

UNDEF



The United Nations
Democracy Fund

**PROVISION FOR POST PROJECT EVALUATIONS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS
DEMOCRACY FUND
Contract NO.PD:C0110/10**

EVALUATION REPORT



TRANSTEC
PROJECT
MANAGEMENT

**UDF-RUS-09-332 - Empowering Civil Society Organizations of Migrants and
Ethnic Minorities in the Russian Federation**

Date: 22 July 2013

Acknowledgements

The evaluator is grateful to CAVT for its support in carrying out this evaluation. In particular, he wishes to thank Fedor Sinitsyn, CAVT Director, for providing extensive information on the project and arranging meetings. A number of other project stakeholders in countries and regions of Russia not visited by the evaluators have kindly agreed to hold interviews by phone, the evaluator wishes to thank them for that.

The evaluator also wishes to thank Vira Sachenko, who conducted research, translations and telephone interviews with project stakeholders across Russia, whom the evaluator could not meet in Moscow.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this report are those of the evaluator. They do not represent those of UNDEF or of any of the institutions referred to in the report.

Authors: Pierre Robert wrote this report. Landis MacKellar (evaluation team leader) provided editorial and methodological advice and quality assurance with the support of Aurélie Ferreira, Evaluation Manager. Eric Tourres, Project Director further supported the evaluation at Transtec.

Table of Contents

- I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1**
- II. INTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT 4**
 - (i) Project and evaluation objectives 4
 - (ii) Evaluation methodology..... 4
 - (iii) Development context 5
- III. PROJECT STRATEGY 7**
 - (i) Project approach and strategy 7
 - (ii) Logical framework 8
- IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS 9**
 - (i) Relevance 9
 - (ii) Effectiveness..... 11
 - (iii) Efficiency..... 12
 - (iv) Impact..... 13
 - (v) Sustainability 13
- V. CONCLUSIONS 15**
- VI. RECOMMENDATIONS 16**

- VII. ANNEXES 17**
- ANNEX 1: EVALUATION QUESTIONS:..... 17**
- ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED: 18**
- ANNEX 3: PERSONS INTERVIEWED 19**
- ANNEX 4: ACRONYMS 20**

I. Executive Summary

(i) Project Data

This report is the evaluation of the project “Empowering Civil Society Organizations of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities” implemented from August 2010 to June 2012 by the Center for Assistance to Victims of Violence and Human Trafficking (CAVT). The UNDEF grant amount was US\$225,000, with USD 22,500 retained by UNDEF for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The total budget of the project was US\$260,000, thanks to a US\$35,000 co-financing amount. According to the original project document, the project’s objective was to “empower the civil society organizations established by migrants and ethnic minorities in order to strengthen their access to justice, ability to combat xenophobia and discrimination, and to promote their social integration and interaction with Russian government bodies and NGOs”.

The project objective was to “empower civil society organizations established by migrants and ethnic minorities” to “strengthen their access to justice, ability to combat xenophobia and discrimination, and promote their social integration and interaction with governmental bodies and NGOs”. Flowing from this objective of support to migrants and ethnic minorities organizations, the project strategy had three prongs:

- Identification of the target organizations’ development and advocacy needs;
- Training of the organizations and other stakeholders (police, social services, media, other NGOs, Ombudsman institutions, etc.);
- Networking among target organizations and with other stakeholders.

In addition, the project planned to hold workshops with human rights NGOs and trade unions in some countries of origin of migrants to Russia: Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Ukraine). The aim of these workshops was to share views on migration-related issues, and good practices.

(ii) Evaluation Findings

The project was **relevant** in that it appropriately identified key needs: capacity development of NGOs working on behalf of migrant workers and ethnic minorities; engagement of law enforcement officials and state institutions; and ensuring better coordination and collaboration among NGOs. The project also sought to address the Russian media’s xenophobic coverage of events involving migrants and ethnic minorities and the attitude of law enforcement officials, some of whom may deal with migrants as possible extremists. In practice, the objective of the project was not so much to claim new rights for migrants and ethnic minorities: it was rather to ensure that migrants and members of ethnic minority groups could *exercise* their legal rights. The relevance of the project was further enhanced by sound design. The activities were clearly linked to each other and results were logically connected with activities.

However, despite this generally very positive background, the project lost relevance in that it did not address the organizational capacity of the target NGOs. Also, while the training of police was appropriate and praised by the beneficiaries, it was not specifically geared to the needs of other institutions such as members of the judiciary dealing with migration issues. Despite these caveats, the project was remarkably relevant and addressed needs that had been clearly and accurately identified.

