

DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT

THE AFRICAN UNION-HORN OF AFRICA INITIATIVE (AU-HOAI)

DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT

JUNE 2024



Table of Content

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
CHAPTER 1	5
BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 Situational Analysis on Irregular Migration in the Horn of Africa (HoA) region	5
1.2 Background to the AU Horn of Africa Initiative	7
1.3 Justification for the Evaluation of the AU-HOAI	7
1.4 Objectives of the AU-HOAI evaluation	8
CHAPTER 2	9
THE EVALUATION APPROACH.....	9
2.1 Methodology	9
2.2 Ethical guidelines for evaluation	11
2.3 Challenges encountered during data collection.....	12
CHAPTER 3	12
EVALUATION FINDINGS	12
3.1 Introduction	12
I. Relevance of the AUHOAI to Member States needs on prevention of TIP and SOM in the Region	13
II. The Structural Design and Modality and leadership of the of AU-HOAI initiative	13
CHAPTER 4:	16
RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION	16
4.1 Conclusions	16
4.2 Recommendations	17
ANNEX.....	19
Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix	19
Annex 2: Key Informant Guides	26

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
CHAPTER 1	5
BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 Situational Analysis on Irregular Migration in the Horn of Africa (HoA) region	5
1.2 Background to the AU Horn of Africa Initiative	7
1.3 Justification for the Evaluation of the AU-HOAI	7
1.4 Objectives of the AU-HOAI evaluation	8
CHAPTER 2	9
THE EVALUATION APPROACH.....	9
2.1 Methodology	9
2.2 Ethical guidelines for evaluation	11
2.3 Challenges encountered during data collection.....	12
CHAPTER 3	12
EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	12
3.1 Introduction	12
I. Relevance of the AUHOAI to Member States needs on prevention of TIP and SOM in the Region	13
II. The Structural Design and Modality and leadership of the of AU-HOAI initiative	13
III. Decision making and Follow up on Implementation.....	14
IV. Complementarity and Synergy to the AU New Policies on TIP and SOM in Africa	15
CHAPTER 4:	16
RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION	16
4.1 Conclusions	16
4.2 Recommendations	17
ANNEX.....	19
Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix	19
Annex 2: Key Informant Guides	26

AUC	African Union
AU-HOAI	African Union-Horn of Africa Initiative
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CoESPU	Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units
EAC	East Africa Community
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
GCM	Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
KII	Key Informant Interview
IR	Inception Report
MPFA	Migration Policy Framework for Africa
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation
DAC	Development's Development Assistance Committee
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	High Commissioner for Human Rights
RECs	Regional Economic Commissions
ROC	Regional Operational Centre
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SLO	Special Liaison Office
SoM	Smuggling of Migrants
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TiP	Trafficking in Persons
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEG	United Nations Ethical Guidelines
UNHCR	United Nations Commission on Human Rights
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of African Union-Horn of Africa Initiative (AU-HOAI) which was commissioned in February 2024 by the African Union Commission (AUC). This evaluation is based on the Report of the Senior Officials meeting of the AU Horn of African Initiative (AUHOAI) that was held in Mombasa in 2022, where Member States requested the Commission to undertake the Evaluation of the Initiative to ascertain its relevance and effectiveness in supporting Member States on issues of prevention of Trafficking in persons and Smuggling of Migrants in the Region.

This evaluation was conducted through document review and virtual key informant interviews with member states and AUC and its partners to assess the impact, relevance and potential Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) of the African Union-Horn of Africa Initiative (AU-HOAI) in tackling human trafficking and smuggling of migrant in the region.

The evaluation identified structural challenges on the operational modality of the Initiative. It was found out that while the Initiative has undertaken several activities since its inceptions, there has been some challenges in terms of political leadership, funding and sustainability of its activities. This has affected its operations and predictability hence denying its Member States opportunities to share experience, collaborate and support each other in the fight against transnational crime, including Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants.

The Report therefore recommends improvements to the leadership modality and structure of the AU-HOAI. One recommendation is to establish a clear leadership rotation system, where member states take turns chairing the initiative for a set period to enhance predictability and ownership by member states. Further, the evaluation also recommends developing a sustainable funding strategy for the AU-HOAI to ensure that its sustainable to undertake its activities. It was noted that while the Initiative had developed a forward-looking Plan of Action between 2017-2022, there was no funding to support its operationalization.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Situational Analysis on Irregular Migration in the Horn of Africa (HoA) region

The Horn of Africa (HoA) has been grappling with the irregular migration especially on issues of trafficking in persons and Smuggling of Migrants in the region. This could be due to various reasons that has either been push or pull factors of this flow. For example, widespread poverty, exacerbated by recurring droughts including the latest that devastated East Africa in 2024¹, creates a breeding ground for exploitation. People, especially in drought-stricken areas of many countries in the region, are more susceptible to traffickers' false promises of employment or a better life abroad. Countries such as Somalia, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya have had a long spell of drought that has given rise to irregular mobility out of the region.

This desperation is further compounded by the region's history of political instability and conflict. Weak governance creates a power vacuum that traffickers and smugglers exploit with impunity. A recent report by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) highlighted how ongoing violence in parts of South Sudan and Somalia displaces thousands, making them easy prey for traffickers². In such movement, vulnerable groups, especially women and children, are easy targets for trafficking networks and criminal groups involved in smuggling of migrants in the region.

