ, Bonn

Printed on 100 % recycled paper,  
certified to FSC standards.

Bonn 2018

This document can be downloaded as a PDF file  
from the GIZ website at [www.giz.de/evaluierung](http://www.giz.de/evaluierung). For  
printed copies, please contact [evaluierung@giz.de](mailto:evaluierung@giz.de)

# Summary

Since 2015, the knock-on effects on domestic, foreign and development policy of the influx of asylum seekers and other migrants to the European Union and its neighbouring countries have been the subject of much discussion by experts and the broader public alike. GIZ has been commissioned by the German Federal Government and by the European Union to implement an array of new projects<sup>1</sup> – some of which have received large-scale funding – to support migrants and refugees in non-European countries. In addition to projects that target migrants and refugees, GIZ implements technical cooperation projects that are designed to assist governments and civil society in transit and host countries in dealing with the challenges and opportunities presented by migration.

How successfully did GIZ carry out this task? What objectives and anticipated results do projects in this area have? How can GIZ gear its work to a greater degree to the achievement of results rather than just to the delivery of outputs? What lessons can GIZ learn from its activities so far? These are just some of the questions addressed by this final short report on the corporate strategy evaluation on displacement and migration.

In consultation with a cross-departmental and cross-sectoral reference group and with GIZ's Evaluation Unit, the Management Board commissioned this corporate strategy evaluation in order to support internal learning and reflection, and secure practical knowledge. As the name suggests, corporate strategy evaluations examine issues related to GIZ's corporate strategy. They also look at output delivery. Above all, the corporate strategy evaluation on displacement and migration should assist GIZ in:

- designing and implementing its projects in the areas of migration and displacement in a more results-based manner. In other words, the planning and implementation of projects should, to the greatest extent possible, reflect the intended and unintended positive and negative changes they trigger and maximise the positive changes.
- strengthening monitoring of its projects'

results. Results monitoring involves continuously monitoring the intended and unintended positive and negative changes and reporting on the findings. The terms 'results orientation' and 'monitoring of results' are used together at GIZ within the context of 'results-based monitoring (RBM)'.

## Object and focus of the evaluation

The object of the evaluation was the design of results and implementation of their monitoring in a selection of 95 projects in the area of migration and displacement. 38 projects were examined in depth; 26 as part of the portfolio analysis and 12 more in case studies. The projects reviewed were chosen from an overall portfolio of 138 projects that explicitly mention migrants and refugees as their target group or aim to support partners in dealing with the impact of migration and displacement. Such projects are usually conducted in transit or host countries. In line with the evaluation's mandate, projects that help mitigate the root causes of displacement were not examined. Rather than being restricted to individual GIZ sectors such as economic development and employment, or security, reconstruction and peace, the projects reviewed are spread across different sectors and regions

In line with the terms of reference:

- the key areas of GIZ's migration and displacement portfolio were identified;
- the framework conditions for designing and implementing projects were analysed;
- the anticipated results of the key project types were reviewed; and
- practical implementation of the projects was examined in light of the challenges identified in results monitoring.

## Methodology

The corporate strategy evaluation was carried out as an ongoing evaluation with ex-ante elements and adopted a formative approach, i.e. the primary objective was to examine the period before and during the implementation phase rather than to assess the situation retroactively for the purposes of accountability. As a formative evaluation, the corporate strategy evaluation set out to help improve ongoing and future projects and knowledge management and to support knowledge management and internal reflection on projects in the areas of migration and displacement.

<sup>1</sup> In this context, the term 'project' refers to measures, projects and programmes implemented by GIZ.

A qualitative, non-experimental, four-step design was chosen for the corporate strategy evaluation. The four steps were: identification of the typology of the projects' objectives; in-depth analysis of the selected individual projects; review of the documented knowledge of selected anticipated results and, finally, case studies.

In addition to two country case studies that involved trips to Morocco and northern Iraq, one thematic case study was conducted. The theme was selected on the basis of the types of objective that are not only relevant for corporate strategy, but also the subject of much controversy among experts at GIZ. Based on both of these criteria (relevance to corporate strategy and type of objective hotly debated within GIZ), 'return and reintegration' was selected as a theme. A short trip to Albania was carried out for the thematic case study.

The key data collection methods were desk study, semi-structured interviews and participatory monitoring. A focus group discussion was also held in Albania.

### Limitations

The approach chosen for the evaluation object has several limitations. Firstly, the projects selected for the in-depth analysis do not fully reflect the migration and displacement portfolio as a whole, because a broader evaluation would have been too time-consuming. Another reason why a full evaluation would not have been feasible is that the portfolio is constantly rapidly evolving, which means that the thematic priority areas and the percentage composition of the target groups could change too. When selecting the projects however, care was taken to ensure that the full range of project types was taken into account. Consideration was also given to the geographical distribution of projects.

