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Spot Analytical Report #2 - Measuring Reintegration

Background

**Background to the Programme**

Migration is a growing reality for millions of people across the globe. IOM estimated 258 million international migrants worldwide, representing 3.4% of the world’s population.[[1]](#footnote-2) In March 2020, Itad were commissioned to carry out an impact evaluation (hereafter referred to as IMPACT) of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative in the Horn of Africa (HoA), focusing on Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan.

In this learning brief we outline the rationale and challenges of conducting a study of this kind, as well as the proposed methodology, outlined in the Methodological Report.[[2]](#footnote-3)

The EU-IOM Joint Initiative in the HoA supports migrants who decide to return to their countries of origin to do so in a safe and dignified way, in full respect of international human rights standards and in particular the principle of *non-refoulement.[[3]](#footnote-4)* The support provided to returning migrants and their communities through this programme is the first stepping stone in the lengthy and non-linear process of reintegration.

As a flagship evaluation for IOM, IMPACT’s objectives are to evaluate the impact of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative (HoA) and provide an accountability mechanism to beneficiaries of the programme, the donor and the wider sector. Other broader objectives are to deepen the understanding of the concept and measurement of sustainable reintegration; to generate substantial learning on evaluating impact of sustainable reintegration programmes; and inform future methodological standards. As part of this commitment IMPACT are producing a series of Spot Analytical Reports such as this one to capture key pieces of learning.

**Background to the Approach**

To meet the objectives of IMPACT, we have proposed a hybrid, semi-experimental evaluation design incorporating: quantitative modelling of impact; natural experiments; and an exploratory qualitative research framework. We have also conducted a review of IOM’s instruments to gain further insights into reintegration.

As the concept of sustainable reintegration is challenging to validate, and requires looking at multiple parameters, we have made suggestions around additional indicators, which would add insight into the process and outcome of reintegration programming.

We use a non-migrant resident calibration group comprised of demographically matched respondents residing in the same, or similar, locations as the returnees. Where possible, we also draw on intra-returnee calibration cohorts assisted under the same programme, identifying different groupings of returnees and characterising their differing experiences of reintegration to better understand the extent of reintegration, including what is working and for whom. We have also carried out a natural experiment based on an external event through the investigation of the effects of COVID-19 on programme implementation and returnees’ reintegration across the three countries. Additionally, we will use qualitative research to support and compliment these components and provide in-depth information on *how* the EU-IOM Joint Initiative (HoA) is contributing to change, including understanding the impact of programme changes or extreme events under the natural experiment.

SPOT Analytical Report #2

This Spot Analytical Report (SAR) on Measuring Reintegration is delivered as part of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative (JI) Programme for sustainable reintegration in the Horn of Africa (HoA) and implemented in Ethiopia, Sudan and Somalia. IMPACT is a flagship evaluation for IOM. Its objectives are as follows: to deepen understanding of the net effect of reintegration assistance on individual reintegration outcomes, to expand understanding of the concept and the measurement of sustainable reintegration, and to generate lessons to inform future methodological standards for impact evaluations in the context of reintegration.

This report focuses on reflections and key learnings from the IMPACT evaluation regarding the second objective of the concept and the measurement of sustainable reintegration. The result is a data driven reflection on the methodology and approach to measuring sustainable reintegration used by IOM and in the IMPACT evaluation. This report thus builds on and considers the different methods used in the IMPACT evaluation country mid-term reports (Pinney and Taylor, 2022) and incorporates lessons learned from the IMPACT Methodology Report (Eager et al., 2020). The findings can inform future developments of the RSI and, more broadly, inform future reintegration monitoring and evaluation programmes.

The target audience for this report consists largely of internal IOM staff at the headquarter and regional level, implementing partners and NGOs involved in reintegration programmes, as well as reintegration practitioners and other interested academics.

The next section reflects on the Reintegration Sustainability Index, which has been the main measurement of sustainable reintegration for IOM since its development in 2018. The IMPACT evaluation provides an opportune moment to reflect on the RSI as a methodology and tool for measuring and evaluating sustainable reintegration. The second section reflects on new methodologies used in the IMPACT evaluation to measure sustainable reintegration. The final section of this report provides a conclusion and recommendations on measuring sustainable reintegration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Glossary | |
| RSI | Reintegration Sustainability Index – An index for measuring reintegration using identified drivers and weights, informed by a combination of principal components analysis, reviewed, and modified by expert consensus. This provides easy interpretation of values, standardised procedures and data, and comparability over time and locations. |
| MIMIC | Multiple Indicator Multiple Cause (MIMIC) – A model specification which generates a latent (unknown) reintegration sustainability index which is not reliant on predefined weights. |
| Baseline | First round of data collection from the migrant returnees, carried out a few weeks after they return to their home country |
| Endline | Final round of data collection, carried out in real-time. i.e., asking questions about the respondent’s current situation. |
| Reintegration | Reintegration can be considered sustainable when returnees have reached levels of economic self-sufficiency, social stability within their communities, and psychosocial well-being that allow them to cope with (re)migration drivers. Having achieved sustainable reintegration, returnees are able to make further migration decisions a matter of choice, rather than necessity (IOM, 2016b). |

