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ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Chief of Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Rights-based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Project Performance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. OVERVIEW

1.1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Unit of the Office of Inspector General (OIG/Evaluation), strives to improve learning based on operational experiences, minimizes risks while continuing to respond rapidly and effectively to the needs of beneficiaries and affected populations on the ground, remains accountable to its stakeholders and ensures that they are fully engaged in the implementation of IOM activities. OIG/Evaluation introduced the project performance reviews (PPRs) mid 2016 with the aim to establish a midterm review mechanism during a project’s lifecycle to measure progress in implementing activities and reaching results as per the agreed indicators, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks and workplans.

The introduction of new M&E tools and practices is part of a wider effort to strengthen IOM’s overall project and programme monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems, accountability and management capacities with a stronger focus on results.

The depth of focus of PPRs is informed by IOM strategies, policies and processes regarding the projects and programmes being reviewed. The guidance is a “living document”, which may be updated based on the lessons learned from the implementation of PPRs.

1.1.1. Audience for the PPR guidance

The PPR tool may be used by any staff involved in M&E work such as project managers in Country Offices (COs), thematic staff in Regional Offices (ROs), Headquarter-based departments and all M&E staff. This Guidance is intended to promote a common understanding of the PPR tool and practices among all staff involved in M&E work, to inform IOM’s Departments, Regional and Country Offices on the scope, objectives, and processes under the project performance review, and to ensure quality throughout the process. It is particularly geared to staff who may decide to use the tool and conduct PPRs directly as it provides more in-depth information on the PPR process for reviewers. Reviewers are recommended to review Module 6 of the Project Handbook related to Evaluation as the PPR process is similar to an evaluative process.

1.2. PPR OBJECTIVE AND FOCUS

The overall objective of PPRs is to support IOM in assessing the performance of projects and programmes using a constructive, participatory and coordinated approach, and in improving implementation where necessary to reach the expected results. The PPR is a midterm review, conducted preferably midway into the project, to identify any corrective measures to be taken.

The specific objective of the PPR is to provide an independent assessment on a project or programme implementation to support project management. The review assesses the status of project design and implementation through an analysis of project documentation and meaningful consultation with all stakeholders involved, including beneficiaries. It also reviews the progress in terms of input provision,
activities undertaken, results delivered (outputs and outcomes) and risk management. PPRs highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the project implementation with a view to assist IOM and key stakeholders in dealing with questions and problems that have emerged, find solutions to revise approaches and, where relevant, adapt to changing needs and circumstances.

Conducting PPRs and distributing information regarding project and programme performance will help IOM to:

- Track progress and results achievements to be able to demonstrate organisational capacity to deliver and report on results;
- Support the overall programming and implementation with accurate, evidence-based reporting that informs project management and wider stakeholders on how to guide and improve project performance whenever required and deliver effective services to its beneficiaries;
- Show accountability for resources invested in projects and programmes; and
- Provide opportunities for stakeholders’ feedback, including beneficiaries, to provide input into IOM’s work during implementation.

1.2.1. PPR evaluation criteria

PPRs focus on the performance of a project or programme per OECD-DAC criteria\(^1\) of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Expected impact and sustainability are briefly analysed given that the exercise is expected to take place during the implementation of an intervention. In cases of humanitarian assistance, PPRs will also focus on humanitarian criteria of coherence, connectedness and coverage.\(^2\) Annexes 1 and 2 show the PPR guiding questions and detailed guidance on how to address each of the criterion during the reporting. The guiding questions can be removed and/or adapted based on the type of programme being reviewed.

---


2 See IOM Evaluation Guidelines or the ALNAP guide Evaluating humanitarian action: [http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/evaluating_humanitarian_action](http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/evaluating_humanitarian_action)
1.2.2. PPR and cross-cutting issues

The review also considers how a project or a programme includes cross-cutting issues in its design and implementation, such as: gender, Rights-Based Approach (RBA) and the environment.

In terms of gender, the alignment with IOM’s policy is analysed (i.e. IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015-2019\(^3\)), along with the incorporation of gender analysis in project design at indicators, outputs and outcome levels, and implementation phases (i.e. methodology and data collection tools). More guidance on the gender perspective can be found in the OIG/Evaluation Guidance on Integrating Gender in Evaluations,\(^4\) the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Handbook and Guidance\(^5\) that provide practical examples and guidance on gender-sensitive criteria, indicators and tools, and IOM Project Handbook/Module 6 on Evaluation.\(^6\)

Moreover, the Rights-Based Approach\(^7\) is analysed to determine the extent to which a project or a programme has incorporated RBA to strengthen the rights of migrants and assisted groups, and also the extent to which the intervention has been guided by the RBA principles (for instance, participation, non-discrimination, accountability and transparency). The PPR also analyses the level of accountability to beneficiaries and affected populations.

In terms of environment, the PPR considers to what extent possible contributions and potential damages were considered during project design. Other considerations include whether good environmental practices may have been followed during the implementation and any critical environmental risks that could adversely affect the intervention.

Finally, PPRs identify the links between the project or programme and IOM strategic orientations such as the IOM Migration Governance Framework,\(^8\) as well as regional and country strategies.

1.3. PROJECT AND PROGRAMME SELECTION FOR PPRs

Projects or programmes are to be reviewed when there is a need for an independent assessment in support of the regular project monitoring by relevant entities. PPRs can be requested (or commissioned)

---


\(^4\) Available under [www.iom.int/evaluations](http://www.iom.int/evaluations) technical references.


\(^6\) Accessible here: [https://intranetportal/Pages/ControlNo.aspx?controlNo=IN/00250/Module6](https://intranetportal/Pages/ControlNo.aspx?controlNo=IN/00250/Module6)

\(^7\) [https://publications.iom.int/books/rights-based-approach-programming](https://publications.iom.int/books/rights-based-approach-programming)

\(^8\) [https://publications.iom.int/system/files/migof_brochure_en.pdf](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/migof_brochure_en.pdf)
by any office or project/programme based on the criteria suggested below. The commissioner will have to be kept informed of the progress of the report and have an opportunity to comment on it.

The criteria for projects and programmes to be considered for project performance reviews include:

- **High profile projects**, which may have: (i) significant political importance and/or sensitivity, in terms of sector or theme coverage; and (ii) large scale budget and long-term implementation, resulting in a high visibility for IOM, donor and/or stakeholders or (iii) complex managerial requirements.
- **High risk projects**, which are having implementation challenges or problems with multiple risks that can impact negatively the Organization.
- **Pilot projects**, which may still require some adjustments prior to potential full implementation or further extension.
- **Innovative projects**, which bring an element of novelty or transformation in IOM activities and expertise or in the modus operandi for implementation.

It may happen that a project or programme of a long duration is reviewed more than once, if the project has demonstrated poor performance during an initial review, prolonged problems are identified, and if issues or constraints render a follow-up PPR important.

### 1.4. WHO IMPLEMENTS THE PPR

This section will provide an overview of the various offices are that are currently conducting PPRs. The reviewers are responsible for planning, conducting and reporting on PPRs. Currently PPRs are being conducted by OIG/Evaluation, ROs and the IOM Development Fund. The PPR process however can be implemented by any office that sees the benefit of conducting such an exercise on ongoing interventions.

**OIG/Evaluation:** OIG/Evaluation conducts PPRs based on its PPR annual workplan, prepared in close coordination with IOM Departments ROs and COs. OIG/Evaluation plans and conducts PPRs to support the regular reporting on results and the assessment of the quality of the performance of IOM assistance. OIG funds its selected PPRs itself.

OIG/Evaluation is also responsible for methodological issues related to PPR planning and conduct of the exercises. The function also serves as contact point for any PPR-related questions.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) Please contact eva@iom.int for any questions.
OIG/Evaluation can organize exchanges of information or mentoring sessions with IOM Departments and COs to support implementation of the PPR processes.