Secondly, when evaluating responses to the evaluation questions, evaluators usually rely on statements made by the responsible staff members themselves. Where possible for the purpose of triangulation, interviews were conducted with representatives of commissioning parties/clients, partners, other implementing organisations and multilateral organisations, and the findings were compared. It was only possible to conduct interviews with migrant target groups as part of one, but not all case studies, so that data triangulation was only possible to a very limited degree.

Thirdly, due to the very diverse nature of the projects, existing evidence could only be collected for selected assumptions. This evidence was collected as random samples and was by no means exhaustive. Fourthly, the evaluators were not able to examine all relevant processes, although this limitation was the exception rather than the rule. The evaluators were given access to a number of ongoing processes and to confidential documents.

### Target groups in the evaluation portfolio

In the evaluation portfolio, GIZ project documents specify refugees as the most important target group, followed by IDPs and returnees. Overall, these projects account for 63% of the evaluated projects. Only 13% of the projects specify other migrants such as skilled workers or (potential) student migrants as a target group. 24% of the projects in the portfolio specify other target groups such as state institutions, international organisations or BMZ divisions whose capacities for dealing with migration and displacement need to be developed. These percentages underline the strong focus of current activities on crises and refugees. In this context, most of the projects address two or more target groups and adopt an integrative approach. Consequently, resources and services are made available not just to a very limited target group of migrants (such as returnees or refugees) but also to all other members of the host community. 66% of the projects in the overall evaluated portfolio state host communities as a target group. A huge 98% of the projects directed at refugees and IDPs also include the host community as a target group.

### Migration and displacement – types of objective

The evaluation portfolio may be broken down into six different types of objective:

- Objective type 1: Stabilising areas/countries affected by acute crises and conflict;
- Objective type 2: Improving living conditions and livelihoods
- Objective type 3: Supporting return and reintegration;
- Objective type 4: Improving psychosocial support;
- Objective type 5: Improving migration policy, asylum systems and border management;
- Objective type 6: Strengthening the development-related potential of migrants.

Objective type 2 accounts for the majority of the projects (53% of all of the projects reviewed); all other objective types account for a mid single-digit percentage of the overall number of projects reviewed. The screened portfolio incorporates a diverse range of sectors and objectives. Most of the projects link up to migration and displacement insofar as they broaden the reach of established project types implemented by GIZ to include the target group of migrants and refugees. At the national level, the majority of the projects also link into established priority sectors of German development cooperation. This means that the target groups of migrants and refugees have been integrated into GIZ's established portfolio. There are some exceptions, however. So far, migrants and refugees have rarely been included in ongoing projects in the legal and judicial, or security and good governance sectors. Issues related to good governance are currently usually only addressed in new displacement or migration-specific projects that support border management and establish asylum systems.

### **How does GIZ deal with the objectives of commissioning parties and clients?**

When it comes to the migration and displacement portfolio, GIZ not only works with the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) – its main commissioning party – but also with other parties and clients such as the German Federal Foreign Office (AA), the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) and the European Commission. In almost all of the projects reviewed, GIZ faced pressure from its commissioning parties and clients to deliver outputs quickly. The GIZ staff members interviewed said that this was the first time they had experienced such pressure and put it down to domestic policy constraints. This applied to projects funded by the EU as well as to those commissioned by the German Government. Mounting pressure is not just down to the domestic policy considerations of commissioning parties and clients – it also stems to a large degree from the urgent need for action in the countries facing crisis and conflict, further increasing the pressure to deliver outputs swiftly.

GIZ's scope to advise on project objectives varied, depending on the commissioning party or client and the mandate in question. It was able to shape technical discussions in the area of BMZ's work with

returnees, for example, proving that it can further develop its commissioning parties' vision of their objectives. The same is true for discussions with the European Commission and with European member states in the area of border management. However, there were also cases where tight policies placed heavy restrictions on GIZ's ability to shape change. For example, GIZ staff at a number of levels viewed some of the goals pursued by Germany and the European Union in the area of refugee and migration policy critically. Many staff members felt that some new projects in the areas of stabilisation, return and border management were out of step with their understanding of development. Others felt that they had no other choice but to observe interest-led technical and international policy and tried to adapt their work to this general framework.

GIZ thus started to develop design principles for migration projects. These aim to bridge the divide between offering technical guidance for dialogue with commissioning parties and clients, while at the same time maintaining scope for developing GIZ's business sectors.

In response to requirements of the Green Climate Fund, GIZ also developed safeguards involving company-specific risk assessment and quality assurance standards that apply to all commissioning parties and clients. These safeguards are also relevant to migration and displacement as they require all projects to be assessed for potential unintended, negative results, irrespective of the commissioning party or client, particularly as regards human rights and conflict dynamics.