Reflections on the Reintegration Sustainability Index (RSI)

The RSI is an index for measing sustainable reintegration based on three dimensions of economic, social, and psychosocial reintegration. As identified in the ITAD Methodological Report (October 2020) for the IMPACT evaluation, there is no universally agreed definition or measurement of sustainable reintegration and accurately measuring such concepts is extremely challenging. Multidimensional indexes have become increasingly popular over the past decade for measuring such complex concepts. A leader in this field has been the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) (Alkire and Foster, 2011). This index is built on three equally weighted dimensions with a total of 10 indicators. The first return and reintegration index (Koser and Kuschminder, 2015) was informed by the MPI and based on three equally weighted dimensions, five equally weighted indicators per dimension, and a threshold of reintegration for each indicator.

The RSI that was built upon this previous work, however, utilized a new methodology of using principal component analysis to select the final indicators for inclusion in the RSI and then applying expert driven weighting to the indicators – meaning, a selection was made to choose how much weight to give to each variable. A discussion regarding the weighting of variables in the RSI is presented further in this section.

The resulting indexes are not intended to be used in singularity, but as one measurement that is interacted with other variables to provide context and understand a situation. The Reintegration Sustainability Survey (RSS), which is the tool for collecting the data in the RSI, also collects other data that can be interacted with the RSI for context and interpretation. For example, key demographic variables are a critical component of the RSS.

In the IMPACT Evaluation Methodological report (Eager et al., 2020), ITAD conducted a review of different measures of reintegration and made four recommendations for inclusion in the RSS:

* Information on the migration cycle
* Indicators of skills acquired during migration
* Indicators of child-specific needs
* Understanding of family reunification

These recommendations were based on a literature review of the key components that influence sustainable reintegration and would be important to interact with the RSS in order to have a full picture of sustainable reintegration.

We explore in four parts the following: 1) we examine the variables in the RSI to understand the extent of what it is trying to measure; 2) we review the alignment of the RSI with IOM programming to understand the relevance of the RSI to measure IOM interventions; 3) consider the thresholds of the dimension and composite score to assess whether the scoring can inform useful analysis; 4) and whether the weighting provided to this scoring is appropriate.

This process then allows us to draw conclusions and reflect on the relevance, utility and credibility of the RSI as a measurement of reintegration and what can be done to improve it.

Individual Variable Measurement

The current RSI used in the IMPACT evaluation has a total of 27 core variables. A full overview of the variables included in the RSI is shown in Annex 1. Each variable has a different form of measurement, however, an outcome closer to 1 is always desirable for reintegration, which makes interpretation quite clear. The 27 core variables are divided into three dimensions of economic reintegration (9 variables), social reintegration (9 variables), and psychosocial reintegration (9 variables).

During the IMPACT evaluation an emergent issue was that of non-response. Two variables frequently resulted in non-response: 1) debt to spending ratio (economic dimension), and 2) school-aged children attending school. These two variables were commonly skipped due to them only being asked if the respondent had an existing debt or had school-aged children in their household respectively. Therefore, the significantly lower response rates are to be expected. However, this does raise questions over whether variables such as these which will commonly go unanswered should be included in an index, and whether they should be imputed using different methods to other variables.

However, almost all other variables in the RSS index also went unanswered on occasion. The frequency of non-response suggests that some respondents were either unable to understand the question or uncomfortable to answer, and/or that enumerators were not properly trained on the questions and the importance of full RSS completion. A combination of the former appears more likely given the sensitivity of the topics. In either case, non-response creates inaccuracies in measurement and highlights the need to revise these variables in order to achieve response in the future. In response to the missing values, the IMPACT evaluation adapted imputation methods in order to cover those missing and not entirely lose the respond from the analysis.