- **IOM Development Fund**: As of the second quarter of 2017, the IOM Development Fund also conducts PPRs of its funded projects and programmes. Decisions on which project to review are taken by the IOM Development Fund and based on the same criteria highlighted in section 1.3. These are then coordinated with the respective office implementing the Development Fund project. The IOM Development Fund funds its own PPRs.

- **IOM Departments, Regional and Country Offices**: In addition to OIG or the Development Fund, ROs, COs and other IOM offices may also decide to request and/or conduct a PPR to review ongoing projects and programmes.

  The Regional Offices, through their Regional M&E Officers, can prepare annual workplans of PPRs that they would like to conduct. The selection criteria highlighted above can be adapted to the regional level and contexts. The funding for PPRs organized by ROs or COs may differ from case to case.

### 1.5. DISSEMINATION AND USE

PPRs, although developed to be able to adjust ongoing projects, should also be made available to more stakeholders such as ROs, COs and Headquarters in order to ensure that others can also benefit from the process and the acquired learnings. Reports should be disseminated accordingly.\(^{10}\)

### 2. PPR PROCESS

As mentioned in previous sections, the preparation and implementation of a PPR follows steps that are common to an evaluation, keeping in mind the objective of the PPR: to support field offices in assessing the performance of their projects using a constructive, participatory and coordinated approach, and in improving implementation when necessary to reach expected results.

In this next chapter, the various stages of the PPR process will be described in order to support any staff intending to adapt the PPR process for their use. The stages include: (1) the preparatory stage, which encompasses (i) the logistics, and (ii) a desk or document review phase; and (2) the implementation stage consisting of (iii) a field phase, which includes consultations with the Project Manager (PM) and/or Chief of Mission (CoM) and key stakeholders; (iv) a report drafting phase; and (v) a quality check and finalization phase, ending with the release of the PPR report and finally, (3) the dissemination and use of the PPR report.

\(^{10}\) A mechanism to share PPRs is being designed to ensure better knowledge sharing. All COs are requested to share the PPRs with their respective Regional M&E Officer and all Headquarter staff are encouraged to share with OIG as a temporary measure.
In summary, the PPR process should take overall about two months, starting with preparations prior to travel, a field visit that would last an average of five working days and a report of about ten pages long.\(^{11}\)

### 2.1. PREPARATORY PHASE

While preparing the PPR implementation and timing, the following standard allocation of working days should be considered by the reviewer. These dates are indicative and may be adjusted based on context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of days (*)</th>
<th>For single country projects and programmes</th>
<th>For regional (multi-country) projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and desk phases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field phase (including travel, briefing, debriefing with ROs/COs)</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>3 – 5 for each country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report drafting phase (excluding review by others)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total days</td>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that these days may be spread over several weeks considering that reviewers will be doing this in addition to their other responsibilities.

The PPR budget primarily consists of the reviewer’s travel and DSA costs. In addition, during the field visit, costs should be set aside for the reviewer’s in-country travel and that of any possible accompanying person. Other costs could be for: interpretation, transcription (if required), and software for data analysis.\(^{12}\) The available budget will have an implication on the breadth of the review.

As soon as the timeframe and budget are decided, the preparatory logistical arrangements start under the responsibility of the PPR reviewer, who contacts the responsible ROs/COs at least one month in advance to announce the field visit, and shares the initial information on the PPR\(^{13}\) (corresponding to Annexes 1, 2 and 4 as these documents replace the terms of reference that are developed for evaluations). The reviewer should identify a focal point for the PPR and request relevant project documentation; this is usually the PM but may be someone assigned by the manager. During this initial correspondence with the focal point, the reviewer should adjust the PPR tool and questions to ensure that the appropriate focus and hence questions are asked during the PPR. If additional data collection tools are required, such as a survey, the questionnaire should be developed and agreed to together with the focal point.

The responsibilities of each actor during the preparatory phase are listed below:

---

\(^{11}\) This is an indicative timeframe knowing that circumstances may differ and the reviewer’s schedule may also determine the timeframe.

\(^{12}\) Software may be required for qualitative or quantitative data analysis. These can be quite costly so should only be considered if the reviewer intends to conduct several PPRs or has additional uses for these software packages.

\(^{13}\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible person</th>
<th>Tasks during preparatory phase</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPR commissioner</td>
<td>✓ Considers the allocation of PPR workload and expenses of the field work; ✓ Provides guidance and arranges first contacts with ROs/COs.</td>
<td>Based on an annual plan or whenever required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Announces the visit to ROs/COs by providing details on PPR tool; requests project documentation and prepares a tentative agenda; ✓ Coordinates the timing for the field work with COs/ROs and arranges the briefing meeting with PM; ✓ Based on the detailed documentary review, identifies needs for collecting information and the stakeholders to interview; ✓ Drafts a brief inception report, indicating particularities of the PPR exercise for the project (e.g. adaptation of prioritization of questions); ✓ With the PM or focal point selects interviewees; and ✓ Organizes his/her own travel arrangements to the country, including visa if necessary.</td>
<td>At least four weeks prior to the field visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal point</td>
<td>✓ Reviews the PPR tool and/or any other data collection tools to ensure relevance and benefit for the project; ✓ Ensures the project documentation is timely available (at least three weeks prior to the scheduled field visit); ✓ Briefs the stakeholders on the main objectives of PPR; announces the visit and arranges interviews; ✓ Supports with the identification of interviewees for the PPR; ✓ Provides a tentative agenda with contact details of the implementing partners and key stakeholders at least two weeks prior to the start of field phase; and ✓ Provides support for visa and/or security issues as well as in-country transport as required.</td>
<td>As soon as PPR is announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.1. Desk phase – document review

Simultaneously with the field visit announcement and the preparation of logistics (i.e. selection of project sites, preparing TDY, etc.), relevant documentation is requested from ROs/COs, using existing technology\(^\text{14}\) for facilitating the sharing of heavy and multiple documents to be made available in timely manner. Ideally, project documents are received at least three weeks prior to the field visit, to provide enough time for familiarization with the context and dynamics of the project or programme.

The documents mentioned in the indicative check list below may not necessarily be separate documents as they may sometimes be annexed to other documents (i.e. log frame and budget to financing

---

\(^{14}\) Documents can be shared via Office365.
agreements or expert outputs to project progress reports). Based on the checklist, the PPR reviewer can identify missing documents and check with the focal point, if they exist for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Concept papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technical proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Donor agreement(s) and other sub-contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Donor reports (narrative and financial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring framework(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring tools (matrices, workplans, log frame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other project-related documentation such as steering committee meetings, output related reports etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Country strategy(ies) linked to the project or sector, and/or regional strategy, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. IOM research related to the project or thematic area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. External reports, research, evaluations linked to the project or thematic area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Non-project related documents such as Government strategies, donor strategies or assessments or documents from other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the documentation review, the reviewer should consider doing the following:

- Analyse all documentation relating to the project intervention logic reflected in the latest log frame, workplans, resources, budget, progress and internal reports, etc.;
- Determine which documents may be relevant for each criteria being reviewed;
- Consider and identify key issues to be addressed during the field phase; and
- Prepare for the briefings/interviews by identifying key issues from document review, identifying any stakeholders that should be interviewed or locations to visit.

Following the document review process, specific questions can be added to the questions provided in the sample PPR report, to be addressed during the briefing with PM or during the interviews with stakeholders. More details on data collection and analysis methods can also be found in the IOM Project Handbook (Second edition) 2017, Module 6 on Evaluation\(^\text{15}\) and UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work 2014, Chapter 3, p. 48.\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{15}\) https://intranetportal/Pages/ControlNo.aspx?controlNo=IN/00250/Module6

\(^{16}\) http://www.uneval.org/document/guidance-documents
Below are a few suggestions of the type of information that may be collected from the documentation review category:

**Strategy or planning documentation:** The policy and strategic context in which a project or programme has been developed is analysed, to assess briefly project relevance and its link to the sector or thematic programming (external sources from other organizations, donors, government(s) or think tanks may also be useful).