### **Project design**

At the practical level, the way the standard appraisal procedure for BMZ business is applied varies. For example, the processes used to prepare project proposals and implement appraisal missions have been abridged or not implemented in their entirety for certain projects in response to increased pressure to implement activities. Even so, in crisis and conflict countries, GIZ usually conducted conflict and context analyses even if they were not explicitly requested by the commissioning party or client. Most of the projects that were analysed in-depth discuss do-no-harm criteria and risks, usually to a varying degree. Among the projects reviewed, the quality of results design varied significantly. About one third of the projects analysed in-depth are very output-based.

They are primarily large-scale transitional aid projects commissioned by BMZ as well as projects implemented in crisis contexts with funding from the German Federal Foreign Office (AA). In order to facilitate the flow of the high amounts of funding, the commissioning parties' requirements focus on short-term outputs for recipients, such as cash-for-work measures or training.

For projects geared towards impact rather than outputs, highly abridged causal chains are one of the observed weaknesses in results design. Here, it was noted that project proposals do not describe results hypotheses in detail. In the project proposals, the module and programme objectives (results) were sometimes intentionally not described in detail so as to enhance flexibility during implementation. Commissioning party and client objectives driven by domestic, foreign or security policy considerations also remain implicit.

## Implementation

The implementation of large-scale transitional aid projects and of activities conducted in crisis and conflict contexts in particular focussed on achieving the specified output targets and on the flow of funds. Results orientation played a secondary role. However, field structure staff continued to develop results orientation during the implementation phase (either with or without support from the Sectoral Department in Eschborn) once the pressure to deliver outputs had abated and there was an increased likelihood that targets would be achieved. To this end, existing scope in the project proposals was leveraged, individual indicators were intentionally exceeded and activities adjusted where possible.

Monitoring and reporting formats were primarily geared towards the requirements of commissioning parties and clients rather than to GIZ's own standards. In extreme scenarios, the pressure to implement activities meant that no monitoring system was put in place. In other cases, the focus lay on special, accurate reports on the outputs delivered. These reports were required by GIZ's commissioning parties and clients. Many of the interviewed staff regarded the focus of monitoring on outputs as problematic and said that demands on monitoring were high. As the pressure to deliver abated, a system to monitor results was developed at a later

stage during implementation.

A review of the results achieved through the delivered outputs among the migrant target groups was made more difficult by the fact that data were not always collected on a disaggregated basis for the different target groups and were only rarely collected on a disaggregated basis within the target groups themselves. This was also observed in cases where the project proposal stipulated particularly vulnerable migrants as the target group. It would be relatively easy to disaggregate the data for projects such as training measures or cash-for-work programmes, which delivered direct outputs. However, a meaningfully disaggregated results monitoring system is more difficult and costly to set up for projects that build the proactive abilities of state structures.

In the implementation of the projects analysed in case studies, a review of conflict sensitivity and of the do-no-harm principle only played a specific role in exceptional cases. This was primarily due to the implementation pressure, but also to the unsatisfactory incentives mechanisms for observing the do-no-harm requirements in the implementation phase.

As a result of the strong pressure to deliver outputs quickly, a number of institutional bottlenecks also clearly arose such as the difficulty of recruiting skilled project implementation staff at short notice. Other bottlenecks were caused by GIZ's administrative structures in general as well as procurement rules in particular.

## Partner and target group orientation

Partners see the value of coordination with GIZ, but also believe that there is further need for political dialogue on the overarching goals that guide both GIZ's work and the decisions made by its commissioning parties and clients in the area of migration and displacement. In this context, there is still unresolved tension as regards the vision of commissioning parties and clients and the priorities of partners and target groups' needs. Although coordination between Germany's various federal ministries on issues related to migration policy has already been stepped up, at a practical level, GIZ continues to be involved in resolving coordination issues. This situation ties up resources and can lead to implementation delays.

In terms of the needs of the target groups, which are

sometimes very heterogeneous (refugees, other migrants including IDPs or particularly vulnerable migrants such as the victims of human trafficking, as well as host communities), it must be pointed out that information on their priorities was not always collected or was only gathered after the project had started. The implementation pressure described above impeded a detailed needs analysis before the project started.

GIZ's staff are one of its strongest assets when dealing with the challenges presented by migration and displacement. Their flexibility, commitment and solution orientation played a key role in the responsible handling of restrictive framework conditions.

### **Design and implementation – conclusions**

The challenges and weaknesses observed in the evaluated projects are primarily due to the difficult framework conditions in which the migration and displacement portfolio was developed and implemented. These include above all the increase in migration and refugee numbers, mixed migration flows, long-standing violent conflict, disagreement between commissioning parties and clients and partner countries on fundamental migration policy issues, as well as the new phenomenon of the need for German international cooperation to reconcile issues related to foreign, security and development policy with domestic policy interests.