Table 1 RSS Indicator Response Rates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Question Text** | **Baseline-**  **Endline** | **Retro-Baseline** |
| rs\_econ\_1 | How satisfied are you with your economic situation? | 99.8% | 99.8% |
| rs\_econ\_2 | How often have you had to reduce the quantity or quality of food you eat because of its cost? | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| rs\_econ\_3 | Are you able to borrow money if you need it? | 99.0% | 98.8% |
| rs\_econ\_4 | Do you borrow money? How frequently? | 100.0% | 99.8% |
| **rs\_econ\_5** | **On average, which amount is bigger: your spending every month, or your debt?** | **40.7%** | **42.0%** |
| rs\_econ\_6 | How would you rate your access to opportunities (employment and training)? | 99.5% | 99.8% |
| rs\_econ\_7 | Do you currently work? | 99.7% | 99.8% |
| rs\_econ\_8 | Do you own any of the following productive assets? | 98.9% | 97.8% |
| rs\_econ\_9 | Are you currently looking for a job? | 99.8% | 99.8% |
| rs\_soc\_11 | How would you rate your access to housing in your community? | 99.9% | 99.6% |
| rs\_soc\_12 | How would you rate the standard of housing you live in today? | 99.6% | 99.8% |
| rs\_soc\_13 | How would you rate the access to education in your community? | 99.8% | 99.7% |
| **rs\_soc\_14** | **Are all school-aged children in your household currently attending school?** | **69.2%** | **68.3%** |
| rs\_soc\_15 | How would you rate the access to justice and law enforcement in your community? | 98.3% | 98.5% |
| rs\_soc\_16 | Do you have at least one identification document? | 99.9% | 99.7% |
| rs\_soc\_17 | How would you rate the access to documentation (personal ID, birth certificates, etc.) in your community? | 97.8% | 97.7% |
| rs\_soc\_18 | How would you rate the access to safe drinking water in your community? | 99.7% | 99.8% |
| rs\_soc\_19 | How would you rate the access to healthcare in your community? | 99.8% | 99.8% |
| rs\_soc\_20 | What is the quality of healthcare available to you? | 97.9% | 99.5% |
| rs\_pss\_22 | How often are you invited, or do you participate in social activities (celebrations, weddings, other events) within your community? | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| rs\_pss\_23 | How do you feel about your support network? Can you rely on the network’s support? | 99.0% | 98.4% |
| rs\_pss\_24 | Do you feel you are part of the community where you currently live? | 99.9% | 99.8% |
| rs\_pss\_25 | How physically safe do you feel for yourself and your family during everyday activities outside your residence? | 100.0% | 99.9% |
| rs\_pss\_26 | How frequently have you experienced important tensions or conflicts between you and your family? | 99.8% | 99.8% |
| rs\_pss\_27 | Have you felt discriminated against? | 99.9% | 100.0% |
| rs\_pss\_28 | Do you often suffer from any of the following? (signs of distress) | 99.3% | 99.9% |
| rs\_pss\_29 | Would you wish to receive psychological support if it was available to you? | 99.2% | 97.7% |
| rs\_pss\_30 | Do you feel that you are able to stay and live in this country? | 95.2% | 93.6% |

Aligning Programme Interventions and RSI Measurement

The RSI is used as both a tool to measure sustainable reintegration and a tool for evaluating IOMs programming to deliver sustainable reintegration to returnee migrants. The latter is the central ambition of the IMPACT evaluation; to understand the sustainable reintegration of returnees in IOMs programmes.

The fact that the RSI has been designed as a tool for multidimensional measurement of sustainable reintegration creates challenges when applying the tool for an impact evaluation of IOMs programme. In this section, an assessment is made of which RSI variables have the potential to be impacted by IOM reintegration programming and which do not, using the mid-term data to assess the impact. The objective is to align how returnees’ individual reintegration improves on variables in the RSI measurement based on programme interventions.

Table 1 presents an overview of variables that would be expected to have a direct relationship on reintegration scores as a result of IOM programming. A **direct effect** is considered as an impact of the outcome variable that would be expected from the program intervention. **Indirect effects** are also considered as variables where exposure to the intervention would have an indirect effect on the outcome variable. No effect is considered as variables where exposure to the intervention would have no effect on the outcome variable. Programme interventions that are considered are the economic interventions of Microbusiness, Start & Improve Your Business (SIYB) Somalia, Kaizen, psychosocial support interventions. For social support this is considered as having received one of: temporary housing support, educational support, or health referral/national insurance card. Other programmes such as TVET and CVI were excluded because the number of recipients of these programmes in the dataset were too small for analysis.