The project was **effective**. The planned activities were virtually all implemented as foreseen in the original proposal, and sometimes – for example in terms of number of participants in training sessions – went beyond the planned indicators. The picture is similar in terms of results achieved: NGO representatives who attended training seminars felt that they had gained a better understanding of the legal and policy context of the treatment of migrants and ethnic minorities, and were better able to advocate in favor of their beneficiaries. Other stakeholders, particularly law enforcement officials, also acknowledged the capacity development dimension of their attendance to training seminars. Networking among stakeholders also increased through meetings during the seminars and workshops.

The project was also able to address the issue of xenophobic reporting in some media. In this regard, the involvement of journalists in training seminars was effective. However the project was not able to address a sufficient number of journalists and media outlets to reach a critical mass able to influence the general tone of reporting about migrants.

The project was **efficient**. Resources were appropriately used to deliver the planned results and that activities were implemented within budget and delivered to an appropriate standard. Appropriate budget design and sound project management contributed to the efficiency of the project. This is noteworthy in the context of Russia, which is a relatively high-costs economy, particularly in Moscow and other large cities. The project was managed efficiently and responsively, addressing the needs of target NGOs and stakeholders as they arose. The only weakness of the project management – stemming also from its design – has been the relatively short-term focus on project activities, to the detriment of the attempt to achieve a longer-term impact.

The project had some immediate **impact** on the professional skills of its direct beneficiaries – participants in training sessions – who broadly reported satisfaction with the learning they obtained. It has certainly also had some positive impact on some target organizations' capacity to support migrants and members of ethnic minorities. It is also likely that the project had a positive impact on relationships among stakeholders. More generally, the project helped reinforce the network of stakeholders dealing with migrant and ethnic minorities issues in Russia and some neighboring countries. However, the project's impact on migrants and people from ethnic minorities could have been greater, had the project developed a full advocacy strategy. This could have included, for example, advice to NGOs on direct lobbying of authorities and of elected officials.

The project also failed to address the important constituency formed by the employers of migrant workers. It is employers who, for example when they refuse to formalize migrant workers' contract, cause many of them to become illegal (undocumented) migrants. It is also employers who ultimately benefit from the bad reputation of migrants that xenophobic media reporting encourages, because this contributes to migrants' fear of claiming their legal rights.

Sustainability was a weak aspect of this project. It addressed NGOs' capacity needs only in terms of knowledge and did not address other constraints facing NGOs, which were often related to weak organizational capacity. Despite this the project has given CAVT a good base to engage further with institutions on follow

(iii) Conclusions

The project was relevant. It was based on a sound analysis of the situation of needs of migrants and ethnic minorities NGOs and its strategy and intervention logic were well

thought-out. However, **the project did not fully address migrant NGOs' capacity building needs** because it was designed to address knowledge gaps concerning the rights of migrants, and did not address other constraints on NGOs' capacity to act.

The project was effective. The activities were implemented as planned and results were achieved, largely because of the expertise of trainers and of the implementing NGO's record of previous effective work with stakeholders, **The project was generally efficient** as resources were used appropriately and project management was responsive. **The project achieved impact**, including through changed knowledge among NGO representatives and institutional stakeholders. It was also noticeable in relation to journalists' understanding of migrant and ethnic minority issues. **The project lacked sustainability**, because there was a lack of attention paid to NGOs' capacity building and governance. The project also failed to address sufficiently the issue of NGO advocacy on behalf of migrants and ethnic minorities.

(iv) Recommendations

These recommendations stem from the findings and conclusions. They are addressed to CAVT, the implementing organization – except the last one, which is addressed to UNDEF.

- CAVT should consider future projects in support of capacity building for migrant and ethnic minorities NGOs.
- Future projects should reinforce the capacity building of NGOs in terms of governance and use of resources.
- CAVT should ensure that future projects should have more formal advocacy strategies.
- CAVT should consider addressing economic actors in future projects, including employers of migrant workers.
- CAVT should consider a specific awareness-raising project directed at the media.

II. Introduction and development context

(i) Project and evaluation objectives

This report is the evaluation of the project “Empowering Civil Society Organizations of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities” implemented from August 2010 to June 2012 by the Center for Assistance to Victims of Violence and Human Trafficking (CAVT). The UNDEF grant amount was US\$225,000, with USD 22,500 retained by UNDEF for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The total budget of the project was US\$260,000, thanks to a US\$35,000 co-financing amount. According to the original project document, the project’s objective was to “empower the civil society organizations established by migrants and ethnic minorities in order to strengthen their access to justice, ability to combat xenophobia and discrimination, and to promote their social integration and interaction with Russian government bodies and NGOs”.

UNDEF and Transtec have agreed a framework governing the evaluation process, set out in the Operational Manual. According to the manual, the objective of the evaluation is to *‘undertake in-depth analysis of UNDEF-funded projects to gain a better understanding of what constitutes a successful project which will in turn help UNDEF devise future project strategies. Evaluations also assist stakeholders to determine whether projects have been implemented in accordance with the project document and whether anticipate project outputs have been achieved’*.