**Monitoring frameworks and tools:** Apprise of the project logic. Reviewer should also pay attention to the quality and relevance of the results indicators and to the baselines and monitoring efforts within the project.

**Workplans and donor, or progress, reports:** Periodical progress reports prepared by the implementing partners on a monthly, quarterly, or less frequent basis, are also useful as they can provide details on project performance. Progress of activities and use of resources should be examined to determine whether they correspond to what is reasonably planned and needed. In case the project has deviated from the activity schedule and the use of resources, the issues can be discussed during the briefing with PM, and later in the PPR report for recommending corrective actions.

### 2.1.2. Preparations for interviews, focus group discussions and/or surveys

In all PPRs, reviewers will be expected to conduct interviews with key informants. During the preparatory phase, the reviewer should identify the list interviewees, either in the field or via Skype/phone. The focal point should provide specific names and recommendations, while the reviewer should ensure that specific individuals are included as required. The reviewer should make all efforts to interview a wide range of interlocuters, keeping in mind gender and diversity considerations as the list is developed.

Below is the list of types of people to interview during the field visits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other programme staff such as programme assistants, monitoring staff etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief of Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resource Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other IOM staff such as other programme managers from related programmes in the country office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other IOM staff from Regional Offices, Headquarters or other offices that are relevant to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Government officials working closely on the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In some cases, it may be necessary to conduct focus group discussions with a group of individuals. A common situation in which this takes place is with beneficiaries during field visits. This allows the reviewer to receive more qualitative information that can support findings. The questions for FGDs should be developed and prepared prior to field visits.

In addition, surveys may also be relevant and useful when trying to collect primarily quantitative information from a large group of people such as participants from trainings, a large group of government officials or beneficiaries. Online surveys are recommended but only work with literate participants who have access to internet. Surveys can also be administered on paper but require more logistical support to send and receive all the copies. The feasibility of surveys needs to be discussed with the office and the focal point to identify how best to administer a survey. Questions should also be developed in advance and shared with the focal point prior to launching a survey.

2.2. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

2.2.1. Field phase

The field phase starts with a briefing meeting organized on the first day of the visit either with the Project Manager or designated person and it concludes with a debriefing meeting on the last day of the visit. The briefing usually involves only the PM or designated staff, while for the debriefing, the attendees can also include the Chief of Mission (COM), other team members, as deemed appropriate, or some external partners, having in mind the PPR is an internal exercise. Any efforts to include beneficiaries is also encouraged in line with IOM’s framework on accountability to affected populations.

During the briefing, the final itinerary for the field visit(s) and interviews is confirmed. This is also the opportunity to highlight any specific issues that should be analysed during the review, highlight new developments and clarifying any outstanding issues. The reviewer should use the opportunity to inform the PM or the focal point on the purpose of the PPR and its likely value to support project management. Furthermore, it is important that the reviewer reiterates that all interviews should be conducted individually, unless an interpreter is required. If so, preferably someone other than the PM or focal point, and less involved in the project, should participate. Their role should be limited to only translating between the reviewer and the interviewee at all times.

During visits to project sites, to check the quality of project outputs, the PPR reviewer conducts bilateral interviews with IOM staff, the national authorities, project implementation partner(s), other key stakeholders including donors and direct beneficiaries. No one, other than the reviewer and a possible interpreter should participate in the interviews. If the focal point or PM accompany for introduction purposes, they should leave when interviews are to start.

The primary purpose of all interviews is to collect evidence by obtaining key stakeholders' reactions and suggestions which can confirm, contest or complete information already gathered on the project through the desk review or during the briefing. During the interviews, the emphasis is on ascertaining credible
information on the progress, quality and sustainability of expected results (outputs and outcomes) and any potential problems that emerged and possible solutions. Exchanges with the interlocutors need to be meaningful to the purpose of the review, considering as much as possible their views and opinions.

The reviewer may also conduct focus group discussions. These may be particularly useful with beneficiaries to obtain open and unbiased insight into the effects of the project on their lives and behaviours. As it may not be possible to hold individual interviews with a sufficient number of beneficiaries, focus group discussions can be a good solution for collecting qualitative data. It is important to ensure that a sufficient number of focus groups with homogenous people are conducted to get a broader perspective. Making the groups homogenous (e.g. same gender, hierarchies or age groups) may encourage people to speak more freely.

Time permitting, given the short duration of a field visit for a PPR, field visits to civil society groups, local authorities or other government agencies that are working in related or complementary fields can also be undertaken, even if they are not directly involved, as they might bring information relevant to reviewing a project’s performance and can be a valuable source of insight into what is happening within the broader project environment. For example, departments of finance or statistics may have information which can complement the data already captured, and donors active in a sector can provide information on the synergies and interactions of the project with their initiatives and/or to identify any planned follow-up for the project or programme.

On the last day of field work, debriefing takes place and if a joint debriefing is foreseen (including COM or other team members), it mainly serves to clarify issues and correct factual errors respecting the independence of the reviewer. This is the opportunity for the reviewer to present preliminary findings, confirm facts, inform of any problems encountered and solutions adopted. During the debrief, an open discussion should take place to enrich the draft findings and discuss any issues. The timeframe and process for the submission of the PPR draft report also should be discussed. Once again, the reviewer should reiterate the benefits and use(s) of the PPR and, to maximise the latter, encourage for any actions that can be taken straightaway to be done.

The conduct of a PPR requires respecting IOM’s Ethics and Code of Conduct, the IOM Evaluation Policy and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for the conduct of evaluations. Ethical principles can also be applied for the selection and conduct of interviews of individuals and groups, guaranteeing the principles of respect for dignity and diversity, including marginalized and vulnerable groups; right to self-determination; fair representation; confidentiality; and, avoidance of harm. During all interviews and focus group discussions, the reviewer should ensure to formally seek consent for the interviews and inform participants of the confidentiality of interventions.

2.2.2. Report drafting phase
The PPR report is produced per standard template provided in Annexes 2 and 3 to ensure methodological consistency and coherence across IOM regions. After the submission of the draft report, the PM and other relevant team members (depending on the project reviewed) provide their comments.

---

17 http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102
The report should be submitted as soon as possible after the field visit, ideally after a maximum of two weeks.

As previously mentioned, the PPR report should ideally be about ten pages. The language should be clear and to the point, avoiding highly technical vocabulary, an overuse of acronyms, too detailed explanations and repetitions. The content of the PPR report includes a concise overview of the programme’s intervention logic or project synopsis; the summary of findings per selected OECD/DAC criteria; cross-cutting issues and a summary of conclusions and recommendations. It should be based on a triangulation of the sources identified and the data collection methods used during the review. See Annex 2 with a more detailed summary of what is expected per section.

2.2.3. Review, quality check and finalization phase

The draft report is to be shared with the PM and/or other designated staff members for consolidated comments. Feedback should be returned ten working days upon the receipt of the draft report at the latest. If the commissioner is not the same as the project management team, then s/he too should have an opportunity to comment on the report at the same time or after the focal point/PM. The reviewer should review the report and submit the final version within two weeks of receiving all the comments. The reviewer should decide whether or how to revise the report based on the comments received. Unconsidered comments should be explained. Reviewers should keep in mind that the purpose of the process is to encourage adjustments where possible and hence the reviewer should strive for an approach that lends itself to learning and constructive criticism.

