

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY

September 2003



IOM International Organization for Migration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Section	Page
1. BACKGROUND	4
2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	7
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE 1035 FACILITY	9
3.1 Institutionalization of the Facility	
3.2 Criteria and Guidelines for the 1035 Facility	
3.3 Management of the Facility	
4. RELEVANCE, PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS	14
4.1 Relevance of the 1035 Facility as a Specific Source of Funds	
4.2 Relevance of the Criteria and Guidelines	
4.2.1 Criteria for Project Selection	
4.2.2 Criteria for Selection of Benefiting Countries	
4.2.3 Guidelines for Project Development, Approval and Implementation	
4.3 Effectiveness of the 1035 Facility Management	
4.4 Effectiveness in Meeting the Overall Goal and Expectations	
5. OVERALL IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY	29
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
ANNEX 1 Terms of Reference	
ANNEX 2 Interviews and Bibliography	
ANNEX 3 Questionnaires to IOM Member States and Field Offices	
ANNEX 4 Project Development, Approval and Implementation Guidelines	
ANNEX 5 Approval Memoranda	
ANNEX 6 Reinvestment Policy	
ANNEX 7 Data Management Table	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IOM Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX), adopted in November 2000, requested *‘the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes’*. The decision to allocate USD 1 million, in addition to USD 430,000 already set aside by the IOM Administration for the same purpose, was taken to balance the approval of a 5 per cent increase in the Administrative Part of the Budget, following years of zero nominal growth. A total of USD 1,430,000 was allocated in 2001 and 2003; in 2002 the final allocation was USD 1,380,000. The fund was called *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition*. A short title, *1035 Facility*, is used for easy reference, ‘1035’ being the number of the Resolution and ‘Facility’ in order to reflect the request by IOM Member States for a flexible mechanism for project development and approval. The 1035 Facility has been added as an agenda item at Subcommittee on Budget and Finance (SCBF) meetings; status reports are prepared by the Administration and progress is also examined through informal consultations.

The criteria and guidelines established by IOM’s Administration to facilitate and streamline allocation of these funds were outlined in document MC/EX/631 and Member States were invited to comment on these guidelines. In June 2001, the criteria were completed to take into account additional suggestions made by Member States:

- fund seed/start-up projects and entire projects if/when they do not exceed USD 50,000;
- fund feasibility studies, where applicable;
- fund high-priority requests for assistance from Member States concerned;
- fund incentives for project development initiatives;
- fund national and/or regional project development initiatives;
- not normally to fund emergencies, as there are other financial funding mechanisms for such purposes;
- not to fund conferences or events for which other sources of funding already exist in the Organization’s Programme and Budget.

Concerning the beneficiaries of the Facility, the list of IOM ‘Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition’ was established using, as a main reference, the list of ‘developing countries and countries in transition’ of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The ‘equitable regional distribution’ is left to the discretion of the ‘1035 Facility Manager’.

The guidelines for project development, implementation and monitoring follow IOM's standard procedures and guidelines. Specific guidelines for project approval were established and submitted to IOM Member States for consideration. The 1035 Facility Manager examines projects using established criteria and makes his/her recommendation for approval or rejection to the Directors of the Migration Management Services Department (MMS) and Programme Support Department (PSD). The project is then sent to the Director General for final approval with the recommendations of both Directors. In the case of disagreement, the project is either sent back to the Facility Manager for further clarification, or the Director General takes the final decision after having examined the reasons for disagreement. Formal endorsement by the benefiting Member State(s) is not a pre-condition for approval. The '1035 Facility Manager' is the Head of the Technical Cooperation on Migration Service (TCM) of MMS. He/she receives support from another staff member of MMS, on a 20 per cent part time basis.

The 1035 Facility, as a specific funding mechanism, is consistent with IOM's Constitution and financial regulations and was institutionalized mainly through Resolution 1035. Resolution 1077 (LXXXIV) of December 2002 recalls the existence of the Facility and confirms that voluntary contributions can be made to the fund. The minimum funding level is USD 1,430,000 (in 2002, the amount was USD 1,380,000, due to problems of interest returns).

Concerning the relevance of the criteria and guidelines, the evaluation proposes to revise the criteria for project selection, to align use of the Facility more closely with its overall objective and 'spirit', as interpreted by Member States. Suggestions are made in the report to answer the concerns raised by various Member States on the lack of focus of the criteria and size of the projects approved.

Regarding the selection of beneficiaries, a recommendation is made for taking into account the concern of some Member States about the approval of projects for countries joining the European Union. As soon as a country becomes EU member, it loses its eligibility to benefit from the Facility. Voluntary withdrawal from eligibility in solidarity with Member States in greater need, following the example of a country at the Executive Committee session of June 2003, is another alternative. A special consideration for IOM Least Developed Countries (LDCs), through voluntary contributions, is also proposed. The fact that a Member State is subject to Article 4 of the IOM Constitution should not be considered as a criterion for exclusion from the 1035 Facility; the issue of outstanding contributions is being debated by Member States in other fora, and any decision affecting 1035 eligibility would have to be taken based on those discussions.

As to the guidelines for project development, approval and implementation, they are consistent with IOM standard guidelines and procedures. The policy of reinvestment of unexpended allocations should be formally added to existing guidelines. It is not found necessary to have a Member State representative in the 'approval board', as there are already sufficient safeguards for a relevant and effective approval process. Such a measure is also considered as micro-management by some Member States. Better reporting to Permanent Missions and a greater involvement of Governments and/or Permanent Missions in Geneva for the development of projects are among the improvements proposed.

The evaluation concludes positively on the effectiveness in meeting the overall goal and Member States' expectations. Improvements are proposed, as mentioned above. However, and as the Facility is expected to continue its activities, strong consideration should be given to the possibility of funding a full-time position to assist the Facility Manager. This would guarantee not only the effectiveness in the follow-up of project implementation, but also better reporting to Member States, as required. It was not possible to examine impact and sustainability in detail, mainly due to lack of relevant data. An impact evaluation could be conducted as a follow-up of this evaluation in two years' time.

1. BACKGROUND

In 2000, the IOM Administration initiated a debate on the possibility of abandoning the constant principle of ‘Zero Nominal Growth’ (ZNG), which had guided the preparation of the Administrative Part of the Budget of the Organization for many years. Various proposals were made to IOM Member States for an increase in the 2001 Administrative Part of the Budget. In the 83rd (additional) Session of the SCBF, held on 20 September 2000, some Member States requested the allocation of a portion of the Discretionary Income to programmes in developing countries, as a condition to the approval of an increase of the Administrative part of the Budget.¹

In preparing document MC/2010 of 4 October 2000, *Programme and Budget for 2000*, the IOM’s Administration allocated an amount of USD 430,000² as a ‘Support for Regions in Development and Transition’, in order to fund feasibility work on new projects, priority project development initiatives or to be used as bridging funds. As mentioned in the document, ‘this allocation will offer the Administration the flexibility to address some of the demands and expectations from countries in development or transition’.

In the 84th Session of the SCBF held on 30 and 31 October 2000, a Member State requested the allocation of an additional USD 1 million from Discretionary Income for projects in developing countries and countries in transition, to balance the proposed increase of 5 per cent in the Administrative Part of the Budget. Another Member State requested making reference to ‘developing Member States and Member States in transition’ and adding the concept of equitable regional distribution. The proposal received support from many other Member States and a draft resolution was prepared along those lines for submission at the next Council Session.³

During the 80th Session of the Council on 28 and 29 November 2000, Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) was approved and requested ‘*the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes*’. This request was formalized in document MC/EX/631 of 18 April 2001 *Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2001*. The amount of USD 1 million was added to the USD 430,000 already set aside by IOM’s Administration for the same purpose, being a total of USD 1,430,000 for the year 2001. The title of this initiative was also changed to *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition* in order to reflect the adopted Resolution more closely.

In the same document IOM also proposed a series of criteria for processing requests for funding, which were already coming from the field. The proposal was actively discussed during the 85th Session of the SCBF held on 9 May 2001 and IOM’s Deputy

¹ See MC/2014, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance, Report on the Eighty-Third (Additional) Session, 18 October 2000.

² An amount of USD 350’000 comes from Discretionary Income and USD 80,000 from the Sasakawa Endowment Fund.

³ See MC/2016, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance, Report on the Eighty-Fourth Session, 30-31 October 2000.

Director General invited Member States to send proposals for amendments, to meet their request for a contribution at that level.

Other concerns were also raised during the same meeting:

- the way in which projects were to be developed and funded;
- lack of references to equitable regional distribution;
- duration for the development of projects under that funding facility;
- publicity and information sharing between IOM and delegations in Geneva.⁴

At the 98th Session of the Executive Committee on 6 June 2001, the criteria for allocation of funds were again briefly discussed. The IOM Administration, following the invitation made by the Deputy Director General to IOM Member States to send their comments on the fund allocation and criteria, confirmed that the Latin American group (GRULAC) proposed two amendments to the list of criteria for project selection. The African group, on its side, called again for the initiation of open-ended and interactive regional consultations with delegations in Geneva and for the consolidation of this initiative as a permanent and institutional mechanism.⁵

In document MC/2049 of 5 October 2001, *Programme and Budget for 2002*, the IOM Administration confirmed the criteria agreed upon in previous meetings, as well as the continuation of the initiative for 2002 at the same budget level. In a Conference Room Paper prepared for the 86th Session of the SCBF of October 2001, entitled *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition*, the criteria were updated to include the GRULAC proposal. It was also stressed that the project proposals submitted must follow the IOM established project development process. A list of approved projects as at October 2001, divided by country and region, was also attached. Reference was also made to the 'Facility' concept in order to reflect the Member States' request for a flexible mechanism for project development and approval, as underlined above.

The criteria and guidelines agreed upon for utilizing the funds are to:

- fund seed/start-up projects and entire projects if/when they do not exceed USD 50,000;
- fund feasibility studies, where applicable;
- fund high-priority requests for assistance from Member States concerned;
- fund incentives for project development initiatives;
- fund national and/or regional project development initiatives;
- not normally to fund emergencies, as there are other financial funding mechanisms for such purposes;
- not to fund conferences or events for which other sources of funding already exist in the Organization's Programme and Budget.

⁴ See MC/EX/633, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance, Report on the Eighty-Fifth Session, 25 May 2001.

⁵ See MC/EX/SR/433, 98th Session of the Executive Committee, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Third Meeting, 28 June 2001.

In order to keep IOM Member States informed on the use of the funds, a progress report was presented in February 2002 at an informal consultation on financial and budgetary issues. Reference was made to ‘the 1035 Facility’ as a short title for the fund, ‘1035’ being the number of the Resolution and ‘Facility’ for reflecting the specificity of the fund, especially its flexibility and rapid response mechanism.⁶ More detailed presentation and analysis on the use of criteria, the project approval process and allocation of funds will be made in the following sections of this report.

⁶ In the text of the evaluation and for easy reference, ‘1035 Facility’, ‘Facility’ or ‘1035’ will be used when referring to the Fund.

2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

During the 87th Session of the SCBF in May 2002, the Administration recommended that the 1035 Facility be internally reviewed.⁷ The recommendation was reiterated at the 88th Session of the SCBF in November 2002: 'An evaluation will be made of the impact of the 1035 Facility and a review will also be carried out of the criteria guiding the allocation of funds in the course of 2003'.⁸ IOM Member States voiced their support for this initiative.

It was agreed that the proposed review would take the form of an internal evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Inspector General, bearing in mind that transparency and objectivity are basic principles guiding evaluation in IOM. The Terms of Reference were shared with IOM Member States during the Informal Consultation on the 1035 Facility and Migration Initiatives organized by IOM in April 2003 (**Annex 1**).

The overall objective of the evaluation, as underlined in the Terms of Reference, is: *'To review the implementation of the 1035 Facility in relation to its intended goals and implementation procedures. In particular to evaluate the Facility's criteria and guidelines, the performance and achievements of representative supported projects, and the Facility's overall impact. The evaluation will also address issues of sustainability of the Facility, and matters related to institutional support for its administration and management'*.

The methodology for the evaluation consisted of three main working levels:⁹

- 1) an extensive documentation review, including the exchanges of e-mails from the beginning of the implementation of the Facility;
- 2) written questionnaires sent to IOM Member States and IOM Field Offices;
- 3) a series of interviews conducted inside IOM and with representatives of Member States in Geneva. The evaluator also attended two specific meetings on the 1035 Facility, one organized by IOM (see above) and the other one by a Member State Representative.

During the SCBF Session of May 2003 a Member State queried the fact that the written questionnaire had been sent to Member States without first being coordinated with them. The evaluator answered the query, confirming that both practices, i.e. coordination before issue and issue without prior coordination, were valid in terms of methodology for data collection. The questionnaire covered the most important issues to be analyzed by the evaluation and, as presented, provided ample space for inclusion of extensive comments where the individual Member States felt these were necessary. The decision made not to coordinate the questionnaire before issue also took time constraints into account.

⁷ See point 7,b Conference Room Paper, *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition*, May 2002.

⁸ Conference Room Paper, *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition*, November 2002.

⁹ For more information, see **Annex 2** Interviews and Bibliography, and **Annex 3**, Questionnaires to IOM Member States and Field Offices.

A low number of replies from Member States was recorded, as only 16 countries returned the questionnaire (16 per cent of the total of Member States at the time of the evaluation). The data collection has been completed by interviews, attendance at two specific meetings on the 1035 Facility and by a documentation review of IOM Governing Bodies' sessions. Forty per cent of IOM Field Offices replied to the questionnaire, which is a representative sample of IOM Field Offices' perception of the Facility.¹⁰

The report is divided into three additional sections based on the specific objectives of the evaluation set out in the Terms of Reference. **Section 3** includes a factual presentation of:

- institutional aspects of the 1035 Facility;
- establishment of guidelines and criteria;
- overall management of the fund.

