

Office of Programme Evaluation

**EVALUATION OF CAPACITY BUILDING IN
MIGRATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAMMES IN
ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN AND GEORGIA**

June 1998



IOM International Organization for Migration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Evaluation Scope and Methodology	3
3. Country Reports	
3.1 Armenia	6
3.2 Azerbaijan	18
3.3 Georgia	25
4. Regional Report	34
5. Recommendations	41
6. Lessons Learned	43

Annexes

- I.** Terms of Reference
- II.** Schedule of Interviews
- III.** Total Humanitarian Assistance to the
Caucasus
- IV.** History of funding for IOM Programmes in
the Caucasus
- V.** Endorsement of CBMMP by Prime Minister
of Armenia
- VI.** List of IOM Publications
- VII.** Statement by the Prime Minister of
Azerbaijan
- VIII.** List of Regional Activities
- IX.** Summary of Meeting of National Programme
Officers

MAP OF THE REGION

1. Executive Summary

An evaluation was made of the Capacity Building in Migration Management Programmes (CBMMP) in the three countries of the Trans-Caucasus region. CBMMP are national programmes, executed by IOM in cooperation with UNHCR, intended to assist the Governments in the region to develop their capacity to manage migration. They are fully congruent with the CIS Conference process, and are presented to donors in that context.

These programmes are structured around Government entities at various levels, from a high-level committee that provides direction and support to the programme to working groups that focus on specific and identified areas of concern within the migration field. IOM provides programme management and necessary inputs (including migration experts, study trips, and provision of materials, translated where needed).

While IOM has had a presence in the region since the early 1990's, focused on training and capacity development, there appears to have been little direct link between those programmes and the CBMMP. There was, however, a link between the preliminary work done for the CIS Conference process and the development of CBMMP.

The programmes were found to be relevant to the needs of the countries concerned. Relevance came from not only the historical context of how migration was handled in the Soviet Union, but also because of current needs and in anticipation of future migration flows connected with broader development activities in the region.

Considering that these are national programmes being managed by IOM, they are being run with a reasonable degree of efficiency. Efficiency has been hampered, for example, by the difficulty in promoting rotational membership in the Task Forces, where much of the work of the programme is carried out. As an additional measure of efficiency, for the year 1997, the programmes were slightly in deficit (USD35,743, or 2.7% of expenditures).

The effectiveness of the programmes in reaching the overall objective was more difficult to assess in the absence of concrete indicators, which would have been useful in assessing progress in this regard. However, using the results reported by project management thus far, it would seem that there has been good progress to date, although progress among the various projects within CBMMP in each country has certainly been uneven.

Although little or no reference is made to regional aspects in the programme documents themselves, project management places emphasis on those regional aspects, both in activities carried out, and also in reporting to donors. IOM's structure in the region reinforces this, with a Regional Representative in Georgia with some regional responsibilities.

The programmes in general were found to be worthwhile and certainly worth continuing. Project management has shown an impressive ability to monitor the situation in-country and

work towards adapting the programme accordingly. Some recommendations have been made for modest changes in the programmes, mostly related to the need for staff development, better use of existing IOM resources (internal expertise and information) and the need to develop ways to better measure progress towards the programme's overall objective.

Some of these recommendations have as well broader implications for the Organization, as management of any given project is unable to effect some of the changes needed. These primarily relate to developing the level of migration expertise among IOM staff, and the better use of information and expertise that already exists within the Organization.

2. Evaluation Scope and Methodology

An evaluation of the Capacity Building in Migration Management Programme (CBMMP) in Georgia was first requested by the Senior Regional Advisor (SRA) for Europe and North America in 1997. Although this evaluation was judged at the time to be worthwhile, project management asked that, due to certain changes in the programme planned for Summer and Fall of 1997, the evaluation be postponed. In the planning process for evaluation for 1998, the SRA again put forward CBMMP as a priority for the year. This was accepted.