Once the draft PPR report is finalized, its quality can be reviewed along the following standards: (i) the availability of project and related background information properly summarized; (ii) the comprehensiveness and quality of the report in terms of language and clarity; (iii) the adequacy and reliability of the data used and data analysis performed; (iv) the coherence of the answers to the guiding questions and the coherence of conclusions; (v) the motivation and potential subjectivity or objectivity in the findings; and (vi) the quality and usefulness of recommendations.

During the finalization, the reviewer is encouraged to have a third party review the PPR for quality checking and to ensure consistency. This could be someone from their office, another team member or the regional M&E Officer.

2.3. DISSEMINATION AND USE OF THE PPR REPORT

It is strongly recommended that the project team put together a follow-up action plan for the implementation of the recommendations, if considered useful, to be shared with entities who are also involved in the implementation. The Annex 5, action plan on recommendations, can be used as a template. The implementation of the follow-up plan is to become part of the regular monitoring.

Reviewers should submit this action plan template together with the final PPR report to incite use of the report. Reviewers are encouraged to include the recommendations straight into the template to facilitate the PM’s work.

Furthermore, the PPR report should be shared with the respective regional M&E Officer, and Headquarters department relevant to the thematic area to encourage further learning from the process.
Whist PPRs remain an internal exercise to benefit primarily the project staff and those who have commissioned the review, external distribution of the report to donors and/or implementing partners can be done, if considered relevant. The responsibility for sharing the report is left to the commissioner or project team.
Annex 1: PROJECT PERFORMANCE REVIEW

This tool guides the analysis and provides to the IOM Office visited an overview of the scope of the project performance review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Start Date</td>
<td>Project End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Office responsible</td>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview date</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Title of Interviewee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. RELEVANCE

1.1 As presently designed, does the intervention logic and related tools allow for effective implementation?

- Do a logframe, results matrix or similar tool exist and are they used as a management tool? Is it clear and logical and does it show how activities will effectively lead to results and outcomes? If not, why not?
- Are the outcomes and indicators Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART)? Are indicators gender-disaggregated? Are baselines set and updated for each indicator? Are targets values set and are they realistic or do they need to be updated?
- Are the indicators/targets used to measure progress in reporting?
- Is a work plan and resource schedule available and used by the project management and other relevant parties? If not, why not?
- Are the risks and/or assumptions still holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?
- Are narrative reports submitted regularly and on time?

Findings/comments

1.2 If relevant, has the project been developed taking into account the IOM Migration Governance Framework and IOM twelve-point strategy?

- Does the project document make reference to any MIGOF principles and objectives and IOM 12-point strategy?
### 2. EFFECTIVENESS

#### 2.1 Is the project effective in reaching its planned results (/outcomes)?

- Have the planned outputs and activities been delivered, or close to be implemented? Are there any delays, and how will they be rectified?
- Do any inter-institutional structures e.g. steering committees, monitoring systems, donors meetings contribute to effective project implementation? Are the meetings/decisions of committees and/or other oversight/monitoring entities, including with donors, well documented?
- If relevant, how does the project coordinate with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid duplication?
- If relevant, are implementing partners managing their role/contribution effectively? Is there any control in place to monitor the work of the implementing partners?

#### Findings/comments

#### 2.2 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the project objective and outcomes to be reached/achieved?

- Are the delivered outputs likely to contribute to the intended results/outcomes?
- To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes (results)?
- Did the programme management take/planned to take appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to environment, gender, human rights, governance, or others)?
- Did changes in policies and stakeholders priorities affect the implementation of the project and how well is it adapting in terms of long-term needs for support?
- Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results? To what extent has this contributed/will contribute to improve project results?

#### Findings/comments

#### 2.3 Does the project presently respond to the needs of the target groups and does the project work effectively with all relevant stakeholders?

- Are the project objective(s), and outcomes consistent with beneficiaries’ needs and supportive of partner government policies and programmes?
- Was the project designed with the beneficiary inputs in the design (e.g. migrants, communities, government etc.)? Do the beneficiaries participate to implementation and how?
- Do all target groups have access to and/or are they using project/services?
- Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (ownership)?
- Does the project benefit from the present capacity of the local partners? Does it contribute to improve it?
• Does the project consider donor priorities and input? Is the donor satisfied with IOM implementation?

Findings/comments

### 3. EFFICIENCY

#### 3.1 How well is the availability/usage of means/inputs managed?

- To what degree are inputs provided/available on time to/from all parties involved to implement activities and at planned cost (or lower than planned)?
- Are project resources monitored regularly and managed in a transparent and accountable manner to guarantee efficient and cost-effective implementation of activities?
- Are all contractual procedures clearly understood, including by implementing partners, and are they being followed during project implementation? Are the financial reports submitted regularly and on time?
- Did the project require a no-cost or costed extension? If so, why?

Findings/comments

#### 3.2 How well is the partner(s) contribution/involvement working?

- Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or human resources contributions?
- Are there any in-kind contributions? If so, are they being acknowledged?
- Are IOM partnerships with stakeholders and donors likely to encourage complementary contributions (seed-money)?

Findings/comments

### 4. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY PROSPECTS

#### 4.1 What are the direct impact(s) prospects (if any) from the project?

- What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?
- Are there any external factors likely to jeopardise project impact?
- Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
- Is there any possible indirect impact that deserves to be taken into account?

Findings/comments

#### 4.2 Financial and operational viability guaranteeing sustainability?

- If relevant, are funds likely to be made available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?
- Is there a phase-out strategy or exit strategy that is in place or being developed?
- Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in
the project framework?
- Are project partnerships being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project’s benefits/services?

Findings/comments

5. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES
*Please determine which of these are relevant to the project being monitored.*

### 5.1 Have practical gender needs\(^{18}\), strategic gender interests\(^{19}\) and other gender-related issues been adequately considered in the project design and implementation?

- To what extent has the project followed the IOM Gender Equality Policy, the IOM Project Handbook and the IOM Gender and RBM Guidance document as well as other gender related instructions and guidance?
- Has a gender analysis been incorporated in the needs assessment, stakeholder analysis and all other assessments and analyses? If not, why not?
- Are there ways to better integrate gender considerations that could lead to improved outcomes of the project?

Findings/comments

### 5.2 Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of rights of migrants?

- Is a right-based analysis carried out to ensure that the rights of migrant/assisted groups are taken into account in the design/implementation of the project (in particular the Rights-based Approach to Programming Manual (Tool II))?
- Will the project contribute to further the realization of any relevant rights (such as decriminalization of the victims of trafficking or the promotion of the rights of migrant children)?
- Do any interested parties and observers raise concerns related to possible violation of rights?

Findings/comments

### 5.3 Is the project respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems?

- Have possible environmental damages/contributions been considered adequately in the project design?
- Are good environmental practices followed in project implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc.)?
- Are some activities of the project or lack of proper planning increasing the risks of environmental damages?

---

\(^{18}\) **Practical gender needs**: the needs of individuals that relate to the responsibilities and tasks associated with their traditional gender roles. Responding to these needs can improve the quality of life but does not challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions.

\(^{19}\) **Strategic gender interests**: the needs individuals identify as a result of their subordinate position in society. Responding to these interests tends to challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions, and assists in achieving greater gender equality.
- What capacities exist (within project, project partners and project context) to deal with critical risks that could affect project effectiveness such as climate risks or risks of natural disasters (in the case of projects in sensitive geographical areas / natural disasters hotspots)?

Findings/comments

### 5.4 Have the communication and visibility actions been implemented in an appropriate manner?

- Have the IOM communication and visibility guidelines been respected by the project?
- Have the donor communication and visibility guidelines been respected by the project?
- Did the project implement certain actions to increase awareness on project achievements as well as visibility of its actions?

Findings/comments

### 5.5. So far, are there good practices inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?

- Has the project already identified some good practices or success stories?
- Are there already some lessons to be learned from the project?