Existing societal inequalities and limited access to education and resources, especially for women, make them particularly vulnerable. Girls as young as 12 years are being trafficked for domestic servitude and sexual exploitation³. This exploitation takes many forms, with forced labor being the most common⁴. Migrants who pay smugglers for passage can end up trapped in exploitative situations, essentially becoming victims of forced labor or sexual exploitation, with many falling victims to violence, extortion and forced labor at the hands of smugglers⁵.

The Horn of Africa Member States are also working on efforts aimed at prevention of TiP and SoM. Initiatives such as Kenya's National Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP) focus on raising awareness⁶. Billboards and community outreach

¹ UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA): <https://www.unocha.org/southern-and-eastern-africa>

² Ibid

³ UN Women Horn of Africa: <https://africa.unwomen.org/en>

⁴ US Department of State: Trafficking in Persons Report 2022: <https://www.state.gov/reports/2022-trafficking-in-persons-report>

⁵ Mixed Migration:

<https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/activities/countries/docs/somalia/Mixed-Migration-HOA.pdf>

⁶ <https://www.state.gov/reports/2023-trafficking-in-persons-report/kenya/>

programs educate citizens, particularly vulnerable youth and women, about the dangers of TiP and SoM. Additionally, programs promoting economic opportunities, such as vocational training in Somalia, aim to empower people and reduce their susceptibility to traffickers' exploitative promises⁷.

Efforts are also being put to develop measures aimed at protection for victims. Djibouti, for instance, has established shelters offering psychological support and reintegration services for trafficking survivors of TiP and SoM⁸. National frameworks are crucial for effective action. Many African countries have developed their own policies following the "four Ps" approach:

- **Prevention:** Public awareness campaigns and addressing root causes that make people vulnerable, such as poverty and lack of opportunity.
- **Protection:** Providing support services to victims of TIP and SOM.
- **Prosecution:** Investigating and prosecuting traffickers and smugglers.
- **Partnership:** Collaboration between government agencies, NGOs, and international organizations.

Member states are however faced with limited resources which often hinder the capacity to identify victims and provide adequate assistance⁹. Recognizing the transnational nature of the problem, regional cooperation is another effort in dealing with TiP and SoM. The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), a regional economic bloc, fosters collaboration between member states. Initiatives include information sharing between law enforcement agencies and developing joint strategies to disrupt trafficking and smuggling networks¹⁰.

Despite these efforts, challenges persist. Resource constraints often limit the effectiveness of anti-TIP and anti-SOM programs. Significant gaps remain in implementation and enforcement. Continued international support, robust regional cooperation and addressing the root causes of vulnerability are critical to dismantling these criminal networks and ensuring safe migration for all.

The Member Countries hold meetings bi-annually to review the progress of implementation of activities and decide on ways forward. The Initiative also convenes a ministerial meeting for political direction, and the alignment of the Initiatives' intended area of work with Member States priorities and existing situation in the Horn of Africa region¹¹.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ <https://www.unhcr.org/news/news-releases/support-trafficking-victims-unhcr-urges-more-protection-services-africa>

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ <https://igad.int/igad-launches-its-regional-trade-policy-2022-2026/>

¹¹ Ibid

1.2 Background to the AU Horn of Africa Initiative

The African Union-Horn of Africa Initiative (AU-HoAI) was established and launched in 2014 through the Khartoum Declaration¹², the main aim of this initiative is to provide a forum for AU Member States from the Horn of Africa region to exchange information, share experiences and improve cooperation on migration management in the region and jointly adopt measures towards countering human trafficking and smuggling of migrants, as well as irregular migration¹³. Member States of the Initiative include Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Sudan as Core Countries; while Djibouti, Kenya, Libya, Somalia, South Sudan, and Tunisia are also Members. The AU Commission, supported by IOM and UNHCR provided a Secretariat of the Initiative.

The AU-HoAI also fosters closer collaboration between countries in the Horn of Africa which is crucial in effectively combating TiP and SoM networks that often operate transnationally. This collaborative spirit echoes frameworks like the ECOWAS Freetown Roadmap, which establishes a structure for information sharing and joint investigations on TiP across West Africa¹⁴. By strengthening the foundation for regional cooperation, the AU-HoAI allows for a more comprehensive response against these crimes.

On their part, the Horn of Africa Member States have also been putting measures in place to deal with the challenges of TiP and SoM at State level. One such effort is legislative and policy reforms on combating irregular migration in their countries, especially TIP and SOM. Countries like Ethiopia, Kenya, and Djibouti have adopted anti-TIP and anti-SOM laws aligning with the Palermo Protocol, a cornerstone international treaty to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children.

1.3 Justification for the Evaluation of the AU-HOAI

Following a senior official meeting of the AU-HoAI on Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants held from 20th – 21st September 2022 in Mombasa, Kenya, Member States reviewed the performance of the initiative, including its achievements and challenges. The meeting took stock of the work done for the last 5 years based on the Plan of Action and agreed to undertake an evaluation of the Initiative with the aim of revamping and positioning it to support its Member States on merging challenges of irregular migration in the region.