Section 4 analyses the following aspects:

- conformity of the 1035 Facility as a specific source of funds with IOM's Constitution and financial regulations;
- relevance of the criteria and guidelines for the 1035 Facility;
- effectiveness of the Facility's management, including project review and decision making;
- effectiveness in achieving its goal and meeting Member States' expectations, including reporting to Member States.

Section 5 briefly analyzes the overall impact and sustainability of the Facility. The analysis of the impact cannot be extensive, for two main reasons:

- 1) In a significant number of cases, the projects are not yet finished and/or impact cannot be assessed in the short term;
- 2) A majority of projects are directed towards capacity building activities and the feedback received from benefiting Member States through the questionnaire was low, as mentioned above. It is difficult to draw conclusions from the question raised on the impact and sustainability of the Facility in the country/region having benefited from assistance.

However, a number of key indications on the Facility's impact will be given, based on available data.

¹⁰ See **Annex 3** for the questionnaires to IOM Member States and Field Offices.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE 1035 FACILITY

This Section describes the institutional framework within which the Facility operates, the work completed by the IOM's Administration in establishing criteria and guidelines, (complementing information already presented under **Section 1**), and how the fund is managed in terms of decision-making and information-sharing.

3.1 Institutionalization of the Facility

The 1035 Facility was initially suggested by a number of Member States and established by the IOM Administration in a *Programme and Budget* document proposal.¹¹ It was institutionalized by adoption of a Resolution at the IOM Council Session of November 2000, within the following main parameters:

- The amount of the fund should come from the *Discretionary Income* and should be of an amount of *USD 1,430,000, at a minimum*. No upper limit has been established and IOM allocated USD 1,430,000 in the first year.
- The fund is established for the *development of migration projects*. This wording is unspecific, because of the broad scope covered by the concept of migration in general and IOM's mandate in particular. Clarifications were necessary and were made through informal and formal consultations.
- The fund is in favour of *developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable distribution*. The OECD's official list of 'developing countries and countries in transition'¹² has been used as a reference to define the beneficiaries, adjusted to the list of IOM Member States. Equitable distribution is part of the management of the funds and is calculated according to objective factors, such as the number of benefiting countries per region.¹³

The Resolution adopted by the IOM Council not only institutionalized the establishment of such a fund, but also reflected the consensus among Member States on its main objective and justification.

As already noted, the criteria and guidelines were not formally established by a detailed Resolution. They were, however, institutionalized during Governing Bodies meetings through the approval of documents such as the yearly *Programme and Budget* document, sometimes after active debates among Member States, or through SCBF meetings held twice per year that examined the performance and management of the fund. The same procedures were applied for establishing the list of benefiting countries. When needs arise, the same approval mechanisms can be used for amending criteria and guidelines without necessarily having to adopt a new Resolution. The issues under **Section 3.2** below are examples on the use of the evolving system for formalizing guidelines.

It should be noted here that there is no distinction in IOM financial regulations between the concept of 'fund' and that of 'facility'. The title '1035 Fund' could

¹¹ See **Section 1** for reference.

¹² DCD/DAC (2002) 26/REV2, *Review of the DAC List of Aid Recipients*, November 2002.

¹³ The four IOM regions are: Africa and the Middle East, the Americas and the Caribbean, Asia, Europe.

have been used, but was not, in order to reflect the flexibility requested by some Member States for the development of projects and funds disbursements.

3.2 Criteria and Guidelines for the 1035 Facility

The criteria and guidelines were established and refined through a series of informal consultations and formal meetings in 2001, 2002 and the beginning of 2003. Four main references constitute the framework for the fund's use:

- 1) Criteria for project selection;
- 2) Criteria for benefiting countries;
- 3) Project development and implementation process;
- 4) Internal approval process for allocation of funds.

As noted under **Section 1**, *the criteria for project selection* were finalized at the beginning of 2002 and have not since been amended. Member States proposed waiting until after issue of the evaluation report to discuss them again, if deemed necessary.

It is important to note that not all criteria have to be met for a project to be approved, e.g. a project need not be a 'seed project' AND a 'high priority' AND a 'project development initiative' to be funded. Another important point is that there is no formal reference to a restriction to, for example, capacity building projects. However, two criteria that exclude emergency activities and conferences under certain conditions have been identified.

Another set of criteria was necessary for *the selection process of benefiting countries*. A list of beneficiaries covering developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition was established by IOM Administration based on the OECD's list of developing countries and countries in transition. The list is updated according to amendments by the OECD. No precise criteria have been established to date on the concept of 'equitable distribution'. The Facility Manager has managed the allocations to achieve as equitable a distribution of funds within the four IOM regions as possible at the year's end, considering the percentage of eligible Member States in each region. The Member States are kept informed through regular status reports. The basic guidelines on the selection of benefiting countries and the regional distribution were formally presented at the 89th Session of the SCBF in May 2003.¹⁴ The relevance of the list and of the regional distribution mechanism will be discussed under **Section 4**.

In the documentation presented in 2001 and related discussions (see **Section 1**), the IOM Administration referred to the necessity for IOM Field Missions and Governments presenting project proposals to follow the procedures in place in IOM for *project development and implementation*.¹⁵ It was, however, decided to

¹⁴ See SCBF/256, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition – final report 1 January to 31 December 2002, April 2003.

¹⁵ The two main steps of the development process can be summarized as follow: 1) the project proposal developed according to established guidelines is presented to MMS – Migration Management Services Department – for technical review and endorsement; 2) the Department of Budget and Finance issues a project

accept a project developed under the SPROUT¹⁶ format, thus reducing the constraints linked to the development of a full project document. The decision was also taken following the request from some Member States for reducing the time necessary for developing and approving project proposals.

This process was, however, refined in a Conference Room Paper presented at the 87th Session of the SCBF held in May 2002, emphasizing the specific criteria guiding the establishment of project proposals, the necessity for paying attention to a regional balance in the approval of projects and the reporting requirements. It was also formally specified that the Head of the Technical Cooperation on Migration Service (TCM) of the Migration Management Services Department (MMS) would serve as the 1035 Facility Programme Manager. Regarding implementation of projects approved under the Facility, the same paper reiterated the responsibility of each Project Manager for project monitoring in terms of achieving planned objectives, reporting requirements and expenditure control.

Clarifications were also made on *the internal approval process for allocation of funds* to a given project. After endorsement by the Service concerned at a technical level, the Facility Manager forwards his comments and recommendation to the Directors of MMS and of the Programme Support Department (PSD) for endorsement. Following the analysis made by both Directors, the project proposal is sent to the Director General with a recommendation from the Directors of both Departments, for final consideration. When a project does not meet the consensus required before being sent for approval to the Director General, the reasons are given. In the case of major disagreement, the document is returned to the Field Office for further clarification.¹⁷

A policy paper was given on the policy of reinvestment of unexpended 1035 Facility allocations in the informal consultations held in February 2003, the basic principle being to reinvest the amount in the fund available for a given year. In exceptional cases, such funds could be transferred to an existing 1035 project deserving additional financial support. This latter action would however require the formal approval of the MMS and PSD Directors.¹⁸

It is important to note that a Government's letter of endorsement is not a formal pre-condition for approval of single projects, but evidence of support from the benefiting Member State can be requested by the Facility Manager before endorsing the project for further consideration by the Directors. Endorsement for regional projects is sometimes given by one Member State in the region covered, or by more than one country. Approval and support from IOM Mission(s) with Regional Functions (MRFs) covering the region, after having discussed the project proposal with the governments concerned, is required in all cases. Also for regional projects, a representative level of benefiting Member States is required,

code authorizing disbursement of funds only if all requirements are met in terms of budget review and MMS endorsement. As soon as implementation starts, usual reporting procedures also have to be followed.

¹⁶ SPROUT – Summary Project Outline. The document contains in fact most of the information required for developing a consistent project proposal.

¹⁷ For more information see **Annex 4** for relevant extracts from the last Conference Room Paper, and **Annex 5** for a sample of a memorandum to the Director General.

¹⁸ See **Annex 6** for policy of reinvestment.

but non-Member States can also participate and benefit from projects approved. As mentioned above, no formal condition for prior formal endorsement by Member States exists.

3.3 Management of the Facility

The overall responsibility for the fund's management was given to the Head of TCM, and the paper presented to the SCBF in May 2003 refers to the '*Facility Manager*'.¹⁹ In the same status report, his/her main tasks are described as follows: 'The 1035 Facility Manager *reviews the proposal* with the Service to *resolve any outstanding issues* relating to 1035 Facility criteria, *evaluates the proposal in relation to other requests from the region and according to overall regional balance*, and recommends approval or rejection of 1035 Facility support to the Director of the Migration Management Services and the Director of the Programme Support Department. The request is then passed to the Director General for the final decision. The Facility Manager also advises on how unexpended 1035 funds may be utilized for further projects under the Facility'.

The following points from the basic Terms of Reference for the position deserve clarification:

- '*Review the proposal*' and '*resolve outstanding issue*' imply an important number of specific tasks, i.e. analysis of the project proposal in line with established criteria, verification of Government interest or endorsement, follow-up on exchanges of correspondence for clarification with IOM Offices, Governments representatives and/or Permanent Missions in Geneva, verification of the non-existence of other fundraising opportunities aside from 1035, preparation of memorandum for project approval decision and notification, as well as follow-up on implementation or not of the project funded in collaboration with the relevant Service;
- '*Evaluates the proposal in relation to other requests from the region and according to overall regional balance*' implies managing of disbursements towards regional benchmarks, including continuing and detailed monitoring by country and region for guaranteeing the most equitable distribution. Monitoring is important in this case, as it can be used as a criterion for the exclusion of a project.

What are not mentioned in the description of tasks above are the reporting requirements for preparation of informal consultations with Member States and SCBF meetings, which are time-consuming even if sometimes repetitive in content. It includes also preparatory discussions inside IOM for amendment/improvement of the guidelines.

Another aspect that will become important for monitoring the Facility as increasing numbers of projects end after two years' implementation, is the management of final reporting requirements from each project approved and of sustainability actions implemented. The Project Tracking Unit will certainly assist the programme manager in tracking progress report submission, and the

¹⁹ See SCBF/256, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition – final report 1 January to 31 December 2002, April 2003.

Accounting Office in following up on project expenditure, but the Facility Manager will have the overall responsibility for follow-up on such matters and for recommending actions when necessary.²⁰

Due to the important workload for monitoring Facility implementation, another staff member of the MMS Department was requested to provide part-time assistance. In theory, 20 per cent of his/her time was to be dedicated to the 1035 Facility. However, in practice, constraints were noticed on the share of work and 20 per cent time allocation proved to be insufficient. Further analysis of overall management requirements will be made under **Section 4**.

²⁰ The roles of the Project Tracking Unit and of the Accounting Office were detailed for the first time in the Conference Room Paper of the 87th Session of the SCBF, May 2002. They follow in fact normal procedures. The responsibility of the Project Manager in charge of the project(s) approved under the Facility is also described in the same paper and follows standard practice.

4. RELEVANCE, PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

This section evaluates the conformity of the 1035 Facility with IOM's Constitution and financial regulations, as well as the relevance of its criteria and guidelines in relation to the Resolution formalizing the creation of the fund and in relation to IOM operational guidelines. It will also analyze the performance of the management of funds, especially in terms of project review and approval, and the effectiveness in achieving its goal and meeting Member States' expectations. Impact and sustainability will be covered under **Section 5**.

4.1 Relevance of the 1035 Facility as a Specific Source of Funds

As mentioned under **Section 3**, the 1035 Facility has been established and institutionalized through a Resolution adopted by the IOM Council. All elements in the Resolution are consistent with the IOM's Constitution. As an example, the main objective of assisting developing Member States and Member States in transition accords with the declaration made in the Preamble of the Constitution: 'Recognizing [...] that in the cooperation and other international activities for migration the needs of developing countries should be taken into account'.²¹ In addition, there is no restriction in the agreed criteria for using the funds that would run counter to Article 1 of the Constitution, which lists the purposes and functions of the Organization.

As a specific source of funds, the 1035 Facility is consistent with IOM's Financial Regulations, adopted by the Council in November 1989. In IOM practice, other specific funds have been established in the past and are still functioning, e.g. the Sasakawa Endowment Fund, the Migrant Loan Fund and the Migration for Development Fund.²² Resolution 1035 (LXXX) specifies that the money allocated to the fund should come from discretionary income and that the amount should be USD 1,430,000. Since the Facility's creation in 2001, these principles have been followed and the amounts budgeted per year followed the level established by the Resolution.²³ As already mentioned under **Section 3**, there is no distinction in IOM financial regulations between a 'fund' and a 'facility' and the term 'facility' has been chosen to reflect the speed and flexibility in the approval of projects required by IOM Member States.

One of the main issues to be highlighted for analysis of the relevance of the fund is that Resolution 1035 has not been adopted for the creation of the Facility, but for approving the Programme and Budget for 2001; the Facility is formally one among many other projects approved by the Council. The allocation of USD 1,430,000 was requested for balancing a 5 per cent increase in the Administrative Part of the Budget for that year. The Resolution not specifying its yearly

²¹ Constitution of the International Organization for Migration, November 1989.

²² For more details see for example MC/2083, Programme and Budget for 2003, October 2002.