Findings/comments

### 6. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SPECIFIC CRITERIA

To be used for emergency/humanitarian assistance projects

#### 6.1 Coherence and coordination

- Were project activities and expected outcomes in line with main humanitarian aims, for instance as described in UN appeals?
- Were project activities fully coordinated with other actors and main partners, including governments as well as military forces in case of conflicts?
- Is the project integrated into an effective government and/or UN led system of sector coordination involving the relevant local stakeholders and donors?

Findings/comments

#### 6.2 Connectedness

- To what extent are the project short-term activities implemented in a way that takes longer-term and interconnected approaches of the emergency into account?
- Does the project contribute to stabilization, peace building in case of conflicts or other form of transition to reconstruction and development?

Findings/comments
### 6.3 Coverage
- Were all the major groups in need of humanitarian assistance properly identified?
- Did all the groups identified receive humanitarian assistance?
- Was the assistance proportionate to their needs, including for protection?

Findings/comments

### 6.4 How is this project accountable to affected populations?
- *Does the project have any mechanisms in place to ensure that it is accountable to the affected populations? If so, what are they?*
- *How has the project adapted to the needs and feedback/input provided by affected populations?*
- *To what extent are relevant target groups actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?*

Findings/comments
Annex 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>ACTIONS RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Prospects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cross-cutting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Humanitarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT SYNOPSIS

Context
Please list here project purposes and results, and shortly comment on project background, beneficiaries, partners, political context, previous M&E visits, if any.
1. RELEVANCE

1.1 As presently designed, does the intervention logic and related tools allow effective implementation?

Findings/comments

1.2 If relevant, has the project been developed taking into account the IOM Migration Governance Framework and IOM twelve-point strategy?

Findings/comments

2. EFFECTIVENESS

2.1 Is the project effective in reaching its the planned results (outcomes)?

Findings/comments

2.2 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the project objective and outcomes to be reached/achieved?

Findings/comments

2.3 Does the project presently respond to the needs of the target groups and does the project work effectively with all relevant stakeholders?

Findings/comments

3. EFFICIENCY

3.1 How well is the availability/usage of means/inputs managed?

Findings/comments

3.2 How well is the partner(s) contribution/involvement working?

Findings/comments
## 4. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY PROSPECTS

### 4.1 What are the direct impact(s) prospects (if any) from the project?

Findings/comments

### 4.2 Financial and operational viability guaranteeing sustainability?

Findings/comments

## 5. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

*Please determine which of these are relevant to the project being monitored.*

### 5.1 Have practical gender needs\(^{20}\), strategic gender interests\(^{21}\) and other gender-related issues been adequately considered in the project design and implementation?

Findings/comments

### 5.2 Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of human rights of migrants?

Findings/comments

### 5.3 Is the project respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems?

Findings/comments

### 5.4 Have the communication and visibility actions been implemented in an appropriate manner (to be asked when there is no specific project component dealing with it and that has to be covered under the analysis of effectiveness)?

Findings/comments

### 5.5 So far, are there good practices inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?

Findings/comments

---

\(^{20}\) **Practical gender needs**: the needs of individuals that relate to the responsibilities and tasks associated with their traditional gender roles. Responding to these needs can improve the quality of life but does not challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions.

\(^{21}\) **Strategic gender interests**: the needs individuals identify as a result of their subordinate position in society. Responding to these interests tends to challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions, and assists in achieving greater gender equality.
### 6. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SPECIFIC CRITERIA

To be used for emergency/humanitarian assistance projects

#### 6.1 Coherence and coordination
Findings/comments

#### 6.2 Connectedness
Findings/comments

#### 6.3 Coverage
Findings/comments

#### 6.4 How is this project accountable to affected populations?
Findings/comments

## OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Annex: Sources of Information

### Persons Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of all Documents Analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: READER FOR PROJECT PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORTING

This tool guides the analysis and provides to the IOM Office visited an overview of the scope of the project performance review

This Annex briefly explains what needs to be considered and added regarding purpose, explanations, examples and sources of information in the report, the sections of which include: (i) generic project information (i.e. title, PM, code, financial information, etc.); (ii) synopsis (i.e. context and project intervention logic); (iii) findings per DAC criteria (i.e. effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability prospects); (vi) conclusions (max one or two paragraphs) and recommendations (max 10 actions for follow up).

Regarding the form, the following should be considered: given that the PPR report is expected to be short (between 5-10 pages excluding annexes), the use of clear, direct and concise language is recommended, free of spelling and grammatical errors (especially typographical, syntax and semantic ones). Correct punctuation marks need to be used (i.e. end points at the end of a sentence). Jargon and excessive use of acronyms should be avoided.

Regarding the content, the following should be considered: the accurate use of evidence and examples must support the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Evidences and examples should be based on quantitative and qualitative data from primary and secondary sources as well as on triangulation of data, all within the framework of data protection. Conclusions and/or recommendations must be derived from previously identified findings. It is important to deal with each issue in the corresponding section and not mixing or advancing them, which should be facilitated using related questions.

The PPRs are conducted at the midterm implementation stage answering how the project responded to the reality and context, has the groundwork for the achievement of project results and objectives been created, are there any good practices or lessons learned identified and can impact and sustainability factors be already analyzed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>List here the title per project proposal, contract or financing agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>List the donor per project contract or financing agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Per code listed in project proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Check the contract or financing agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Start Date</td>
<td>Check the contract or financing agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project End Date</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Office responsible</td>
<td>Project management site per contract or financing agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>Explain where the project is implemented, specifying it’s local or regional character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monitoring Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of PPR visit – from first to last day</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>Date when the draft report was submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Reviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the reviewer</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Name of PM or COM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Relevance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List here a shorter version of recommendations listed on the last page of the report, to provide actions for follow up at a glance per DAC criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Impact and Sustainability Prospects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Cross-cutting issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Humanitarian assistance</strong> Remove this section if the humanitarian criteria are not covered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT SYNOPSIS

**Context**

Produce a brief sectoral, thematic and/or local context, the geographic location of the targeted population and what issues the project is addressing. Then, list briefly the objective, outcomes and outputs of the project. Finally, indicate project partners and institutions responsible for implementation, actors involved in the implementation and the direct and indirect beneficiaries.

### 1. RELEVANCE

**1.1 As presently designed, does the intervention logic and related tools allow effective implementation?**

Findings/comments

Relevance is the extent to which the project’s objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified.

In this section, the reviewer will check if the intervention logic of an action is still appropriate to allow effective implementation.

Firstly, begin with an overall finding relating to the main question (1.1). Then, elaborate more specifically on the questions to support the main finding:

You can provide a brief overall assessment of the results matrix: quality, consistency, clarity, etc. and if the results matrix is used as management tool together with other tools such as work plan or resource schedule.
Mention if the indicators have target values, if they are realistic/SMART or need to be updated. Confirm if any baseline study was conducted.

In case the project brings innovative elements related to its design or approach, it should be assessed whether they should be reflected in the results matrix.

Analyse also if activities and indicators consider the participation of women and is covered in M&E reports as per reporting standards on gender.

Analyse the information/data needed to measure indicators, if it is appropriate, realistic, accessible and effectively used in the reports to enable assessing progress towards results or consider alternative information/data sources, if necessary. Check if the narrative reports are produced on time, if they are of good quality (i.e. structured to present the project developments per the results matrix, indicator and results achievement).

