

Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

Title: European Union Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa		
Programme Value: UK £5,522,115		Review Date: 02 June 2018
Programme Code: 300165	Start Date: 2 June 2016	End Date: 31 December 2020

Summary of Programme Performance

Year	2017	2018			
Programme Score	A	A			
Risk Rating	Low-Medium	Low-Medium			

Summary of progress and lessons learnt since last review

This is the second annual review of this programme.

Despite our upcoming Exit from the EU, the UK remains engaged with the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) both in order to shape its work on an issue of high priority to the UK, and to ensure Value for Money from our direct investment (now €6M) and from the significant amount (circa 15%) of the EUTF's underlying funding drawn from UK contributions to the EU budget and development instruments.

Overall, the EU, Member States and international partners (with DG DevCo as the European Commission lead) have continued to deliver on the expected outputs in a difficult operational context, while also responding to emerging political and practical priorities, including the pressing need to facilitate returns of migrants in Libya in support of the joint AU-EU commitment to act following CNN coverage of migrant slave markets. More broadly, the EUTF remains a key instrument in operationalising enhanced upstream cooperation between EU and African partners in the migration space, taking forward a number of projects to support better migration management and address the drivers of irregular flows.

To date the €3.39BN Trust Fund has approved 147 projects across its agreed strategic areas of focus, to a total value of €2.6BN. In order to implement those projects, 226 contracts have been signed to a total value of €1.6BN. We have generally assessed proposed project fiches to be of a good quality, and are increasingly engaged in the development of projects through DFID Country Offices and FCO Posts, although the Horn of Africa window remains the most responsive to UK and other Member State concerns, and 'in country' engagement on project development requires further improvement. As well as new programming in areas including migration management, conflict and fragility, and protracted refugee crises – much of which is closely aligned with UK national priorities and DFID objectives – the past year has also seen the further development of EUTF research facilities, and enhanced monitoring and evidence capabilities, as well as the development of a new website (<https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/>) and development of a new reporting platform and common indicators for Trust Fund projects. These improvements are in line with the UK's previous insistence on the need to enhance monitoring and evaluation under the Trust Fund, and the importance of evidence-based programming.

The EU remains receptive to UK engagement. On the Horn of Africa regional 'window', a priority for the UK and the focus of €3M of our investment under this programme, our funding has helped ensure UK influence on the overall approach and the development of key projects as part of the Trust Fund's €846M programmed spend to date, multiplying the impact of our own investment and giving greater traction over the use of underlying UK ODA.

We have also continued to engage on the Trust Fund's North Africa window (€371M programmed to date). The Prime Minister committed a further €3M UK contribution to the Trust Fund at the December 2017 European Council, focused on North Africa. Our engagement with the North Africa programme manager in Brussels remains broadly good, although we have found it harder to engage with some EU Delegations in the region. While the Trust Fund's efforts in Libya are a necessary focus, that work involves significant risks; on that basis, we will need to further enhance our engagement with the Commission, Italy (given its leading role in shaping and implementing the Trust Fund's work in Libya) and with implementing partners to ensure these risks are properly managed.

Our enhanced contribution also underpins our influence on the Trust Fund overall, including the Sahel / Lake Chad 'window' (€1376M), and demonstrates the UK's continuing commitment to shared efforts on migration and development with our European partners. We have been able to work with the Commission, Member States and other partners to shape project fiches during their development and – where we are not content – following their presentation at the Operational Committees. In several cases, we have pressed successfully for further changes where we have not been satisfied with project quality or risk mitigation. However, while we remain broadly positive on the Commission's management of the Fund, like other Member States we see the need for further improvements on governance, transparency and project development (in particular on arrangements for scrutiny of proposed projects during their development, and on project revision following presentation at the Committees), and on further prioritisation in the light of decreasing funds, as well as the need to further bolster monitoring, evaluation and results reporting.

Following the commitment of the majority of the available funding, the Commission has identified a €1.2bn funding gap in EUTF pipelines between now and the Trust Fund's closure in 2020. It seems likely that the majority of further funds will need to be found by the EU, including through reprioritisation and use of reserves. Given limited funds, the UK has joined others in supporting the Commission's proposed priorities for future Trust Fund spend (which are well aligned with UK objectives, reflecting the UK's emphasis on the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and anti-trafficking measures at the Strategic Board).

Gender is addressed as a cross-cutting priority under the EUTF, with specific projects addressing key issues including the particular vulnerabilities of women and girls in the context of unmanaged migration and forced displacement. A number of projects also include an explicit focus on disability, although this does not receive the same cross-cutting focus as gender.

Summary of recommendations for the next year

- Extend the **governance approach and level of transparency** achieved under the Horn of Africa window across the other geographical 'windows', both in Brussels and in-country (with better coordination by EU Delegations on project design and implementation).
- Ensure **robust monitoring and evaluation** arrangements in place across all regional 'windows', including third party monitoring and key risks tracked at programme level.

- Improve **results reporting**, with clear, comprehensive and user-friendly results presented at a 'whole-of-programme' level – we should consider sharing UK expertise.
- Encourage further **broadening of the implementation base**, and ensure that key implementing organisations have the capacity and sufficient expertise to deliver projects.
- Seek a solution to the **funding gap** identified by the Commission that ensures the continuation of the Trust Fund where it delivers best value, but which does not impact negatively on other priorities.
- Ensure '**lessons learnt**' through the Trust Fund (and its relation with the EDF) inform the EU's approach under the new MFF. That should include maintaining and extending the strategic coherence on upstream programming offered by the Trust Fund for African routes.

A. Introduction and Context (1 page)

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300165/
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	https://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-GOV-1-300165/

Outline of the programme

The European Union (EU) and Member States have sought to develop a scaled-up and coordinated response to the migration and refugee crisis in the Mediterranean, and its impacts on countries of destination, transit and origin as well as on migrants and refugees themselves.