Although these conditions lie outside of GIZ's control, they offer an opportunity for further improving how it is positioned – even against the backdrop of this difficult framework – to design and implement high-quality, results-based projects that are relevant for the target groups. To this end, GIZ needs not only to observe technical aspects when designing results but also to optimise standard processes, step up dialogue with commissioning parties and clients, and engage in stronger networking with other actors.

### **Plausibility of the anticipated results**

For anticipated results of strategic importance, the report under review summarises good practice, documented evidence of results, challenges and risks, and lists areas to be observed. The selected anticipated results relate to the establishment of mechanisms to protect refugees and vulnerable

migrants (protection governance), cash-for-work programmes, the integrative approach, return and reintegration as well as mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS).

The amount of evidence for these themes varies considerably. Overall, only very few anticipated results have sufficient evidence to support project design. In fact, gaps in evidence are apparent. By stepping up results-based monitoring, GIZ can and should help generate more knowledge for evidence-based design.

Evidence on the establishment of national administrative structures to determine the status of refugees, identify vulnerability and provide referral advice for vulnerable migrants such as the victims of human trafficking is still quite scant. Unlike in other areas however, here, GIZ can seek guidance from international reference documents on protection standards and international cooperation that provide a generally accepted basis for good practices.

Existing evidence on cash-for-work programmes shows that short-term, positive results have been achieved in terms of improving living conditions, boosting the self-esteem of recipients and developing public and social infrastructure, basic services and the local economy. There is no evidence of long-term results, however. In other words, cash-for-work cannot replace long-term development cooperation approaches or peace-building measures.

Furthermore, cash-for-work poses certain risks such as a bias towards the selection of certain groups, increased competition on the labour market and the onset of psychological problems when support is withdrawn. From an efficiency point of view, the question arises as to whether cash transfers, which are less cumbersome and increasingly common in humanitarian aid, would not be preferable to the cash-for-work approach. From this point of view, cash-for-work should only be given priority over cash transfers in cases where work assignments are able to generate value above and beyond short-term needs.

Almost all GIZ projects that generate outputs for migrants and refugees use the integrative approach. However, not all staff members have the same understanding of the term. It is a key method used in conflict resolution, a hypothesis that is also adopted in literature on the subject, based however among other things on the premise that cash is distributed using a well-thought-out allocation method that is suited to the specific situation and accepted by the

target groups. Possible risks associated with the approach include elite capture, a failure to distinguish appropriately between host communities and migrants (both of which are heterogeneous groups) and the subjective perception of bias towards particular target groups.

In the areas of return and reintegration, there is evidence to substantiate key results anticipated by GIZ. Improved services for returnees and host communities (focus on socio-economic support) can help improve the sustainability of the return and reintegration process. However, there are a number of specific and structural factors that play a key role in determining the sustainability and success of reintegration measures and are very difficult for GIZ to influence. The reviewed evidence does not confirm the expectation that reintegration assistance will prevent repeat migration. Some of the key challenges in the area of return and reintegration include the heterogeneity of returnees as a target group and the measurement of reintegration.

There is still little in the way of scientific evidence to corroborate the anticipated results of mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) measures in displacement and migration contexts. One of the difficulties in systematising practical experience is the sheer variety of different ways in which the results of MHPSS measures can be worded. Standardised wording could help resolve this dilemma. To the extent that it can be transferred to the DC context, the standard wording for results developed by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee could provide guidance for GIZ in this regard, and help offset the emphasis on outputs that practitioners have been critical of.

## Recommendations

The report contains eight recommendations that are designed to help GIZ improve the design of results and to support results-based monitoring in the migration and displacement portfolio. These recommendations are concretised by operational guidelines. The recommendations are:

1. Act with foresight and in a networked manner.
2. Harmonise GIZ's responsiveness with its standard processes – move away from crisis mode.
3. Retain results orientation despite pressure to deliver.

4. Prioritise results monitoring in implementation.
5. Observe the duty of care to exercise human rights due diligence and adhere to the principle of do-no-harm.
6. Consolidate the integrative approach.
7. Focus to a greater degree on the needs and know-how of the target groups.
8. Engage in dialogue on controversial issues within migration policy.

Recommendation 1 deals with GIZ's strategic positioning. It involves ensuring that GIZ is better prepared to deal with future trends in migration and displacement movements, complementary and cross-border design, dialogue between migration and displacement experts, networking with other actors and thematic priority areas.