Conclude with the summary on risks and assumptions. Comment on the risk management strategy, if it exists or not, and if it had to be adapted to reflect the project reality. Analysis also of the capacity of project team to access and use the tools and implement the action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 If relevant, has the project been developed taking into account the IOM Migration Governance Framework and IOM twelve-point strategy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings/comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section determines if the project has considered the above listed IOM frameworks. Further elaborate on the exact principles and objectives the project is referring to, in terms of MIGOF and 12-point strategy, but also regional and/or country strategy, in case such a strategy exists. Tackle also the project’s pro-activeness to promote and further make visible principles and objectives from the above framework documents, by listing concrete examples, in case such actions are already visible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. EFFECTIVENESS

2.1 Is the project effective in reaching its the planned results (/outcomes)?

Findings/comments

The effectiveness criterion assesses the extent to which a project achieves its intended results. Start with an overall finding relating to the main question (2.1), of the extent to which the project is effective or not in reaching its results (outcomes) and if the planned results are expected to be reached by project’s end. Then, by answering the guiding sub-questions (see Annex 1), elaborate in more detail by using cause and effect analysis to support the findings:

Assess the output delivery and quality, to verify if satisfactory as per work plan. In case of delays or deviations, mention the reasons and the implications for milestones and targets. It is not about “justifying” the delays but rather identifying the causes, analysing and describing the adopted corrective measures. If such actions were not performed, then negative effects on the project or risks of such effects need to be mentioned.

To understand inter-institutional structures, coordination and communication mechanisms among partners, analyse the relationships, and if an internal monitoring or follow up system exists (such as steering or technical committees), its characteristics (i.e. how regularly it convenes, who are the members, discussions, reporting etc.), and if it is effective to steer the action, ensure accountability and rectify situation if necessary. Consider additionally if the project M&E system is functional and linked to the results matrix’s indicators.

Analyse government coordination mechanisms (if it is effective, how regularly it convenes) and if the donor coordination mechanisms are led by the government or donors to have a better idea if coordination and
complementarity support impact and sustainability, enable synergies and prevent overlap. Consider as well this factor from the point of view of capacity development of national stakeholders.

### 2.2 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the project objective and outcomes to be reached/achieved?

#### Findings/comments

Same as before, provide an overall finding relating to the guiding question above (2.2)

Analyse causes and effects of the strategy of implementation and its flexibility and each main output and the level of achievement or delivery. Compare what was planned (i.e. in the results matrix, implementation schedule, work plan, etc.) and what was effectively implemented. The analysis can be done by component/result with concrete cases or examples. Analyse if any relevant facts or circumstances took place in the project context (political, economic, social, etc.) since it was launched, and if those affected the project and how. Here you consider the project’s ability to adapt to changing external conditions to ensure results achievement (i.e. by changing its strategies, intervention logic, intervention areas, partners, beneficiaries, activities, or by adapting the budget).

Check also if changes to design have been reflected in the management tools.

Comment if the project environment has produced any planned or unplanned positive or negative effects on target groups, and if the project actions contributed to increasing positive and diminishing negative effects.

### 2.3 Does the project presently respond to the needs of the target groups and does the project work effectively with all relevant stakeholders?

#### Findings/comments

As a priority, start with the overall finding relating to the guiding question (2.3), whether the project presently responds to the beneficiary needs and if the commitment of all stakeholders towards the project objectives is effective. Then elaborate in more detail by addressing the individual questions.

(Questions focus on whether the objectives and the implementation of the intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities, partner and donor policies, considering if project circumstances have remained the same or if they had changed.)

Focus is also placed on project partners’ policies/actions and if the project strategy supports them, referring to capacity development. To become familiar with the national (local) policies of the beneficiary country to which the project contributes will help to conduct the analysis. The analysis of coherence and alignment of the project with the policies and strategies of the partner (beneficiary) country should also incorporate the regional or international best practices, and if the project is aligned with them.

Also as a priority, verify if target groups have been reached by the project, and if they can use project services, by providing concrete examples (including numbers and location of beneficiaries).

Analyse if the commitment of all stakeholders towards the project objectives is effective, with examples. To verify the local ownership, assess to what extent the target groups are involved. Check if the local stakeholders have been involved in project design also, which is not indicative of design quality but rather to analyze partnerships and impact on the current level of ownership. Complementarity between all partners and stakeholders involved in project implementation is also checked.

Finally, analyse links with donor priorities, input and overall satisfaction with project implementation and if the project’s management and monitoring practices support such priorities. Reflect on the quality of donor-project relationship, reporting and satisfaction with overall implementation, and if any issues have been noted.
### 3. EFFICIENCY

#### 3.1 How well is the availability/usage of means/inputs managed?

**Findings/comments**

Efficiency is the level of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into outputs.

Check the project budget, burn rate or expenditures and compare it with the time elapsed under the project, to understand if the input utilization is aligned with the timeframe spent. Use the quantitative analysis to understand the state of inputs (human, material and financial means) and delays in the planned situation to identify any deviations. To check cost-efficiency: a) assess if there are synergies with other projects, activities, organizations, etc. to save costs or make more profitable activities or outputs (i.e. common events, sharing venues, reusing manuals, etc.); b) compare the actual cost of outputs versus the planned costs in the original budget to check for deviations and its causes and effects.

Mention any delays in the disbursements made by the donor or other partners or if the planning for activities has been revised.

Identify issues or serious deficiencies, which need to be immediately addressed in order not to jeopardize results. In such cases the cost-efficiency of outputs may also be questioned, and if corrective measures can be financially implemented. In case substantial changes cannot be made, the project may face failure. Check also what monitoring mechanisms the project has established to be able to regularly report on the efficient and cost-effective implementation, and if these reports are regularly shared with the donor and/or project partners.

Analyse the implementation modalities under the project (grants or similar) and the contractual arrangements (donor or IOM or project partner co-managed). Consider: 1) human resources: quantity, quality, geographic distribution; 2) technical and physical resources: quality/know-how, offices, technology, vehicles and materials; 3) implementation time: was it sufficient and realistic? 4) Financial resources: is the budget well-structured and sufficient for the project purposes?

#### 3.2 How well is the partner(s) contribution/involvement working?

**Findings/comments**

As under previous sections, provide an overall finding relating to the main guiding question (3.2).

This section focuses on the resources provided by the national or project partners. Assess to what extent resources from all committed parties in terms of quality and quantity (%) have been put at project’s disposal to correspond to its needs. List financial, human and physical (in kind) resources provided by the partners as per the financing agreement. Assess if partners involved are providing them and if this is not the case or if delayed, what are the consequences for project implementation.

Assess if other stakeholders support project implementation, such as entities or groups not mentioned in project documents (i.e. informal partners), for example grassroots level organizations, seed-money and contributions from other partners or donors resulting from project’s coordination with complimentary actions.

### 4. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY PROSPECTS

#### 4.1 What are the direct impact(s) prospects (if any) from the project?

**Findings/comments**

This section covers the impact and sustainability prospects, which in case of midterm implementation of the project, could still be non-apparent. Some prospects may be however discerned, as measured through the indicators related to the overall objective for the project.
Based on the analysis conducted under the previous sections comment if the project is on the right track to produce expected impact/changes, both positive and negative. Unexpected impact may be more difficult to assess at this stage.

Analyze if some external factors may jeopardize impact prospects,

### 4.2 Financial and operational viability guaranteeing sustainability?

**Findings/comments**

*Sustainability is the level of continuation of benefits from the projects after the external support is ceased.*

Assess if the funds are likely to be made available by project partners or stakeholders to ensure financial/economic sustainability (i.e. planned to be allocated in the budget of project partners already, to cover the costs for services or maintenance of equipment, databases and similar). Check if project services are affordable to target groups, and if there are foreseeable external factors that could jeopardize the use of project services. Comment on whether the implementing partners have financial means beyond those provided by the project. Also, consider the sustainability of goods and services in the event of changes in external factors (e.g. variation in inputs prices or selling products).

Analyze if the project plans to prepare an exit strategy. Consider if the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in the project framework.