²³ In 2002, the initial amount budgeted was USD 1,430,000 but due to low interest rate returns from the Sasakawa Endowment Fund, which was completing the full allocation, the final amount was USD 1,380,000. In 2003, the IOM Administration took measures for keeping the level at the USD 1,430,000 requested by the Resolution. During interviews and through documentation review, it has been possible to note however that the management of the disbursement of funds from the Sasakawa fund inside the 1035 Facility allocation is sometimes problematic due to potentially conflicting criteria/beneficiaries. When possible, the IOM Administration should avoid such a solution for completing the amount of USD 1,430,000.

‘renewal’ and being restricted to the year 2001, there is no formal obligation to allocate an amount every year, especially if there is no increase in the Administrative Part of the Budget in a given year. On the other hand, Resolution 1077 (LXXXIV) on a *Systemic solution for the use of the surplus in the Administrative Part of the Budget*, adopted by the Council in December 2002, recalls the existence of the Facility. It also recommends IOM Member States to contribute voluntarily to the fund in the case of reductions in assessed contributions. The Resolution thus formalizes, to a certain extent, the possibility for voluntary contributions in addition to the amount allocated from the discretionary income²⁴. Declarations made by a majority of Member States also call for the maintenance of the Facility and its institutionalization. Resolutions endorsing documents with reference to the Facility, such as the SCBF reports, formalize its yearly allocation.

Conclusion: the 1035 Facility as a specific source of funds is consistent with the IOM’s Constitution and financial regulations. The Resolution was adopted for the year 2001 and in the text there is no mandatory obligation to allocate such an amount every year. However, the practice established by the IOM Administration for the years 2002 and 2003 in maintaining the fund, the clear indications provided by Member States and subsequent Resolutions adopted by the Council fill in the gap. Should the need arise to adopt again a specific resolution on the 1035 Facility, the issue can be addressed at that time. Resolution 1077(LXXXIV) of December 2002 confirms that voluntary contributions can be made to the Facility in addition to the amount allocated from the discretionary income.

4.2 Relevance of the Criteria and Guidelines

As stressed under **Section 3**, no detailed criteria or guidelines were established through Resolution 1035. They have been refined through a series of discussions with IOM Member States and approved through Resolutions endorsing official documents presenting them. Member States were invited to make proposals in addition to the suggestions made by IOM Administration, as already mentioned.

The Resolution states that the allocation is ‘... for the development of migration projects’. Such a definition is very broad and the criteria adopted are easily in line with the Resolution’s goal. Another benchmark was the reference to beneficiaries: ‘... in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition’. The category is more precisely framed, but its relevance was sometimes questioned through the written questionnaire for Member States or through interviews. The issue will be further discussed below.

Three ‘levels’ of criteria and guidelines have been identified within the framework of the evaluation and will be used for examining the relevance in relation to the overall objective of the Resolution and to IOM operational guidelines and activities:

- 1) criteria for project selection;
- 2) criteria for selection of benefiting countries;
- 3) guidelines for project development, approval and implementation.

²⁴ Voluntary contributions can be made at any time, not only in cases of reductions in assessed contributions.

4.2.1 Criteria for Project Selection

Before starting the analysis it is important to note that a project does not need to meet all the criteria in order to be funded. The concept has to be maintained in case of a revision of the criteria, otherwise there is a risk of unnecessarily restricting the use of the Facility. In trying to categorize the criteria established for the selection of projects, some difficulties and inconsistencies have been noted.

First, there are two broad categories: *what can be funded and what cannot be funded*. That division can be maintained, but needs to be clarified and better defined, e.g. when reading ‘not normally to fund emergencies’, identifying what will define the limit of ‘normal’. During the interviews conducted or through the discussions held for establishing the Facility,²⁵ there was broad consensus on the view that emergency activities²⁶ should not be funded, whatever the prevailing situation. In addition, other funds are available in IOM for supporting emergency activities, such as the Emergency Preparedness Account.

Other excluding criteria are ‘not to fund conferences or events for which other sources of funding already exist in the Organization’s Programme and Budget’. The meaning behind ‘... already exist in the Organization’s Programme and Budget’ deserves clarification. The interpretation made by the 1035 Facility Manager is that the Facility should not be asked to provide core support to ongoing dialogue and similar activities, already well established, that appear in the yearly Programme and Budget document. However, other conferences and similar events that seem to be useful in launching new regional processes and opening new geographic coverage, or in increasing programme planning and implementation between IOM and Member States should not be excluded. In other interviews conducted inside IOM, there was also an agreement on the possibility of funding conferences if the expected outcome clearly identified potential for development of follow-up actions and programmes, especially for IOM. The ‘seed’ concept should be applied in such cases. Fundraising should also be explored before funding conferences with high-level country representatives through the 1035 Facility.

Among the excluding criteria, there is also evidence in the questionnaires received and in various debates that the 1035 Facility is not intended to fund IOM staff and office costs, or to bear the main cost of opening an IOM office in a given country. Staff and office costs can, however, be charged to the project funded if assistance for implementing activities is required, as is generally the case with IOM projects. IOM’s projectization rule should be applied in such cases, with staff and office budget lines covering only the necessary costs for project implementation. Where staff and office costs are unusually high as a percentage of a 1035 project budget, a letter of endorsement from the benefiting Government can guarantee the relevance and necessity of the project as presented. The same guiding principles should apply for regional projects.

²⁵ See **Section 1** for references.

²⁶ ‘Emergency activities’ as listed in document MC/INF/260 of November 2002, *Role of IOM in Emergency and post-conflict situations*.

Second, there are criteria establishing *the type of project to be funded*: ‘seed/start-up projects’, ‘entire projects’ and ‘feasibility studies’. The category of ‘entire project’ is not very useful, in the sense that seed projects or start-up projects have to be developed as ‘entire project’; the idea of funding seed or start-up actions that could lead to a full-scale project might be a more useful construct. The establishment of the limit of USD 50,000 is a specific criterion in the practice, but not exclusively linked to the entire project concept. In addition, the limit is not applicable for regional projects (the limit for funding will be discussed below).

When looking at projects approved, it has been possible to identify in addition to ‘seed’ and ‘start-up’, concepts such as ‘pilot projects’, and ‘bridging funds’. ‘Bridging funds’ are allocated for instance for reinforcing the sustainability of an intervention, for facilitating the transfer of responsibility to Governments or for funding the continuation of an activity for the time required to receive other funds. Both concepts are in line with the philosophy of the 1035 Facility, as noted through the questionnaires received or interviews, and could also be mentioned specifically.

Third, there is a general criterion, funding ‘*high priority requests for assistance*’. What is not a ‘high priority request’? That question highlights the problem behind the criterion, many activities and projects being considered by governments and/or IOM Offices as high priority. It could easily be dropped and replaced by a criterion asking for the clear support of the benefiting Government or Governments in case of regional activities. One of the initial ideas behind the Facility, as noted through discussions and preparatory papers,²⁷ was to meet demands and expectations from developing Member States that encounter difficulties through normal fundraising channels, but where the projects are considered worth implementing. This is especially true for pilot projects or seed projects.

Finally, there are two criteria that are rather similar: ‘to fund incentives for project development initiatives’ and ‘to fund national and/or regional project development initiatives’. If we forego the ‘national and/or regional’ aspects, both being accepted by the 1035 Facility practice and not only applicable to that criterion, the only difference is the concept of ‘incentives’, which can be important in terms of support and motivation. At that point, ‘to fund incentives for project development initiatives’ is sufficient, keeping in mind, however, that incentive is not a common wording used in project development activities.

In the questionnaires received,²⁸ in the documents of the Governing Bodies’ meetings and during the interviews, proposals for revising the criteria or for restricting them were also made. Comments were made on the way to interpret the notion of ‘migration projects’ contained in the Resolution. An Executive

²⁷ See **Section 1** for references

²⁸ In the questionnaires received from IOM Field Offices, 65% are satisfied with the existing criteria, 21% ask for more clarifications or for a yearly update based on experiences conducted and 14% have no opinion. In the questionnaires received from Member States, 56% are satisfied with the criteria for selection and 44% requested their revision. Not all Member States disagreeing with the criteria made proposals for adjusting them. Some of them are awaiting the results of the evaluation in order to have an informed opinion on the subject.

Committee document²⁹ states that the 1035 Facility concerns migration and should not fund disarmament projects, even if the project proposal could have been considered as falling under the criterion of ‘seed/start-up projects’.

A Member State also pointed out that the initial understanding was to utilize the funds for ‘IOM’s core service areas focused on capacity building for migration management’; another country also referred to capacity building activities and confirmed its interpretation of the area of intervention in its questionnaire; such views are however not supported by official documents. Another document³⁰ refers to the interpretation of migration projects, versus demobilization/disarmament projects, but not restricted to capacity building: ‘[the Facility] would accomplish the task of encouraging the implementation of viable migration projects, enhancing national capacities [...] to develop effective and innovative migration projects and successfully face migration challenges’.

In practice, looking at a total of 31 projects approved in 2002, there are:

- 14 (45 per cent) projects that can be considered as capacity building projects in its restrictive sense;
- 6 (20 per cent) as technical cooperation projects;
- 5 (17 per cent) as research projects;
- 2 (6 per cent) as counter-trafficking projects;
- 2 (6 per cent) as support to migration centres, one being a reception centre and the other an information centre;
- 1 (3 per cent) a micro-credit start-up project with a joint funding from UNDP;
- 1 (3 per cent) the small arms collection project that was questioned by two Member States.

Approximately half the projects can be termed capacity building activities. The three first categories (82 per cent of projects approved) are technical cooperation activities, close to capacity building activities in its broad sense, e.g. research projects. In analyzing them in the light of the interpretation of the Resolution referring to ‘viable migration projects’, or projects ‘successfully facing migration challenges’, a significant majority of projects approved are relevant to that particular interpretation of Resolution 1035. In the questionnaire, one Member State also considers it important to fund counter-trafficking activities; the information centre will certainly be considered as a core activity for migration management by the country supporting its implementation. Finally, the micro-credit project falls within the ‘start-up’ criterion.

Concerning *the level of funding*, the amount of USD 50,000 established for all ‘National’³¹ projects was not always considered fully appropriate or adequate to the purpose of the project. As noted above, it was initially established for a

²⁹ MC/EX/SR/436, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Sixth Meeting, June 2002.

³⁰ MC/EX/642, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance, Report of the Eighty-Seventh Session, May 2002.

³¹ ‘National’ is used to make the difference with ‘Regional’ projects.

specific case and then extended to all national projects. In the questionnaires received, only 20 per cent of Member States who replied consider it appropriate, 30 per cent do not have any opinion or await the results of the evaluation and 50 per cent suggested changing the limit. Many proposals suggested an amount of USD 100,000, some of them, however, adding a proviso that this should be for exceptional and well-justified cases.

For the category of 'Regional' projects, the view is equally divided in the questionnaires received³² and during the interviews conducted on the establishment of a limit. When a limit was proposed, it was between USD 100,000 and USD 150,000, which in fact is the practice. However, if the funding level exceeds USD 200,000, it is certainly deviating from the Facility's initial intention and fundraising activities should be considered for such levels. If the project is not attractive for donors, its appropriateness and effectiveness should also be questioned. Concerning the establishment of specific criteria for the selection of regional projects there was a proposal requiring a similarity of identified needs in the region and the active participation of countries concerned. Another proposal focused on capacity building and inter-state cooperation. Both requests remain marginal, except for the fact that commitment and involvement of governments assisted is a basic requirement of the Facility.

Conclusion: the criteria for the selection of projects are broad, sometimes too broad, possibly leading to a deviation from the initial intent of Resolution 1035. The revision of the criteria for the selection of projects is necessary at this point in order to frame the selection process and respect the 'spirit' of the Resolution more closely. A proposal is made in this report (see Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3), which also takes into account other selection criteria and guidelines.

4.2.2 Criteria for Selection of Benefiting Countries

According to the text of the Resolution, the Facility's beneficiaries are '*developing Member States and Member States in transition*'. It has been clear from the outset that for national projects, only IOM Member States are eligible for funding. In the case of regional projects, there is a consensus that non-IOM Member States can also benefit from the intervention, especially due to the 'inter-state' nature of migration. Another common argument was the 'opening' of IOM activities to non-Member States with the idea of encouraging request for membership. However, there is also a consensus that the majority of countries benefiting from regional projects should remain IOM developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition.

The list used for determining the IOM developing countries and countries with economy in transition was that established by the OECD. Other lists have been examined by IOM's Administration, such as the list of the G-77 countries and the list of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Both lists were, however, not fully appropriate to the targeted beneficiaries, as there was no reference to countries with economy in transition, and one list focused on a sub-group of developing countries. The World Bank publishes similar lists for developing countries, based

³² 50% consider that no changes should be brought to the existing situation, 44% consider that specific limits and/or criteria should be established, 6% await the results of the evaluation.

on Gross National Income (GNI) per capita. Other lists based on the level of indebtedness are published by the World Bank, but do not reflect the concepts of developing countries and countries in transition.³³

In the questionnaires received³⁴ and through the interviews conducted, there is consensus on the use of the OECD list as the main reference. One disagreement lies on the fact that countries close to joining the EU already benefit from special assistance in terms of migration management through EU funded programmes.³⁵ Of the 13 EU Candidate countries, nine candidates fall into the first sub-category of the OECD category 'Countries and Territories in Transition', which indicates eligibility for 1035 if they are an IOM Member State (one candidate is not an IOM Member State). Three are listed in the second sub-category, which is excluded from 1035 access (one candidate is not a Member State).³⁶ One country only, Turkey, though not presently an IOM Member State, is listed under 'developing' countries on the OECD list.

In other words, the eligibility of eight IOM Member States, all falling within the category 'Member States in Transition' of Resolution 1035, is questioned here.³⁷ However, during the last Executive Committee meeting in June 2003, an eligible Member State specifically requested IOM Administration that it be removed from the list of countries entitled to 1035 assistance, thereby 'demonstrating solidarity with countries whose needs were greater'.