Table 2 Overview of Expected Direct and Indirect Effects on RSI Variables from IOM Programme Interventions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Programme | Type of Intervention | RSI Variables of expected direct effects | RSI Variables of expected indirect effects | RSI Variables of no expected effects |
| Economic | Microbiz  SIYB Somalia  Kaizen | -Economic reintegration assistance of small business set-up support  -SIYB and Kaizen include business training components | 1)Satisfaction with current economic situation  6) Perceived access to employment and training  7) Currently working | 2) Frequency of Food insecurity  3) Financial Inclusion  4) Frequency of borrowing money  5) Debt to spending ratio  8) Ownership of productive assets  9) Currently searching for a job |  |
| Social | No specific programme intervention | Consider received social support as having received one of:  - temporary housing support  - educational support  - health referral/national insurance card | 14) School aged children attending school  19) Access to health care | No indirect effects expected | 11) Access to housing  12) Standard of housing  13) Access to education  15) Access to justice  16) Possession of ID  17) Access to ID  18) Access to safe drinking water  20) Quality of healthcare |
| Psycho-social | PSS provided by IOM or referral organizations | -Group or individual support offered based on preliminary assessment of need | 26) Frequency of conflict with family/ domestic tension  28) Frequency of experiencing signs of distress | 22) Participation in social activities  23) Strength of support network  24) Sense of belonging to community  25) Sense of physical security  27) Feeling discriminated against  29) Desire to receive psychological support | 30) Able to stay and live in the country  31) Intention to remigrate |

Table 2 highlights that the current IOM programming would be expected to have a direct effect on 7 variables in the RSI, an indirect effect on 11 variables in the RSI, and no effect on 11 variables in the RSI[[4]](#footnote-5).

The following Tables 3-5 show the number of respondents in the data that received economic support (Microbiz in Sudan, Kaisen in Ethiopia or SIYB in Somalia), social support, psychosocial support. Table 2 shows that the majority of recipients in the programme have received some form of economic support (88%) whereas roughly one third received social support (36%), and a minority received psychosocial support (19%). Of respondents that did receive psychosocial support, the vast majority were in Ethiopia. A key criterion to received support was vulnerability. Annex 2 includes IOM vulnerability criteria per country.

Table 3 Overview of respondents that received economic support

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | No Economic Support Received | Received Economic Support | Total |
| Ethiopia | 164 | 668 | 832 |
| Somalia | 5 | 207 | 212 |
| Sudan | 74 | 900 | 974 |
| Total | 243 | 1,775 | 2,018 |

Table 4 Overview of respondents that received Social support**[[5]](#footnote-6)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | No Social Support Received | Received Social Support | Total |
| Ethiopia | 783 | 49 | 832 |
| Somalia | 200 | 12 | 212 |
| Sudan | 300 | 674 | 974 |
| Total | 1,283 | 735 | 2,018 |

Table 5 Overview of respondents that received psychosocial support

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | No PSS Support Received | Received PSS Support | Total |
| Ethiopia | 647 | 185 | 832 |
| Somalia | 200 | 12 | 212 |
| Sudan | 974 | 0 | 974 |
| Total | 1,821 | 197 | 2,018 |

Table 6 provides an analysis of the change in each variable across the entire sample (all countries) from baseline assessment to endline assessment. The following categories are used in this table:

* None – Change from baseline to endline was not significant
* Positive – change from baseline to endline represents an “improvement” that is statistically significant
* Negative – change from baseline to endline represents a “worsening” that is statistically significant
* \*Asterisk\* - indicates that those who received support “improved” significantly more than those who didn’t receive support
* Blanks – Variables not analysed as no theorised effect
* Variable names in bold are the ones with theorised direct effect

Table 6 also provides a breakdown by each of the three countries, with surprisingly consistent findings. Ethiopia does have a higher number of variables where there is a statistically significant difference in the level of improvement between those who received support and those who did not. In Somalia and Sudan there is typically still a positive effect for many of the same variables, but the effect is similar for those who received the intervention and those who didn’t.