¹² International Organization for Migration (IOM): <https://www.iom.int/african-union-horn-africa-initiative-human-trafficking-and-smuggling-migrants-au-hoai>

¹³ African Union: https://au.int/sites/default/files/pages/32824-file-16-04-13_informational_note_on_the_HoA_initiative_final.pdf

¹⁴ Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). "New Regional Road Map to Strengthen Counter-Trafficking in West Africa: The Freetown Roadmap". <https://www.iom.int/news/new-regional-road-map-strengthen-counter-trafficking-west-africa>

The meeting also noted that the initiative had made significant strides in combating trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling in the region. In pursuit of broader regional impact, the AU-HoAI has also explored collaboration with organizations like SADC and IGAD, aiming to expand its reach beyond geographical space.. Further, a training manual, developed using a systems approach, has been piloted in Ethiopia. Workshops focusing on data collection and sharing have also been conducted, paving the way for harmonized data practices among member states. To further equip law enforcement trainers, a generic training manual adaptable to each member state's specific needs has been created.

Additionally, the Initiative has also invested in its visibility by developing a logo and a dedicated website to serve as a central information hub. Materials for the website are still under development, but the initiative's commitment to promote clear communication strategy and awareness creation of the crime within the region is evident. Member states noted that these achievements demonstrate the AU-HoAI's ongoing efforts to foster collaboration and empower member states in the fight against trafficking in person and smuggling of migrants.

On the other hand, Member States noted that the initiative faces a number of challenges. One major challenge is the frequent change of focal points within departments or offices in Member States that handles the Initiative file. While this is a normal operational issue at State level, this constant turnover disrupts continuity and makes it difficult to maintain a consistent follow up in the implementation of the work of the Initiative. Sharing information effectively is another hurdle. The sensitive nature of some data creates difficulties in open collaboration between countries. Additionally, the dedicated website for the initiative, AU-HoAI, appears to lack sufficient content, which hinders its potential as a central information hub. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the initiative seems to be struggling financially, lacking the resources needed to fully implement its plans and achieve its goals.

Following the identification of the above challenges, member states recommended that the AU Commission in close collaboration with Member States and other relevant key stakeholders conduct an evaluation of the AU-HoAI to identify gaps and opportunities to be considered to revamp the initiative and ensure that the initiative brings much needed value and that it responds to the needs and realities faced by Member States, in addressing trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

1.4 Objectives of the AU-HOAI evaluation

The main objective of the evaluation included the following:

- a) Review the AU-HOAI relevance to the needs of the member countries,
- b) Identify the initiatives potential Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) in a bid to strengthen it to be able to respond to Member States' needs.
- c) Align the Initiative with the new AU Policies on prevention of Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants in Africa

- d) Propose to Member States on ways to revamp the process to respond to current and future dynamics and challenges associated with combating irregular migration in the Region.

DRAFT

CHAPTER 2

THE EVALUATION APPROACH

2.1 Methodology

This evaluation of the AUHOAI employed a mixed methods approach using both primary and secondary sources of information. This methodology was employed in

order to ensure that data from primary sources was triangulated with information from secondary sources to improve its reliability. For secondary sources, documents were reviewed that relates to the AU-HOAI shared by the AU Commission. For primary sources of information, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were undertaken with relevant stakeholders including AU-HOAI secretariat staff, select AU HOAI member states representatives from Ethiopia, Eritrea, South Sudan and Egypt and partners- International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD).

An evaluation matrix to guide the evaluation was prepared (Annex 1) showing different evaluation questions, data sources and analysis methods employed in the evaluation. The evaluation matrix provided an evaluation instrument for the consultant and a source of triangulation. The Evaluation Matrix links the evaluation criteria to required information and sources.

Data collection for KIIs was undertaken through virtual interviews using pre-designed interview guides with a separate set of questions for different stakeholder groups (annex 2). The table below shows the representation of key informants that were conducted in this evaluation.

Table 2: KIIs breakdown

Key Informant	Organization	Number
AU-HOAI secrétariat	AU	3
Representatives of AU-HOAI member states	Member states ¹⁵	4
Partners	IOM, UNHCR, IGAD,	5

Qualitative data analysis method was applied. Data was analyzed using comparison, mixed data integration, contribution analysis and triangulation to answer the evaluation questions. To control bias as well as ensure accuracy and reliability, triangulation within and across methods was used. Methodological triangulation ensured that more than one option was used to gather data. For example, results from interviews with AU-HOAI secretariat and implementing partners were checked against interviews with member states representatives and monitoring reports. The same questions were asked to similar stakeholders to ensure consistency.

Inferences of conclusions were drawn from data collected until all information obtained was cross-checked to verify the accuracy of the data. The evaluation matrix demonstrates how every key evaluation question was answered through multiple sources of evidence, using different methods. The quality of the evidence for each of

¹⁵ One KII from Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia and South Sudan. It was not possible to interview the other member states as all interview requests went unanswered despite several attempts including phone calls.

the main evaluation questions was assessed using a three-point scale as shown on table 2 below.