Those efforts include the enhanced cooperation between the EU and Member States and African partners agreed at the Valletta Summit in November 2015, which saw the launch of the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF). The EUTF is intended to address forced displacement and irregular migration and their drivers across 3 regional 'windows' (Sahel and Lake Chad, North Africa and the Horn of Africa). The EUTF aims to achieve this through projects focused on 4 agreed objectives: (i) contributing to better migration management; (ii) improving governance and preventing conflicts; (iii) providing economic and employment opportunities; and (iv) enhancing resilience, addressing the needs of refugees and the most vulnerable.

The EUTF has demonstrable links to DFID's overarching global and regional objectives, most notably: strengthening resilience and response to crisis; strengthening global peace, security and governance; and tackling extreme poverty and helping the world's most vulnerable. The EUTF also contributes to broader HMG objectives on unmanaged migration, and peace and security.

Our programme (*'European Union Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa'*) provides a total €6M (£5.5M) bilateral contribution to the EUTF's Horn of Africa and North Africa windows, alongside other Member State and international contributions and core EU funding. The Horn of Africa window (which covers Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) is the DFID / HMG priority under the EUTF. Joint efforts under the North Africa window (covering Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia) are essential to tackle unmanaged flows, prevent deaths at sea and in the desert, and address the exploitation and abuse of migrants and refugees in transit. However, our contribution is also intended to provide leverage to influence work across the whole of the Trust Fund, including its Sahel / Lake Chad window, ensuring a coherent, evidence-based programme that delivers value for money and supports broader partnership working with African countries on migration and development.

In order to ensure impact, the DFID SRO (Senior Responsible Owner) has developed an agreed cross-DFID and cross-Whitehall strategic approach to the EUTF, working with DFID's Migration and Modern Slavery and African Regional Departments, the North Africa Joint Unit, FCO and Home Office, and with country offices and Posts. DFID leads efforts to assess the EU's proposals for the three regional windows, and engage proactively to influence the EU's approach and the quality of project proposals. This includes DFID officials and HMG partners taking an active role in steering the EUTF through its Steering Board and Operational Committees, as well as bilateral engagement with the Commission and other Member States and with African partners. We also influence the EU's management of the Trust Fund in Brussels through our SNEs (Seconded National Experts), several of whom work directly on the Fund (in particular on the Horn of Africa window) and on EU migration policy more broadly. The Prime Minister, Ministers and senior officials also continue to discuss the Fund in key EU meetings and summits. We have used these

engagements to secure a more strategic and evidence-based approach to Trust Fund programming, and to ensure enhanced transparency and coordination, allowing us to press for better value for money through the EUTF's activities.

B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS (1-2 pages)

Annual outcome assessment

A: Outputs met expectation.

Based on the quality of the outputs delivered over the last year, along with feedback from the European Commission and other stakeholders, our assessment is that this programme has delivered against agreed outcomes, continuing to make an important contribution to addressing migratory flows and their drivers upstream, and underpinning enhanced engagement with African countries of origin and transit. Following the last review, we have also seen further improvements on governance and transparency, and on in-country coordination, although these improvements remain uneven.

To date, the EUTF (Horn of Africa 'window') has approved 50 projects amounting to €846M, covering all nine countries of the Horn of Africa window except for Tanzania. In addition to country specific projects, we have seen the development of regional initiatives, including the 'Better Migration Management' programme, which is linked to the Khartoum Process – a regional migration dialogue in which the UK plays a leading role, and which fosters enhanced cooperation with African partners to help deliver a sustainable response to current migratory flows and their impacts on countries of origin, transit and destination. Following UK lobbying, we have also seen further support for the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), which supports sustainable approaches to those hosting refugees from protracted crises in their region.

The North African window has 14 approved programmes worth a total of €371M, covering all countries in the region save Algeria (with whom discussions are ongoing). The Trust Fund has a particular focus on Libya (€208M approved spend to date), including providing protection, assistance and alternatives to migrants, refugees and internally displaced people in Libya, border and migration management, and supporting voluntary returns to migrants' countries of origin, with assistance being provided at disembarkation points, inside and outside detention centres and in host communities. Much of this work is of considerable importance, given the role of Libya as the key departure point for migrants crossing the Mediterranean and the treatment of migrants in that country. Nevertheless, we continue to pay particular attention to Trust Fund projects proposed for Libya given the potential risks involved, and we have encouraged the Commission's efforts to develop means of monitoring work in the Libyan context, including via third parties.

We have also seen progress on the Sahel / Lake Chad window, with 79 programmes and an increase of total financial resources committed (now nearly €1.4BN). As with the other windows, much of that spend is well aligned with UK objectives, including in the Sahel, including significant support for Niger's efforts to tackle trafficking networks and support for agricultural activities across the Lake Chad region, as well as substantial support for IOM's efforts on return and reintegration in origin countries in West Africa, which has provided for over 13,000 returns to date.

In thematic terms, the approved programme spend has become more balanced across the four main strategic priorities agreed for the Trust Fund: (i) strengthening resilience of communities (€732M), (ii) economic and employment opportunities (€568M), (iii) improved migration management (€755M), and governance and conflict prevention (€502M). A further €36M has been allocated to other and cross-cutting projects, including the Trust Fund's research, monitoring and evidence facilities.

Many Trust Fund projects are still in the initial phase of implementation, or have not yet begun to be implemented. But there is already a growing body of evidence pointing to the contribution of the Trust Fund

to efforts to tackle unmanaged flows and address their drivers. The first quarterly report of the (externally-produced) EUTF Monitoring and Learning System for the Horn of Africa¹ concludes that despite the complex operating environment, it is already possible to highlight tangible results for that window of the Trust Fund that include shorter- and longer-term elements, focus on the most vulnerable, ensure benefits also flow to host communities as well as migrants and refugees, address the needs of youth (including those most prone to irregular migration or turning to extremism), support economic activities and resilience-building, and enhance local government capacity. Key results to date include delivering medical services to over 1.5M people in South Sudan, assisting nearly 50,000 migrants in transit (including victims of trafficking, children, refugees and IDPs), delivering training to over 20,000 people, and involving nearly 13,000 in conflict prevention and peace building activities. In North Africa, the IOM reports the voluntary return of over 13,000 migrants from Libya in support of the joint response to the maltreatment of migrants in that country, with the linked UNHCR programme evacuating nearly 1,500 vulnerable refugees and asylum-seekers (including single mothers, families and unaccompanied and separated children) from detention in Libya, relocating them in Niger or in Europe². Additional information on results and quality of Trust Fund projects is expected as the Trust Fund's monitoring and evaluation systems become further established in coming months.