Three solutions are possible:

- 1) The 'Member States in transition' category could be cancelled because of the high number of EU candidate countries, affecting one IOM Member State that is not an EU candidate and potential new Member States that could fall in the category. In addition, the Resolution should be changed accordingly;
- 2) The OECD periodically updates its list and will certainly remove EU candidates from the category after having joined the EU (some of them already due next year); IOM can update its list accordingly and maintain the status quo on the way of selecting beneficiaries, based on OECD list;
- 3) An intermediary solution would be for IOM to remove EU candidates as soon as they join the EU, without waiting for the OECD update, which takes place every two years, while keeping open the possibility for a voluntary withdrawal from eligibility, as was the case in the last Executive Committee meeting (whether EU Candidate countries or not). The solution would not

³³ See relevant Websites: www.g77.org; www.unctad.org; www.worldbank.org

³⁴ Only 4 respondents out of 16 do not agree with the list of beneficiaries, mentioning that countries joining the EU should not benefit from the 1035.

³⁵ The most imminent 13 EU Candidate Countries: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey.

³⁶ The first section 'Central and Eastern European Countries and new Independent States of the former Soviet Union' includes the following IOM Member States: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Ukraine. The second section 'More advanced Developing Countries and Territories' includes Cyprus, Israel, Korea and Slovenia.

³⁷ When mentioning 'Transition', reference is made to economic transition as per OECD criteria.

oblige IOM to cancel the ‘in transition’ category and would meet the concerns of some Member States on the eligibility of EU candidates.

Two other comments were made regarding the list of beneficiaries, one asking for focusing assistance on LDCs³⁸ while not excluding other developing countries, and the other requesting inclusion of a selection process based on the human rights situation. As regards focusing on LDCs, this is an understandable position, but cannot be met without limiting access for other beneficiaries. A formal decision should also be taken on the percentage to be allocated to LDCs in order to avoid problems of beneficiary selection. However, the impetus for doing more for the LDC Member States could be seen as a guiding principle for expansion of the Facility through voluntary contributions that would be specifically allocated to the category, the fund being open to such contributions as mentioned under **Section 4.1**. Concerning human rights, the request stems from one Member State only. The topic being not specific to the 1035 Facility, it should not be examined in that context alone.

Another criterion for the selection of beneficiaries that was deeply discussed was the possible exclusion of Member States falling under the provision of Article 4 of the IOM Constitution for non-payment of contributions for two consecutive years or more, from the list of beneficiaries. That restriction cannot be applied now for two main reasons. First, it is clear from the interviews conducted that there is not a consensus on such a measure in the context of the 1035 Facility. Second, Member States requested the IOM’s Administration to examine possible measures to improve the situation of outstanding contributions. Should such a criterion of exclusion apply to some 1035 Facility beneficiaries, it should be through the approval of the overall set of measures to be debated and not as a result of the evaluation.

Concerning the concept of ‘equitable regional distribution’, there is no major criticism of the work done by the 1035 Facility Manager for its maintenance. A comment made in an answer to the questionnaire was linked to the ‘application of Article 4’ showing that there is a clear imbalance if non-payment of contributions is taken into account. Another comment was again linked to the imbalance due to the participation of Member States who will join the EU, too much funding being allocated to Europe from this perspective.

Conclusion: while there is a consensus on the use of the OECD list for establishing the list of IOM Member States beneficiaries, the applicability of the ‘Member States in transition’ category as stated in the Resolution has been questioned. New solutions will have to be examined and agreed upon, possibly based on the evaluation report’s proposals. There is also broad consensus for not excluding non-IOM Member States from Regional projects, but with the condition that the project should first benefit a majority of IOM’s developing Member States. There is no consensus for an exclusion measure as a consequence of being in arrears in the payment of assessed contributions.

³⁸ LDC: Least Developed Countries. OECD list includes it under the overall category ‘Developing Countries and Territories’.

Recommendation: IOM's Administration is encouraged to make a proposal for clarifying the selection criteria and guidelines along these lines:

'The 1035 Facility has been established to respond to the needs of IOM's Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition in the field of migration management. The Facility should remain a flexible tool that can respond to important migration demands and challenges rapidly and efficiently. The following criteria and guidelines must be followed in presenting and approving project proposals for funding:

- 1) **Beneficiaries:** the main beneficiaries of the 1035 Facility are IOM Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition. The list of Developing Member States is established according to the OECD list of 'Developing Countries and Territories'; the list of Member States with Economy in Transition according to the OECD sub-category 'Central and Eastern European Countries and New Independent States of the former Soviet Union'. As soon as a country joins the European Union, it will be automatically excluded from the list of beneficiaries, due to the technical assistance offered by the EU in the field of migration management. Voluntary withdrawal from eligibility in solidarity with Member States in greater need is possible and open to any country.

In the context of regional projects, non-IOM Member States can be included among the beneficiaries, but only in the case where a majority of IOM Member States is benefiting from the project.

The decision for an allocation of funds on the basis of an equitable regional distribution remains at the discretion of the 1035 Facility Manager, based on objective factors such as the number of beneficiaries per region.

- 2) **Special Consideration for the Least Developed Countries:** IOM encourages voluntary contributions to the Facility for use exclusively for the benefit of LDC Member States (based on the OECD's LDC category).
- 3) **Type of assistance:** priority should be given to capacity building projects in the various IOM Services (including research and feasibility studies related to such activities). Assistance can be extended to other IOM core activities only if the following two conditions are met: a) the project does not fall under the criteria of exclusion below and b) the IOM Member State endorsing the project proposal formally justifies the benefit and impact in using the Facility (at least two benefiting Member States in case of regional projects). The type of assistance that cannot be provided by the Facility includes the following services or fields of intervention:
 - movement;
 - emergency;
 - major conferences and similar events that are continuations of on-going dialogue and similar activities already well established. However, other conferences and similar events that seem to be useful in launching new regional processes, opening new geographic coverage or in increasing programme planning and implementation between IOM and Member States should not be excluded. The 'seed' concept should be applied in such cases

and guide the approval criterion. Fundraising should, however, be also explored before funding conferences with high-level country representatives through the 1035 Facility. Assistance for project development initiatives funded as a follow-up of a conference or similar event is acceptable;

- projects mainly supporting IOM Staff and Office costs in a given country or region, including projects proposed for the specific purpose of opening an IOM office, are not eligible. IOM Staff and Office costs can however be included in the budget for project implementation following the usual IOM projectization approach.
- 4) **Type of project:** any type of project can be presented for consideration under the Facility, be it national or regional. Cross-country, cross-theme and cross-regional approaches deserve specific attention due to the nature of migration phenomena and problems, as well as the shared benefit and impact among targeted countries. Priority should also be given to seed, start-up or pilot projects, not only due to the difficulties in fundraising from normal sources, but also due to their potential for development of major initiatives. Bridging fund projects and projects that provide co-funding to major donor commitments can also be considered, but need to be well justified. The IOM SPROUT or Project Document format must be utilized.
 - 5) **Funding level:** for national projects, a maximum amount of USD 50,000 is established. There is however the possibility of increasing the budget in exceptional circumstances, up to a maximum of USD 100,000 if the increase is well justified in accordance with the purpose of the project. In the case of regional projects, a maximum amount of USD 200,000 can be considered. If over USD 100,000, proof of previous or on-going fundraising efforts should be presented.
 - 6) **Application Procedure:** A project can be presented by the central Government of an eligible Member State, by its Permanent Mission in Geneva with, however, confirmation of the endorsement by the capital, by an IOM Mission (IOM Field Office or IOM Mission with Regional Function) or by an IOM Headquarters Department. In all cases, the channelling IOM Mission or Headquarters Department must provide assurance that the benefiting Member State(s) is/are fully aware of the project and supportive of 1035 expenditure for that purpose. In the case of regional projects, a minimum of two IOM Member States must endorse the project proposal. The projects are referred to the IOM Mission(s) for coordination and final development. The 1035 Facility Manager may ask for additional documentation, when deemed necessary.

4.2.3 Guidelines for Project Development, Approval and Implementation

As mentioned under **Section 3**, the project development and implementation process, including reporting requirements, follows standard IOM procedures and guidelines. It can therefore be considered as relevant to IOM's administrative, financial and operational guidelines. In the questionnaires received from IOM Offices and from IOM Member States, the relevance of the guidelines were not questioned.

Concerning the approval process, it is well defined and goes through different steps guaranteeing an impartial and relevant examination of projects submitted and of decisions taken. The high-level commitment of the Director General and two Directors of Department highlights the importance given to the Facility's management. The effectiveness of the decision-making process will be examined in a following section.

The project implementation guidelines are also congruent with IOM's standard procedures and established practice. The Project Manager in the field has the overall responsibility for the implementation and monitoring of the project approved, with usual reporting requirements, including mid-term and final progress reports and monthly financial reports. The Project Tracking Unit and the Department of Budget and Finance track the implementation status of the project and financial matters respectively. All this information is made available to the 1035 Facility Manager and to the Head of the Service who endorsed the project.

As already mentioned, a policy of reinvestment of unexpended allocations has been established and discussed with IOM's Member States in an informal consultation. No element in the policy presented is in conflict with IOM's financial regulations and the funds are reinvested in the 1035 Facility for the benefit of IOM Member States.³⁹ If a project approved is not implemented in a two-years timeframe and no effort is made by the benefiting Member State(s) to correct the situation, the Facility Manager, with the approval of the Director General, should have the authority to cancel the project and re-allocate the amount to the overall fund.

Recommendation: The guidelines for project development, approval and implementation as presented during the 89th Session of the SCBF in May 2003 (SCBF/256), are relevant to the IOM administrative, financial and operational guidelines. They can be maintained as such and added to the proposal for revised criteria of selection, in particular point 4.a), 4.c), 4.d), 4.e), 4.f), taking however into account any adjustments that could be brought to the IOM internal structure in 2004 and that would have a bearing on the management of the Facility. Point 4.b) about the use of the OECD list as a reference has been moved under the revised criteria for selection. The policy of reinvestment can be added to the guidelines, including also a provision for approved project not implemented in a two years timeframe.

³⁹ For more information on the procedures for project development, approval and implementation, and on the policy for reinvestment, see **Section 3** and **Annexes 4, 5 and 6**.

4.3 Effectiveness of the 1035 Facility Management

As underlined under **Section 3** and **Section 4.2**, a set of criteria and guidelines governs the work of the 1035 Facility Manager for the overall management of the fund. He receives the support of another IOM staff on a theoretical 20 per cent time allocation basis. Before going into details on the effectiveness of the management, it is appropriate to highlight the level of work and effectiveness required for maintaining an adequate performance.

Section 3.3 gave a brief presentation of the Terms of Reference of the Facility Manager. It is evident from the exchanges of e-mails, the documentation review and interviews that tasks to be performed are time-consuming and not expected to decrease as projects close down, implying an important monitoring function on final reporting and follow-up actions:⁴⁰ for example, exchanges of e-mails for additional information from IOM Field Offices, Governments and/or Permanent Missions sending project proposals are important in order to guarantee a sound and relevant project proposal. They also include rejected projects that do not appear on the status reports presented. Discussions with IOM Services on technical matters, as well as with both Directors for the approval process, have also been noted. Data management for follow-up of project implementation status, for guaranteeing equitable regional distribution and equitable distribution by country and for reporting to Member States is also important and time-consuming.⁴¹

As a quantitative reference, almost 1,100 e-mail exchanges have been counted in 2002, giving an average of 4.5 e-mails per day. In 2003, the same average per day has been noted, taking into account that some e-mail exchanges require time to be monitored, e.g. when a project document is received, or when asking for additional information. Such a volume puts many constraints on the fund's management and on the other tasks to be performed by the staff assigned to 1035. This is why reference was made above to a *theoretical* 20 per cent. There is sufficient evidence that the effectiveness can only be guaranteed further if additional staff resources are appointed to the 1035 Facility management, especially as Member States' Permanent Missions are asking for more detailed information.

In the questionnaires sent out to Member States there was a request concerning the possibility of allocating a certain sum for administrative support, giving IOM's Administration the possibility of allocating more human resources to the management of the Facility. Views were divided equally on the possibility of deducting such an amount from the USD 1,430,000 available. Some Member States disagreeing with the procedure were ready to change their opinion if valid arguments for doing so were presented. Among the Member States agreeing with the proposal, there was no common view on how to fund such support.

⁴⁰ There is an average of 30 to 35 projects approved per year.

⁴¹ See sample in **Annex 7**.

Various options worth considering include:⁴²

- 1) Funding such a position out of the 1035 Facility funds, based on a fixed percentage or on the cost of a full time staff member;⁴³
- 2) Charging 12 per cent overhead on Staff and Office costs of approved projects, in line with IOM's general rule, but with problems for planning costs as the amount per year varies.⁴⁴ The balance should be taken out of the allocated funds to ensure an adequate funding level for the position.

During the interviews conducted and Governing Bodies' meetings, IOM Member States raised few concerns regarding the effectiveness of the project review and decision-making process, compared to the number of projects reviewed and approved. This report has already referred to the disarmament project. The approval of another project was also questioned by one Member State, remarking that UNAIDS had previously rejected it; it has not been possible to confirm if or why UNAIDS rejected it, but it has been possible to note that UNAIDS remained a partner in its implementation. Another project questioned by a Member State was a study on Internally Displaced Women (project value USD 5,000), co-funded by the special IOM fund on Gender Issues and by IOM Colombia. It was presented as a multi-regional project but without clear indication of the developing Member State's beneficiaries. There were also some concerns about the level of funding for IOM staff and office as already mentioned. In most cases, the 1035 Facility Manager confirmed that problems raised were noted in order to avoid them in the future and some of them are addressed through the proposal for revised criteria made under **Section 4.2**.⁴⁵

In the documentation review and through interviews with IOM staff working on the 1035 Facility, it was also noted that a certain number of projects have been rejected as not fitting the established criteria, e.g. the general MIDA⁴⁶ programme and a request for funding for the 3rd South American Conference on Migration were not approved, even with the pressure of IOM MRFs concerned and from some benefiting Governments. It is also important to underline that during the interviews conducted or through the questionnaire, many IOM Member States were supportive of IOM's work in the management of the facility and did not raise any complaints.