Table 2: Triangulation scales used in the evaluation

Scale	Description
3	High degree of triangulation – more than three sources of evidence of good quality
2	Satisfactory degree of triangulation – two sources of evidence of good quality or more than two sources of variable quality
1	Limited degree of triangulation – only two sources of evidence of variable quality

2.2 Ethical guidelines for evaluation

The evaluation was conducted in line with IOM Data Protection Principles and in adherence with United Nations Ethical Guidelines (UNEG) ethical guidelines (2008)¹⁶. The consultant also reviewed a recent report prepared for the UNEG Task Force on Ethics and Code of Conduct, which considers state-of-the-art practices within organisations undertaking evaluations.¹⁷ Aligned with these guidelines, the evaluation ensured that:

a. Respect for rights of individuals and institutions:

The consultant accorded respondents the opportunity to participate voluntarily while maintaining their anonymity, and to make an independent and informed decision to participate without pressure or fear of penalty. The consultant also assured respondents that information would be kept confidential and that reports would be written such that responses/contributions would not be traced back to them.

b. Respect for diversity, including cultural identities and sensitivities:

Variances in culture, political sensitivities, religious beliefs, gender, disability, age of all involved were respected. As a result, evaluation processes were mindful of context, and the rights and choices of all stakeholders to self-expression and participation, as well as the needs of the respondents and rights-holders the Initiative is supposed to serve.

c. Professional responsibilities and obligations of evaluators:

The consultant exercised independent judgement and operate in an impartial and unbiased manner. Any sensitive issues and concerns were addressed through the appropriate mechanisms.

d. Respect for the principle of “do no harm” at all times:

¹⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

¹⁷ <http://www.uneval.org/document/download/3444>

The commitment to ensure that any action planned by the consultant did not take any action that exposed interviewees, to any risks. The consultant reviewed any planned step in this evaluation against this principle and adjusted accordingly.

2.3 Challenges encountered during data collection

This evaluation encountered major challenges related to unavailability of member states representative to participate in interviews. Despite many interview requests and interventions from the AU secretariat for member states to respond to the consultants' requests for interviews. Only 4-member states eventually obliged to the requests. This not only delayed the delivery of the interviews but potentially meant that some important insights and recommendations could have been missed in this evaluation. The consultant however did everything possible to triangulate all information gathered to ensure strong findings and recommendations emerged from the evaluation.

CHAPTER 3

EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the AU-HOAI evaluation. The chapter begins by examining the relevance of the initiative by assessing interviewed respondents' views on how the initiative has responded to member states' needs, priorities and policies and its ability to adapt as needed. The chapter also provides findings on the AU-HOAI initiative structure, leadership,

strategic focus and general architectural designs' responsiveness to current and future migration needs in the Horn of Africa.

I. Relevance of the AUHOAI to Member States needs on prevention of TIP and SOM in the Region

Evaluation findings indicate that the AU-HOAI is very relevant to the needs, priorities and policies of member states. Findings indicate that the AU-HOAI was founded to serve as a forum for participating countries from the Horn of Africa region to debate issues, exchange information, share experiences and deliberate on the status and counter measure approaches to human trafficking and migrant smuggling in the Horn of Africa region¹⁸.

Findings from this evaluation clearly shows that the AU-HOAI has been very relevant to member states as a forum of sharing and exchanging information developing joint policies and approaches on countering TiP and SoM through prevention of trafficking and smuggling, strengthening of protection and assistance to victims of trafficking and smuggled persons, enhancing rule of law, prosecution and integrated border management capacity building, national coordination, partnerships and international co-operation.

The Law enforcement working group of the Initiative played a big role in supporting Member States in building coalition on combating TIP and SOM. Its plan of Action had identified various issues/ themes that would have gone a long way in addressing challenges associated with the combating TIP and SOM in the region. Further, respondents identified collaboration in information and intelligence sharing as one of the critical areas that the initiative had started building up as well.

Further, besides this, respondents also appreciated the fact that the Initiative created awareness among different stakeholders on the need to combat irregular migration in the region. This visibility is very important because for a very long time, TiP and SoM were very big challenges in the Horn of Africa posing fundamental challenges to peace, stability and development in the region due to the fact that large numbers of people in the region are on the move, for reasons ranging from poverty, unemployment and underemployment, conflict and violence, political instability, natural disasters, violations of human rights and pull factors in countries of destination¹⁹.

II. The Structural Design, Modality and leadership of the of AU-HOAI initiative

The Evaluation found out that there is no clear Terms of Reference to define the leadership and modality of the Initiative. In practice, AUHOAI Member States have been providing political leadership to the process while the AUC supported by IOM and UNHCR has been providing Secretariat to the Initiative. This has impeded

¹⁸ <https://www.iom.int/african-union-horn-africa-initiative-human-trafficking-and-smuggling-migrants-AU-HOAI>
¹⁹ Strategy and Plan of Action of the AU-HOA Initiative on Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants

predictability and sustainability of the Initiative since there is no clear guideline of how leadership and secretariat need to work and support.

Further, the existence of Addis Group of the Initiative with no clear mandate on their roles was also found to be an impeding obstacle to progressive involvement of relevant stakeholders at national levels on key decisions and activities of the Initiative. Most of the respondents agreed on the need for the Initiative to involve as much as possible technical officers on the ground for sustainable implementation of the Initiative.

The AUHOAI as a non-binding interstates dialogue framework, needs to be state-led. All activities and decisions of the Initiative needs to be agreed upon and be led by States from the region. The evaluation however revealed that Member States Membership of this initiative is vague and doesn't give equal status of ownership of the process to all Member States. The evaluation found out that there are two categories of Membership: Core and non-core Members. The criteria for such dichotomy aren't clear and no document exist to justify this kind of classification.

This kind of situation has affected the interest and morale of Member States involvement and participation in the Initiative. While there are efforts to mirror the way Khartoum Process, an AU-EU interstates dialogue similar to the AUHOAI, there is need to structure the process in such a way that there is equal participation and ownership by all Member States of the Initiative despite their time of being admitted as Members, among other reasons. This will enhance sustainability of the Initiative while at the same time give ownership to Member States, including RECs.