During February 1998 discussions were held with IOM staff involved in CBMMP, following which Terms of Reference were developed (**Annex I**). During this process, it was decided that the CBMMP in all three countries of the Trans-Caucasus should be evaluated. As the three programmes were developed from a single model, and were at different stages of implementation, it was hoped that examining the three together would provide additional insight.

Time was spent at Geneva Headquarters reviewing the files on all three programmes. In the latter half of March, a site visit was made to the three countries of the Trans-Caucasus. A one-day trip to Vienna — site of both the responsible Sub-Regional Office and the Technical Cooperation Centre — was made in mid-April. This evaluation report was drafted in May.

During the visits to the three countries of the Trans-Caucasus, a series of semi-structured interviews were carried out with programme partners (**Annex II**), with project staff providing interpretation services. Further information was obtained from IOM staff in the three countries, Vienna, and Headquarters, as well as from programme records.

This report is organized with a chapter devoted to the programme in each of the three countries concerned. Much of the information in each chapter is the same, since the programmes themselves are similar. This format was selected to enable readers interested in only one country to focus on that country by skipping the chapters concerning the other two. The introductory and final chapters combine all three programmes.

Context

When the three countries of the Trans-Caucasus were part of the Soviet Union, there was little need for the local authorities to manage migration. Due to the system of ‘propiskas’, population movements were relatively limited and reasonably well-controlled. Furthermore, the system of centralized decision-making that existed at the time meant that when a migration-related problem arose it was referred to the central authorities for a decision, which was then implemented at the local level.

This is not to imply there were no movements at all. For example, one of the interlocutors in Armenia mentioned that an investigation of migration in 1978 revealed that upwards of 70,000 migrants normally left Yerevan, Armenia’s capital city, for construction work in other areas of the Soviet Union in March and returned in October.

This centralized process — where problems were reported to the central authorities, decisions were made centrally, and implemented locally — has had some implications for implementing a process based on the more consensus-driven decision making approach which project management has tried to promote.

During Soviet times, the borders of the country that were controlled in a significant fashion were those at the farthest reaches of that country, not those that delineated the divisions between these Republics. This too has had an impact on the work of the programmes, particularly because the agreements reached when the CIS was created included aspects of control of what had been the external borders of the Soviet Union.

As countries have emerged from the immediate consequences of the dissolution of the Soviet Union — its impact on food supplies, utilities, etc.— they are preparing themselves to take full control of activities on their territory in addition to facing the need for economic development. They have recognized a need to develop national policies, with concomitant legislation, regulations, and structures in a number of areas, among which is migration.

An idea of the magnitude of migration-related problems in the three countries of the Trans-Caucasus can be obtained from the figures in the table below, taken from the IOM CIS Migration Report.

SUMMARY TABLE OF POPULATION MOVEMENTS IN 1996*

Total Population	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Georgia
Total population	3,780,000	7,566,000	5,411,397
Citizens	Not available	Not available	Not available
Aliens	Not available	Not available	940
Stateless persons	Not available	Not available	Not available
Immigrants	2,706	Not available	1,241
Emigrants	9,094	Not available	13,206
CIS Refugees & persons in refugee-like situations	218,950	233,000	101
Non-CIS refugees & asylum-seekers	109	Not available	Not available
Internally displaced persons	72,000	549,030	286,621
Repatriants	Not available	Not available	Not available
Involuntary relocating persons	Not available	Not available	Not available
Formerly deported peoples	Not applicable	48,000	412
Ecological migrants	400,000	Not applicable	28,930
Illegal migrants	Not available	Not available	Not available

The CBMMP is intended to assist the Government in establishing a migration management programme and making it operational. It is a national programme implemented by IOM in collaboration with UNHCR. The programme is overseen by an Executive Committee, composed of Government officials at the highest levels, which provides migration policy decisions, and is carried out mainly through Work Groups, which analyze needs and plan and develop activities in five different programme areas.

IOM provides overall management of the programme, coordinating inputs — such as provision and translation of documents, experts in specific migration fields, etc. — and activities such as training and organizational development.