Another issue that has been brought to the attention of the evaluator is the suggestion by a Member State to have a representative of IOM Member States in an 'approval board' for projects. That request did not receive the support of other Member States and IOM's Administration, as noted during the interviews, especially as it was considered to amount to micro-management. It is important to

⁴² In the questionnaire, 6% of the amount of the Facility was proposed, i.e. USD 85,800. Two other proposals were made by Member States: 5% and between 1% and 3%. These options are included under point 1) above.

⁴³ A full time P2 (even P3) position should be considered to work as an Assistant of the 1035 Facility Manager (remaining the Head of TCM).

⁴⁴ In 2001 12% on S&O costs of all projects approved amounts to USD 60,600; in 2002, USD 73,000.

⁴⁵ A representative number of projects were selected for review in the framework of the evaluation. Close to 30 projects – approved and rejected – were examined and additional information requested by the Facility Manager when needed. Only a small percentage, among which the projects mentioned by the Member States, raised questions, but not to the point of falling completely outside the interpretation of established criteria.

⁴⁶ MIDA - Migration for Development in Africa.

note here that IOM Member States requesting assistance must also act as a ‘guarantor’ that the request is in line with the 1035 Facility criteria. By adopting the proposal for revised criteria made under **Section 4.2.2** above, asking for a formal endorsement by benefiting IOM Member States,⁴⁷ there is a stronger guarantee for transparency at that level. A greater involvement of IOM Missions in discussing the project proposal with Government(s) concerned is another guarantee of a proper follow-up of procedures. Finally, by improving reporting mechanisms to Member States as discussed in the following section, the need for micro-management can be avoided.

Conclusion: it is possible to conclude positively on the effectiveness of the management of the fund by IOM, including the effectiveness of the project review and approval process, even if some projects approved are questioned. Most problems encountered have already been addressed, as noted through the improvement brought every year by the 1035 Facility Manager, or will be duly taken into account in the follow-up of the evaluation report’s recommendations.

Recommendation: in order to guarantee the continuation of effective and transparent management of the Facility, it is recommended that additional human resources be allocated to assist the 1035 Facility Manager (P2/P3 UN scale). Due to financial constraints on IOM budgets, two options should be considered:

- 1) **Funding such a position out of the 1035 Facility;**
- 2) **Charging 12 per cent overhead on staff and office costs of projects approved in line with IOM’s rules, with the balance taken out of allocated funds to ensure adequate funding level. If the balance were positive, the surplus would be transferred back to the Facility budget in the following year.**

4.4 Effectiveness in Meeting the Overall Goal and Expectations

There is broad consensus among Member States, as noted through the Governing Bodies’ meetings reports and through the interviews, that the 1035 Facility is a useful and important mechanism that deserves to be maintained and institutionalized. It is a flexible tool for IOM and its Member States to respond to specific and urgent requests for migration management assistance from developing IOM’s Member States and Member States with economy in transition. Satisfaction with the management, as noted in the above sections, and on the relevance of most projects approved, are indications that the 1035 Facility has been effective in meeting the overall goal as stated in the initial Resolution.

It has also been possible to note that, since its beginning, constant improvements have been made to the selection criteria, the management guidelines, the requests to the Field for presenting relevant project proposals and to reporting mechanisms to IOM’s Member States. The request for an evaluation by IOM’s Administration will also contribute to establishing an effective tool for long-term implementation, and in correcting some weaknesses identified. The inclusion of the 1035 Facility

⁴⁷ Reference is made in the recommendation of **Section 4. 2. 2** to an endorsement by the central Government for projects proposed by the Permanent Missions in Geneva. It has been noted in the documentation review that there was a case of a project requested by a Permanent Mission in Geneva and rejected by its central Government.

as a specific agenda item for the SCBF meetings will also help IOM Administration to update the Facility and adapt it to evolving needs through active debates with Member States.

Concerning projects implemented, it has been possible to note, through the sample of projects selected and the feedback received from Member States, that Governments benefiting from the projects were generally satisfied. It has also been mentioned in the questionnaire or through the interviews conducted, that there are positive expectations of the results of projects recently approved under the Facility, both national and regional. One concern was raised by three Member States, however not eligible for 1035 funds and not having benefited from projects, on the lack of focus and small size of some projects approved and on the effectiveness in bringing valuable outcomes. The lack of focus and the small size is addressed through the revised criteria. Concerning effectiveness, the view is not shared by benefiting Member States as noted through the evaluation. However, and as proposed under **Section 5**, a more detailed impact and sustainability evaluation could bring more informed answers and a clear picture of the specific issue.

One major issue that has been noted through official documentation or through the questionnaire is the mode of reporting. Member States showed dissatisfaction over the short timeframe between the reception of the status report prepared by the IOM Administration and the informal consultations and SCBF meetings, leaving insufficient time to examine approved projects in detail. In terms of sharing of information, a list of rejected projects could also be attached to the status report.

Another issue was the information sharing with the Permanent Missions in Geneva on projects approved in their country or region, as well as on monitoring and progress reports. They are confident that such information is shared with the Government in the field, but they would like to be kept informed, as proposals could also come from their level. Additionally, Permanent Missions in Geneva can assist IOM Administration in receiving prior endorsement, especially in the case of regional projects, to show the level of support and commitment of the benefiting government(s) and to guarantee transparency in the approval process.

Recommendation: the IOM Administration has been found effective in meeting the Member States' major expectations. However, reporting to Permanent Missions in Geneva should be improved at two levels:

- 1) Status reports should be sent at least three weeks in advance to IOM Member States, to allow time for detailed examination before informal consultations and the SCBF meetings;**
- 2) Approval notifications and progress reports should be sent to Permanent Missions of IOM Member States benefiting from national and/or regional projects.**

The reporting requirements between IOM and Member States, (with the Permanent Missions in particular), should be added to the revised guidelines when established.

5. OVERALL IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

As mentioned in **Section 2**, it has not been possible to provide a detailed impact evaluation of the 1035 Facility, for two main reasons:

- in a high number of cases, the projects are not yet completed and/or the impact is not expected in the short term;⁴⁸
- the majority of projects are directed towards capacity building activities and/or 'seed' activities, and the feedback received from benefiting Member States through the questionnaire was very low. It is therefore difficult to draw conclusions from the question raised on the impact and sustainability of the Facility in the country/region having benefited from assistance.

Taking into account both above factors, it would certainly be appropriate to examine the possibility in two years time of conducting a follow-up of the present evaluation with a focus on an impact evaluation. If informed in advance of the necessity of their involvement for a relevant and detailed impact analysis, Governments having benefited from 1035 assistance would be better placed to prepare the impact evaluation of the project(s) in their country and/or region. On his/her side, the 1035 Facility Manager could ask IOM Field Offices to include a section briefly describing the impact of the project at the end of its implementation in each final report, bearing in mind that sometimes the impact is not immediate, or is difficult to measure without investments. A preliminary, brief analysis of 'seed' projects and other follow-up activities, e.g. in the case of 'bridging' funds, could also be presented by the Facility Manager at the first SCBF meeting in 2004.

There are, however, indications through official statements, the few questionnaires received or interviews, and information from the field that projects approved had the expected impact, especially for projects such as study tours or follow-up of conferences and workshops for project development. The workshop organized in Gabon in 2001 on MIDA programme was, for instance, considered as having had an impact on the support received from African countries on the initiative. The *'IOM Programme Planning Working Session (with the Issik-Kul dialogue countries)'* also led to the implementation of a major EU-funded programme. The *'Pilot Project for the Construction of an Inter-sectoral Response to Sexual and Reproductive Health, with Emphasis in Prevention and Attention of STD/HIV/AIDS, among Young IDPs and Residents in Receptor Communities of IDPs'* implemented in Colombia led, with an initial investment of USD 48'000, to a follow-up phase of USD 8 million. An external evaluation of a project implemented in Kyrgyzstan for combating trafficking and smuggling in human beings concluded positively on the impact of the technical assistance provided. However, this is insufficient feedback for analyzing the overall impact of the Facility on migration management assistance in IOM developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition.

The lack of information received and available also applies for analysis of sustainability. However, regarding sustainability, it is very important to recall that the commitment of the beneficiaries is a key element for its guarantee. It is interesting to

⁴⁸ For the first two years, 2001/2002, a total of USD 2,810,000 was allocated to projects for implementation. As of April 2003, an amount of USD 1,291,000 was still unspent, i.e. 45% of the total.

mention here that proposals were made for funding follow-up activities in some of the questionnaires. This should be examined by the IOM Administration for possible funding, but could reduce the commitment of the Government(s) in actively working and contributing to the sustainability of the intervention.

Recommendation: in order to complement the work done by this evaluation and to examine the implementation of the recommendations, a follow-up evaluation with a major focus on the impact and sustainability of the 1035 Facility could be planned in two years' time. In the meantime, preparatory work can be organized by the 1035 Facility Manager and benefiting Governments for assembling sufficient data for such a detailed impact analysis. Due to the significant workload and research necessary for preparing and conducting that type of evaluation, funds should be set aside to that end.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

1. *The 1035 Facility as a specific source of funds is consistent with the IOM's Constitution and financial regulations. The Resolution was adopted for the year 2001 and in the text there is no mandatory obligation to allocate such an amount every year. However, the practice established by the IOM Administration for the years 2002 and 2003 in maintaining the fund, the clear indications provided by Member States and subsequent Resolutions adopted by the Council fill in the gap. Should the need arise to adopt again a specific resolution on the 1035 Facility, the issue can be addressed at that time. Resolution 1077(LXXXIV) of December 2002 confirms that voluntary contributions can be made to the Facility in addition to the amount allocated from the discretionary income.*
2. *The criteria for the selection of projects are broad, sometimes too broad, possibly leading to a deviation from the initial intent of Resolution 1035. The revision of the criteria for the selection of projects is necessary at this point in order to frame the selection process and respect the 'spirit' of the Resolution more closely. A proposal is made in this report (see Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3), which also takes into account other selection criteria and guidelines.*
3. *While there is a consensus on the use of the OECD list for establishing the list of IOM Member States beneficiaries, the applicability of the 'Member States in transition' category as stated in the Resolution has been questioned. New solutions will have to be examined and agreed upon, possibly based on the evaluation report's proposals. There is also broad consensus for not excluding non-IOM Member States from Regional projects, but with the condition that the project should first benefit a majority of IOM's developing Member States. There is no consensus for an exclusion measure as a consequence of being in arrears in the payment of assessed contributions.*
4. *It is possible to conclude positively on the effectiveness of the management of the fund by IOM, including the effectiveness of the project review and approval process, even if some projects approved are questioned. Most problems encountered have already been addressed, as noted through the improvement brought every year by the 1035 Facility Manager, or will be duly taken into account in the follow-up of the evaluation report's recommendations.*

Recommendations:

1. IOM's Administration is encouraged to make a proposal for clarifying the selection criteria and guidelines along these lines:

'The 1035 Facility has been established to respond to the needs of IOM's Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition in the field of migration management. The Facility should remain a flexible tool that can respond to important migration demands and challenges rapidly and efficiently. The following criteria and guidelines must be followed in presenting and approving project proposals for funding:

Beneficiaries: the main beneficiaries of the 1035 Facility are IOM Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition. The list of Developing Member States is established according to the OECD list of 'Developing Countries and Territories'; the list of Member States with Economy in Transition according to the OECD sub-category 'Central and Eastern European Countries and New Independent States of the former Soviet Union'. As soon as a country joins the European Union, it will be automatically excluded from the list of beneficiaries, due to the technical assistance offered by the EU in the field of migration management. Voluntary withdrawal from eligibility in solidarity with Member States in greater need is possible and open to any country.

In the context of regional projects, non-IOM Member States can be included among the beneficiaries, but only in the case where a majority of IOM Member States is benefiting from the project.

The decision for an allocation of funds on the basis of an equitable regional distribution remains at the discretion of the 1035 Facility Manager, based on objective factors such as the number of beneficiaries per region.

Special Consideration for the Least Developed Countries: IOM encourages voluntary contributions to the Facility for use exclusively for the benefit of LDC Member States (based on the OECD's LDC category).

Type of assistance: priority should be given to capacity building projects in the various IOM Services (including research and feasibility studies related to such activities). Assistance can be extended to other IOM core activities only if the following two conditions are met: a) the project does not fall under the criteria of exclusion below and b) the IOM Member State endorsing the project proposal formally justifies the benefit and impact in using the Facility (at least two benefiting Member States in case of regional projects). The type of assistance that cannot be provided by the Facility includes the following services or fields of intervention:

- movement;
- emergency;
- major conferences and similar events that are continuations of on-going dialogue and similar activities already well established. However, other conferences and similar events that seem to be useful in launching new

regional processes, opening new geographic coverage or in increasing programme planning and implementation between IOM and Member States should not be excluded. The 'seed' concept should be applied in such cases and guide the approval criterion. Fundraising should, however, be also explored before funding conferences with high-level country representatives through the 1035 Facility. Assistance for project development initiatives funded as a follow-up of a conference or similar event is acceptable;

- projects mainly supporting IOM Staff and Office costs in a given country or region, including projects proposed for the specific purpose of opening an IOM office, are not eligible. IOM Staff and Office costs can however be included in the budget for project implementation following the usual IOM projectization approach.