The evaluation also revealed a huge funding challenges for the Initiative. While the Initiative prides itself to be an AU led process, unfortunately it doesn't attract adequate funding from Member States. This has a huge impact on implementation of its activities. This may explain why other similar initiative like Khartoum Process is activities and attracts Member States participation since it is well funded by the EU. The below quote from respondents depicts the situation:

“The Khartoum Process has taken over most of the member states attention. It's well funded, it involves the EU, people could travel from one city of Europe to another, and everybody would want to do that, and it was more appealing to member states unlike AU Horn of Africa, where there was no money”-KII respondent.”

“You can't expect to produce a child and then have that child be taken care and looked after by another person. It's not right. So, despite its convening power, you'll find that the lack of resources for the initiative to implement its decisions and programs, this plays a big part in it being ineffective. Because with no resources, there is no way you can flex your muscles. You rely on donors to be able to finance your program. But what happens when the interests that you're trying to peddle are not synchronized with the interests of the donor? You'll have a situation where most of your activities are not financed at the end of the day”- KII respondent.

III. Decision making and Follow up on Implementation

On the initiative's strategic focus and architectural design, evaluation findings indicate that the AU-HOAI strategic focus and general architectural design as currently constituted is unclear and needs to be reviewed. While the structure is political,

respondents felt that the political process needs to be structured in such a way that it goes to the highest level of decision making i.e. the heads of states. In this case, ministers must be involved which is not the case at the moment. Instead, the process is merely led by technical people from member states governments and thus, the decisions that they arrive at in their deliberations are not binding to the member states mainly because these deliberations are not made at the highest political levels of decision making. It therefore becomes difficult to follow-up on these deliberations. There is therefore need to re-design the initiative's architectural design to not only address decision making but also the technical and leadership aspects. This will also help define clearly the roles and responsibilities of the secretariat and partners to improve coordination and thus avoid duplication of efforts between different partners thus improving the effectiveness of the initiative.

IV. Complementarity and Synergy to the AU New Policies on TIP and SOM in Africa

With regard to the AU-HOAI's synergy and complementarity with new TiP and SoM policies, findings indicate that the AU-HOAI has not been very effective in linking up with other ongoing TiP and SoM policies. For instance, according to interviewed respondents, despite the fact that the Ouagadougou Plan of Action²⁰ was a creature of the AU-HOAI, it has been nowhere in the discussions of the initiative. Respondents therefore recommended that the AU-HOAI implements the decision of the 2018 Specialized Technical Committees (EX.CL/987(XXXII)) on Migration, Refugees and IDPs that urged the AU Commission to sustain, replicate and extend the operational mechanisms of the AU-HoAI to other trafficking and smuggling routes across the continent and also to other Regions.

On the same breadth, findings indicate the need for the AU-HOAI to work in complementarity with other regions as recommended by the Migration Policy Framework for Africa (MPFA 2018)²¹ which notes the ever-growing number of migrants, and the complexity of migratory movements within and across regions. To this end the MPFA (2018) highlights the need to develop inter-State and interregional approaches to managing migration in Africa. Such co-operation can be fostered by developing clear objectives, providing opportunities for exchange of experiences, views and best practices, and working towards the coordinated implementation of policies and programmes.

Further, respondents urged the AU-HOAI to implement the provision of the MPFA (2018) which recommended the need to speak a 'common language' when addressing migration as a critical step and one that is on-going and evolving. This is in realization

20 The Ouagadougou Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, Especially Women and Children (2006) is a program that aims to mobilize state and non-state actors to fight against trafficking in persons. The plan was adopted in November 2006 by the AU-EU Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development and is part of four major migration policies in Africa. The plan encourages collaboration between governments, international, inter-governmental, and non-governmental organizations to mobilize resources to combat trafficking. It also calls for various interventions, including criminal prosecution of those involved in trafficking, and disruption of their networks.

21 https://au.int/sites/default/files/newsevents/conceptnotes/35595-cn-1-_cn_regional_meeting-midsa-au-hoai_20-21_dec_2018-maseru.pdf

that TiP and SoM are not unique to the Horn of Africa region alone and there is need to develop synergies with other regions to develop effective mechanisms to deal with TiP and SoM in a wholistic manner.

Respondents also indicated the need for the AU-HOAI to conduct regular research on TiP and SoM and related emerging threats. In this regard, there is need for the initiative to establish a technical working group on migration research. This working group will work in coordination with Continental Operation Centre in Khartoum (for sharing information on human trafficking and migrant smuggling) and the Training Centre in Cairo for Law Enforcement and to facilitate evidence-based research and sharing of current information and data on TiP and SoM.

CHAPTER 4:

RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

4.1 Conclusions

In conclusion, the AU-HOAI has demonstrably addressed a critical need in the Horn of Africa region by fostering dialogue and raising awareness of trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of migrant (TiP/SoM). It has provided a platform for Member States within the region an opportunity to share experiences, strategize countermeasures, and build upon existing initiatives like the Khartoum Process. However, the initiative's effectiveness has been hampered by a lack of clarity regarding its scope and responsibilities. Additionally, its reliance on member state contributions which have not been forthcoming has placed it at a financial disadvantage compared to better-funded alternatives.