However, despite these results, and improvements in process across all three windows of the Trust Fund, questions have continued to be raised on the speed of implementation (with 37% of approved spend not yet contracted); implementation has also been slowed in some cases both by the capacity of implementing agencies and the difficult nature of many projects. A number of projects also involve substantial levels of risk, particularly in the areas of migration management and security. We continue to work with the Commission to ensure that these risks are sufficiently monitored and mitigated (building on the development of a regional risk register for the Horn of Africa following DFID lobbying), and on their approach to monitoring and evaluation more broadly. The latter continues to be the focus of considerable efforts (and investment) by the Commission, but we would like to see further progress and a more coherent approach across the three regional windows.

The Commission's Trust Fund managers continue to meet with the UK and other donors to discuss developments and future initiatives, and have enhanced the level of engagement with EU Member States and other donors ahead of Operational Committees, building on the approach trialed by the Horn of Africa window. However, project fiches have continued to be provided only days ahead of some Operational Committees in some instances, and the Commission's response to Member State concerns has not been adequate in a small number of cases. Engagement 'in-country' by EU Delegations has also improved, including on project development, although the level of engagement remains uneven, and it remains difficult to engage where Member States (including the UK) do not have local representation in country. We will continue to press for further improvements where necessary.

EUTF transparency is generally good – the Commission publishes a considerable amount of information on projects and regional programmes, updating this information in a timely fashion, and has recently launched a new dedicated, publicly accessible website³. The Commission has also developed a new publicly available results reporting platform (*AKVO Really Simple Reporting*⁴), with reporting being based on a results framework using common indicators against Trust Fund objectives⁵. While these efforts are

¹ *EUTF Monitoring and Learning System Horn of Africa: Quarterly Report – Q1 2018 – Executive Summary*. Altai Consulting, May 2018.

² IOM and UNHCR presentations to EU Trust Fund Strategic Board (24/04/18) and Horn of Africa and Sahel Operating committees (29/05/18).

³ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/content/homepage_en

⁴ <https://eutf.akvoapp.org/en/projects/>

⁵ https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/107944_es

welcome, with progress particularly apparent for the Horn of Africa, we believe that the Trust Fund's results reporting needs further improvement, with clear, comprehensive and user-friendly results presented at a 'whole-of-programme' level. We will continue to engage the Commission on improving results reporting under the Trust Fund to help secure the improvements needed.

On balance – while noting areas where further work is needed – the EUTF has met our expectations, and in some cases moderately exceeded them, given the challenging nature of work in its regions of operation.

Overall output score and description

OVERALL: A: Outputs met expectation.

Output 1: A: This output met expectation.

Output 2: A: This output met expectation.

Key lessons

In the context of the migration and refugee crisis, the political and substantive requirement for quick action given the rising death toll in the Mediterranean led to an imperfect start to the Trust Fund's programming, further complicated by the difficult operating environment across all three of its regional windows. However, lessons have clearly been learned, with further phases more focused on evidence-based programming, shaped by the expertise and local knowledge of the Commission, EEAS and Member States, and of implementing partners and the African countries themselves. For the Horn of Africa in particular – but also for the EUTF as a whole – we have found that the EU has further improved the Trust Fund's structures and processes as well as its project delivery. In so doing, the EU has maintained the Trust Fund's relevance to the political and operational relationship with key African countries of origin and transit, and those hosting large numbers of migrants and/or refugees. However, the dwindling amounts of available funding for the three windows have led the Commission to press Member States on the need to decide whether to continue to bolster the funding available (while further prioritising areas for action), or whether to wind down further spend and focus on implementing existing projects.

In terms of governance, the European Commission has continued to respond to Member States' concerns about the potential to engage with project proposals locally, and from an early stage of development. We have seen a growing number of EU Delegations engage actively with the UK and other Member States in country on proposed projects. Nevertheless we – and other Member States – note that the problems continue in some instances (most markedly under the Sahel window) and we will continue to press jointly with others to ensure further improvements in local EU Del coordination on Trust Fund projects and on coordination with broader donor efforts in country. A proposal from the Commission to convene a donor group in Brussels on developing the Trust Fund's approach in the Sahel is promising in this regard. It also remains of vital importance that Member States are able to be fully appraised of, and engaged with, the monitoring and evaluation of projects.

In retrospect, it would seem that the Commission's aims for rapidity of programming under the Trust Fund were too ambitious. Pace has been achieved in some cases – notably the EU-IOM establishment of a regional returns programme in Libya, the Sahel and West Africa, which has proved impressive in terms of sheer numbers and its rapid response to the scandal of human trafficking of migrants in Libya (while also raising questions about the ability to scale up effectively in terms of the sustainable reintegration of those returned). In other cases, however, the pace has been less impressive – the significant proportion of approved projects that remain uncontracted (37% of approved spend) is of concern. It is clear that contracting and implementation issues are partly explainable in terms of the capacity of implementing agencies (including Member States' own agencies), as well as the Trust Fund's own processes (which nevertheless remain faster than the 'standard' EU development channels including the EDF). But these are clearly compounded by the difficult and risky operating context across the three Trust Fund windows. Given this context, while supporting calls for further improvements in the speed of implementation, we have made clear that this cannot be at the cost of not sufficiently considering and addressing the significant risks that accrue from work in areas such as migration management and security efforts in the relevant sub-regions. Proper scrutiny of the use of EU (and UK) ODA remains essential, ensuring a robust 'do no harm' approach to minimise the likelihood of unintended consequences of EU action.