Table 6 Variable Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Question Text** | **No Support** | **Received Support** | | | |
| **Total** | **Ethiopia** | **Somalia** | **Sudan** |
| **rs\_econ\_1** | How satisfied are you with your economic situation? | None | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive | Positive |
| rs\_econ\_2 | How often have you had to reduce the quantity or quality of food you eat because of its cost? | None | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive | None |
| rs\_econ\_3 | Are you able to borrow money if you need it? | Negative | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive\* | None |
| rs\_econ\_4 | Do you borrow money? How frequently? | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Positive |
| rs\_econ\_5 | On average, which amount is bigger: your spending every month, or your debt? | Negative | Negative | Negative | None | Positive |
| **rs\_econ\_6** | How would you rate your access to opportunities (employment and training)? | Negative | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive | Positive |
| **rs\_econ\_7** | Do you currently work? | None | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive | Positive |
| rs\_econ\_8 | Do you own any of the following productive assets? | Negative | Positive\* | Positive\* | Positive | Positive |
| rs\_econ\_9 | Are you currently looking for a job? | Negative | None | Negative | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_11 | How would you rate your access to housing in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_12 | How would you rate the standard of housing you live in today? | Negative | Negative | Negative | None | Negative |
| rs\_soc\_13 | How would you rate the access to education in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| **rs\_soc\_14** | Are all school-aged children in your household currently attending school? | Negative | None | None | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_15 | How would you rate the access to justice and law enforcement in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_16 | Do you have at least one identification document? | Positive | Positive | Positive | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_17 | How would you rate the access to documentation (personal ID, birth certificates, etc.) in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_18 | How would you rate the access to safe drinking water in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| **rs\_soc\_19** | How would you rate the access to healthcare in your community? | None | None | None | None | None |
| rs\_soc\_20 | What is the quality of healthcare available to you? | None | None | Negative | None | None |
| rs\_pss\_22 | How often are you invited, or do you participate in social activities (celebrations, weddings, other events) within your community? | Positive | Positive\* | Positive\* | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_23 | How do you feel about your support network? Can you rely on the network’s support? | Positive | Positive | Positive | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_24 | Do you feel you are part of the community where you currently live? | Positive | Positive | Positive | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_25 | How physically safe do you feel for yourself and your family during everyday activities outside your residence? | Positive | Positive\* | Positive\* | None | n/a |
| **rs\_pss\_26** | How frequently have you experienced important tensions or conflicts between you and your family? | Positive | Positive\* | Positive | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_27 | Have you felt discriminated against? | None | None | None | None | n/a |
| **rs\_pss\_28** | Do you often suffer from any of the following? (signs of distress) | Positive | Positive\* | Positive\* | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_29 | Would you wish to receive psychological support if it was available to you? | None | None | None | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_30 | Do you feel that you are able to stay and live in this country? | None | Positive | Positive | None | n/a |
| rs\_pss\_31 | On a scale from 1 to 5, how likely are you to migrate in the future? | None | None | None | None | n/a |

**Economic Dimension**

In the economic dimension table 6 shows that 6 out of 9 economic variables show a statistically significant positive change from baseline to endline for respondents that received the economic support. All direct effect variables show this change and three indirect variables. For respondents receiving support there is **an 18% increase in their economic satisfaction, a 60% increase in currently working, and a 20% increase in owning at least one productive asset**).

Two out of the 9 economic dimension variables show a negative change from baseline to endline for both respondents receiving and not receiving support. The ability to borrow money, results showed a significant decrease for those who didn’t receive support (almost all of whom were in Ethiopia) and a significant increase for those who did receive support. On ownership of productive assets results also showed a decrease among those who didn’t receive support and a significant and quite large increase among those who did receive support. More than 20% are more likely to own at least 1 productive asset at endline.

**Social Dimension**

In the social dimension, 7 out of 9 variables show no change from baseline to endline for both respondents that received support and did not receive support. Both respondents that received support and did not receive support reported a **negative change in their housing** from baseline to endline. Both respondents that received support and did not receive support reported a **positive change in having at least one form of identification** from baseline to endline. Respondents that received no support report more negative outcomes for school aged children currently attending school. This is the only variable where results differ from respondents that did receive support wherein no change was reported.

**Psychosocial Dimension**

In the psychosocial dimension, 7 out of 9 variables show a positive change from baseline to endline for respondents that received the psychosocial support and four of these variables are statistically significantly different from respondents that received no support. All direct effect variables show this change. For respondents receiving support there is an average improvement of 16.6% from the mean in less frequent conflict with family and friends and an average improvement of 19.8% from the mean in reporting less frequent signs of distress. Indirect psychosocial variables that also had a significantly positive finding include variable 24- sense of belonging in the community and variable 25- sense of physical security. Although the result was positive for respondents that received no support as well, the increase was statistically significant in scale. Both respondents that did receive and did not receive psychosocial support reported a positive improve on variable 22 – participation in social activities and variable 23- strength of support network. The differences in respondents were not statistically significant on either variable. Both respondents reported no change on variable 29, the desire to receive psychosocial support. Regarding variable 30- the ability to stay in the country- respondents that received support reported a positive change in their responses compared to no change in respondents that did not receive support.