* Source: CIS Migration Report, IOM, 1996

3.1 ARMENIA

History

IOM began activities in Armenia in 1993, after an assessment mission early that year, at the request of a donor country. The initial IOM project undertaken was modelled on IOM's capacity building activities in Tajikistan. Training and technical assistance activities in Armenia were intended to strengthen the Government's capacity to manage humanitarian and emergency assistance. At that time such aid was flowing into the region in large amounts. The earliest DHA reports, covering 1994-1995, show some US \$44.5 million in aid going to Armenia (**Annex III**). Donors were expressing concern that there was insufficient ability on the Government's side to assess what the exact needs were, where the existing aid was going, and whether there were duplication or gaps. Organized and coordinated information was the identified need. It should however be noted that the level of funding of IOM programmes (**Annex IV**) was quite modest compared to overall aid.

To assist in ameliorating the identified problem, IOM undertook a number of activities, including training workshops and placing an official within the Government office dealing with coordination of humanitarian aid to work with them on capacity development.

In 1995, as the focus of the international community moved away from mostly humanitarian aid to development assistance, the focus of the IOM project shifted as well. Although the types of activities carried out by the project remained the same, greater emphasis was placed on sustainability, prioritization of aid, and analysis as well as collection of data. Based on information provided by IOM about its other programmes in the region, there was also a request from the Government of Armenia that IOM modify its activities to assist in the development of a migration management plan for the country.

As a result of this request, a consultative process took place which culminated in a ministerial round-table that confirmed the need for a overall plan for migration management (**Annex V**). Furthermore, this round-table requested IOM assistance to develop and implement this plan. This assistance took the form of the IOM Capacity Building in Migration Management Programme (CBMMP), based on a similar project in Georgia, with modifications made to adapt it to Armenia. Among these adaptations was the addition of a Work Group on labour migration.

In a project proposal for 1995 the results of previous activities were judged by IOM to be "somewhat disappointing", and were characterized by IOM staff during the course of this evaluation as being useful mainly in creating a forum for dialogue. There were few Government interlocutors interviewed during the evaluation who were even vaguely aware of any projects carried out prior to the current CBMMP.

There was little or no direct connection between the previous projects and CBMMP visible on the ground or from talking to programme staff. The only identified connections were the IOM staff, who had in many cases worked on both programmes, and a few Government officials who were cited as having participated in both. Obviously, though, it was these projects that provided the IOM presence upon which CBMMP was built. The paper trail also seems to indicate that at the time certain connections were being made, particularly in project proposals.

Relevance

Relevance addresses the question of whether the programme continues to make sense or not, i.e., is it still responding to the needs that were identified when the programme was designed? Also to be asked is the question of whether it continues to be relevant to the goals of IOM.

An initial statement of relevance came from the Prime Minister at the round-table organized to discuss migration issues: ... *“there is no clear migration policy, coordination of activities and reliable information, as well as legislative basis that would regulate this process”*...

Given the context described earlier, and in light of the above statement, there seems to be little question that there was initially a need for Armenia to be able to manage migration. That this need continues was confirmed by all of the persons interviewed. While most of these persons are involved with the programme, and so could be assumed to have an interest in it, they were nearly all able to give cogent explanations as to why the programme was important for their country:

...“the programme fits well because Government lacks necessary experience – research, statistics, etc”...

Although interlocutors interviewed all identified migration as a major issue facing the country, there was a tendency to consider the issue in a somewhat limited way. The primary concern was with ethnic Armenians; either those who were originally resident in other parts of the CIS and who returned to Armenia, or those originally resident in Armenia who have left for other countries. There was very little recognition that other types of migration might eventually become an issue for the country.

In Armenia, where the programme has been operating for over a year, there was a noticeable restlessness on the part of some interlocutors to move into what they generally referred to as the ‘practical’ stage of the programme and out of the ‘theoretical’, or at least to have both aspects underway simultaneously. There was a sense that they had been discussing long enough, and now it was time to be doing. However, it was also notable that the strongest statements to this effect were from those who were associated with the Government entity that

seemed to be the most-talked about location for whatever migration service might eventually be set up.