Recommendation 2 focuses primarily on standard processes in the area of *recruitment, procurement and contracting*. GIZ's standard processes should not be geared towards its ability to respond to crises, as established appraisal procedures are one of GIZ's strengths. However, GIZ can improve its ability to respond. It should lay the foundations for not always having to implement measures in crisis mode in cases where it is requested to set up large-scale projects at short notice. Above all, it is advisable in this context to strengthen capacities for rapid recruitment and for coaching.

Recommendation 3 tackles results orientation, in particular the issue of how GIZ can maintain its well-established results orientation even in crisis and conflict scenarios and in situations when it is under pressure from commissioning parties and clients to deliver. Ways in which GIZ can improve its results orientation include investing in the quality of appraisal missions and improving the availability of their findings for officers responsible for the commission and for field staff. Appraisal missions and quality assurance processes should ensure to a greater degree that projects formulate results (rather than outputs) at the module objective level. Assumptions should be described in detail in the narrative sections of project proposals; general project and context-related results models are not recommended. In the migration and displacement portfolio, safeguards should be applied systematically and consistently throughout, for all commissioning parties and clients. Recommendation 4 addresses the monitoring of results during implementation. GIZ should prioritise monitoring during the implementation phase and

develop its monitoring systems at an earlier stage. To this end, it is advisable to use monitoring-specific budget lines. The data collected should include information on the results achieved and, where relevant, the contribution of GIZ projects to peace-building. Where possible, monitoring by third parties should be supplemented with other forms of monitoring and only be the sole form of data collection in exceptional cases. Results orientation is particularly challenging if a specific commissioning party or client requires rapid delivery of outputs in response to political pressure. In such cases, GIZ should agree, in consultation with the various commissioning parties and clients in question, on a balance between timely reporting on the delivery of outputs, and a more relaxed critical analysis of the results achieved or in some cases not achieved. Recommendation 5 concentrates on the duty of care to exercise human rights due diligence and the principle of do-no-harm. In accordance with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and as a member of the Global Compact, GIZ has a duty to exercise human rights due diligence, independently of its duties in this respect vis-à-vis its commissioning parties and clients. It should therefore invest in impact assessment (safeguards). Internal guidelines should provide a detailed description of known risks in the context of migration and displacement. Incentive mechanisms to improve monitoring of the do-no-harm principle should be expanded. Recommendations 6 to 8 pick up on technical approaches and the challenges faced in this context. Above all, this involves consolidating the integrative approach. A uniform definition of this approach needs to be identified. Corresponding internal expertise should be further systematised, and staff sensitised to the boundaries of the approach. Above all, GIZ should review its different targeting procedures and develop guidelines for future targeting within the scope of the integrative approach. We also recommend focusing to a greater degree on the needs, know-how and expertise of the target group. Information in this regard should be collected at an early stage and disaggregated appropriately, group by group. Longer-term projects should always contain participatory elements and also incorporate migrant and refugee representatives in this context. In order to exercise human rights due diligence and to recognise and counteract at an early stage possible negative effects of its own actions in the

context of migration and displacement movements, GIZ needs to expand its existing grievance mechanism.

Ultimately, GIZ will have no other choice but to deal with controversial migration policy issues. In doing so, it should try to adopt a role as mediator between commissioning parties and clients, partner governments and target groups and to help facilitate the required reconciliation of interests in this context. It is advisable for GIZ to take an even closer look at its staff's technical preconceptions and to improve communication on decisions related to corporate strategy. One particularly effective way of doing this would be to review the current process for wording design principles, to clarify the mandatory nature of these principles and then publish them. Staff should receive better training on communicating information externally, not just in order to safeguard GIZ's reputation but also to ensure that sections of Germany's political system and the general public have realistic expectations of the objectives that can be achieved through the migration and displacement portfolio, and rectify any misconceptions they may have.

### **Structure of the report**

The report consists of eight sections. Section 1 outlines the evaluation objectives, the object of the evaluation and the envisaged use of the findings. Section 2 defines key terms. The methodological approach is described in greater detail in Section 3, followed by an overview of the evaluated portfolio in Section 4. The report goes on to describe the findings and conclusions in relation to the design of results (Section 5) and the implementation of results monitoring (Section 6). Based on a review of the existing evidence and practical experience, Section 7 examines the plausibility of selected pledged results. Section 8 describes the recommendations in detail. Following on from the main body of the report, comments are provided along with a management response in the annex.

*The main report (German version only) can be downloaded from:*

*[https://www.giz.de/de/downloads/FINAL%20Hauptbericht\\_USE%20Flucht%20und%20Migration\\_final%20200618.pdf](https://www.giz.de/de/downloads/FINAL%20Hauptbericht_USE%20Flucht%20und%20Migration_final%20200618.pdf)*

# Comments

In December 2016, GIZ commissioned a consortium comprising GPPi and adelphi to implement a corporate strategy evaluation on displacement and migration.