For the same reason, it is particularly important that the Trust Fund moves as quickly as possible to further enhance its monitoring and evaluation arrangements across the three geographical 'windows', including via third parties. It is essential that the risks inherent in many of its projects are clearly identified and carefully monitored. Projects like the Technical Cooperation Facility under the North Africa window, which will deliver enhanced monitoring in sensitive areas, are particularly welcome in this regard. Likewise – and

given the limited evidence base in key areas of work (e.g. reintegration; upstream migration management) – it will be important for the Commission and others to take forward planned evaluations and audits of the Trust Fund as a whole, as well as on individual projects (e.g. the Better Migration Management programme in the Horn of Africa). The Court of Auditors report on the design and implementation of the Trust Fund, due this summer, will be read with interest both within HMG and partner Governments and externally.

Lessons learned to date should also be brought to bear on the current €1.2bn Trust Fund funding gap and the Commission’s proposed response. In this context, the Commission has rightly sought to further prioritise efforts, with a sensible set of priorities for future work (including returns and reintegration; support for protracted refugee crises; and anti-trafficking). But, while considering further EU sources for funding (e.g. the EDF reserves), the Commission should also make the link to the high level of uncontracted funds, and consider redeploying these where it makes sense to do so.

Lastly, the Commission and other EU partners should also reflect on the experience offered by the Trust fund in developing the new external funding instruments for the next (post-2020) Multiannual Financial Framework. If – as currently proposed – the Commission moves to ‘mainstream’ upstream efforts on migration under a single, on-budget instrument, it will be vital to develop forms of migration-specific strategic governance, maintaining and building on the approach developed under the Trust Fund. Otherwise, what might be gained in terms of a more flexible replacement for the EDF (addressing some Member States’ concerns about the use of the Trust Fund for ‘standard’ development projects) will be lost in terms of a coherent and strategic approach to upstream migration funding, linked to regional dialogue and cooperation mechanisms such as the Valletta framework and the Khartoum and Rabat Processes. In this regard, it would also be in both the EU and the UK’s interest (and the interest of other non-EU donors including Switzerland and Norway) for the new MFF instruments to retain the Trust Fund’s openness to engagement beyond the EU and its Member States.

Key actions

Issue	Lead	End-date
Continuing improvement of governance across the Trust Fund, including response to Member State concerns on proposed projects, building on the Horn of Africa approach under other geographical ‘windows’.	DFID SRO; DFID ‘window’ leads; UKRep, based on lobbying of Commission	31 Dec 2018
Improve EU Del coordination with Member States in country.	DFID SRO; DFID ‘window’ leads; UKRep; FCO; DFID Country Offices and Posts, based on lobbying of Commission / EEAS in Brussels and in country.	31 Dec 2018
Enhance reporting and monitoring frameworks, including tracking of key risks at programme level. Offer to share UK best practice on results reporting and risk monitoring.	DFID SRO; ED reporting leads & DFID SNE; DFID ‘window’ leads; UKRep; FCO; HO, based on lobbying of Commission (including on BMM and ROCK projects for HoA, and North Africa / Sahel projects with significant security focus or ‘do no harm’ concerns).	31 Dec 2018

Use Trust Fund monitoring and evaluation to enhance the evidence base for further programmes in areas including migration management and reintegration.	DFID SRO; MMSD (incl evaluation adviser); DFID 'window' leads; UKRep; Posts, based on lobbying of Commission.	31 Dec 2018
Ensure effective prioritisation of EUTF given funding gap, and securing of sufficient funds from EU sources without undermining other UK priorities.	DFID SRO; ED; UKRep, based on engagement with Commission and other Member States.	June-Oct 2018
Feed 'lessons learnt' into thinking on new MFF, including maintaining strategic coherence of migration programming under future EU instruments.	DFID SRO; ED; MMSD; UKRep	June-Oct 2018

Has the logframe been updated since the last review?

No logframe was developed at inception following business case exemption.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	<i>To ensure good evidence based programming with an increasingly strategic approach.</i>		
Output number per LF	1	Output Score	A
Risk:	<i>Minor</i>	Impact weighting (%):	60
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>No</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>No</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
The number of projects / spend approved (during last 12 months).	Approval of a significant tranche of good quality projects, balanced across the four agreed objectives of the EUTF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 further projects approved for the HoA window (50 projects total, €846M), 14 projects to date under the NA window (for a total of €371M). Projects cover all four Trust Fund strategic objectives.⁶ * Fiches generally assessed by SRO and DFID team as outlining good quality projects.
Number of Strategic Board and Operational Committee meetings (all windows; during last 12 months).	2 Strategic Boards; 2 Operational Committees per 'window'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Strategic Board meetings since June 2017. Operational Committees for HoA (3 meetings); S&LC (2 meetings) and NA (2 meetings) since last Annual Review (June 2017). Active UK participation in all meetings; EU Commission generally responsive to issues raised, although there is a need for further improvements under North Africa and (particularly) the Sahel windows when UK and other donors raise concerns on proposed projects.
Steps taken to ensure evidence-based programming of EUTF.	<p>Continued development of Research and Evidence Facilities (REF) for Horn of Africa and other EUTF 'windows'. REFs underpin project development.</p> <p>Well-developed engagement between EU Dels and Member States on project development in country.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued development of Research and Evidence Facilities (REF) for Horn of Africa and for Sahel / North Africa (joint facility). Development of further projects on basis of proposals from Horn of Africa Facility. Impact of Sahel/NA REF less apparent than that of more coherent approach of HoA REF. Improved engagement by EU Dels with Member States (esp HoA), but picture remains mixed.
Clear strategic direction of EUTF agreed by Member States and African partners	Clear strategic priorities agreed and acted upon.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Orientation Documents developed for EUTF and its three regional 'windows'.