In the course of interviews with interlocutors in Armenia, there were substantial differences in the numbers used to describe migration movements. The interlocutors themselves recognized that these wide variations existed, which in itself is a reasonable indicator of the relevance of CBMMP in the area of data collection. The IOM CIS Report referenced earlier estimates that official statistics reflect only 10-15% of the real migration volume.

As far as the programme's relevance to IOM is concerned, it is most directly related to Objective 4: ...“to offer expert advice and cooperation to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and others on migration matters”... Another way of looking at the relevance to IOM is to recognize that this is the programme on which IOM has based its presence in Armenia, and indeed in many other parts of the region.

The programme also promotes other IOM objectives, among them to be the reference point for information on migration and to provide a forum for debate on international migration issues.

Recommendation: As the programme is relevant to both the needs of the country and the objectives of IOM, it should be continued.

One concern is how this programme supports the promotion and development of IOM's own migration expertise. Although the management of the programme is careful to underscore that IOM is providing through its own staff management expertise, rather than migration expertise, nonetheless, even IOM's name naturally leads interlocutors to expect staff to be knowledgeable about migration issues.

Generally speaking, the staff in Armenia is knowledgeable about migration at a relatively basic level. This is due in large part to their own efforts, as there was no evidence of formal training being provided to IOM staff under this programme. It would seem likely that, as the level of knowledge of migration issues among programme partners increases, the level of knowledge on the part of IOM staff should also be increased to keep pace.

Recommendation: Project management find ways to enhance the migration-related knowledge of key staff.

Similarly, experts that were brought in for specific purposes were almost exclusively external to IOM. While IOM has never expressed the intent to be the source of all expertise on migration, there were some barriers identified to utilizing the expertise that does exist within the Organization .

Firstly, there is the problem of identifying and defining what expertise IOM has on staff. Although IOM is not so large an organization, there is no readily available roster of internal expertise in activities related to technical cooperation, even though IOM has been carrying out technical cooperation activities for many years, particularly in Latin America. The paper roster that does exist has neither been updated nor accessed in several months, and contains only 8 internal experts of the 72 listed. To be useful this roster would naturally have to include some appreciation of that expertise and the experts' ability to share it, including linguistic ability.

Secondly, there is the problem of making the expertise available. At a time when resources are stretched to the limit, and when project-supported missions are under substantial pressure to produce projects to support the mission, a reluctance to take the time to serve as an expert in another project is perhaps understandable.

Recommendation: To improve the ability of project management to utilize internal IOM expertise, it is recommended that, as part of the various enhancements in information sharing that are being developed, a profile of expertise of IOM staff be developed, including the ability to transmit that expertise. The ability and willingness to share expertise widely should be a consideration in the staff development process.

Efficiency

To address the question of efficiency, it is necessary to look at how well the inputs are being transformed into outputs.

Any examination of efficiency has to consider that these are not, strictly speaking, programmes that are 'owned' by IOM. They are instead national programmes implemented by IOM, which implies a certain loss of control. Unlike certain other programmes, such as those carried out by IOM on a fee-for-service basis, IOM must rely much more heavily on persuasion in implementing the programmes and ensuring that they accomplish the overall objective.

One of the specific ways in which this has affected the efficiency of the programme is in the composition of the Work Groups, where the bulk of the work of the programme is carried out. Project management does not have full control over the composition of the Work Groups, as experts are designated as members by the Government in principle based on qualifications established through the programme. Although in theory participation in the Work Groups is contractually-based — with objectives, terms of reference, and contracts that are themselves for a limited period — in practice it proved difficult for necessary adjustments to be made in the composition. The need for such changes arises for various reasons, including changes in qualifications required as the work of the groups moved through various phases.

It must also be noted that the fact that Work Group members were paid a stipend for their participation in the groups may have had an effect on the ability of the programme to make

necessary changes in the members. This stipend is relatively large compared to salaries received by civil servants, and could unintentionally have come to be seen as salary supplement.