Corporate strategy evaluations are funded and conducted by the Evaluation Unit at the behest of the Management Board. The Unit bears full responsibility. The evaluations address the company's decision-making needs as well as its change processes, which may relate to both output delivery and corporate strategy. They also support evidence-based decisions, organisational learning and accountability.

Use of the evaluation findings is encouraged by the fact that the design phase focuses on the specific issues to be examined, the information required and the implementation capacities of the actors involved. This is achieved, for example, by involving all key stakeholders in the evaluation process through reference groups.

Displacement and migration was selected as the subject matter of this corporate strategy evaluation due to the theme's strong relevance and the many challenges GIZ faces in this regard. A lot of funding has been channelled into the area and several new projects have been commissioned, many of which have been allocated large volumes of funding. The different donor modalities, dynamic contexts and the complex nature of the problems involved all present special challenges in terms of project design and implementation.

Above all, the corporate strategy evaluation on displacement and migration should assist GIZ in:

- designing and implementing its projects in the areas of migration and displacement in a more results-based manner and
- strengthening the monitoring of its projects' results.

The object of the evaluation was the design of results and implementation of their monitoring in a selection of 95 projects in the area of migration and displacement. 38 projects were examined in depth;

26 as part of a portfolio analysis and 12 more in case studies.

The evaluation was not designed to examine individual projects and did not use the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria as structural elements. The corporate strategy evaluation was set up as a formative evaluation with ex-ante elements: Rather than assessing the situation retroactively for the purposes of accountability, its primary goal was to conduct an analysis in the run-up to and during implementation of the evaluated displacement and migration projects with a view to continuously and systematically improving the orientation and monitoring of their results.

The evaluators used a mixture of qualitative methods, above all desk study and semi-structured interviews. Where possible, data, method and investigator triangulation was used. For the purposes of in-depth portfolio analysis and preparation of the case studies, project proposals were assessed, along with their results models and results matrices, proposed changes, progress reports and information on project implementation. Within the scope of a literature review, the evaluators assessed relevant GIZ guidelines, international reference documents as well as relevant evaluations and academic literature (for example, evidence repositories such as 3ie evidence gap maps and evidence aid were used). The evaluators also conducted semi-structured interviews with 121 people. A detailed description of the methodology used as well as its limitations is provided in Section 3 of the long report.

In order to optimise usability of the evaluation findings, the evaluators sought to engage in close dialogue with all relevant actors at GIZ. In addition to dialogue with the corporate strategy evaluation's reference group, the following dialogue platforms were used for several events to ensure the formative nature of the evaluation:

- Dialogue event with the GIZ-wide working group on displacement and migration (dialogue event at the director of division level).
- Discussion with field staff on the goals of the corporate strategy evaluation, the approach to be used and issues to be examined, which took place at a workshop in Amman on the lessons learned by the special initiative 'Tackling the root causes of

- displacement, (re)integrating refugees’.
- Participation at an expert forum in Eschborn and a workshop in Berlin on the issue of returnees.
- Dialogue event as part of a four-day workshop with the working groups ‘Refugees, IDPs, Returnees, Host Communities’ and ‘Mental Health and Psychosocial Support’ held by the GIZ network ‘International Cooperation in Conflicts and Disasters (NICD)’.
- Two debriefing sessions following completion of the country case studies. Here, the focus was on discussion of the preliminary observations and findings.
- Presentation and discussion of the recommendations with selected specialist GIZ staff with a view to further critical investigation, fine-tuning and finalisation.

The report was produced by the commissioned external experts. From GIZ’s point of view, the evaluation was carried out in a user-oriented manner using robust methods. The evaluation matrix in Annex 3 of the long report explains the methodologies used to work on the relevant evaluation questions. It also lists the data sources used and the corresponding conclusions and recommendations.

Overall, the evaluation’s findings are valid and useful for GIZ.

## Management response

This section provides information on the extent to which GIZ’s management agrees with the recommendations made by the evaluation. GIZ will develop an implementation plan for the high-priority recommendations. This plan will describe the improvement measures to be carried out and state the responsible organisational unit, the deadline and the resources to be used. Implementation will be monitored by the Evaluation Unit and by the organisational units carrying out the measures.

The following overarching recommendations were made as part of the corporate strategy evaluation:

1. Act with foresight and in a networked manner
2. Harmonise GIZ’s responsiveness with its standard processes – move away from crisis mode
3. Retain results orientation despite pressure to deliver
4. Prioritise results monitoring in implementation
5. Observe the duty of care to exercise human rights due diligence and adhere to the principle of do-no-harm
6. Consolidate the integrative approach
7. Focus to a greater degree on the needs and know-how of the target groups
8. Engage in dialogue on controversial issues within migration policy

47 operational guidelines were drafted to flesh out details of the recommendations (cf. Section 8 of the long report). Rather than examining each individual point in detail, this section responds to the overarching recommendations, referring to specific points where relevant. The recommendations target different levels: the first recommendation focuses on GIZ’s strategic orientation and the second addresses internal standard processes and procedures, above all recruitment. Recommendations three and four deal with results orientation and the monitoring of project results, while recommendations five to eight look at technical approaches and challenges. The management response revolves around these levels.