(ii) Evaluation methodology

One expert carried out the evaluation in December 2012. Its methodology is set out in the Operational Manual governing the UNDEF-Transtec framework agreement, with brief additions in the evaluation Launch Note. In accordance with the agreed process, a set of project documents was provided to the evaluators in September 2012 (see list of documents consulted in Annex 2). On that basis, they prepared the Launch Note REU-09-332 setting out issues to be considered during the evaluation.

The evaluator was able to follow the standard methodology. The only practical challenge was that it was not possible to visit all locations, as these were dispersed across Russia, including the country’s Far East. To address this challenge, the evaluator visited Moscow, where formerly Perm-based implementing NGO CAVT had moved its offices in December 2012. In addition to meetings with a range of stakeholders in the Russian capital, the evaluator held an number of phone interviews with project stakeholders (using a Russian-speaking translator) scattered in a number of cities.

In addition to the project documents provided to UNDEF, the evaluation used documents, including training materials, produced during the project period. He also considered press articles referring to the project’s activities and reports produced by the implementing NGO in a range of contexts (meetings organized by the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), referring to project activities.

(iii) Development context

Example of a civil society organization targeted by the project: the Trade Union of Migrant Workers

With headquarters in central Moscow, the TUMW is a unique organization: a trade union specifically dedicated to protecting the rights of migrant workers. Supported by the membership dues of about 30,000 members (as well as some subsidies from other unions), the TUMW has 5 offices across Russia.

The TUMW organises regular information sessions for migrant workers, discussing such issues as legislation and procedures governing application for residency, work permits, medical insurance, etc. The Director of CAVT has attended some of the monthly sessions,

According to the TUMW, the complexity of the legislation and the narrow interpretation of rules by authorities lead to a gradual increase in the number of illegal migrants in Moscow. This is due to new legal requirements, including a recently introduced Russian language test that penalizes casual workers from ex-Soviet states.

By working with CAVT, the TUMW was able to help more migrant workers obtain legal documents, and to lobby Moscow authorities on the unwanted effects of legal restrictions on the exercise of their rights by migrants.

Ethnic minorities in Russia

At the latest census in 2010, the Russian Federation's population (just under 143 million) was estimated to be 81% ethnic Russian, the rest being made up by members of about 160 officially recognized ethnic groups, the largest of which are the Tatars (3.7% of the population), Ukrainians (1.4%), Bashkirs (1.1%) and Chuvash (1%). All the other groups represented less than 1% of the population.¹

Within the territory of Russia are 21 republics, in areas where ethnic minorities are concentrated. The largest such republic is Bashkortostan (about 4m inhabitants); the smallest is Altay (0.2m). Due to centuries of migration, the so-called "titular nationality" of these republics does not necessarily represent a majority of the local population. For example, only about 30% of the people of Bashkortostan are Bashkirs, whereas 95% of the 1,1m population of Chechnya are Chechens.²

Movements within the old Soviet Union were limited by citizen's obligation to obtain a residence permit (*propiska*, internal passport) wherever they wished to live and work. This system was abolished in Russia in 1993 and replaced

with a requirement merely to declare one's place of residence. Although the current system is still not fully neutral in terms of freedom of movement – because registration is only possible on the basis of a formal proof of residency – it is much easier today for people to move around the country irrespective of ethnicity. However ethnic prejudices may continue to make it difficult for members of ethnic minorities to obtain legal residency registration – something for which they may get help from civil society organizations.

Immigrants in Russia

Immigration to Russia peaked between 1993 and 1995 (at about 1m net immigration per year) on the occasion of the break-up of the Soviet Union, when ethnic Russians and others moved to Russia from newly independent former Soviet states. Net annual immigration has been under 300,000 since 2001 and was estimated at between 100,000

¹ All the Russian demographic figures given in this section come from the 2010 Census and were issued in 2011 by Russia's Federal State Statistical Service (www.gks.ru, last accessed 6 March 2013).

² See www.gks.ru for detailed population tables in each republic.

and 200,000 since 2009.³ Much of this immigration was legal in the sense that immigrants had the right to stay in Russia, but a high proportion (which the paper mentioned in the footnote below assessed at about 70%) did not have the legal right to work “because most employers reject employees’ requests to formalize their hire”.

A development in the last several years concerned trafficking. Whereas Russia and neighboring republics have long be a “source” of people trafficked into Western Europe, Russia in recent years has also become a destination for people traffickers from other countries. There has also been a movement of return of former trafficking victims back to Russia: though the number of people concerned is low, civil society organizations providing psycho-social support to returning survivors of trafficking have noticed an increase.

As a result of the trends outlined above, two patterns emerged with regards to minorities and migrants in Russia:

- Many of the beneficiaries targeted by the project have the right to reside in Russia under the existing legal framework. However, legislation is sometimes overly complex and implementation not always correct, which causes some migrants to be unable to attain a legal status for both residency and work.
- Some members of minority groups as well as some migrants and victims of trafficking may be well placed to integrate in mainstream society: though often poorly educated and poor, they are likely to be familiar with Russian society and culture. This does not necessarily protect them from prejudice but may help ensure that, once given legal rights, they become productive citizens.