Exemplifying this problem was that, when the work of the groups for 1997 had been concluded, the members were advised that under a new arrangement for 1998 there would be new Work Groups formed, and that they could take their belongings home. When IOM subsequently removed desks from the premises it was discovered that many of the members had simply locked their belongings in their desk, clearly assuming that they would be back.

While project management has now agreed with the Government to a contract based on output rather than attendance to deal with this problem, there has not yet been time to determine if this new approach will have the anticipated effect.

Recommendation: To the extent possible, given that IOM does not have full control over appointments, every attempt should be made to gain support for the concept that membership in Work Groups will be based solely on programme needs for expertise, which needs change over time.

While workplans have been prepared and are in use for the Work Groups, there needs to be a more explicit link between those workplans and the project purposes. The workplans are for a single year, while the programme is of three-year duration. Formalizing the linkage between the overall programme and the yearly workplan for the Work Groups would be helpful to:

- Divide work over the life of the programme
- Track progress made
- Make adjustments in work
- Facilitate comparison of planned vs. actual
- Indicate progress
- Serve as a basis for recording achievements.

Recommendation: strengthen the use of workplans in the programme by tying them explicitly to the project purposes, results, etc.

The availability and use of information on migration also has an impact on programme efficiency. IOM is seen as a major resource for this kind of information within Armenia, and indeed this is a role that IOM is promoting.

...“It is a real problem for Armenia to create migration information systems, so it will have a network to deal with very real problems” ...

However, the information that is available to the office is somewhat limited. Even information that is produced by IOM is not necessarily available, nor does the office have

resources to know what is available to them through IOM. As an example, the office does not have a list of IOM publications, although one exists since December 1997 (**Annex VI**). There are also resources available in IOM such as through the IOM Library at Headquarters, including:

- Quarterly list of recent acquisitions (including IOM publications)
- IOM Key Word Thesaurus on Migration Terminology
- The possibility to request a search of topics of interest
- Limited photocopying of documents

Additional resources are the Centro de informacion sobre migraciones en America Latina (CIMAL), with some information available in Spanish, and the IOM Home Page.

While the office does have Internet access, its utility is limited by the quality of the Internet service provider. In fact, using the Internet is difficult and inefficient due to the difficulty of getting access, and of maintaining that access for the length of time necessary to research information. There is an impact, although not quantified, on the efficiency of the programme.

Recommendation: Project management should ascertain what resources are available to it from IOM, and ensure that copies of relevant publications are available for reference locally.

Recommendation: Switch to an Internet server that will enable office to make efficient use of available information resources.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a programme is determined by looking at whether or not the programme has achieved its objective, or, in the case of an evaluation conducted in the course of the programme, the progress made towards the achievement of that objective.

The overall objective of the programme is ..“to contribute towards the establishment of a unified system and operational capacity of the management of migration processes and migratory flows in the Republic of Armenia”.

At present there are no objectively verifiable indicators established that would provide measurements of progress towards the objective. As an alternative to these indicators, and in order to analyze the progress towards the overall objective, the current results reported by project management were compared to each project’s purposes in the project document. As the project document foresees that the project is of three years’ duration beginning in mid-1996, and as the evaluation is being done in early 1998, it was assumed that the project is approximately half-over.

Comparisons were not made with the expected results of the projects, even though these results were stated in quite concrete ways which would enable a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. Since the results are expected to be achieved only at the end of the projects, none of them have yet been achieved. Consequently the project purposes were used, as lending themselves more readily to this type of analysis, as they refer to a process.

A. Policy and Management

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish an initial overall migration policy of the Government of the Republic of Armenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Documents prepared on -current legislation -statistical indices -EU experience -migration vs demography and its consequences -study on migration tendencies -main reasons for migration -NGO role 	— Preliminary work required to attain project purpose, which will not necessarily result in a policy being established.
	— Draft conceptual approaches presented to Governmental Committee	— Indicates progress towards purpose, but “conceptual approaches” requires further work to be turned into an established policy.
2. To establish mechanisms and processes for continual policy review and revision.	— None reported	

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
3. To establish the administrative structures necessary for the effective implementation of migration policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Analysis of need to improve structure and three possible options for structure presented to Governmental Committee. — Administrative and functional structure of three options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -existing structures -analysis of, and improvements in, document flow -mechanism of inter-agency collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — For the structures to be established by the end of the project, the selection by the Government of an option is necessary. Should this selection be delayed substantially, there may be some difficulty in carrying out the numerous activities foreseen.