However, the Evaluation has indicated the need to address some of the gaps and challenges for the initiative to achieve its maximum potential. This includes clarity in

its mandate and scope, including its leadership and fundraising strategy. There is need for AU Member States in this region to provide clear leadership and direction on the future of this initiative. There is also need to address level of participation and frequency of the forums of the meeting. Furthermore, elevating the decision-making process to ministerial or even head-of-state involvement would ensure tangible outcomes and stronger member state commitment. By addressing these shortcomings, the AU-HOAI can evolve into a more robust and impactful force in combating TiP and SoM in the Horn of Africa.

4.2 Recommendations

Based on the above evaluation findings and conclusions, below are the recommendations for improving the relevance, visibility, effectiveness and strategic focus and general architectural design of the AU-HOAI.

I. Develop and adopt a clear Terms of Reference to define clarity on structure, modality and leadership of the Initiative

As noted above, there is need to develop a clear Terms of Reference to guide the operational modality of this Initiative. Specific areas of the TOR may include clarity of criteria for membership, level participation, leadership cycle and secretariat roles. The TOR should provide clarity whether this initiative is operational in nature or political including decision making process and procedures.

In particular emphasis should be the Leadership and Secretariat clarity. There is need for clarity in terms of how Member States will be involved in the leadership of the Initiative for ownership purposes. The Commission, supported by IOM and other partners should be well facilitated to provide Secretariat role to this Initiative. This may be through provision of dedicated staff to support the work of the Initiative as it the case of Khartoum Process and other similar mechanism.

II. Develop and adopt a strategic Plan of Action to guide the work of the Initiative

While the evaluation found out the existence of Plan of Action for the Law Enforcement Working Group, there is need to develop a forward-looking strategic Plan for the Initiative to guide its work and operations. This plan will incorporate key areas of interventions based on the scope and mandate of the Initiative as per the Terms of Reference.

III. Establish and operationalize thematic Working Groups for the AU-HOAI

To enhance implementation of the envisaged Strategic Plan, there is need to establish thematic working groups of the initiative that will involve activities participation of various stakeholders. It should be noted that combating irregular migration needs not only government-wide approach but also a societal wide approach. There is need to involve not only Law Enforcement agencies in this fight, but also other state and non-state actors, including media, private sector, among others.

IV. Develop and operationalize funding and resource mobilization strategy for the AU-HOAI

One of the main challenges faced by the Initiative is lack of funding. It was clear from the evaluation that AUHOAI is not well funded as compared to other process, including the Khartoum Process. There is need therefore to develop a sustainable funding model for the AU-HOAI akin to that of the Khartoum Process²². This funding should come from Member States, particularly within the AU Budget process to enhance its visibility and relevance. Member States must be ready to fund activities of AU Horn of Africa as compared to the current status where it relies on partners support.

This will provide the initiative with predictability in terms of funding which is key to its effectiveness and sustainability.

V. Develop Strategic partnership with other similar Processes and AU RECs on TIP and SOM Issues

AU-HOAI should work in complementarity with other regions and mechanism, including the Khartoum Process. There must be deliberate efforts within the envisaged Strategic Plan to build partnership with other regions in the continent in the combating TIP and SOM. Regular joint coordination meetings between AUHOAI and other mechanism and regions, including Khartoum Process should be encouraged. This will foster collaboration, sharing of best practices and eliminating duplication, as it is the case with Khartoum Process.

Further, the Initiative should strive to also provide synergy with continental efforts in combating TIP and SOM in the continent. It should be one of the building blocks of continental initiatives and efforts in combating TIP and SOM in the continent. Additionally, with now the establishment of new centers of migration data, training and intelligence sharing on Migration in Mali, Sudan and Morocco, provides another opportunity for collaboration and partnerships. This must be harnessed.

²² The Khartoum Process is funded through the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) which receives funding from the European Commission, which is the executive branch of the EU and more than half of its budget comes from this source. The ICMPD also receives funding from its Member States, the UN, other multilateral institutions, and bilateral donors. The ICMPD's annual budget is about EUR 20 million.

ANNEX

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

This evaluation matrix shows different evaluation questions, data sources and analysis methods to be employed in the evaluation.

Main evaluation questions	Means of verification	Sub-questions	Data sources	Data collection tools	Approaches/roadmap to data analysis
RELEVANCE The extent to which the AU-HOAI initiative is suited to member states' needs, priorities and policies and its ability to adapt as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of alignment with the needs of member states and country priorities • Extent to which the initiative has adjusted to the changing migration needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where did the demand for this initiative come from? • To what extent is the strategy aligned with the relevant continental, regional plans and strategies on addressing TOC especially TIP? • Have there been any change(s) in the initiative design or implementation due to the changing context or circumstances and because of new changes/migration policies? What were the procedures to reflect those changes? • To what extent is the AU-HOAI design valid? (i.e. 	<u>Secondary</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy documents • Reports of academic institutions, organizations and think tanks on the migration trends in the HOA and globally <u>Primary</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AU-HOAI staff • AU Partner- IOM, UNHCR etc. • Member states staff 	<u>Secondary</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review template <u>Primary</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured interview guide 	<u>Example of approach</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence for the achieved results based on key informant interviews data and most significant change stories <u>Other methods</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic analysis • Narrative analysis • Statistical analysis

How does the initiative align with the member states' needs, priorities and policies?)