Policy towards civil society organizations

The Russian Federation introduction of new legislation on NGOs with international funding did not directly affect the project, which ended earlier. The activities of CAVT continued at local level with stakeholders including law enforcement officials. Cooperation remained possible throughout the project period. Indeed, several interviewees highlighted the good working relationship between CAVT and local authorities, as well as police forces, during the project. The reasons for this are reviewed below.

³ See www.gks.ru and: *Immigration to Russia: Why it is inevitable and how large it may have to be to provide the workforce Russia needs*, Working Paper by Grigory Ioffe and Zhanna Zayonchkovskaya, National Council for Eurasian and East European Research, University of Washington, Seattle, USA, January 2010.

III. Project strategy

(i) Project approach and strategy

Initial design and implementation

The project objective was to “empower civil society organizations established by migrants and ethnic minorities” to “strengthen their access to justice, ability to combat xenophobia and discrimination, and promote their social integration and interaction with governmental bodies and NGOs”.

Flowing from this objective of support to migrants and ethnic minorities organizations, the project strategy had three prongs:

- Identification of the target organizations’ development and advocacy needs;
- Training of the organizations and other stakeholders (police, social services, media, other NGOs, Ombudsman institutions, etc.);
- Networking among target organizations and with other stakeholders.

In addition, the project planned to hold workshops with human rights NGOs and trade unions in some countries of origin of migrants to Russia: Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Ukraine). The aim of these workshops was to share views on migration-related issues, and good practices.

The project could build on the credibility acquired by CAVT through its previous work with government and NGOs. Two factors further contributed to the capacity of CAVT to work with these stakeholders:

- The project was seeking to enhance the capacity of a specific type of NGOs, which already existed and were working legally. It was not about helping people who were in conflict with the law: as indicated in the previous chapter, the beneficiaries of the projects (migrants, former victims of human trafficking) generally lived legally in Russia, though they may have faced difficulties exercising their rights.
- CAVT’s focus was on building NGO capacity and networking: to that extent, it was working with stakeholders it already knew, which facilitated cooperation.
- In addition to working with NGOs the project emphasized awareness raising and advocacy with law enforcement officials and other government officials. In this respect as well, it could build on its track record, particularly that of its director, who was experienced in working with representatives of the police and judiciary on migration issues.

Project activities

The project foresaw the following main activities:

- Baseline study to assess the situation and needs of migrants and ethnic minorities NGOs with respect to the needs of their beneficiaries;
- Production of a handbook for NGOs on the rights of migrants and ethnic minorities, and on advocacy on their behalf;
- Training seminars for target NGOs on supporting migrants’ and ethnic minorities’ rights, including training of trainers;
- Similar training seminars for police, government institutions representatives, as well as other NGOs and media;
- Development of a training curriculum for police on the prevention of xenophobia;
- Workshops with human rights NGOs in selected countries of origin of migrants;

- Conference on the above issues, with NGOs and officials.

(ii) *Intervention logic*

The table below summarizes the intervention logic, based on the project document.

Main activities*	Expected Results*	Project objective*	General purpose*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline study • Training of NGOs • Handbook for NGOs 	Address the capacity development needs of NGOs	To empower civil society organizations to access justice, fight xenophobia and discrimination	To enhance the capacity of migrants and ethnic minorities civil society organizations to address violence and protect human rights
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of non-migrant NGOs • Training for police • Curriculum for police 	Train NGOs and other stakeholders	To help organizations' social integration and interaction with governmental bodies and other NGOs	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops with NGOs in Russia and other countries • Conference in Russia 	Enhance networking among NGOs and with other stakeholders		

* This table summarizes information provided in the project document, which may not have used the exact same wording.

Project implementation

During implementation, the following concerns were highlighted:

- The baseline study noted the role of migrants and ethnic minorities NGOs in the preservation of their beneficiaries' cultural heritage and religious tradition, as well as in relation to the protection and promotion of their members' human rights. In this regard, the lack of knowledge of the cultural tradition by NGO leaders themselves was a concern. The study also noted the NGOs' precarious financial situation.
- The training seminars were implemented, with significantly larger numbers of participants than anticipated (over 300 police officers in Moscow and Perm, instead of the anticipated 100).
- Workshops in countries of origin of migrant worker were conducted in Azerbaijan, Tajikistan and Dagestan (instead of Ukraine as planned originally).
- The planned conference, held in October 2011 was organized in cooperation with the Russian Red Cross and the Center for Migration Studies, an academic institution.