Type of project: any type of project can be presented for consideration under the Facility, be it national or regional. Cross-country, cross-theme and cross-regional approaches deserve specific attention due to the nature of migration phenomena and problems, as well as the shared benefit and impact among targeted countries. Priority should also be given to seed, start-up or pilot projects, not only due to the difficulties in fundraising from normal sources, but also due to their potential for development of major initiatives. Bridging fund projects and projects that provide co-funding to major donor commitments can also be considered, but need to be well justified. The IOM SPROUT or Project Document format must be utilized.

Funding level: for national projects, a maximum amount of USD 50,000 is established. There is however the possibility of increasing the budget in exceptional circumstances, up to a maximum of USD 100,000 if the increase is well justified in accordance with the purpose of the project. In the case of regional projects, a maximum amount of USD 200,000 can be considered. If over USD 100,000, proof of previous or on-going fundraising efforts should be presented.

Application Procedure: A project can be presented by the central Government of an eligible Member State, by its Permanent Mission in Geneva with, however, confirmation of the endorsement by the capital, by an IOM Mission (IOM Field Office or IOM Mission with Regional Function) or by an IOM Headquarters Department. In all cases, the channelling IOM Mission or Headquarters Department must provide assurance that the benefiting Member State(s) is/are fully aware of the project and supportive of 1035 expenditure for that purpose. In the case of regional projects, a minimum of two IOM Member States must endorse the project proposal. The projects are referred to the IOM Mission(s) for coordination and final development. The 1035 Facility Manager may ask for additional documentation, when deemed necessary.

2. The guidelines for project development, approval and implementation as presented during the 89th Session of the SCBF in May 2003 (SCBF/256), are relevant to the IOM administrative, financial and operational guidelines. They can be maintained as such and added to the proposal for revised criteria of selection, in particular point 4.a), 4.c), 4.d), 4.e), 4.f), taking however into account any adjustments that could be brought to the IOM internal structure in 2004 and that would have a bearing on the

management of the Facility. Point 4.b) about the use of the OECD list as a reference has been moved under the revised criteria for selection. The policy of reinvestment can be added to the guidelines, including also a provision for approved project not implemented in a two years timeframe.

3. In order to guarantee the continuation of effective and transparent management of the Facility, it is recommended that additional human resources be allocated to assist the 1035 Facility Manager (P2/P3 UN scale). Due to financial constraints on IOM budgets, two options should be considered:
 - 1) Funding such a position out of the 1035 Facility;
 - 2) Charging 12 per cent overhead on staff and office costs of projects approved in line with IOM's rules, with the balance taken out of allocated funds to ensure adequate funding level. If the balance were positive, the surplus would be transferred back to the Facility budget in the following year.
4. The IOM Administration has been found effective in meeting the Member States' major expectations. However, reporting to Permanent Missions in Geneva should be improved at two levels:
 - 1) Status reports should be sent at least three weeks in advance to IOM Member States, to allow time for detailed examination before informal consultations and the SCBF meetings;
 - 2) Approval notifications and progress reports should be sent to Permanent Missions of IOM Member States benefiting from national and/or regional projects.

The reporting requirements between IOM and Member States, (with the Permanent Missions in particular), should be added to the revised guidelines when established.

5. In order to complement the work done by this evaluation and to examine the implementation of the recommendations, a follow-up evaluation with a major focus on the impact and sustainability of the 1035 Facility could be planned in two years' time. In the meantime, preparatory work can be organized by the 1035 Facility Manager and benefiting Governments for assembling sufficient data for such a detailed impact analysis. Due to the significant workload and research necessary for preparing and conducting that type of evaluation, funds should be set aside to that end.



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

**INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS
ON THE 1035 FACILITY AND
MIGRATION INITIATIVES (MI)**

English only

Geneva, 9 April 2003

**EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION
TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) 5th paragraph, adopted at IOM's 432nd meeting on 29 November 2000, requested ***'the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'***. The decision to allocate USD 1 million from Discretionary Income was taken to balance a 5 per cent increase in the Administrative Part of the Budget, following years of zero nominal growth. A total of USD 1,430,000 was allocated for the Facility in 2001; in 2002 the final allocation was USD 1,380,000 and USD 1,430,000 is budgeted for 2003.

The criteria and guidelines established by IOM's Administration to facilitate and streamline allocation of these funds were outlined in document MC/EX/631 and Member States were invited to comment on these guidelines. In June 2001, the criteria were completed to take into account additional suggestions made by Member States. The criteria and guidelines for utilizing the funds, as revised, are:

- to fund seed/start-up projects and entire projects if/when they do not exceed USD 50,000;
- to fund feasibility studies, where applicable;
- to fund high-priority requests for assistance from Member States concerned;
- to fund incentives for project development initiatives;
- to fund national and/or regional project development initiatives;
- not normally to fund emergencies, as there are other financial funding mechanisms for such purposes;
- not to fund conferences or events for which other sources of funding already exist in the Organization's Programme and Budget.

During the 87th Session of the SCBF (May 2002), as noted under point 7.b of the Conference Room Paper *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition*, the Administration recommended that the 1035 Facility be internally reviewed. This recommendation was reiterated in the similarly titled Conference Room Paper presented in the 88th Session of the SCBF (November 2002): 'An evaluation will be made of the impact of the 1035 facility and a review will also be carried out of the criteria guiding the allocation of funds in the course of 2003'. IOM Member States voiced their support for this initiative. Document MC/EX/642 *Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report of the Eighty-seventh Session*, notes that: 'The need for a process of review and evaluation of the 1035 Facility was also stressed, perhaps in the form of an overall internal review of its impact'.

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Based on the above statements, the proposed review will take the form of an internal evaluation, conducted by the Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Inspector General. The overall objective of the evaluation is:

To review the implementation of the 1035 Facility in relation to its intended goals and implementation procedures. In particular to evaluate the Facility's criteria and guidelines, the performance and achievements of representative supported projects, and the Facility's overall impact. The evaluation will also address issues of sustainability of the Facility, and matters related to institutional support for its administration and management.

More specifically, the evaluation will examine:

- The relevance of the 1035 Facility, as a specific source of funds with special objectives and allocation procedures, to the IOM Constitution and financial regulations;
- The relevance of the criteria and guidelines of the 1035 Facility in relation to IOM's overall operational guidelines and activities, and in relation to the overall goal of the Facility;
- The appropriateness and effectiveness of the project review and decision-making process;
- The achievements of representative funded projects in relation to the criteria and overall goals of the Facility;
- The value added by projects approved under the 1035 Facility and follow-up activities;
- The effectiveness in achieving its overall goals and in meeting IOM Member States' expectations;
- The overall impact of the Facility;
- Issues related to sustainability of the Facility, including matters related to institutional support for the Facility's management and administration.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will include the following components:

- a) A documentation review: the Technical Co-operation Unit in MMS will be responsible for providing the necessary documentation, including selection process notes, activity and project performance reports, financial data, correspondence with Member States and IOM field offices, specific agreements and/or sub-agreements signed in the framework of selected projects and any other documentation relevant to the exercise.
- b) A series of interviews with IOM Member State representatives, IOM Headquarters Departments and Field Offices, other programme beneficiaries when appropriate and any other institutions or persons that the Evaluator or the Programme Manager deem necessary. The schedule of interviews will be finalized with all concerned.
- c) The interviews may be complemented by written questionnaires.

4. RESOURCES AND TIMING

The evaluation will be conducted by OIG and costs will be borne by OIG. Reports on the preliminary and final results will be presented under special agenda items of either or both informal consultations and Subcommittee on Budget and Finance meetings in 2003. It is anticipated that a draft report will be available by the end of May 2003.

Interviews

IOM Member States:

P. Birdsall, First Secretary, USA, Permanent Mission, Geneva
J.N. Busiega, Counsellor, Kenya, Permanent Mission, Geneva,
(also acting as the Head of the African Group)
W. Lundy, Counsellor, Canada, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Focus Group Discussion with GRULAC:

M. Bello de Kemper, Counsellor, Dominican Republic, MP, Geneva
N. Cruz, First Secretary, Nicaragua, MP, Geneva
M. Duchatellier, Counsellor, Haiti, MP, Geneva, Head of GRULAC
V. Gonzalez, Minister and Counsellor, Colombia, MP, Geneva
A. Hernandez-Basave, Minister, Mexico, MP, Geneva
A. de Hoz, Minister, Argentina, MP, Geneva
M. A. Perez, Attaché, Honduras, MP, Geneva
W. Santana, First Secretary, Venezuela, MP, Geneva

Attendance at the Informal Consultation of 9 April 2003

Countries which participated in the meeting included: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Dominican Republic, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United States of America and Zambia.

Attendance at the IOM-1035 Fund meeting organized by the Canadian Permanent Mission on 4 June 2003

Countries which participated in the meeting included: Canada, Croatia, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, Pakistan, Switzerland and Thailand.

IOM Staff Members

I. Omelaniuk, Director, Migration Management Services Department, Geneva,
J. de Wilde, Director, Programme Support Department, Geneva,
O. Sarmad, Director, Department of Budget and Finance, Geneva,
C. Harns, Head, Technical Cooperation on Migration, 1035 Facility Manager, Geneva,
S. Nonnenmacher, Labor Migration Service Assistant, 1035 Facility part-time Assistant.

Bibliography

- MC/2115, Report on the Hundredth Session of the Executive Committee, July 2003
MC/2113, Financial Report for the Year ended 31 December 2002, April 2003
MC/2097, Draft Report on the Eighty-Fourth Session of the Council, February 2003
MC/2095, Resolutions adopted by the Council at its Eighty-Fourth Session, December 2002
MC/2088, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Eighth Session, November 2002
MC/2083, Programme and Budget for 2003, October 2002
MC/2081, Report on the Ninety-Ninth Session of the Executive Committee, June 2002
MC/2080, Report of the Director General on the Work of the Organization for the Year 2001, May 2002
MC/2043, Report on the Ninety-Eighth Session of the Executive Committee, June 2001
MC/2049, Programme and Budget for 2002, October 2001
MC/2019, Resolutions adopted by the Council at its Eightieth Session, December 2000
MC/2016, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Fourth Session, November 2000
MC/2014, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Third (Additional) Session, October 2000
MC/2010, Programme and Budget for 2001, October 2000
- MC/EX/651, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Ninth Session, May 2003
MC/EX/650, Zero Nominal Growth in the Administrative Part of the Budget and IOM's Growth, May 2003
MC/EX/642, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Seventh Session, May 2002
MC/EX/633, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Fifth Session Part I, May 2001
MC/EX/631, Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2001, April 2001
- MC/C/SR/446, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-Sixth Meeting, January 2003
MC/C/SR/445, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-Fifth Meeting, January 2003
MC/C/SR/441, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-First Meeting, January 2003
MC/EX/SR/438, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Eighth Meeting, July 2003
MC/EX/SR/437, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Seventh Meeting, July 2003
MC/EX/SR/436, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Sixth Meeting, June 2002
MC/EX/SR/433, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Third Meeting, June 2001
- SCBF/257, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 30 April 2003), April 2003
SCBF/256, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Final Report 1 January to 31 December 2002), April 2003
Informal Consultations on the 1035 Facility and Migration Initiatives, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 31 December 2002), April 2003
Conference Room Paper/I, 88th Session of the SCBF, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 31 October 2002), November 2002

Conference Room Paper, 99th Session of the Executive Committee, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, June 2002

Conference Room Paper, 87th Session of the SCBF, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, May 2002

Informal Consultations on Financial and Budgetary Issues, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, February 2002

Conference Room Paper, 86th Session of the SCBF, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, October 2001

EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY IOM MEMBER STATES

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) - 5th paragraph, adopted on 29 November 2000, requested *'the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'*. A total of US\$1,430,000 was allocated for the facility in years 2001 and 2003; in 2002 the final allocation was US\$1,380,000.

During the 87th Session of the SCBF (May 2002), the Administration recommended that the 1035 Facility be internally reviewed and IOM Member States voiced their support for this initiative. The overall objective of the evaluation is:

To review the implementation of the 1035 Facility in relation to its intended goals and implementation procedures. In particular to evaluate the Facility's criteria and guidelines, the performance and achievements of representative supported projects, and the Facility's overall impact. The evaluation will also address issues of sustainability of the Facility, and matters related to institutional support for its administration and management.

To assist in this evaluation, we would very much appreciate your taking the time to complete this questionnaire on behalf of your Government as fully as possible and to return it, either by fax or e-mail, by 9 May 2003 to Evaluation/Office of the Inspector General (fax number: 0041-22-798.61.50; email address: eva@iom.int). Your response will remain confidential and will be used only for the purposes of this evaluation.

1. Do you think, after two years of implementation, that the criteria for allocation of the 1035 facility to projects are appropriate?

YES

NO

- If no, what changes do you suggest?

2. Member States requested IOM to allocate US\$1 million to the Facility in addition to the amount already set aside for that purpose by the IOM administration. The amounts available for the facility were US\$1,430,000 for the first and third year and US\$1,380,000 for the second year. Do you think that IOM should:

- a) Maintain the current level of US\$1,430,000
- b) Continue to make efforts to increase the funds allocated to the Facility through fundraising efforts, and if so do you think such additional contributions should be ‘earmarked’ toward specific areas of activity (please suggest the areas)?

3. Are you satisfied with the overall reporting for the Facility (informal consultations and formal reports presented), and with the information sharing on the selection of projects funded?

YES NO

- If no, why?

4. Are you satisfied with the list of countries that can receive funding from the Facility, and with the rationale for their selection?

YES NO

- If no, why?