- How has this initiative worked? Has it enhanced ownership and leadership by the Core countries? What can be done to improve on the leadership and ownership of this process by AU Member States?
- Have these priorities strengthened prevention of TIP and SOM in the region? What are the gaps? What needs to be changed?
- Do we have new challenges and or emerging issues that need to be prioritized in the coming years?
- Since its inception, how have you gauged its impact and what has changed, if any?

- To what extent was adaptability to context, risk and changing circumstances built into the initiative design?
- How well was the initiative able to adapt and respond to evolving challenges associated with irregular migration in the continent and particularly within the Horn of Africa?
- How has the initiative adapted to emerging nuances and shift in global and continental efforts to address and combat issues of Trafficking in persons, especially with the continental efforts of developing policies on the prevention of trafficking in persons and Smuggling of Migrants that were adopted recently by the AU Decision making bodies?

- | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How has this process supported the national, regional, continental and global process on TIP? Where are the gaps and how can they be improved?
What is the particular added value of the Initiative in comparison to ongoing projects /initiatives being implemented in the region by other actors?• Are there any other actors providing a similar type of initiative in the regional, targeting the same stakeholders?• Would it be valuable to replicate best practices and lessons learned from the initiative, to future or ongoing projects /initiatives with the AUC or other actors, with or without modifications, and if so how? | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

<p>EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p>Measure of the extent to which the AU-HOAI initiative structure, leadership, strategic focus, and general architectural design is responsive to current and future migration</p> <p>How is the monitoring data actually being used (to adapt, and to improve initiative performance or effectiveness?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the initiative leadership structure? How is it developed and by who? • Frequency and quality of initiative monitoring activities • Evidence of use of monitoring results to improve initiative delivery and implementation. • How participatory are the initiative activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is the initiative structure, leadership, strategic focus, and general architectural design effective in making it responsive to current and future dynamics in migration governance in the continent and beyond? • What does this tell us about what works, how and why for member states with different migration challenges? • Does the initiative have a monitoring system? If so how • does it (the monitoring system) demonstrate results for initiatives implementation achievements and progress? • If available, how is the monitoring data being used (to adapt, and to improve initiatives?) 	<p><u>Secondary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme reports • IPs and TPM monitoring reports • Monitoring reports with information disaggregated along age, gender and other diversity-related elements, including by disability • Agenda and notes of trainings organized with partner staff on monitoring • Minutes of meetings where results of monitoring are being discussed • Progress reports showing how monitoring results are used to improve the programme <p><u>Primary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AU-HOAI staff 	<p><u>Secondary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review template <p><u>Primary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured interview guide 	<p><u>Example of approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of use of monitoring data in Initiative improvement by showing how monitoring results fed into initiative activity planning <p><u>Other methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic analysis • Narrative analysis
---	---	---	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which were the coordination bodies/Actors involved and what were their roles? To what extent has the initiative achieved the stated objectives. (Achievements)? • What are the major challenges and obstacles that the Initiative encountered? Was the initiative able to cope with them or did they prevent the initiative from producing the intended results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AU Partner- IOM, UNHCR etc. • Member states staff 		
<p>COHERANCE Extent to which the initiative was designed and implemented in coherence with other actors in the context, as part of a coordinated response to an identified problem</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which there are synergies and inter-linkages between the initiative and member states migration management systems, policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is the initiative in sync with member states, regional (RECs) continental policies and the GCM migration management systems, policies etc.? • What were any barriers to/opportunities for synergies, and how were these managed by the initiative? 	<p><u>Secondary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative reports • Review of bilateral or multilateral meetings/conferences dedicated to migration, TIP and SoM <p>Declarations and commitments made by States and regional</p>	<p><u>Secondary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review template <p><u>Primary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured interview guide 	<p><u>Example of approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess emerging TIP and SoM prevention policies in the region and globally analyse the current initiative and apply exert analysis to identify how it has adapted to these new policies/ideas to

<p>(member states & other actors)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of joint collaboration/ programming of other relevant migration management initiatives • Extent to which the initiatives priorities and objectives mirror the priorities of member states • Extent to which initiative has aligned to other key regional discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How synergistic has the initiative been, both to the programmatic work in the HOA region and other affected regions and countries? 	<p>organizations on migration management in the region <u>Primary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AU-HOAI staff • AU Partner- IOM, UNODC, UNHCR etc. • Member states staff 		<p>improve its implementation.</p> <p><u>Other methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic analysis • Narrative analysis
--	--	--	--	--	--

Annex 2: Key Informant Guides

Interview Protocols

The following paragraph will be read to all participants prior to interviews.

The AU is commissioning evaluation to examine the relevance, effectiveness and coherence of its Horn of Africa Initiative which deals with issues of irregular migration, specifically combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants in Africa. The purpose of the evaluation is to contribute to learning and knowledge exchange on how the initiative can work better and ensure it meets its objectives. Your participation will take about 45 minutes. There are no right or wrong answers, or desirable or undesirable answers. If it's okay with you, everything you say will remain confidential, meaning that only myself and the evaluation team will be aware of your answers. Your name will not be associated with your responses.

Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. Whether or not you decide to participate and what you tell us will not affect your continued relationship with AU. You are free to decline to answer any question, or to stop the interview at any time.