**Summary**

The results show that on variables where IOM interventions have the potential to have a direct or even indirect effect, there is a significant positive impact for respondents receiving the economic and/or psychosocial support. Table 7 provides a summary of variables with a positive change from baseline to endline for respondents receiving support. Of the 7 variables across the three dimensions where a positive direct effect was predicted, 5 of these variables show a positive result. Of the 11 variables where an indirect effect was predicted, 7 of these variables show a positive result. Finally, of the 9 variables where no direct effect was predicted, two variables show a positive result.

The vast majority of positive effects are in the economic and psychosocial domains. Respondents receiving the economic or psychosocial support have much better outcomes on these variables than respondents that have not received the interventions. This aligns with where IOM programming interventions are focused, and the predictions made in Table 2. There is little impact in the social domain where IOM has few programmes, and the variables in this domain are largely beyond the scope of IOM programming.

Table 7: Overview of variables with positive change from baseline to endline in respondents receiving support

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension/ Prediction | Direct Effect Positive | Indirect Effect Positive | No Direct Effect |
| Economic | 1) Satisfaction with current economic situation  6) Perceived access to employment and training  7) Currently working | 2) Frequency of Food insecurity  3) Financial Inclusion  8) Ownership of productive assets | N/A |
| Social | Null | Null | 16) Do you have at least one identification document? |
| Psychosocial | 25) Frequency of conflict with family/ domestic tension  27) Frequency of experiencing signs of distress | 22) Participation in social activities  23) Strength of support network  24) Sense of belonging to community  25) Sense of physical security | 30 Ability to stay and live in this country |

This analysis demonstrates that the RSI may be an effective tool for measuring reintegration, but is not necessarily as effective of a tool to evaluate IOM reintegration programming as 9 of the variables within the RSI are outside of the scope of IOM programming. Log frames would be useful to align programming to intended results and outcome variables that would be relevant to IOM programming rather than a conceptual approach to measuring sustainable reintegration.

Thresholds

The defining of thresholds is significant in an index. In general, thresholds used in indices are normally benchmarked to global standards and available data. Thresholds are difficult to benchmark as reintegration indexes are very new and such standards do not exist. Further, the RSI is comprised of several subjective variables, due to the fact that reintegration is a subjective and objective process, however, benchmarking of subjective variables adds further complication. Therefore, the defining of a threshold for either the dimension level of composite RSI score is highly subjective.

Here we explore different thresholds of the dimension and composite RSI scores at 50%, 65%, 75% and 90%. In theory, a composite RSI score of 100% is most desirable, however, recognizably a score of 100% is likely impossible.

Table 8 shows the dimension RSI scores threshold comparison at 50%, 60%, 75%, and 90%. Corresponding to the composite RSI score (Table 9), there is a striking difference from 50% and 65% threshold reintegration scores in both the economic and social dimensions. **At endline on the economic dimension 47% of respondents are reintegrated at the 50% threshold and this decreases to only 18% at the 65% threshold.** In the **social dimension at endline 72% of respondents are reintegrated at the 50% threshold and this decreases to 29% at the 65% threshold.** The decrease is far less pronounced in the psychosocial dimension wherein at endline 97% of respondents are reintegrated at the 50% threshold and this decreases to 84% at the 65% threshold.