5. Do you think that the current US\$50,000 maximum amount per project for a particular country is appropriate?

YES NO

- If no, which limit do you suggest and why?

6. Do you think that a maximum amount and specific criteria should also be established for regional projects (including a possible participation of non-member states)?

YES NO

- If yes, which limit and criteria do you suggest?

7. Do you think that a maximum number of projects/amount per country should be established annually in order to ensure further equitable distribution of funds?

YES NO

- If yes, how many/how much?

8. Resolution 1035 asks for an ‘equitable regional distribution’: are you satisfied with the distribution of funds for the first two years of activity?

YES NO

- If no, why?

9. Did your Country benefit from a project funded by the Facility?

YES NO

a) If yes, are you satisfied with the overall outcome and impact of the project?

YES NO

Comments, if any:

- Were you properly informed on the implementation status of the project?

YES NO

Comments, if any:

- Do you think that follow-up activities should still be funded by the Facility?

YES NO

Comments, if any:

b) If your Country did not benefit from projects funded by the Facility, was it because:

- ☐ Your Country does not belong to the category benefiting from the Facility.
- ☐ No projects were needed and/or submitted by your Government through the IOM Office.
- ☐ IOM was not pro-active enough in your Country for submitting proposals.
- ☐ A proposal was submitted but rejected because it did not fit the criteria.

10. Would you be in favour of assigning a small portion of the 1035 Facility funds to increase the support for administering and managing the Facility to provide better and enhanced service to its stakeholders (for instance charging 6 per cent of the budget of approved projects)?

YES NO

If yes, how much?

Thank you for your contribution.

Evaluation
Office of the Inspector General

Member States who completed the Questionnaire:

Argentina
Australia
Austria
Belgium
Benin
Canada
Colombia
Haiti
Iran
Kazakhstan
Madagascar
Netherlands
Romania
Switzerland
United Kingdom
Venezuela

Only 16 Member States answered the questionnaire, representing 16% of the total of Member States at the time of the evaluation. An extension of the deadline was formally proposed at the SCBF Session in May 2003, but without a positive result. In order to facilitate the reading of the results, percentages will be used. No further mention will be made of the number of countries. Comments will be condensed where possible.

Data analysis: Member States

Q.1 *Relevance of the criteria:* 56 % consider the criteria appropriate; 44% do not.

Main comments: Three comments were made on the need for better focus, mainly on migration management capacity building. One comment raised the issue of applying an exclusion criterion as an alternative to Article 4, another proposed focusing on LDCs. There was a suggestion to take into account the migration situation in the selection of countries, mainly the problems linked to it. The 1035 Facility should avoid funding projects for IOM's partners (regional or international organizations).

Q.2 *Total amount of USD 1,430,000 allocated to the Facility:* 44% propose maintaining it at the same level, 44% wish to increase it and 12% are divided on the subject. Many countries propose waiting for the results of the evaluation before taking firm decision on the subject.

Main comments: Only one country proposes increasing the amount to USD 2 million taking the difference from DI. The same country, however, also suggests that the limit of USD 2 million should not be rigid and that voluntary contributions could be added, but only if there were a better definition of the scope and criteria of the Facility. Two countries proposed earmarking the surplus to specific areas of intervention, one towards the socioeconomic welfare of target populations and the other to capacity building and assisted returns.

Q.3 *Overall reporting and information sharing:* 69% are satisfied, 31% are not.

Main comments: Three countries ask for more information on the criteria used for each project approved. One country also underlines the need for more information on the benefits of projects including non-Member States. Two comments also raise the need to be informed more in advance, especially when informal consultations and SCBF meetings are taking place. One comment was made on more detailed financial reporting, another on better synergy regarding information-sharing between Permanent Missions, central governments, IOM Field Offices and IOM Headquarters. Finally, the question of the impact of projects examined through an evaluation was underlined, and the necessity of avoiding micro-management by Member States and IOM Administration was mentioned in justification for maintaining present situation.

Q.4 *List of benefiting countries and the selection process:* 69% are satisfied, 25 % are not and 6% have no opinion.

Main comments: Three countries raise the problem of EU candidate countries and the assistance they receive for migration management. One country also points out that special attention should be given to LDCs. One country considers that the human rights situation should be included as a criterion. Another country suggests waiting for the results of the evaluation in order to take informed decisions on the subject.

Q.5 Limit of USD 50,000 for national projects: 20% consider it appropriate, 50% do not and 30% have no opinion on the subject.

Main comments: All the countries that answered negatively proposed increasing the limit, many of them suggesting an amount of USD 100,000. One country suggests keeping the amount of USD 50,000 as an average, but with the possibility of increasing it to USD 100,000 where specific advantages can be identified. This will also avoid reaching saturation point for small-scale projects, with diminishing returns. Four countries suggest considering the needs of eligible countries, and therefore possibly enabling bigger projects to be implemented. Three comments were made to the effect that if the criteria and scope were re-examined, the limit could be established accordingly. They propose waiting for the results of the evaluation.

Q.6 Specific criteria and a maximum amount for regional projects: 44% consider that criteria and a limit should be established, 50% propose maintaining the status quo and 6% have no opinion.

Main comments: Only a few comments were made on the question. One country suggests a limit between USD 100,000 and USD 150,000. Three comments referred to the link of establishing criteria and limits with the 'revised' scope of the Facility, waiting for the results of the evaluation. Three comments were made on the participation of non-Member States, one excluding their participation and two accepting it only if Member States remained the main beneficiaries. One country suggested a criterion of 'similarity of needs' in the region covered.

Q.7 Maximum of projects per country and per year: 37% consider that a maximum number of projects or amount should be established annually, 50% do not and 13% have no opinion.

Main comments: Only a few comments were made on the subject. Two countries consider that an amount of USD 100,000 per country should be established. One suggests a limit of USD 50,000 for 'seed' projects. Two countries consider that this decision should be left to IOM, taking into account, however, an equitable distribution. Two comments again drew the link with the Facility's objective and felt that the issue should be examined again after the evaluation.

Q.8 'Equitable distribution': 63% consider it appropriate, 12% do not and 25% have no opinion or cannot answer.

Main comments: Three countries did not answer the questions, due to the lack of references for taking a stand on the issue. One country draws a parallel with Question 1 on the relevance of criteria and suggests again the exclusion as an alternative to Article 4, showing in such a case that Africa and the Middle East region and the Americas and the Caribbean region have been over-funded. Another country, however, considers that Latin America was under-funded. One comment suggests taking into account the number of LDCs and another suggests looking at a balance inside each region.

Q.9 Did the country benefit from the 1035: 44% did not benefit as they were ineligible; another 31% did not benefit but were eligible: either no projects were submitted or projects are still under discussion; 25% benefited from the Facility.

Main comments: Three countries that benefited are satisfied with the impact of the project and the information sharing. One country considers that more information should have been shared with the its Permanent Mission in Geneva. All countries consider that the Facility should not fund follow-up interventions.

Q.10 Allocation of funds for administrative support: 37% are in favour of such an allocation, 50% are not and 13% have no opinion.

Main comments: Two countries that answered negatively are ready to re-consider their opinion based on the results of the evaluation. Among the countries without an opinion, two consider that the question will be answered by the evaluation. Among the countries that are open to such a possibility, various suggestions were made: 6% of the Facility as suggested, 5%, between 1% and 3%, and 2%. One country suggests receiving further proposals by the Administration.

EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY: QUESTIONNAIRE TO IOM FIELD MISSIONS

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) requested *'the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'*. A total of USD 1,430,000 was allocated for the facility in years 2001 and 2003; in 2002 the final allocation was USD 1,380,000.

During the 87th Session of the SCBF (May 2002), the Administration recommended that the 1035 Facility be internally reviewed and IOM Member States voiced their support for this initiative. The overall objective of the evaluation is:

'To review the implementation of the 1035 Facility in relation to its intended goals and implementation procedures. In particular to evaluate the Facility' s criteria and guidelines, the performance and achievements of representative supported projects, and the Facility' s overall impact. The evaluation will also address issues of sustainability of the Facility, and matters related to institutional support for its administration and management'.

To assist in this evaluation, we would very much appreciate if you would take the time to complete this questionnaire as fully as possible and to return it by 7 May 2003 to Evaluation/Office of the Inspector General (email address: eva@iom.int). Your response will remain confidential and will be used only for the purposes of this evaluation.

(Please refer also to the attached 2002 status report on 1035 as a reference for background, criteria, selection and allocation information concerning the Facility)

1. Did your Office examine the possibility of using the 1035 Facility to fund a project/activity in your country/region?

YES

NO

Please explain why:

If yes, did you coordinate the project proposal with the Government? YES NO

If you did not coordinate with the Government, please explain why:

2. Did you benefit from resources of the 1035 to implement a project or projects?

YES NO

If yes:

- Did the project complement another activity/project or was it a stand-alone intervention?

Complement Stand-alone

- Did the project result in follow-up activities that were separately funded by donors or sustained by the government? YES NO
- Did you provide PTU and the appropriate Service Area with monitoring reports on a regular basis? YES NO
- Did you inform the Government on the progress made? YES NO
- How do you evaluate the impact of the project and the added value?

3. Do you think that the criteria for selection of projects are sufficiently detailed and should not be changed?

YES NO

If no, please explain:

4. In case you submitted a project proposal for funding, are you satisfied with the selection process and the feedback received from the relevant Service Areas and the 1035 Facility?

YES NO

If no, please explain:

5. Do you think that the funds allocated to the 1035 Facility should be increased compare to 2003 (USD 1,430,000 for 2001 and 2003; USD 1,380,000 for 2002)?

YES NO

If yes, at which level and how (fundraising, allocation from DI)?

6. How do you perceive/evaluate the 1035 Facility?

7. Do you think that it should be maintained as a specific source of funds for the benefit of developing MS and MS in transition?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

Data sources:

- 13 MRF answered the questionnaire, 10 being in countries eligible for the 1035 Facility
- 26 IOM Field Offices answered it, 15 being in countries eligible for the 1035 Facility
- 64% of the replies are from IOM Offices in eligible countries
- the total number of replies represents 40% of IOM Field Offices around the world

Data analysis: IOM Field Missions

Q.1. Examining the possibility of using the 1035 Facility: 70% answered yes, 28% answered no and 2% did not reply.

If yes, did you coordinate with the Government: 55% answered positively, 19% negatively and 26% as not applicable.

Main comments: Most of the comments were explaining why they considered using 1035 funds. A majority of them were either for 'seed'/pilot projects often difficult to fundraise, one with the specific intention to attract further funds, or for funding a 'platform', a support unit for migration management, being National or Regional. Two Field Offices made requests linked to specific needs (HIV and migration and counter-trafficking). One MRF located in an ineligible country made requests however for eligible countries in its region for 1035 funds.

Q.2 Did you benefit from resources: 58% answered positively, 11% negatively and 31% did not answer.

If yes, was it a stand-alone activity or did it complement another one: 50% answered that it complements another activity, 8% a stand-alone project and 42% N/A.

Did it result in follow-up activities funded by donors or sustained by the Government: 40% answered positively, 14% negatively and 46% N/A.

Main comments: some Field Offices stressed that the projects were continuing and it was not possible to answer on the follow-up.

Did you provide HQ with monitoring reports: 36% answered positively, 20% negatively, 44% N/A.

Did you inform the Government on progress made: 46% answered positively, 2% negatively, 52% N/A.

Main comments: One MRF mentioned that in some cases the Government was not informed. A Field Office plans to do so in the near future.

How they evaluate the impact: 47% answered the question. Many missions where the project(s) is (are) completed already noted a positive impact through additional funds received or projects implemented, or the replication of activities in other countries in the region, or through an increased visibility of the assistance that can be provided, or to strengthen relationships among partners, or with an upgraded standard of services in the Government. One MRF mentioned that in its region's results were ranging from good to modest, for instance on the lack of granted sustainability. One Field Mission expects a positive impact even if the project is not yet finished.

Q.3. About the criteria for selection: 65% consider them appropriate, 21% do not and 14% did not answer.

Main comments: One Mission proposed increasing the limit to USD 100,000 instead of USD 50,000. Another suggested not allocating 1035 funds to MRFs as they already received DI for implementing activities in their region. Two Missions considered that criteria should be revised every year, based on experiences and major migration problems arising. Two other Missions asked for maintained flexibility. One Mission considered the criteria vague and requiring better definition. One Mission considered that too great a proportion of funds were allocated to conferences or seminars and not enough for direct help to migrants.

Q.4 Approval process and feedback received from HQ: 54% are satisfied, 3% are not and 43% N/A.

Main comments: One Mission had a problem in knowing which Service at HQ endorsed its project. Another Mission was complaining on the length of time needed for receiving feedback and the volume of exchanges of correspondence before receiving the final approval.

Q.5 Total amount allocated to the Facility: 59% consider that the amount should be increased, 23% do not and 18% did not answer.

Main comments: Many proposals were supportive for additional fundraising activities. Some Missions were however proposing to share the increase between DI allocation and additional fundraising. Concerning the amount, it varies from USD 1.5 up to USD 3 million. Some Missions suggested adapting it according to the effectiveness and needs of the Facility, therefore proposing that it could also be permanently increased.

Q.6 How they perceive/evaluate the Facility: 87% answered the question.

Main comments: Many comments highlight the usefulness and flexibility of the Facility in funding seed, start-up, pilot or innovative projects and in answering urgent needs. Other comments underlined the benefit for IOM in terms of visibility of being a 'donor' agency, even if funds allocated were comparatively small, they could be extremely useful. Some comments referred to the benefit for governments of being IOM Members. Two comments also referred to the possibility of increased partnership, especially with UN, and having the capacity to fund joint initiatives.