AU-HOAI secretariat

1. Ask the interviewee about his/her role and level of involvement/role in the AU-HOAI.
2. What has worked well with regards to the AU-HOAI implementation? Could you give some examples?
 - *What have been the reasons to explain the opportunities and enabling factors?*
3. *How has this initiative worked? Has it enhanced ownership and leadership by the Core countries?*
 - *What can be done to improve on the leadership and ownership of this process by AU Member States?*
4. What has worked less well with regards to the AU-HOAI implementation? Could you give some examples?
 - *What explains the challenges experienced in implementation? For example: political buy-in, recruitment of staff, security constrains, others.*
5. How did you make sure the AU-HOAI remained relevant to the needs of the member states and other beneficiaries including victims of TiP and SoM?
 - *How has the AU-HOAI responded to the protection needs of migrants? Has there been any beneficiaries' needs assessment conducted?*
 - *Is there a comment/complaint mechanism in place to collect feedback and adjust initiatives activities if needed?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI adjusted due to a change in the context? How has the AU-HOAI adapted to the new TiP and SoM policies and member states priorities?*
 - *How did the AU-HOAI prioritize what needs to respond to?*
6. Can you describe how the migration landscape has evolved or changed since the AU-HOAI started?

- *How have different member states policies and priorities changed if at all?*
 - *How have the global compacts for migrants and refugees led to changes?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI build on others initiatives, particularly good practices/successes/achievements?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI incorporated any lessons that you may have learned from previous/other programs targeting migrants? Can you give examples?*
7. Are objectives, strategies, and action plans on schedule and fulfilling expectations?
 - ✓ If so, how can the initiative build on this progress?
 - ✓ If more progress than expected has been made, should objectives be set higher?
 - ✓ If less progress than expected has been made, should objectives be lowered or extended in time?
 - ✓ Should strategies be revised, overhauled, or thrown out entirely?
 - ✓ Are other changes are required to allow the initiative to make progress?
 8. What recommendations would you give on strategies to improve the performance of the AU-HOAI?

Representatives of Member states (Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Sudan, Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia and South Sudan)

1. Ask the interviewee about his/her role and personal involvement in the AU-HOAI (if any).
2. How was your country involved during the AU-HOAI design and implementation?
 - *Has your country been involved in the AU-HOAI? If so in what way?*
 - *How is the AU-HOAI aligned with your government priorities?*
3. According to you, what has worked well in the implementation of the AU-HOAI?
4. What has worked less well?
 - *What explains the challenges experienced?*
5. Could you tell us a bit about the relevance of the AU-HOAI – do you feel the AU-HOAI is in line with your country's' most urgent migration dynamics?
 - *Anything in the design is missing to ensure migrants are better protected?*
 - *Were your country's priorities and needs taken into consideration?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI adapted to imminent issues such as security, political and governance, socio-economic and climate change etc. dynamics in your country and the HOA region?*
 - *What other relevant initiatives (bilateral/multilateral) can be leveraged?*
6. What needs and priorities of your country's would you like the initiative to consider and adopt in order to be more relevant to your country's policies?
7. Are objectives, strategies, and action plans on schedule and fulfilling expectations?
 - ✓ If so, how can the initiative build on this progress?
 - ✓ If more progress than expected has been made, should objectives be set higher?

- ✓ If less progress than expected has been made, should objectives be lowered or extended in time?
 - ✓ Should strategies be revised, overhauled, or thrown out entirely?
 - ✓ Are other changes required to allow the initiative to make progress?
8. What recommendations would you give on strategies to improve the performance of the AU-HOAI?
 9. Did the initiative compliment any interventions at Member State (MS) level? or, will the initiative compliment any current interventions at MS level?

UN Agencies – Partners of AU

1. Ask the interviewee about his/her role and involvement in the AU-HOAI. How and in which areas does your agency partner or collaborate with AU on migration management and or programming?
2. Could you tell us a bit about the relevance of the AU-HOAI – do you feel the AU-HOAI is relevant to the needs to the member states and other beneficiaries, meeting their needs?
 - *What is your understanding of the AU-HOAI initiative? What does it seek to achieve?*
 - *How does AU-HOAI respond to the priorities of member states in migration management?*
 - *How does the AU-HOAI prioritize what needs to respond to?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI adapted its activities to the changing TIP and SoM policies in the region?*
3. According to you, what has worked well?
 - *Promising areas: Development of national TiP and SoM prevention frameworks, social workforce strengthening, development of case management (including cross border case management etc)*
4. What has worked less well in designing and implementing the AU-HOAI?
 - *Anything should have been done differently?*
5. Can you describe how the migration landscape has evolved or changed since the AU-HOAI started?
 - *How have different member states policies and priorities changed if at all?*
 - *How have the global compacts for migrants and refugees led to changes?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI build on others initiatives, particularly good practices/successes/achievements?*
 - *How has the AU-HOAI incorporated any lessons that you may have learned from previous/other programs targeting migrants? Can you give examples?*
6. Are objectives, strategies, and action plans on schedule and fulfilling expectations?
 - ✓ If so, how can the initiative build on this progress?
 - ✓ If more progress than expected has been made, should objectives be set higher?
 - ✓ If less progress than expected has been made, should objectives be lowered or extended in time?
 - ✓ Should strategies be revised, overhauled, or thrown out entirely?

- ✓ Are other changes are required to allow the initiative to make progress?
7. What recommendations would you give on strategies to improve the performance of the AU-HOAI?