The evaluation was conducted in close consultation with the relevant actors, who were very helpful. The formative nature of the evaluation was supported by the fact that the evaluation team was actively involved in various dialogue forums, including those held to discuss feedback on the evaluation's (interim) findings. For this reason, several improvement measures at the operational level were already introduced during the evaluation particularly given the fact that, in a field as dynamic as displacement and migration, numerous learning and dialogue platforms lead to continuous adjustment. Changes were therefore repeatedly initiated or validated and consolidated as part of the evaluation process. This also means that the evaluation's effects cannot always be captured in specific terms. Certain issues, particularly those related to results levels (see recommendations 3 and 4), proved controversial and were hotly debated throughout the evaluation as was the perception of some staff members that projects on displacement could in certain cases erode development values and be overshadowed by domestic, foreign and security policy interests (recommendation 8).

#### **Recommendation 1: Act with foresight and in a networked manner**

GIZ shares this recommendation in principle. It also sees the relevance of anticipating migration and displacement routes and improving cross-border harmonisation between projects, for example along these routes. The corporate strategy evaluation thus confirms the significance of activities and processes that have already been initiated in this area and that are to be stepped up. For example, scenario analyses for migration routes are being developed in different regions and cooperation arrangements in this field are being expanded, with the World Bank and the University of Maastricht, among others. There is no questioning the importance of cross-border cooperation, particularly in the migration and displacement context, and relevant arrangements have already been put in place wherever possible. Most country-specific commissions impose restrictions in this context, however.

To a large degree, the first recommendation addresses the challenges associated with mixed migration and displacement flows, both in terms of

conceptual design, and technical and institutional dialogue. The technical and strategic dialogue recommended in this context is already taking place. GIZ does not share the evaluators' definition of migration and displacement, whereby displacement is a 'sub-topic' of migration. Although scientifically speaking this may be correct, at the policy level a different approach is taken, internationally too within the context of two global compacts.

GIZ is not only in favour of the evaluators' call to link up short-term measures with structure-building projects. We also believe that our wide array of instruments leaves us particularly well positioned to tackle the nexus between humanitarian aid and development cooperation, for example using transitional aid. One of the unique characteristics of German transitional aid is that this very linkage of short-term aid and structure building is incorporated into the design and implementation of BMZ projects. Although it has already implemented measures in the area, GIZ believes that there is additional need to act on the recommendation to address governance in the displacement and migration portfolio and will incorporate such aspects into implementation planning.

#### **Recommendation 2: Harmonise GIZ's responsiveness with its standard processes**

GIZ does not share the evaluators' opinion to the extent worded in the recommendation. Successful implementation shows that GIZ is responding increasingly quickly to crises, even in the context of large-scale, conflict-sensitive crisis management projects and stabilisation measures. Here, diverse optimisation measures have already led to significant improvements in standard processes. However, GIZ still believes it has challenges to overcome in this context, particularly as regards more rapid recruitment, appropriate onboarding and ongoing advice and coaching on-site. The commissioning system restricts implementation of some of the proposed measures, while the feasibility of others is being discussed as part of implementation planning. Those that are feasible will be carried out.

#### **Recommendations 3/4: Retain results orientation and results monitoring despite pressure to deliver**

GIZ is and always has been aware of the challenges presented by ensuring that projects implemented in the displacement and migration context are results-oriented. Different donor modalities, fragile contexts, complex problems and very strong time and implementation pressure present a variety of different challenges in terms of results orientation and project monitoring, given the strong external interest in terms of domestic policy, for example. In this context, the corporate strategy evaluation should, together with the persons responsible, help improve results orientation through specific reflection and suggestions, if possible during the evaluation process itself.

GIZ shares the recommendations made by the evaluation in principle. However, there is disagreement as regards two aspects, which from GIZ's point of view are relevant for assessing the recommendations, above all with respect to the issue of output versus results orientation. Firstly, the requirements for large-scale transitional aid projects with strong implementation pressure in particular are different than for technical cooperation. Rather than planning and implementing long-term development results, projects in this context need to lay the foundation for future sustainable development cooperation. Secondly, the results levels are not defined by GIZ but by the commissioning parties and clients, which frequently set objectives at the output level in response to the acute situation on site and to the need of partners and target groups to achieve rapid results. When appraising projects and advising on the commission, GIZ critically analyses and discusses the results levels together with the commissioning parties and clients. These levels are then stipulated in the commission, which constitutes the framework for action for the projects themselves and for results monitoring and reporting.

