

Cross-Cutting Theme 2: Monitoring and Evaluation

Chair: David McKenzie, World Bank

1. Objectives

This Theme has three concrete objectives. First, it will provide support to the TWG work programs on Monitoring and Evaluation. This will include engagement with pilot activities as they emerge, along with support with selected efforts to ex-post identify the impact of migration and development policies.

Second, it aims to determine what we already know about the impacts of policies designed to enhance the development impacts of migration. The CCT will prepare a literature review analyzing current evidence and knowledge gaps on the impacts of policies designed to enhance the development impacts of migration. This will form a resource for TWGs, as well as a broader audience.

Third, it will lead the evaluation of a pilot evaluation. Too both provide new knowledge and also act as a demonstration effect, the CCT will actively lead an evaluation of a skills training program for migrants. This will provide knowledge to several themes, including reintegration, remittances, and mobilizing diaspora.

2. Work Program Highlights

The CCT plans to deliver two outputs during 2013/4. It will produce a literature review. The CCT along with a short-term consultant will prepare a critical review of existing literature studying the impact of policies designed to enhance the development impact of migration. This will include (among others) topics such as financial literacy training and enhanced financial access for migrants, pre-departure orientation training programs, reintegration programs, remittance saliency programs, resettlement policies, and policies to facilitate migration.

Second, it will support to the Diaspora Working Group on Assessing Matching Grant programs. Following a direct request from TWG 10, the CCT will work together with this working group to assess what can be said about the impact of existing matching grant programs such as the 3x1` program.

3. Key Findings and Lessons Learned

The team has produced a draft literature review, which suggests the following findings.

The existing evidence base suggests some areas of policy success: bilateral migration agreements for countries whose workers have few other migration options, developing new savings and remittance products that allow migrants more control over how their money is used, and some efforts to provide financial education to migrants and their families.

Suggestive evidence together with theory offers support for a number of other policies, such as lowering the cost of remittances, reducing passport costs, offering dual citizenship, and removing exit barriers to migration. Research offers reasons to be cautious about some policies such as enforcing strong rights for migrants like high minimum wages.

As to assessing matching grant programs, the review finds that existing evidence does support the idea that home town associations can increase the provision of local infrastructure. Policy concern is twofold: first, it is unclear empirically the extent to which the matching funds lead to more of such projects being undertaken, versus crowding out funding that the associations would otherwise provide on their own. Second, given the sometimes regressive nature of such programs, it is unclear whether public funding devoted to this program is better for development than other uses this social funding could be put towards – for example, in Mexico SEDESOL also runs the Progresas/Oportunidades program, and it is far from clear that additional dollars going towards 3x1 have greater impact than using this funding instead for cash transfers to poor households.

Since a number of other countries, including Haiti, Somalia, the Philippines, Peru, and Colombia are looking to implement their own co-financing programs with Home-town Associations, additional evaluations to answer these questions are important.

Several countries also try to encourage their migrants abroad to invest in projects in the origin country. For example, the Philippines Embassy in Qatar brings agricultural projects to pitch as potential investments to migrants there. Most of these programs seem relatively small in scale, and it is unclear whether the government has a comparative advantage in identifying investment projects.

4. Outcomes

As all TWGs' work has been at the infant stage, the CCT's involvement on evaluating policy actions arising from the TWGs' work would begin only from the second year – 2014/5. During this first year, the CCT has focused building the foundation for the second year, i.e. stock-taking the existing literature on the impact evaluation of migration policies, largely those of sending countries. This effort is expected to shed light on the evidence base on what policies work and what not.

5. Synergies Across Thematic Working Groups and Cross-Cutting Themes

The CCT will cooperate and provide support to each TWG as needs arise. There are likely to be three types of engagement. First, the background paper on the impacts of existing policies will coordinate with existing literature review efforts by various TWG, with the CCT providing guidance on the quality of existing evidence, as well as drawing out cross-cutting issues and themes that come from these evaluations. Second, the diaspora TWG has specifically requested support in the first year in attempting to assess the impact of matching grant programs for migrants. Third, as KNOMAD progresses, several TWGs are likely to launch pilot programs, and the CCT will engage with these activities to determine when rigorous evaluations are feasible and desirable.

6. Building Partnerships and Expanding the Thematic Working Groups and Cross-Cutting Themes

The CCT will draw on the work of other researchers in putting together the impact evaluation overview paper. It plans to engage with academics and organizations such as DIME, IPA, and J-PAL who work on impact evaluations as demand from KNOMAD for work on this topic grows.

7. Next Steps

Going forward, the CCT will assist TWGs on diaspora as requested, finalize the draft literature review, and develop the Year 2 Work Program (July/ August), including qualitative surveys of past participants in training program.