Table 8 Dimension RSI Scores thresholds comparison

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| % **Econ RSS** scores meeting threshold |  | Total Scored | 50%  Current RSS (cut-off x) | 65% | 75% | 90% |
| Ethiopia | Baseline | 519 | 83 | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Endline | 832 | 401 | 129 | 48 | 1 |
| Somalia | Baseline | 155 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Endline | 212 | 126 | 78 | 33 | 3 |
| Sudan | Baseline | 603 | 247 | 82 | 20 | 1 |
| Endline | 974 | 425 | 154 | 44 | 2 |
| Total | Baseline | 1237 | 332 | 91 | 21 | 1 |
|  | Endline | 2018 | 952 | 361 | 125 | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| % **Social RSS** scores meeting threshold |  | Total Scored | 50%  Current RSS (cut-off x) | 65% | 75% | 90% |
| Ethiopia | Baseline | 519 | 352 | 99 | 9 | 0 |
| Endline | 832 | 585 | 256 | 58 | 1 |
| Somalia | Baseline | 155 | 133 | 44 | 8 | 0 |
| Endline | 212 | 193 | 96 | 21 | 1 |
| Sudan | Baseline | 603 | 410 | 133 | 33 | 5 |
| Endline | 974 | 666 | 237 | 68 | 7 |
| Total | Baseline | 1237 | 895 | 276 | 50 | 5 |
|  | Endline | 2018 | 1444 | 589 | 147 | 9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| % **PSS RSS** scores meeting threshold |  | Total Scored | 30% | 50%  Current RSS (cut-off x) | 65% | 75% | 90% |
| Ethiopia | Baseline | 519 | 517 | 438 | 261 | 123 | 13 |
| Endline | 832 | 831 | 786 | 637 | 413 | 106 |
| Somalia | Baseline | 155 | 154 | 149 | 131 | 97 | 2 |
| Endline | 212 | 211 | 209 | 204 | 197 | 69 |
| Sudan | Baseline | 603 | 603 | 597 | 548 | 458 | 263 |
| Endline | 974 | 973 | 961 | 847 | 701 | 371 |
| Total | Baseline | 1237 | 1,274 | 1184 | 940 | 678 | 278 |
|  | Endline | 2018 | 2,015 | 1956 | 1688 | 1311 | 546 |

Table 9 Composite RSI scores Reintegration thresholds comparison

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **% Composite RSI scores meeting threshold** |  | **Total Scored** | **50%** | **65%** | **75%** | **90%** |
| Ethiopia | Baseline | 519 | 334 | 49 | 1 | 0 |
| Endline | 832 | 708 | 274 | 64 | 0 |
| Somalia | Baseline | 155 | 119 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Endline | 212 | 201 | 124 | 31 | 0 |
| Sudan | Baseline | 603 | 543 | 282 | 82 | 1 |
| Endline | 974 | 888 | 426 | 145 | 2 |
| Total | Baseline | 1,273 | 996 | 338 | 83 | 1 |
| Endline | 2,018 | 1,797 | 824 | 240 | 2 |

As shown in the country reports, the composite RSI scores increase at the 50% threshold used for measurement, substantially in Ethiopia and Somalia from baseline to endline and less so in Sudan. When considering different thresholds **it is striking the different between the 65% cut-off and 50% cut-off of the composite RSI score, wherein 89% of respondents are reintegrated at a 50% threshold at endline, compared to only 41% of respondents being reintegrated at a 65%** threshold at endline. This simple comparison highlights the importance of the threshold decision as it describes a very different picture of reintegration. Further, at a 75% threshold, only 12% of respondents are considered reintegrated.

Figure 4 shows a graphic representation of the composite RSI scores and Figure 5 examines in more detail the composite RSI score at the 50-65% reintegration threshold.

Figure 4 Percentage of Returnees' RSS scores meeting reintegration thresholds

Figure 4 shows that for all three countries there is little variability from the 30-50% reintegration threshold, illustrating that this is quite stable. However, for all countries the 50% threshold is a point where the slope changes to a steep decline, particularly for the baselines in Ethiopia and Somalia. The decline becomes flatter for all three countries at the 75% threshold showing a steep dropping off towards the 90% range. There are also differences across the three countries, and these are exacerbated at the 65% threshold compared to the 50% of 75% threshold. There is almost no difference between any of the countries at the 30% or 90% threshold. It’s also interesting to see that the Baseline and Endline threshold scores are almost identical in Sudan, but we see large differences in Somalia and Ethiopia.

Figure 5 Percentage of Returnees' RSS scores meeting reintegration thresholds between 50% and 65%

Figure 5 provides a detailed view of composite RSI scores from the 50-65% threshold. Figure 5 illustrates that there is a continuous decline from the 50% threshold to the 65% threshold and not a single point of demarcation. The large differences between the 50% and 65% threshold suggest that reintegration at the 50% threshold is quite tenuous and questions the sustainability of reintegration based on this threshold.

This raises several questions for consideration, including the utility and effectiveness of thresholds. First, regarding utility, are thresholds the best measurement for assessing sustainable reintegration? Would an overview of scores be more effective at illustrating the range of reintegration at a moment in time? Or would assessing changes in reintegration scores over time be more useful? Second, regarding the effectiveness of thresholds, the results suggest that further calibration of the thresholds is necessary, which should include accounting for context specificities and changes between countries. It could be an option to use the non-migrant population in each country as a benchmark to then calibrate the 'sustainable' reintegration thresholds to be used by the RSI.