⁶ n.b. This year has seen a shift of spend towards migration management (to date there has been greater EUTF spend on economic/ employment and resilience/protection objectives than on its migration management and governance / conflict).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refreshed strategic orientation and priorities agreed at 4th Strategic Board, April 2016. • Agreed prioritisation in light of €1.2BN funding gap to end 2020, with continuing discussion on how to address this.
Coherence of EUTF with sub-regional (e.g. Khartoum; Rabat) and regional (e.g. Valletta) frameworks for engagement with African & international partners.	<p>Clear strategic link made to Khartoum & Rabat.</p> <p>Cross-border projects linked to regional processes / routes. Coherence of EUTF and Valletta framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued linking of EUTF to Khartoum and Rabat under refreshed strategic orientation, although only partial articulation of KP/RP and EUTF in practice. • Clear linking of EUTF projects with 5 Valletta 'pillars'. • Development of further cross-border and 'cross-window' projects, including IOM-led cross-regional return efforts.

Key Points

Overall, the EUTF has met, and in some cases exceeded, expectations with regard to programming and the strategic framing of its overall approach, delivering new pipelines of projects across the three regional 'windows'.

EUTF projects increasingly demonstrate a good evidence base; Research and Evidence Facilities are now in place for all three windows and are used to inform project proposals, although (to date) the role played by the Facility for the Horn of Africa has continued to be more substantial than under the other two windows.

For the most part, new projects are likely to make a significant contribution to enhanced migratory management along the key African routes, and to address the drivers of unmanaged migration and refugee flows. The migration-linked rationale for a small number of projects remains less clear, although these project proposals have also been broadly robust in terms of their objectives.

The Strategic Board – attended by both EU and African partners – has provided a means of agreeing a refined strategic approach, including agreement of further prioritised spend going forward (and in light of the shortfall in funds in relation to future pipelines). We will now need to ensure the Commission is rigorous in terms of holding to these priorities, while recognising the need for flexibility if the situation demands it.

The Commission has remained open to bilateral engagement by the UK and we have been able to work with them to shape the EU's approach.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

- Coordination with the Commission (in Brussels) and with EU Delegations (in country) has improved over the past year, although the latter remains uneven.
- There has been further progress in the development and use of the Research and Evidence Facilities, which inform project development across all three windows.

- The Commission has ensured a link between Trust Fund programming and the regional processes (Khartoum and Rabat), although this coordination remains somewhat haphazard and could be further improved.
- A range of implementers are being drawn upon (Member State agencies having the largest share).
- The Commission has responded to concerns on the relationship between the Trust Fund and the EDF, and has considered this in developing its proposals for the new MFF.

Recommendations

- While welcoming improvements to date, we should continue to press the European Commission/EEAS to further enhance responsiveness to Member State concerns on project files, as well as EU Del coordination with Member States on project design and implementation and on broader donor work in country, ensuring engagement is consistent across the Trust Fund and its countries of operation.
- Monitoring of existing initiatives should form part of the evidence base used for the design of further projects (and extensions to existing projects), and should be fed into broader EU migration policy and operational efforts. Ensuring further improvements in results reporting will be important in this regard, as will the Commission's proposed bolstering of the Trust Fund's Research and Evidence Facilities.
- The Commission should continue to broaden the implementation base where it makes sense to do so, while ensuring that all delivery partners' capabilities are sufficient to implement projects effectively and at sufficient pace.
- We should continue to ensure that the Trust Fund is sufficiently linked to regional processes (Khartoum and Rabat), with coherent programming on a 'whole of route' basis (including further cross-border and 'cross-window' projects).
- Ensure that 'lessons learnt' through the Trust Fund (and its relation with the EDF) inform the EU's approach to upstream migration efforts under the new Multiannual Financial Framework. That should include maintaining and extending the strategic coherence on upstream programming offered by the Trust Fund for African routes.
- We should also work with the Commission and other European partners to find a solution to the funding gap identified by the Commission regarding future pipelines, ensuring the continuation of Trust Fund programming where it delivers best value, but without impacting negatively on other UK priorities for EU ODA.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	<i>To strengthen the governance of the EUTF and ensure appropriate oversight and coordination on the ground.</i>		
Output number per LF	2	Output Score	A
Risk:	<i>Moderate</i>	Impact weighting (%):	40
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>No</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>No</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
Strengthened governance arrangements for EUTF and its projects.	<p>Transparent process of project development and with improved end-to-end engagement in country and via Brussels, including early circulation of proposals.</p> <p>Substantive discussion and agreement of strategy (including changes and refreshed priorities) via Strategic Board and Operational Committee meetings.</p> <p>Steering Committees of projects open to Member State participation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other 'windows' have followed Horn of Africa 'window' lead in enhancing engagement around Operational Committees, although project fiches continue to be circulated late in some cases. 'In-country' engagement by EUDels has also improved, although this remains uneven. Continued discussion and refinement of strategy via Strategic Board. Steering Committees continue for key projects with UK participation (incl Better Migration Management (BMM); Regional Operational Centre in support of the Khartoum Process (ROCK)).
Strong framework in place for monitoring and evaluation of projects.	<p>Robust monitoring and evaluation framework in place for all three windows, with Member States fully engaged.</p> <p>[<i>new</i>.] Sufficient monitoring and mitigation of key risks at programme as well as project level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation arrangements in place for all three windows; Commission seeking to further bolster these. DFID and other HMG Post engaged with EU Dels and local project development – need to press for further engagement where currently less convincing. Risk registers at project level – need to press for whole-of-programme tracking of key risks, e.g. 'do no harm'.
Appropriate measures for oversight and coordination of EUTF and its projects on the ground.	<p>All EU Dels engaged with most active / interested Member States on development and implementation of projects, and on coordination with bilateral work by Member States and other donors.</p> <p>Sufficient arrangements required where UK and others do not have local representation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some further progress in EUDel engagement, though remains mixed. Horn of Africa broadly good, including dedicated migration groups. Sahel in particular needs further improvement, including on transparency / openness.