The planned project activities were implemented, with the only exception being that the anticipated Ukraine workshop was replaced by a workshop with human rights activists in Dagestan – this region being, according to CAVT, one of the main source of internal migrants within Russia.

IV. Evaluation findings

The following findings stem from the evidence gathered by the evaluator.

(i) **Relevance**

The project was relevant in that it appropriately identified three key needs:

- The capacity development needs of NGOs working on behalf of migrant workers and ethnic minorities;

Migrant women: addressing the risk of assault

Migrant women are particularly vulnerable to sexual assault. Legal protections for migrants, said the director of the Sisters' Sexual Assault Recovery Center, an NGO, are weaker than those for Russians, particularly if they lack official documents. In effect migrant victims of sexual assault must legalize their status before their case is investigated. CAVT joined seminars with the government and NGO experts to debate this concern.

Another issue CAVT has addressed has been the situation of former victims of human trafficking returned to Russia from other countries. These women sometimes return to Russia with partners or children, who face difficulties getting access to social services and education.

Victims of trafficking into Russia face the additional challenge that, once they escape from slavery-like situations (or are released by other migrants, as occasionally happens) they face difficulty proving to the police that they had been held against their will. CAVT noted that, for such cases to be addressed effectively, the police and NGOs that help the victims must better understand Russia's legal system and the relevant international standards, including the Convention against the trafficking of people, which Russia signed in 2003.

project, NGOs rarely lobbied regional authorities such as the Perm city government.

- A high degree of ignorance on the part of economic decision-makers of migrants' contribution to economic development. CAVT found that the media failed to cover this aspect of migration, and that few economists had studied the impact of migration.

- The need to engage law enforcement officials and state institutions in awareness raising activities and dissemination of good practices relating to migrants and minorities;

- The need to ensure better coordination and collaboration among NGOs supporting migrant workers and ethnic minorities, in Russia and in the countries of origin.

In addition to these key needs, the project sought to address other related but lower-priority concerns, including:

- The Russian media's coverage of events involving migrants and ethnic minorities can be perceived as xenophobic. In case of violence involving migrants, CAVT found that the media tended to take a partial view, partly because no one would speak publicly on behalf of migrants in such situations.

- The attitude of law enforcement officials, some of who may deal with migrants as possible extremists. That situation is made worse by the lack of action in this field on the part of regional ombudsmen, who have been wary of taking up complaints by migrants.

- The failure of migrant NGOs themselves to conduct adequate advocacy activities on behalf of migrants. CAVT noted that, prior to the

The previous experience of the implementing NGO ensured that the project was based on a sound needs assessment. The early months of the project confirmed the assessment, particularly with regards to the institutional capacity of many of the target NGOs and the need to enhance coordination and collaboration among them. The project's relevance was also enhanced by sound legal analysis and a detailed understanding of the legal, political and practical challenges that migrants and ethnic minorities face in Russia.

In practice, the objective of the project was not so much to claim new rights for migrants and ethnic minorities: it was rather to ensure that migrants and members of ethnic minority groups could *exercise* their legal rights. To this end, it made more sense to strengthen the capacity of a range of local NGOs to protect those rights, rather than expecting CAVT itself to take up the defense of people with a complaint. This approach was further justified by the long-standing existence in Russia of NGOs focusing on migrants and ethnic minorities from across the CIS and Russia itself: these organizations, which include the TUMW described in the box in Chapter II, are sometimes linked to the broader Russian trade union movement and have historical ties to local and regional authorities.

The relevance of the project was further enhanced by sound design. The activities were clearly linked to each other – baseline study, handbook, publications, training, conference – and results were logically connected with activities. However, despite this generally very positive background, two aspects of the project design have somewhat reduced its relevance:

- Empowerment vs. capacity building. The project aimed at enhancing the legal and policy skills of the target NGOs so that they get better at helping migrants and people from ethnic minorities. However the project did not address the organizational capacity of the target NGOs – whereas, according to several interviewees, one key challenge faced by the NGOs is the lack of sufficient human and financial resources to support their beneficiaries. It is clear that the project was neither designed nor able to provide NGOs with such resources – however it could have provided NGOs with some of the training and knowledge they would have needed to reorganize themselves to meet the priority needs of their beneficiaries.
- Results vs. impact. The project was designed around some key activities and outlined explicitly the expected results. However there was no explicit overview of the expected project impact. As a result, the project design and management was focused on achieving activities, which may have reduced the longer-term impact of the project. This issue is reviewed in the sections below.
- Work with officials. The training of police and Ombudsmen's office personnel were very appropriate and praised by the beneficiaries. However the project had identified a range of other institutional stakeholders, whose needs were not considered as closely as those of law enforcement officials. The police forces dealing with extremism, the police training academies as well as the Federal Migration Service were identified by CAVT as important stakeholders, and indeed each of these institutions sent participants to training sessions. However the training was not specifically geared to the needs of these institutions. Members of the judiciary (prosecutors and judges) dealing with migration issues were also identified as relevant stakeholders, but were not systematically involved in training.