Weights – TBC upon input from Andrew

New Approaches to Measures Sustainable Reintegration – To be completed by S4SD

Conclusion – TBC

Points to be explored:

* Is having an index of reintegration useful? What are the drawbacks to the approach? What exactly is it measuring? How does the RSI compare to the other approaches (Section 2 forthcoming)? Comparing these approaches, what can be the overall reflections on different approaches to measuring reintegration?
* How can the indicators for measuring reintegration (either in an index or outside of an index) be considered? To what extent do the current variables align with national plans? Should individual variables be categorized differently such as: (i) *variables that are specific measures of reintegration* *(e.g. around trust, psycho-social well-being, etc.) - and therefore unique and are additional to current SDG / national indicators (but IOM might need to advocate for their inclusion); (ii) variables that are common measures of any population, but where returnees might be expected to suffer more (e.g. food security, incomes, etc.)?*

References – TBC

Annex 1

**Overview of RSI Variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Text** | **0** | **1** |
| **rs\_econ\_1** | How satisfied are you with your economic situation? | Very dissatisfied | Very satisfied |
| **rs\_econ\_2** | How often have you had to reduce the quantity or quality of food you eat because of its cost? | Very often | Never |
| **rs\_econ\_3** | Are you able to borrow money if you need it? | No/none | Yes |
| **rs\_econ\_4** | Do you borrow money? How frequently? | Very often | Never |
| **rs\_econ\_5** | On average, which amount is bigger: your spending every month, or your debt? | Debt | Spending |
| **rs\_econ\_6** | How would you rate your access to opportunities (employment and training)? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_econ\_7** | Do you currently work? | No | Yes |
| **rs\_econ\_8** | Do you own any of the following productive assets? | No assets | At least 1 asset |
| **rs\_econ\_9** | Are you currently looking for a job? | No | Yes |
| **rs\_econ\_10** |  |  |  |
| **rs\_soc\_11** | How would you rate your access to housing in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_12** | How would you rate the standard of housing you live in today? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_13** | How would you rate the access to education in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_14** | Are all school-aged children in your household currently attending school? | No/none | Yes |
| **rs\_soc\_15** | How would you rate the access to justice and law enforcement in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_16** | Do you have at least one identification document? | No | Yes |
| **rs\_soc\_17** | How would you rate the access to documentation (personal ID, birth certificates, etc.) in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_18** | How would you rate the access to safe drinking water in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_19** | How would you rate the access to healthcare in your community? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_soc\_20** | What is the quality of healthcare available to you? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_pss\_21** |  |  |  |
| **rs\_pss\_22** | How often are you invited, or do you participate in social activities (celebrations, weddings, other events) within your community? | Never | Very often |
| **rs\_pss\_23** | How do you feel about your support network? Can you rely on the network’s support? | Very poor | Very good |
| **rs\_pss\_24** | Do you feel you are part of the community where you currently live? | 0 strongly disagree | 1 agree |
| **rs\_pss\_25** | How physically safe do you feel for yourself and your family during everyday activities outside your residence? | I feel very unsafe all the time | I feel very safe all the time |
| **rs\_pss\_26** | How frequently have you experienced important tensions or conflicts between you and your family? | Very often | Never |
| **rs\_pss\_27** | Have you felt discriminated against? | Very often | Never |
| **rs\_pss\_28** | Do you often suffer from any of the following? (signs of distress) | Very often | Never |
| **rs\_pss\_29** | Would you wish to receive psychological support if it was available to you? | No | Yes |
| **rs\_pss\_30** | Do you feel that you are able to stay and live in this country? | No | Yes |
| **rs\_pss\_31** | On a scale from 1 to 5, how likely are you to migrate in the future? | Very unlikely | Very likely |

1. IOM, 2018 Link [here](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/global_migration_indicators_2018.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Itad, 2020. Link [here](https://www.itad.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/IOM_Methodological_Report_FINAL_22102020-min.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. IOM defines the principle of non-refoulement as “The prohibition for States to extradite, deport, expel or otherwise return a person to a country where his or her life or freedom would be threatened, or where there are substantial grounds for believing that he or she would risk being subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment, or would be in danger of being subjected to enforced disappearance, or of suffering another irreparable harm.” (IOM, 2019 – link [here](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iml_34_glossary.pdf)) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. If TVET was included in the current analysis than the this would change to current IOM programming would be expected to have a direct effect on 6 variables in the RSI, an indirect effect on 11 variables in the RSI, and no effect on 14 variables in the RSI. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. There is no specific social support as such. Instead, this indicator is comprised of those who received any one of medical referral, education support, housing support, or a national insurance card. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)