[New:] Effective results reporting at a 'whole-of-programme' level.

[New:] Robust results reporting, with clear, comprehensive and user-friendly presentation.

- New reporting platform for results (AKVO RSR) developed. Need for further improvements of results reporting on that basis.
- Common indicators developed to measure progress against Trust Fund objectives.

Key Points

The EU has broadly met the required delivery against this output, particularly in the Horn of Africa, with improvements under other windows. Further progress will be needed in coming months on the other regional 'windows', especially Sahel/Lake Chad. The EU has used the Strategic Board to refine and enhance the EUTF's strategic direction in consultation with both European and African partners.

All teams in DG DevCo have sought to improve transparency and engagement with Member States (including the UK), building on the enhanced engagement led by the Horn of Africa window (which remains the best of the three windows in this regard).

Coordination in country remains vital given a complex environment where Member States are delivering related work bilaterally alongside joint EU efforts and other donors and international organisations. We will need to press actively in Brussels and the region to ensure consistency in transparency and engagement across all three windows.

There is a clear EU commitment to ensuring sufficient monitoring and evaluation – including via third parties – across all three windows, with a framework for M&E now in place in each instance, and the Commission seeking to further bolster these.

The Commission has also developed a results reporting platform (AKVO RSR) for the Trust Fund. At present it is difficult to access a clear, comprehensive account of results across the Trust Fund.

Given the level of risk inherent in key areas of the Trust Fund's operation (including border management and security-linked projects), it is important to ensure risk sufficiently monitored at a 'whole-of-programme' basis, as well as through individual projects.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

- The enhanced approach to governance trailed by the Horn of Africa window has now been taken up in part by the Sahel and North Africa windows, although we would like to see this further consolidated.
- Similarly, there have been improvements in EU Del coordination with Member States 'on the ground' in African partner countries, but this remains uneven.
- The Commission has made progress on its monitoring and evaluation provisions – and is seeking to further enhance these. While evidence-based programming is increasingly evident, we would like to see more coherent use of the Facilities in this regard, particularly for the Sahel window, where the approach can appear piecemeal.

- The new website has enhanced the visibility and transparency of the Trust Fund and its projects. Senior Commission officials have also made concerted efforts to engage with those concerned about the Trust Fund and its work, including in the UK.

Recommendations

- We should continue to press the European Commission for further improvements in governance and transparency, including a more uniform improvement in Member State engagement across the geographical 'windows' (particularly in the Sahel), both on project design and on implementation, as well as further enhancing coordination on broader work by donors in country.
- We should ensure further embedding by the Commission of evidence-based project design and monitoring & evaluation, across all regional 'windows', including third party monitoring and key risks tracked at programme level.
- We should also ensure sufficient monitoring and mitigation of key risks at programme as well as at project level.
- We should work with the Commission to improve the Commission's results reporting, building on the contribution of the new website to the Trust Fund's visibility and transparency.

D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (1 page)

Key cost drivers and performance

The UK's €6M programme is a bilateral contribution to the set of projects developed under the EUTF's Horn of Africa and (from this year) North Africa 'windows'. While tenders are sought in some instances, the Trust Fund rules allow the EU Commission to allocate projects or components to Member State (by preference) or international implementing agencies; we scrutinise that process through our engagement with project development and through the Operational Committees and Strategic Board.

The EUTF has met (and in some cases exceeded) expectations with regard to programming, delivering several pipelines of projects across the three regional 'windows'.

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case

A business case exemption was agreed at the onset of the project.

The EU Commission's regional Trust Fund Managers oversee EUTF financial management, providing regular reporting to the Operational Committees.

The SRO, DFID geographical 'window' leads (working with country offices and Posts) and other Government department partners have scrutinised all projects ahead of agreement at the Operational Committees. That includes assessing Value for Money, and the ability of implementing agencies to deliver effectively (including scrutiny of their costs). Where needed, we have challenged the Commission and implementers on capacity and on VfM, e.g. where unnecessarily long delivery chains have been proposed, or where we have had questions about costs, as well as on risks and their mitigation (in particular where we have 'do no harm' concerns in relation to migration management or security-linked projects). We have also worked closely with DFID Country Offices and FCO Posts to assess Value for Money and deliverability of project proposals being developed in country, and to monitor project implementation, offering UK expertise and engagement where projects overlap with our objectives and interests.

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money

Overall, our assessment is that the EUTF represents value for money; that is particularly the case for the Horn of Africa window. The EUTF has produced a good level of project output since its inception, although the speed of implementation is slow in some cases and the rate of contracting remains a concern. Conversely, we have cautioned partners on pressing for speed of implementation where that may lead to insufficient attention to associated risks; in some cases in the initial regional pipelines, the political requirement for quick delivery had negative impacts on the quality of programming.

Our €6M programme has ensured UK influence over the EUTF overall and in the development of key projects, multiplying the impact of our own investment and giving us greater traction over the use of underlying UK ODA.

We will continue to press the European Commission to ensure that the EUTF and its component projects are delivering best Value for Money, and that risks are tracked and sufficiently mitigated.

Quality of financial management

The EUTF for Africa operates under the European Commission's general system of internal control. Once approved by the Operational Committee, actions are implemented in accordance with implementing procedures defined by the applicable Commission rules and regulations, including those applicable to EDF.

Project implementation is directly managed by the Commission where the EUTF for Africa is the contracting authority, or through indirect management where project implementation is delegated to a third party, an EU Member State Agency or an International Organisation. Implementing agencies have to demonstrate a level of financial management equivalent to that of the Commission. International Organisations and Member States Agencies have to provide declarations on the use of the funds they are entrusted with.

In line with DEVCO and NEAR contractual models and audit policy, audits / expenditure verifications are either foreseen in contracts or can be launched by the EUTF for Africa where required. The EUTF for Africa accounts are subject to an annual external audit (the most recent audit, dated 31 December 2017, was published in the Commission's Annual Report for 2017⁷). Audits are planned by the Commission on individual projects and on the EUTF overall. An external evaluation of the Trust Fund (focusing on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) is also planned. A performance audit by the European Court of Auditors is underway, with a draft report expected in Summer 2018.