Human and financial factors are the main sustainability factors to be analysed here.

Analyze whether the project contributes to developing or improving the existing institutional capacities of the implementation partners and direct beneficiaries and whether these capacities are adequate for the continuation of the project’s benefits.

### 5. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Please determine which of these are relevant to the project being monitored.

For all cross-cutting issues, refer to the annexes in each chapter of the Project Handbook (2017) where guidance and questions pertaining to all cross-cutting themes are provided.

#### 5.1 Have practical gender needs\(^{22}\), strategic gender interests\(^{23}\) and other gender-related issues been adequately considered in the project design and implementation?

**Findings/comments**

If relevant, this guiding question pertains to gender mainstreaming from the design to implementation of the project. The project's sensitivity towards gender equality must be analysed considering the guidelines provided by IOM, donor and project partners. Check if project's activities and outcomes include gender equality but do not specifically target gender equality; in case the equality is significant, this means that gender equality is an important factor of the project's outcomes or main objective of the project. Also, analyse if the project's intervention strategy has adequately considered the gender aspects, and what formal or informal strategies exist to support these. Check if measures have been undertaken by the project or partners.

---

\(^{22}\) **Practical gender needs**: the needs of individuals that relate to the responsibilities and tasks associated with their traditional gender roles. Responding to these needs can improve the quality of life but does not challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions.

\(^{23}\) **Strategic gender interests**: the needs individuals identify as a result of their subordinate position in society. Responding to these interests tends to challenge existing gender roles, norms and power divisions, and assists in achieving greater gender equality.
To improve the role and status of women. Try going beyond the participation of women in project activities and analyse whether there exists a gender strategy, comment on its quality, its implementation and impact on the target groups and project sustainability.

### 5.2 Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of rights of migrants?

**Findings/comments**

If relevant, check if the rights-based approach was considered to determine the extent to which a project or a programme has strengthened the rights of migrants and assisted groups but also to which extent the intervention has been guided by the RBA principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability and transparency). Consider if the information flows and update mechanisms are satisfactory and if beneficiaries are regularly informed on project objectives, time-frames, if they participate in the decision-making and receive feedback, and can raise concerns freely. Assess if the project is supporting the realization of human rights, and provide examples. Also, note the cases of possible violation of human rights and if appropriate mechanisms are established to respond to such violations. Using the RBA Manual[^24] and specifically the monitoring tool in Annex IV may help respond to this section.

### 5.3 Is the project respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems?

**Findings/comments**

In this section, analyse if and to what extent the project addresses environmental needs or considerations. Check if environmental concerns have been adequately considered in the project design and if the project follows good environmental practices in its implementation. Then tackle whether the environmental dimension of the project has been considered during implementation to contribute to environmental sustainability and/or to combat climate change, or in case the project has contributed further to environmental damages. In case the project has an environmental impact related to climate change, check if the corresponding instruments been applied (i.e. environmental impact assessment, environmental management plan, climate adaptation plan, etc.). Finally, assess if project partner capacities are adequate to deal with climate change, natural risks and disasters.

### 5.4 Have the communication and visibility actions been implemented in an appropriate manner (to be asked when there is no specific project component dealing with it and that has to be covered under the analysis of effectiveness)?

**Findings/comments**

Communication activity is every activity the project undertakes to communicate with target groups regarding activities, outputs and outcomes, including the established channels of dialogue, such as forums, meetings or events. Visibility is everything the projects undertakes to make its objectives visible to the general public, such as brochures, posters, magazines, websites, but this does not necessarily include communication channels.

Analyse if the communication and visibility activities have been properly implemented, and in accordance with the donor and IOM communication and visibility materials and manuals, the purpose of which it to ensure that project actions bring information and raise the awareness of specific or general audience of the reasons for the project and the donor support in the country or region concerned, as well as the results and the impact of this support. Pay particular attention to the possible “invisibility” of donor support vis-à-vis the image of the implementing partners (government, NGOs, UN, etc.).

### 5.5. So far, are there good practices inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?

**Findings/comments**

Summarize good practices and/or lessons learned that have already been identified, referring to, for example: coordination, management and implementation mechanisms, relationship between partners, quality of outputs and outcomes, M&E mechanisms, sustainability factors, etc., having a high replication potential in geographic or thematic terms. If applicable, mention specific current practices and eventually “possible or future” practices, and indicate why they are good and their replication potential. Good practices can also be related to the innovative aspects of the project, but not necessarily.

## 6. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SPECIFIC CRITERIA

**To be used for emergency/humanitarian assistance projects**

### 6.1 Coherence and coordination

**Findings/comments**

Start by analysing the project alignment with main humanitarian goals and objectives, beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs and global humanitarian priorities. The state of the current problems and needs are analysed, explaining if the actions proposed by the project are relevant or viable regarding the humanitarian context, the results and the objectives it pursues.

### 6.2 Connectedness

**Findings/comments**

Analyse if the humanitarian intervention implements the activities in such a way that short-term approaches turn into the longer-term ones, reaping the positive change or important contributions to resolving the humanitarian issues and supporting the overall objective for the project. If not, provide explanations why this is the case. Comment if the project could produce contributions to peace building and stabilization measures or other forms of reconstruction and development. Analyse prospects, both positive and negative, expected and unexpected, such as improved (or not) reconstruction and development capacity, involvement (or not) of local institutions in all stages of peace building process.

### 6.3 Coverage

**Findings/comments**

Analyse the current state of beneficiary needs, and compare with the initially identified ones, to conclude if the humanitarian needs were correctly or viably identified and appropriate assistance provided. The analysis should also consider the problems or needs that the project cannot address (for example: a human or gender rights not properly addressed in the humanitarian context). Verify if all major groups have been reached by the project and received the humanitarian assistance, and if they are able to use the assistance, by providing concrete examples if this is the case or not. Underline factual statements using evidence to reflect the extent to which assistance was proportionate to profile, numbers and location of major groups. Comment also on deviations, if any.

### 6.4 How is this project accountable to affected populations?

**Findings/comments**

Based on the analysis of needs of affected population and humanitarian assistance provided, conclude if there exist mechanisms to ensure accountability to affected populations. For instance, mechanisms could relate to communication and transparency, feedback and response, participation and inclusion, and learning and adaptation. Through participatory assessment, partnerships with affected populations are built, as separate dialogues with women, girls, boys, and men, including adolescents, enable the project and partners to gather accurate information on the specific protection risks that different groups face, identify underlying causes, understand refugees’ capacities, and hear their proposed solutions. It helps communities to take collective action to enhance their own protection, and makes it possible to implement a rights- and community-based approach.

Check also if the needs of vulnerable groups have been taken into account, and if all beneficiaries are timely informed on humanitarian actions, if they participate in decision making regarding project orientation and implementation. Verify if systematic feedback and complaints are collected, and what are the response mechanisms, the level of analysis and what is learned from the feedback to adapt the
assistance to the needs of affected populations. This is done to confirm if all persons of concern enjoy their rights, have access to protection, services and assistance on an equal footing, and can participate fully in decisions that affect them and their family members and communities. Community engagement in all aspects of the protection work help identify the needs of communities in humanitarian crises, in order to avoid harm and ensure that humanitarian programmes do not inadvertently leave people and communities worse off.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS
Summarise the most important conclusions surfacing under all criteria. Conclusions must be simple and short, highlighting the relationships between cause – effect – findings. Confirm if the situation assessed is satisfactory overall or if the issues were noted in case of deficient or problematic projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations address the most significant weaknesses identified in the findings and summarized under conclusions above. Always bear in mind that coherence should to be ensured: recommendations cannot appear “out of the blue”.

The tone in recommendations should be appropriate, constructive and positive.