Despite these caveats, however, the project was remarkably relevant and addressed needs that had been clearly and accurately identified.

(ii) Effectiveness

The project was effective. The planned activities were virtually all implemented as foreseen in the original proposal, and sometimes – for example in terms of number of participants in training sessions – went beyond the planned indicators. Here is an overview of the effectiveness of the project in terms of activities implemented:

The point of view of a police officer

Police Major Tatiana Anatolyevna Sadilova, from the Perm police, helped organize training sessions for police focusing on working with migrant victims of violence and trafficking. The sessions included participants from a police detachment specializing in work with juveniles.

Ms Sadilova told the evaluator that CAVT's strength was in providing police with methodical, practical advice and recommendations on dealing with specific situations: how to talk to victims of violence, whom to notify, what questions should be asked, etc. There was also advice on contacting NGOs that provide support to migrants and on helping migrants obtain appropriate legal documents.

Ms Sadilova noted that police was generally ill-informed about the legal and social situation of migrants and needed more training sessions. She also noted that participants in sessions benefited from interactions with CAVT due to the organization's practical experience of work on migration issues and record of addressing the problems of migrants.

human rights NGOs and trade unions. They were an opportunity to explore the reasons for migrating and particularly ways in which NGOs and unions in the countries/regions of origin could help migrants by giving them information about labor law and legal requirements in Russia, and informing them about Russian NGOs supporting migrant workers and ethnic minorities.

- The October 2011 conference brought together NGOs, officials and academics. Participants noted in particular the need to advocate for more consultations between NGOs and the authorities when legislation affecting migrants is being considered.

The picture is similar in terms of results achieved:

- NGO representatives who attended training seminars felt that they had gained a better understanding of the legal and policy context of the treatment of migrants and ethnic minorities, and were better able to advocate in favor of their beneficiaries.

- The training sessions involved almost twice as many participants (police, other institutions, as well as NGOs) as originally planned, largely thanks to a higher than expected number of sessions with police. Participants provided positive feedback on the scope of the training, the quality of the knowledge provided and the expertise of the trainers. Some institutional participants noted, however, that it was difficult to implement some of the recommended good practices in the existing institutional context of policy towards migrants.

- The publications (handbook for NGOs, police training curriculum) were also praised by participants and appeared to the evaluator to be comprehensive in their coverage. In the view of the evaluator, the documents only lacked an adequate number of practical case studies based on actual events. Such case studies would effectively have complemented the more theoretical knowledge and general advice given in the documents.

- The workshops in two of migrants' countries of origin (Azerbaijan and Tajikistan) and in one region of origin within Russia (Dagestan) brought together CAVT and representatives of

- Other stakeholders, particularly law enforcement officials, also acknowledged the capacity development dimension of their attendance to training seminars.
- Networking among stakeholders also increased through meetings during the seminars and workshops.

The project was also able to address the issue of xenophobic reporting in some media. In this regard, the involvement of journalists in training seminars was effective. According to the Perm representative of the Russian Journalists' Union, the participation of journalists in various project events resulted in contacts being established between local media, migrants' NGOs, police and the Perm Ombudsman's office, which in turn led to more balanced reporting about migration issues in the local press. The media representative noted that a series of three roundtable in Perm, with CAVT's support, led for the first time to direct dialogues between journalists and senior municipal police officers. Despite this sign of progress, however, the project was not able to address a sufficient number of journalists and media outlets to reach a critical mass able to influence the general tone of reporting about migrants. A larger, media-focused project would be necessary to achieve this objective.

(iii) Efficiency

The project was efficient, in the sense that its resources were appropriately used to deliver the planned results and that activities were implemented within budget and delivered to an appropriate standard. Appropriate budget design and sound project management contributed to the efficiency of the project. This is noteworthy in the context of Russia, which is a relatively high-costs economy, particularly in Moscow and other large cities. The main areas of expense were the following:

- Staff costs. The project team (project director, assistant, training coordinator and accountant) cost under \$38,000, which was appropriate for a project with total project costs in slight excess of \$200,000.
- The largest costs were for the seminars in Perm and Moscow and for the conference in Perm, which had a total budget of \$80,000.
- Further major costs were related to the training materials for NGOs, police, media and others, which cost over \$40,000 – a cost justified by the large print-run and distribution costs around the country.

Project management

The project was managed efficiently and responsively, addressing the needs of target NGOs and stakeholders as they arose. CAVT's location in Perm obviously led to prioritizing the Perm regional stakeholders in many activities, but national stakeholders in Moscow were also involved. The project director also used travel across Russian regions (sometimes for other activities) to support the work of regional stakeholders in Siberia and elsewhere.