We consider the quality of the EU Commission's financial management to be good, with regular updates to the Operational Committees and other key forums (e.g. CoDev Working Group). Most projects remain in the initial phase of implementation, or have not yet begun to be implemented; it will be important to continue to work actively with the Commission to ensure effective and transparent monitoring and evaluation of projects on the ground as implementation proceeds.

Date of last narrative financial report	31 December 2017
Date of last audited annual statement	31 December 2017

⁷ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/euetfa/files/2017_tffa_en_web_lowres_final05.pdf

E: RISK (½ page)

Overall risk rating: Low-Medium

Overview of programme risk:

The below table shows an updated version of the principle risks identified for delivery of the programme (i.e. focused primarily on the EUTF's Horn of Africa and North Africa windows) and the mitigating actions DFID and EU Partners will take to minimise them.

Risk	Impact	Probability	Mitigation
<i>Projects poorly designed / insufficient evidence base / unlikely to achieve objectives</i>	Medium	Low-Medium	Work with Commission, including via Strategic Board and Operating Committees, and through engagement with EU Delegations in country, to shape project development and quality assure projects prior to approval, ensuring a robust, evidence based Theory of Change.
<i>Slow project contracting and implementation leads to delayed or reduced impact</i>	Low-Medium	Low-Medium (dependent on project and implementing partner)	Press Commission for further efforts on contracting and implementation, while recognising difficulties in undertaking work in some areas, and need to ensure risks sufficiently managed. Work with country offices / posts to gauge where implementation not adequate. Press for broadening of group of implementing agencies where appropriate.
<i>Poor ownership of / engagement with African partners has negative impact on upstream partnerships</i>	Medium	Medium	Press Commission / EEAS for enhanced engagement and communication with African partners. Engage African partners bilaterally via country offices / Post where we have a strong interest, to assess concerns and ensure these are addressed.
<i>EUTF as a whole insufficiently strategic/forward-looking</i>	Medium	Low	Work with Commission and key Member States to ensure a sufficiently strategic approach (incl via Strategic Board and Operational Committees, and via bilateral engagement in Brussels).
<i>Projects not coherent with wider regional efforts, including UK and other bilateral and other EU development spend</i>	Low	Low	Work with Commission, including via Strategic Board and Operating Committees and through engagement with EU Delegations in country. Ensure linkage with Valletta / Khartoum and Rabat Processes. Ensure project proposals clear on fit with related EU / MS initiatives.
<i>Loss of UK influence over spend (particularly due to Brexit)</i>	Low	Low	Maintain bilateral engagement with Commission and other EU Member States and African partners to shape spend. Trust Fund included in A.50 Withdrawal Agreement.
<i>EU Delegations fail to engage sufficiently with UK and other EU Member States</i>	Medium	Low (Horn of Africa); Low-Medium (Sahel and North Africa)	Proactive engagement with EU Delegations via Post. Engage Commission / EEAS as needed in Brussels, coordinating with 'like-minded'. Ensure enhanced transparency on project development via Brussels at early stage, continuing to build on Horn of Africa model.
<i>Turn-over in DFID staff leads to loss of institutional memory and ineffective engagement on regional 'windows'</i>	Low	Medium	Clear reporting and documentation of work to date. Use multiple DFID / OGD stakeholders (ED; MMSD; ARD; FCO; HO) to maintain and transfer corporate knowledge.
<i>Significant project spend proves to be non-ODA-able</i>	Medium	Low	Careful scrutiny of all project proposals, particularly in areas of concern (migration management; police cooperation; security). Work with Commission to address issues, including early bilateral engagement in Brussels and via EU Del, as well as via Strategic Board and Operating Committees.
<i>Projects cause harm and/or reputational damage (e.g. ROCK; GAR-SI; BMM)</i>	High	Medium	Careful scrutiny and risk management of all project proposals, particularly in areas of concern (migration management; police cooperation; security). Development of programme-level risk management. Work with Commission to address issues, including

			early bilateral engagement in Brussels and via EU Del, as well as via Strategic Board and Operating Committees.
--	--	--	---

Outstanding actions from risk assessment

The risks identified and the relevant mitigating actions are ongoing.

F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (½ page)

Delivery against planned timeframe

YES. The programme has made good progress on the majority of outputs within the timeframe.

Performance of partnership(s)

DG DevCo and DFID have a long standing partnership. This is particularly evident with the Commission's Horn of Africa team, but is also apparent in partnership working with its North African and Sahel teams. Both the European Commission and DFID are learning and applying lessons from the experience of this programme to date. We have used the good practice on the Horn of Africa component to press for improvement on partnership arrangements under the EUTF more broadly, leading to improvements both in engagement in Brussels and with EU Delegations in country.

Asset monitoring and control

Over our longstanding partnership we have a good degree of confidence in DG DevCo's overall management of the programme, although we will need to continue to push for enhanced transparency and engagement under the Sahel and (to some degree) the North Africa 'windows', particularly in country.

G: CONDITIONALITY (½ page)

Update on partnership principles (if relevant)

N/A

H: MONITORING & EVALUATION (½ page)

Evidence and evaluation

This review was conducted by DFID staff in Europe Department, supported by staff in ARD, NAJU and Migration and Modern Slavery Department (MMSD). It draws on regular financial and progress reports provided by DG DevCo, including reporting provided to the Strategic Board and Operational Committees and the 2017 Annual Report on the EUTF, as well as bilateral meetings with regional Trust Fund Managers and their teams (including UK SNEs), and input from relevant DFID Country Offices and Posts, and from other Government Departments (FCO; Home Office).