Recommendations should be listed from the highest to the least importance, and priorities in recommendations should be considered as not every conclusion necessarily leads to a recommendation.

Recommendations must clearly identify who is responsible for their implementation, i.e. project team, ministry, donor, etc., always taking into account the partner responsibilities and roles.

Concrete, clear and viable solutions should be proposed; complicated and structural recommendations should be avoided. Sufficient detail need to be provided to make the recommendations operationally applicable.

Provide consistent and realistic recommendations in line with midterm implementation timeframe.

Annex: Sources of Information

Persons Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the name and surname of the interviewee</td>
<td>List the position and institution the interviewee is representing (also location)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of all Documents Analysed

Author, Name of document, Date (i.e. IOM, Baseline report for mitigating risks of voluntary return, August 2008).
Annex 4: [OIG] PROJECT PERFORMANCE REVIEWS - PPR: A SHORT GUIDE

Introduction

[OIG- to be replaced with office conducting the PPR] is conducting Project Performance Reviews (PPR) based on pre-identified programmes or projects that are considered high-risk and/or high-profile programmes; these can be proposed by IOM departments and offices. [OIG] will aim to complete at least six reviews a year, which will be followed by the submission of short PPR reports (ideally 5 pages long and not exceeding 10 pages), to be coordinated with the managing office and the department(s) and regional office(s) concerned, in particular if proposals are coming from those entities.

The aim of the PPRs is to conduct a review during the lifecycle of the programme, which will essentially measure progress in implementing activities and reaching results as per agreed indicators, M&E framework and work plan. They usually take place during the implementation of the project, preferably mid-way for any corrective measures that could be taken. PPRs can also be assimilated into Real Time Evaluations for emergencies that are preferably organized at the start of an emergency. The objective is to support field offices in assessing the performance of their projects using a constructive, participatory and coordinated approach, and in improving implementation when necessary in order to reach expected results. Any comments or concerns will therefore always be welcome.

The PPRs will focus primarily on the performance of the project through OECD-DAC Criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Impact and sustainability will only be briefly analyzed given that the exercise is normally taking place during the implementation of the programme. A section on the humanitarian criteria of coherence, connectedness and coverage is available for humanitarian programmes.

PPRs will look at cross-cutting issues such as: gender, rights-based approach, and the environment. In terms of gender, the alignment with IOM’s policy and guidance will be analysed, along with the incorporation of gender analysis into project design (indicators, outputs, outcome levels) and implementation phases (methodology, methods, data collection tools). The inclusion of a right-based approach will be analysed to determine the extent to which the project has strengthened the rights of migrants/assisted groups but also to which extent the project has been guided by rights principles (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability and transparency). In terms of environment, damages and contributions to it will be considered in the project design but also if the good environmental practices have been identified during the implementation as well as any critical risks of natural disasters that could impact the project.

---

25 IOM Evaluation guidelines uses the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria with evaluation being defined as an assessment “to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability” of efforts supported by aid agencies: http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/eva_techref/Evaluation_Guidelines_2006_1.pdf; or http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

26 See IOM Evaluation Guidelines or the ALNAP guide Evaluating humanitarian action; http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/evaluating_humanitarian_action
PPRs will also analyse the level of accountability to beneficiaries and affected populations, as well as the programme’s links to MIGOF and to regional or country IOM strategies.

The Project Performance Review tool is provided in advance as a reference for the scope of the exercise and [OIG] welcomes any comments that the programme managers may have in preparation for the PPRs. All questions can be adapted based on the type of programme being reviewed.

**Preparing for the PPRs**

[OIG] will cover expenses of the field visit for the OIG staff and will coordinate with the programme manager the preparation of the exercise and the appropriate time for the travel.

PPR visits will last between 3 to 5 working days. To maximize the benefits of the field visit and ensure that [OIG] can prepare it in advance, the following is needed from the managing office:

1. **Availability of the Programme Manager or designated person:** this will be important to answer questions about the programme implementation, to provide the necessary documentation, list of interviewees etc. and to ensure that meetings are organized in the field mission.

2. **Documents related to the programme,** which should consist of:
   a. Project proposal and donor agreement
   b. Budget
   c. Donor reports (narrative and financial)
   d. Monitoring Framework
   e. Monitoring reports
   f. Monitoring tools (matrices, work plans...)
   g. Country strategy (if applicable)

   Other useful documentation which should be provided if applicable:
   h. Any IOM research undertaken related to the programme
   i. Government strategies linked to the programme
   j. External reports, research, evaluations from the country or region that are linked to the programme

3. **List of people to interview.** The reviewer aims to meet as many people as possible during the visit to the field location. The interviews need to be organized by the IOM office and may include, in addition to the Programme Manager or designated person:
   a. Chief of mission
   b. Other team members working on the programme
   c. Government stakeholders working closely on the programme or aware of the programme
   d. Beneficiaries (to the extent possible)
   e. Related UN agencies working on similar or complementary programmes
   f. Related NGOs working on similar or complementary programmes
   g. A list of interviews that may be conducted outside of the country (IOM headquarters, donors’ capital, Regional Office(s) etc.).

---

27 A multi-country programme may require more time in order to visit other countries.
28 This could be a Regional Office, Country Office or Headquarters based on the type of programme.
The reviewer will submit a draft report to the managing office (see attached template) and will welcome any comments on the report. The report and its proposed recommendations can then be used by the managing office to make adjustments as they see fit. OIG can continue to support the office as required in this process.

Following initial comments and feedback from the managing office, the final document will then be sent to the managing Country Office (programme manager and Chief of Mission), related regional offices, Regional Thematic Specialists and the related Headquarter-based department and Director as well.
### Annex 5: Template for Action Plan on PPR Recommendations

**Project Performance Review Title/Year:** *(Insert title of evaluation)*

**Person or body responsible for completing management follow up response matrix:**

*(Insert name and title of person or body responsible for completing the management follow up response matrix. For example, the Project Manager, the Chief of Mission, the Project Team, the Project Steering Committee, etc.)*

**PPR recommendation 1:**

Cut and paste the first recommendation from the evaluation report. Note that once an evaluation report has been accepted and finalized, the recommendations cannot be revised. Therefore do not amend the recommendations, simply copy them in as they are from the final version of the final report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation to:</th>
<th>Priority level (1 to 3):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify for whom this specific recommendation is intended. Usually this will be one or more of the following: project management, senior management (including financial managers), project implementation and oversight bodies such as a project steering committee, donors, or IOM Headquarters.</td>
<td>Prioritize the importance of this recommendation. Be realistic. Some recommendations are very important (for example they affect the well-being of beneficiaries, they address critical risks to the project, etc.) while others are less important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)**

*Indicate if management accepts, partially accepts, or rejects the recommendation. Provide an explanation if management only partially accepts or rejects. Bear in mind that ideally, enough evidence will have been provided to an evaluator that by the time the recommendations are finalized, there is not too much disagreement on the recommendations. However disagreements do occur, and it is acceptable to reject or only partially accept a recommendation. However, this decision should be adequately explained in this section.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Timeframe or deadline</th>
<th>Responsible individual or unit(s)</th>
<th>Implementation monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments or action taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the</td>
<td>Specify the</td>
<td>Specify who will be responsible</td>
<td>Do not complete this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation</td>
<td>timeframe or</td>
<td>for this action.</td>
<td>column when you are first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been</td>
<td>deadline for this</td>
<td></td>
<td>preparing the matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed upon</td>
<td>action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete the column when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or partially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>following up and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monitoring the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>action. At that time,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insert comments and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>description of the action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert rows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPR recommendation 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add lines as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the instructions above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation to:**

**Priority level (1 to 3):**

**Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Timeframe or deadline</th>
<th>Responsible unit(s)</th>
<th>Implementation monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments or action taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>