The only weakness of the project management – stemming also from its design – has been the relatively short-term focus on project activities, to the detriment of the attempt to achieve a longer-term impact. For example, little was done within the project to support the development by beneficiary NGOs of effective advocacy strategies to follow up on the training. Similarly, the project did some work to address xenophobia in the media but the activities in this respect remained incidental and unsystematic.

(iv) Impact

The project had some immediate impact on the professional skills of its direct beneficiaries – participants in training sessions – who broadly reported satisfaction with the learning they obtained. It has certainly also had some positive impact on some target organizations' capacity to support migrants and members of ethnic minorities. Police forces in Perm and the TUMW are among the stakeholders who benefited in that way. Evidence for this was that the TUMW is more actively liaising with municipal authorities in Moscow and some other cities on migrant workers issues. The Perm police, for its part, has reportedly improved its handling of migrant workers, according to local NGO representatives.

It is also likely that the project had a positive impact on relationships among stakeholders. Several interviewees indicated that they valued the relationships among NGOs, law enforcement, media, and other institutions that were developed on the occasion of the training sessions, and gave examples of on-going collaboration (such as contacts between journalists and migrants' NGOs, referred to above). It is likely that some of these relationships will develop in the future.

More generally, the project helped reinforce the network of stakeholders dealing with migrant and ethnic minorities issues in Russia and some neighboring countries. While financially and institutionally fragile, NGOs in particular have become more aware that they form a community of interests.

However, as highlighted above (section on relevance), the project's impact on migrants and people from ethnic minorities could have been greater, had the project developed a full advocacy strategy. As it was, the project limited itself to conveying information about legislation and advice about good practices. A fuller strategy could have included, for example, advice to NGOs on direct lobbying of authorities and of elected officials.

The project also failed to address the important constituency formed by the employers of migrant workers. It is employers who, for example when they refuse to formalize migrant workers' contract, cause many of them to become illegal (undocumented) migrants. It is also employers who ultimately benefit from the bad reputation of migrants that xenophobic media reporting encourages, because this contributes to migrants' fear of claiming their legal rights.

(v) Sustainability

Sustainability was a weak aspect of this project, mainly for internal reasons.

The project did not explicitly build sustainability into the project design. In particular, it addressed NGOs' capacity needs only in terms of knowledge – and addressed that need in a strategic and effective way, as outlined above. However it did not address other constraints facing NGOs, which were often related to weak organizational capacity: lack of human and financial resources that constrain activities, weak governance that limit NGOs' strategic scope and credibility with institutional stakeholders, and lack of explicit advocacy strategies, which contribute to NGOs' activities lacking an adequate structure.

It was clear that the project could not have addressed all of these concerns at once, and could probably not have thoroughly addressed even one of them. However, there was scope for the project to raise awareness among beneficiary NGOs about the above issues, and to provide them with advice on good practices in this field. This could for example have included:

- Advice on project cycle management to help NGOs make the best possible use of their existing human and financial resources;
- Advice on good governance and accountability practices, taking into account Russian legal requirements on NGOS;
- Training on the development of advocacy strategy, from analysis of audiences to message development techniques and stakeholders analysis.

Despite these limitations, the project has given CAVT a good base to engage further with institutions on follow

Government skepticism towards some human rights NGOs has increased over the last 10 years. However, CAVT's record shows that it is possible to discuss sensitive human rights issues with representatives of government authorities provided an organization can build confidence and demonstrates expertise.

V. Conclusions

The conclusions presented here are based on the findings set out in the previous section and on the contextual information presented in section II.

(i) The project was relevant.

It was based on a sound analysis of the situation of needs of migrants and ethnic minorities NGOs and its strategy and intervention logic were well thought-out.

(ii) The project did not fully address migrant NGOs' capacity building needs.

The project was designed to address knowledge gaps concerning the rights of migrants, and addressed this appropriately. However it did not address other constraints on NGOs' capacity to act on behalf of migrants and ethnic minorities. In particular, it did not address issues of NGO governance, management, and advocacy.

(iii) The project was effective.

The activities were implemented as planned and results were achieved, sometimes beyond expectations. In particular, the training sessions were highly appreciated by participants, largely because of the expertise of trainers and of the implementing NGO's record of previous effective work with stakeholders, including law enforcement agencies.

(iv) The project helped develop migrant and ethnic minorities NGOs defend the rights of their beneficiaries.

It did so through training and the dissemination of publications. It also helped enhance NGOs' networking with local officials, particularly law enforcement agencies.

(v) The project was generally efficient.

Resources were used appropriately, and project management was responsive. This was a significant achievement in the relatively high-cost context of the Russian Federation.

(vi) The project achieved impact.

The clearest impact was in changed knowledge among NGO representatives and institutional stakeholders. It was also noticeable in places in relation to journalists' understanding of migrant and ethnic minority issues.

(vii) The project lacked sustainability.