Monitoring progress throughout the review period

As above - this Annual Review draws on regular formal and informal reporting from the European Commission and from DFID and other HMG staff, included those seconded to the EU or working in relevant Posts. For future reviews, we will want to draw on the evidence available from enhanced EU results, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, working with the EU Commission and EEAS to ensure these are taken forward with the required degree of robustness and Member State engagement.

Smart Guide

The Annual Review is part of a continuous process of review and improvement throughout the programme cycle. At each formal review, the performance and ongoing relevance of the programme are assessed with decisions taken by the spending team as to whether the programme should continue, be reset or stopped.

The Annual Review includes specific, time-bound recommendations for action, consistent with the key findings. These actions – which in the case of poor performance will include improvement measures – are elaborated in further detail in delivery plans. Teams should refer to the Smart Rules quality standards for annual reviews.

The Annual Review assesses and rates outputs using the following rating scale. ARIES and the separate programme scoring calculation sheet will calculate the overall output score taking account of the weightings and individual outputs scores

Description	Scale
Outputs substantially exceeded expectation	A++
Outputs moderately exceeded expectation	A+
Outputs met expectation	A
Outputs moderately did not meet expectation	B
Outputs substantially did not meet expectation	C

Teams should refer to the considerations below as a guide to completing the annual review template.

Summary Sheet

Complete the summary sheet with highlights of progress, lessons learnt and action on previous recommendations

Introduction and Context

Briefly outline the programme, expected results and contribution to the overall Operational Plan and DFID's international development objectives (including corporate results targets). Where the context supporting the intervention has changed from that outlined in the original programme documents explain what this will mean for UK support

B: Performance and conclusions

Annual Outcome Assessment

Brief assessment of whether we expect to achieve the outcome by the end of the programme

Overall Output Score and Description

Progress against the milestones and results achieved that were expected as at the time of this review.

Key lessons

Any key lessons you and your partners have learned from this programme

Have assumptions changed since design? Would you do differently if re-designing this programme?

How will you and your partners share the lessons learned more widely in your team, across DFID and externally

Key actions

Any further information on actions (not covered in Summary Sheet) including timelines for completion and team member responsible

Has the logframe been updated since the last review? What/if any are the key changes and what does this mean for the programme?

C: Detailed Output Scoring

Output

Set out the Output, Output Score

Score

Enter a rating using the rating scale A++ to C.

Impact Weighting (%)

Enter the %age number which cannot be less than 10%.

The figure here should match the Impact Weight currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Revised since last Annual Review (Y/N).

Risk Rating

Risk Rating: Low/Medium/High

Enter Low, Medium or High

The Risk Rating here should match the Risk currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Where the Risk for this Output been revised since the last review (or since inception, if this is the first review) or if the review identifies that it needs revision explain why, referring to section B Risk Assessment

Key points

Summary of response to programme issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendations

Repeat above for each Output.

D Value for Money and Financial Performance

Key cost drivers and performance

Consider the specific costs and cost drivers identified in the Business Case

Have there been changes from those identified in previous reviews or at programme approval. If so, why?

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case? Performance against vfm measures and any trigger points that were identified to track through the programme

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money?

Overall view on whether the programme is good value for money. If not, why, and what actions need to be taken?

Quality of Financial Management

Consider our best estimate of future costs against the current approved budget and forecasting profile

Have narrative and financial reporting requirements been adhered to. Include details of last report

Have auditing requirements been met. Include details of last report

E Risk

Output Risk Rating: L/M/H

Enter Low, Medium or High, taken from the overall Output risk score calculated in ARIES

Overview of Programme Risk

What are the changes to the overall risk environment/ context and why?

Review the key risks that affect the successful delivery of the expected results.

Are there any different or new mitigating actions that will be required to address these risks and whether the existing mitigating actions are directly addressing the identifiable risks?

Any additional checks and controls are required to ensure that UK funds are not lost, for example to fraud or corruption.

Outstanding actions from risk assessment

Describe outstanding actions from Due Diligence/ Fiduciary Risk Assessment/ Programme risk matrix

Describe follow up actions from departmental anti-corruption strategies to which Business Case assumptions and risk tolerances stand

F: Commercial Considerations

Delivery against planned timeframe. Y/N

Compare actual progress against the approved timescales in the Business Case. If timescales are off track provide an explanation including what this means for the cost of the programme and any remedial action.

Performance of partnership

How well are formal partnerships/ contracts working

Are we learning and applying lessons from partner experience

How could DFID be a more effective partner

Asset monitoring and control

Level of confidence in the management of programme assets, including information any monitoring or spot checks

G: Conditionality

Update on Partnership Principles and specific conditions.

For programmes for where it has been decided (when the programme was approved or at the last Annual Review) to use the PPs for management and monitoring, provide details on:

- a. Were there any concerns about the four Partnership Principles over the past year, including on human rights?
- b. If yes, what were they?
- c. Did you notify the government of our concerns?
- d. If Yes, what was the government response? Did it take remedial actions? If yes, explain how.
- e. If No, was disbursement suspended during the review period? Date suspended (dd/mm/yyyy)
- f. What were the consequences?

For all programmes, you should make a judgement on what role, if any, the Partnership Principles should play in the management and monitoring of the programme going forward. This applies even if when the BC was approved for this programme the PPs were not intended to play a role. Your decision may depend on the extent to which the delivery mechanism used by the programme works with the partner government and uses their systems.

H: Monitoring and Evaluation

Evidence and evaluation

Changes in evidence and implications for the programme

Where an evaluation is planned what progress has been made

How is the Theory of Change and the assumptions used in the programme design working out in practice in this programme? Are modifications to the programme design required?

Is there any new evidence available which challenges the programme design or rationale? How does the evidence from the implementation of this programme contribute to the wider evidence base? How is evidence disaggregated by sex and age, and by other variables?

Where an evaluation is planned set out what progress has been made.

Monitoring process throughout the review period.

Direct feedback you have had from stakeholders, including beneficiaries

Monitoring activities throughout review period (field visits, reviews, engagement etc)

The Annual Review process