Q.7 Beneficiaries – Developing Member States and Member States in Transition: 86% suggest maintaining both categories, 5% do not consider it appropriate, 9% N/A.

Main comments: two Missions consider it important to open the Facility to Observers and even non-Member States.



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

**INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS
ON THE 1035 FACILITY AND
MIGRATION INITIATIVES (MI)**

English only

Geneva, 9 April 2003

**SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION**

(Status report 1 January to 31 December 2002)

**SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION**

Background and Guidelines

1. Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX), adopted on 29 November 2000, requested the Director General to allocate USD 1 million in 2001 from the Discretionary Income of the Organization for project seed money in developing Member States and Member States in transition. The USD 1 million were in addition to the USD 430,000 also designated for this purpose in 2001, including USD 80,000 from the interest on the Sasakawa Endowment Fund,⁴⁹ bringing the total to USD 1,430,000 for 2001. These funds were to be used for migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes.
2. The initial criteria and guidelines established by the IOM Administration to facilitate and streamline the allocation of these funds were outlined in document MC/EX/631, and Member States were invited to comment on these guidelines. In June 2001, the criteria were completed, to take into account suggestions made by Member States.
3. The criteria and guidelines for utilizing the funds, as revised, are:
 - to fund seed/start-up projects and entire projects if/when they do not exceed USD 50,000;
 - to fund feasibility studies, where applicable;
 - to fund high-priority requests for assistance from concerned Member States;
 - to fund incentives for project development initiatives;
 - to fund national and/or regional project development initiatives;
 - not normally to fund emergencies, as there are other financial funding mechanisms for such purposes; and
 - not to fund conferences or events for which other sources of funding already exist in the Programme and Budget of the Organization.
4. To complement the guidelines, the IOM Administration established and continues to revise and improve specific implementing procedures to guide the application and review process, as well as the process of reporting on projects in progress or completed. These implementing procedures now include the following:

⁴⁹The Sasakawa Endowment Fund was established in 1990 for the purpose of promoting the expansion of the transfer of human resources programmes and other migration for development activities, for furthering the understanding and analysis of migration and for responding to emergency and other humanitarian migration needs.

- (a) The funds are managed under the programme name "1035 Facility". The Head of the Technical Cooperation on Migration (TCM) Service serves as the 1035 Facility Programme Manager.
- (b) The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee listing of developing and transition countries is used as a basis for determining the eligibility of Member States to participate as recipient countries of the Facility.⁵⁰
- (c) Projects funded from the 1035 Facility follow the same process of programme development and approval as all other IOM projects, while specifically addressing 1035 Facility project criteria. IOM Field Missions/Offices submit the project proposal or concept to the appropriate Service at Headquarters for review. The Service collaborates with the Field Office to resolve any issues with the proposal in its draft stages, and passes the endorsed project to the 1035 Facility Programme Manager for inclusion in the group of proposals for 1035 Facility consideration. Headquarters units may also request 1035 Facility support for special activities, particularly those extending across regions or Services.
- (d) Priority requests received at Headquarters from representatives of eligible Member States are welcome, as are discussions between Member State representatives and relevant Headquarters units of possible initiatives for consideration under the Facility. All initiatives are referred to the IOM Field Mission/Office for coordination and final development.
- (e) The Project Tracking Unit of the Programme Support Department includes 1035 Facility proposals in the normal project tracking procedures. Regular progress reports are expected and are requested through the established reporting channels, managed through the Project Tracking Unit within the Programme Support Department. Financial reporting is tracked through the usual accounting procedures of the Accounting Office within the Administrative Support Department. The project managers are expected to bring the project in on time and within budget, achieving the planned objectives, and to ensure that any adjustment to objectives and budget are made in concert with the relevant project counterparts and Headquarters Services.
- (f) The 1035 Facility Manager reviews the proposal with the Service to resolve any outstanding issues relating to 1035 Facility criteria, evaluates the proposal in relation to other requests from the region and according to overall regional balance, and recommends approval or non-approval of 1035 Facility support to the Director of the Migration Management Services and the Director of the Programme Support Department. The request is then passed to the Director General for the final decision. The Facility Manager also advises on how unexpended 1035 funds may be utilized for further projects under the Facility.

⁵⁰From the OECD Development Assistance Committee list, all countries included under "Part I: Developing Countries and Territories" are eligible for 1035 Facility allocations. Of those countries listed under "Part II: Countries and Territories in Transition" only those in the first category are eligible for 1035 Facility allocations (Central and Eastern European Countries and New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union).

“1035” DI FOR SEEDING PROJECTS IN DEVELOPING/TRANSITION COUNTRIES

To: Director General

From: Director, Migration Management Services
Director, Programme Support Division

Date: 24 June 2002

Project: Third South American Conference on Migration

IOM Region: Latin America

Funding Amount: USD 51,000

Requesting Mission/Unit:	Benefiting IOM Members:	Other Benefiting Countries:
MRF Buenos Aires	Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	

This allocation will cover coordination meetings with Governments, documents preparation, arrangements for Conference itself, and for participation of IOM' South American Officials and Experts and participation of respective delegations. In addition to that, at the Cartagena Meeting, Governments representatives made to IOM, new request for technical cooperation activities. This was reflected in the summary of the meeting. To further support the process, and in particular to help the governments prepare for the Third Conference, 1035 support is requested.

Recommended (Yes/No): No

Reasons for negative recommendation:

Considering the funding at 150,000 in 2001 from 1035 for Follow Up to the Second South American Conference on Migration, which included several technical cooperation actions, and considering that the Conferences now represent an on-going process in which key donors have expressed interest, further funding from 1035 to support the Third Conference is not recommended.

While the activities and process are quite significant and important to IOM and the involved Member States, the 1035 contribution would, in this case, serve as a continuing budgeting vehicle for a process that should by now be well-seeded with donors and participating countries.

“1035” DI FOR SEEDING PROJECTS IN DEVELOPING/TRANSITION COUNTRIES

To: Director General

From: Director, Migration Management Services
Director, Programme Support Division

Date: 24 June 2002

Project: Albania Migrants Assistance Center

IOM Region: Europe

Funding Amount: USD 19,500

Requesting		
<u>Mission/Unit:</u>	<u>Benefiting IOM Members:</u>	<u>Other Benefiting Countries:</u>
IOM Tirana	Albania	

The purpose of this project is to create a migrant assistance centre, which will act as a “one stop shop” for all potential Albanian migrants. This centre will offer a number of services to migrants in the pre-departure phase and in the post return phase of the migration process. In this way the project will fulfil two wide goals one of preventing irregular and illegal migration, and promoting legal migration, and the other of harnessing the development potential of migrants who are returning and reintegrating into the host community. Specifically, the Center will:

- ♣ Reduce the burden upon Consular authorities by assisting them by providing services to migrants;
- ♣ Provide Albanian emigrants with accurate and free information concerning possibilities for legal migration, thus preventing recourse to inaccurate information and illegal channels of emigration;
- ♣ Ensure return migrants have access to information concerning employment and education upon return to Albania; and,
- ♣ Raise awareness among potential migrants especially young people to the risks of illegal migration, and to offer support and advice relating to migration issues.

Funding from the 1035 would complement anticipated and received funding from Belgium, Canada and Italy for various specific activities of the Center, and would allow the Center to initially operate as a full service provider, and provide a basis for evaluating its effectiveness in that regard.

Recommended (Yes/No): Yes



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION

Policy on Reinvestment of Unexpended 1035 Facility Allocations

The following policy is seen as consistent with and supportive of the basic intent of Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX), adopted on 29 November 2000, and the specific implementing procedures for 1035 projects, as noted originally in Conference Room Paper *Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition* at the 87th Session of the SCBF, in particular item 7,b which notes: "The project managers are expected to bring the project in on time and within budget, achieving the planned objectives, and to ensure that any adjustment to objectives and budget are made in concert with the relevant Headquarters Services."

Policy points:

- Unexpended funds from 1035 Facility projects that have been completed or otherwise closed will be reinvested without exception in the 1035 Facility for re-allocation.
- As a general rule, these unexpended funds will be added to the pool of funds available for allocation through the usual 1035 application and allocation procedures.
- In special cases the Facility Manager may make a recommendation to the two relevant Directors (MMS and PSD) to assign a particular amount of these funds to an existing 1035 project that has demonstrated sound management and that also demonstrates specific unforeseen legitimate financial needs. These decisions will be made at the level of the two Directors, upon the recommendation of the Facility Manager. When agreement can not be reached on such a specific re-allocation, the funds in question will be assigned to the current year's 1035 Facility overall fund.

26 February 2003

DATA MANAGEMENT TABLE

ANNEX 7

UPDATE ON SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND MEMBER STATES IN TRANSITION (1035 FACILITY) 2003 APPROVED/PENDING PROJECTS: 27 May 2003

Responsible Mission/Unit	Project	Amounts in USD		
		Pending	Funded	Recommended
<u>Africa and the Middle East</u>	(31/74:41,89%)			
IOM Guinea	Mobilization of Guinean and Sierra Leonean Women in Favour of Social and Economic Construction of their Country of Origin	12,000		
IOM Sudan	IDP Return and Reintegration in Sudan, Socio-economic, Demographic Survey		50,000	
IOM Tunisia	Migration Dialogue in the Western Mediterranean	150,000		100,000
IOM Zambia	Effective Utilisation of Zambian Students and Young Professionals for Regional and National Development	200,800		
MRF Cairo - Yemen	Migration Dialogue in the Arabian Peninsula	49,584		49,584
MRF Dhakar	MIDA CEDEAO	50,000		
MRF Nairobi	Programme Planning Workshop with the Countries of the Greater Horn of Africa		27,000	
MRF Nairobi	East Africa Technical Cooperation on Migration Management	0		
MRF Nairobi	MIDA EAC	50,000		
MRF Pretoria	MIDA SADC	50,000		
MRF Pretoria	IOM/NORAD Cooperation on Migration Matters in SADC	0		
MRF Pretoria	MIDA Madagascar	50,000		
MRF Pretoria	Addressing Health Workers Migration in the SADC Sub-Region	0		
Sub-totals:		612,384	77,000	149,584
			5.58%	16.43%
				10.85%

Responsible Mission/Unit	Project	Amounts in USD		
		Pending	Funded	Recommended
<u>Americas and the Caribbean</u>	(19/74: 25.68%)			
IOM Bolivia	Technical Cooperation on Border Management	0		
IOM Colombia	Migration and Health Focal point: IOM-PAHO	50,000		
IOM Ecuador	Establecimiento de una base de datos de trabajadores migratorios ecuatorianos en España.	50,000		50,000
IOM Honduras	Return of Highly Vulnerable migrants	0		
IOM Honduras	Technical Cooperation on Labour Migration	0		
MRF Buenos Aires	Programa Iberoamericano de Educacion, Cultura y Migraciones (P.I.E.C.U.M.)	160,500		
MRF Buenos Aires & MRF Lima	Priority Actions of the action Plan on Migration in South America	50,000		50,000
MRF Costa Rica/IOM HQ Mass Info	Regional Mass information Campaign with OAS	0		
MRF Costa Rica - Mexico	Advance Information Technology to Improve Identification and Documentation of Irregular Extra-Regional Migrants to Speed up their Return	50,000		50,000
<i>Sub-totals:</i>		360,500	0	150,000
			0.00%	10.88%
				10.88%
<u>Asia</u>	(9/74: 12.16%)			
IOM Cambodia	Assisted Voluntary Return of Irregular Migrants Stranded in Cambodia	50,000		
IOM Cambodia	Cap Bldg for SARS Assessment at Border Points	49,985		49,985
IOM Sri Lanka	Labour Migration Ministerial Consultations for Countries of Origin in Asia		57,489	
MRF Bangkok	Regional Focal Point on HIV/AIDS		77,587	
MRF Bangkok	Training of Migrant Community Health Volunteers	8,000		
MRF Bangkok	Thailand/Laos Agreements on Labour Migration: Preparatory Meeting and Technical Assistance			
<i>Sub-totals:</i>		107,985	135,076	49985
			9.79%	13.42%
				3.62%

Responsible Mission/Unit	Project	Amounts in USD		
		Pending	Funded	Recommended
Europe (15/74: 20.27%)				
IOM Albania	Gap Analysis on Migration Management in Albania		50,000	
IOM Azerbaijan	Expert visits, Azeris to Denmark			
IOM Azerbaijan	Operational Recommendations on Introduction of Visa Counterfoils and Improvement of the Visa Policy in Azerbaijan	20,500		20,500
IOM Czech Republic	Czech-Hungary-(Romania?)-Moldova-Ukraine Working Group on Irregular Migration			
IOM Poland	Training Project for Polish Public Administration Employers			
MRF Budapest	CARDS Regional Support Program (continuation)			
MRF Vienna	Development of Common Return Practice Guidelines for CIS and Candidate Countries	55,000		
MRF Vienna	Promotion of AVR in Central Europe	49,900		
TCC	Soderkopping process-secretariat			
Sub-totals:		125,400	50,000	20,500
			3.63%	5.11%
				1.49%

Responsible Mission/Unit	Project	Amounts in USD		
		Pending	Funded	Recommended
<u>Multi-Regional</u>				
IOM HQ/MMS	Migration and Integration for Development Training Course		50,920	
IOM HQ/MMS	Feasibility Studies for AECI (Dev Coop Spain) on Micro Credit Projects in Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Morocco, Peru, Serbia and Montenegro			
<i>Sub-totals:</i>		0	50,920	0
			3.56%	0.00%
				3.56%
GRAND TOTALS:		1,080,869	312,996	370,069
			21.89%	47.77%
				25.88%
Total Fund	1,430,000			
Multi-Regional Total	50,920			
Total Available, less Multi-Regional	1,379,080			