Although project design was generally sound, sustainability was not explicitly built into the project, and in particular there was a lack of attention paid to NGOs' capacity building and governance. The project also failed to address sufficiently the issue of NGO advocacy on behalf of migrants and ethnic minorities.

VI. Recommendations

In this section, recommendations (i) to (iii) are addressed to CAVT and the last one to UNDEF. The recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions set out above.

Recommendation to CAVT

(i) CAVT should consider future projects in support of capacity building for migrant and ethnic minorities NGOs.

CAVT has excellent expertise and record of credibility in the field of human rights of migrants and ethnic minorities. It also has excellent project design and management experience, and carries credibility with institutional stakeholders.

(ii) Future projects should reinforce the capacity building of NGOs in terms of governance and use of resources.

In addition to current work focusing on capacity building in the protection and promotion of migrants' rights, CAVT should also help NGOs address governance and project management challenges, with a view to make the best possible use of their limited resources.

(iii) Future projects should have more formal advocacy strategies.

Any new project that aims at building the capacity of migrant and ethnic minority NGOs should also build their advocacy capacity, by training NGO representatives in the development of sound advocacy strategies. This should include stakeholders analysis, message development, and provide advice on good advocacy practices.

(iv) CAVT should consider addressing economic actors in future projects, including employers of migrant workers.

Employers are important stakeholders, with direct influence on the welfare of migrant workers. It is often their failure to legalize the situation of such workers that leads to human rights violations or more broadly to the inability of migrants to exercise their rights.

(v) CAVT should consider a specific awareness-raising project directed at the media.

Journalists benefited significantly from participation in the project, and their coverage of migrant issues improved as a result. However the improvement was limited due to the small number of journalists involved. A more focused project addressing the reporting needs of journalists would provide greater benefits in this regard.

VII. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Evaluation questions:

DAC criterion	Evaluation Question	Related sub-questions
Relevance	To what extent was the project, as designed and implemented, suited to context and needs at the beneficiary, local, and national levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities for democratic development, given the context? Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented to better reflect those needs, priorities, and context? Why? Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks? Was the project overly risk-averse?
Effectiveness	To what extent was the project, as implemented, able to achieve objectives and goals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the project's objectives been reached? To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document? If not, why not? Were the project activities adequate to make progress towards the project objectives? What has the project achieved? Where it failed to meet the outputs identified in the project document, why was this?
Efficiency	To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between resources expended and project impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs? Did institutional arrangements promote cost-effectiveness and accountability? Was the budget designed, and then implemented, in a way that enabled the project to meet its objectives?
Impact	To what extent has the project put in place processes and procedures supporting the role of civil society in contributing to democratization, or to direct promotion of democracy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has/have the realization of the project objective(s) and project outcomes had an impact on the specific problem the project aimed to address? Have the targeted beneficiaries experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative? To what extent has the project caused changes and effects, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization? Is the project likely to have a catalytic effect? How? Why? Examples?
Sustainability	To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created what is likely to be a continuing impetus towards democratic development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact? Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?
UNDEF value added	To what extent was UNDEF able to take advantage of its unique position and comparative advantage to achieve results that could not have been achieved had support come from other donors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was UNDEF able to accomplish, through the project that could not as well have been achieved by alternative projects, other donors, or other stakeholders (Government, NGOs, etc.). Did project design and implementing modalities exploit UNDEF's comparative advantage in the form of an explicit mandate to focus on democratization issues?

Annex 2: Documents Reviewed:

In addition to standard project documents submitted to UNDEF by CAVT (original project document, mid-term and final review, the evaluation considered the following elements provided by CAVT (in Russian):

- Handbook for NGOs on the rights of migrants and ethnic minorities;
- Training manual for police and other law enforcement agencies on the situation and rights of migrants and ethnic minorities, including issues of sexual violence and people trafficking;
- Press articles covering some migrant issues, as well as reporting about training sessions with government officials.

Annex 3: Persons Interviewed

Name	Position
Fedor Sinitsyn	Director, CAVT
Tursunoy Alimardonova	Director, TUMW
Erenat Karimov	Deputy Director, TUMW
Dmitry Poletayev	Director, Center for Migration Studies
Maria Mokhova	Director, Sisters' Sexual Assault Recovery Center
Tatiana Vitalyevna Stennikova	Director, District Public Order Squads, Perm
Olga Gannadyevna Loskutova	Chair, Regional Chamber, Russian Journalists' Union
Tatiana Anatolyevna Sadilova	Major, Police Department 2, Perm
Svetlana K. Bazhenova	Director, Far-East Center for Development
Yuliana Pavlovskaya	Representative, IOM
Alexey Nikolaevich Tsukanov	Police Colonel, Perm Police Academy

Annex 4: Acronyms

CAVT	Center for Assistance to Victims of Violence and Human Trafficking
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
NGO	Non-governmental organization
TUMW	Trade Union of Migrant Workers