By contrast, GIZ believes that there is indeed a need to act on the recommendation to improve the presentation of anticipated results and the underlying theory of change as well as the presentation of results models in module proposals. GIZ also believes in the importance of increased processing of evidence and documented practical experience and

plans to address this issue during implementation planning.

The importance of a robust results-based monitoring system that is established early on is undeniable. However, the monitoring levels are based on the objectives levels defined in the project. The recommended thematic expansion of the areas to be observed, for example, as regards the sociocultural and security situation of the target groups and the projects' contribution to peace is regarded as relevant and will be pursued. However, the general difficulties experienced in collecting data in civil war and fragile contexts pose restrictions in this context. Here, the use and triangulation of third-party monitoring, as recommended in the report, will become increasingly important.

#### **Recommendations 5-8: Observe the duty of care to exercise human rights due diligence and adhere to the principle of do-no-harm; consolidate the integrative approach; focus to a greater degree on the needs and know-how of the target groups; engage in dialogue on controversial issues within migration policy.**

These recommendations largely reflect the debate among GIZ experts, particularly as regards fine-tuning a concept for an integrative approach and improving data collection on and consideration of the needs of the different target groups. A decision will be made on the remaining need for action and further steps during implementation planning.

GIZ welcomes the suggestion to come up with a more accurate definition of the term 'integrative approach'. This definition should be included in the design principles for the area of migration, for example.

GIZ also views the recommendation to collect disaggregated data for the different target groups, e.g. for needs analyses, as very important. However, in many countries, this is viewed as very difficult, if not impossible. This data collection format should be used where possible. As outlined in the corresponding recommendation, participation is an important underlying principle of GIZ's work. The requirement of participation is viewed as justified and of crucial importance. The implementation framework is very context and partner-specific, however.

Appraisal of compliance with the do-no-harm principle and with safeguards is already a comprehensive requirement for all projects. As regards the minimum limit of EUR 1 million, which was criticised, it was established that there were very few relevant projects below this amount. Awareness of the instruments in place to ensure that the do-no-harm principle is observed (e.g. migration policy checklists, peace and conflict assessment matrix) should, however, be raised, and greater use should be made of these instruments. The existing grievance mechanism should be better promoted and – depending on the project in question – extended (illiteracy and internet access are frequently obstacles in this context).

In terms of domestic policy, migration policy is frequently a very controversial topic and of course within GIZ there are many different views in this regard too. Some staff members fear that development principles could be eroded and overshadowed by foreign and security policy interests. These concerns were also expressed during the corporate strategy evaluation. GIZ agrees with the recommendation that corporate decisions (in relation to tapping into new business sectors) need to be better communicated to staff in order to provide normative guidance and win over staff. The guidelines on migration, which were drafted during the evaluation, have since been the subject of broad discussion at GIZ. In future, GIZ will engage in proactive communication with its staff and with the general public to an even greater degree. However, GIZ also believes that it is important to clarify that criticism and the views of individuals cannot dictate corporate decisions or the acceptance of commissions from the German Government.

In line with the recommendation on external communication by GIZ, it is also important to clarify that preventing migration cannot be the objective of development cooperation. As also advised in the last recommendation, GIZ will continue to build on its tradition and strengths as regards partner and target group orientation and, in this way, help reconcile interests between commissioning parties, clients, partner governments and target groups.

## Photo credits and sources

### Photo credits/sources:

© GIZ/Harald Franzen, Samuel Goda, Ala Kheir, Florian Kopp

### URL references:

This publication may contain links to external websites. The respective provider of the website is always responsible for the content on external web pages. When initially inserting the link, GIZ checked the external content for any infringement of civil or criminal law. However, it is not reasonable to expect permanent monitoring of linked external pages without specific indications of legal violation. If GIZ becomes aware, either directly or through third parties, that external content to which it has made reference infringes civil or criminal law, it will immediately remove the reference to the content in question. GIZ dissociates itself expressly from such online content

### Maps:

The maps printed here are intended for information purposes only and do not imply the legal recognition of any borders or territories. GIZ accepts no responsibility for these maps being up to date, correct or complete. GIZ accepts no liability for any damage, direct or indirect, resulting from the use of these maps.



Deutsche Gesellschaft für  
Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Registered offices  
Bonn and Eschborn

Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 36 + 40  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
T +49 228 44 60 0  
F +49 228 44 60 1766

Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5  
65760 Eschborn, Germany  
T +49 6196 79-0  
F +49 6196 79 1115

E [info@giz.de](mailto:info@giz.de)  
I [www.giz.de](http://www.giz.de)