Comment: Significant progress has been made towards attaining the first project purpose, none reported towards the second, and modest progress towards the third. A cause for concern at this point is the length of time that it may take the Government to decide among options.

B. Migration Information System

Project Purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
To establish and make operational an information system for the capture and analysis of data on entry and exit that is also capable of links with other demographic databases such as those to be established for the 1999 census.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Concept paper developed -migration control structure -information system model -technological process description -equipment -software -creating initial information base -means to provide other users with information -unified registration forms -migration information network model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Results represent mostly necessary preliminary work, with one concrete output.

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
	— Improvement of the structural model of the information system of the migration service	
	— Unified forms for information gathering at border points	

Comment: Without specific indicators, it is difficult to assess whether the results so far represent reasonable progress towards the project purposes. However, with the wording in the purpose of ...“to establish and make operational an information system”..., project management would seem to have significant work left to be able to achieve this during the life of the programme.

C. Refugees and Displaced persons

Project purposes	Reported results	Comparison
1. to establish a Refugee and Displaced Persons (DPs) department within the central migration agency through the direct assistance of UNHCR.	— None reported	— No central migration agency exists yet
2. to increase the capacity of the migration agency to manage populations movements, repatriation, reintegration programmes, legal and social protection for refugees and DPs, including emergency preparedness/early warning.	— Draft law on refugees	— First result not directly connected with purpose. (This result was also found under another project.) Other results will assist in the capacity to manage.
	— Refugee travel document	
	— Analysis of laws on refugee rights and assistance provided to them.	
	— Survey on conditions of refugees	
	— Analysis of obstacles to	

	integration	
--	-------------	--

Comment: The contribution of the reported results towards the project purposes seem relatively small, depending on how one looks at ‘increasing’ capacity. If one assumes that, as there currently is no ‘migration agency’ then presumably the ability to manage is non-existent, and consequently any ability to manage is thus an improvement. However, there could remain considerably more than half of the work left in order to achieve the project purposes, which might indicate some need for concern, the more so as this is the project that is jointly managed with UNHCR, so that there are three partners rather than two.

D. Labour Migration

Project purposes	Reported results	Comparison
1. To identify the lead Government agency for coordinating overseas employment initiatives and elaborating policy.	— Structure and functions of Labour Migration Department of Migration Service	— Appears that identification has been made
2. To establish the policies, standards, legislation and procedures governing the international movement of Armenians for overseas work.	— Analysis of current labour market situation	— Taken together, the reported results indicate good progress towards purpose.
	— Analysis of international conventions on labour migration	
	— Concepts on labour migration policy	
	— Requirements and model for contract between employee and employer	
3. To delineate the functions of all involved Government agencies and the private sector.	— Role of Armenian diplomatic representatives in labour migration	— Excellent progress towards purpose.
	— Requirements for inter-state and inter-agency agreements	

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Draft papers on regulation of recruitment -licensing order -application form for agencies -licensing model form -questionnaire to register those seeking work 	

Comment: This project appears to have made excellent progress towards achieving its purposes. However, to a certain extent, given the absence of indicators and workplans, these project level analyses are somewhat subjective, in that two persons looking at the same information above could reach different conclusions; not an ideal situation for an evaluation.

E. Legislation and Procedures

Project purpose	Reported results	Comparison
To strengthen the legislative basis for the management of migration processes in the Republic of Armenia.	— Draft law on refugees	— Compared with the purpose, significant progress has been made. The output is however <u>draft</u> legislation, which will have to be adopted by the legislature.
	— Draft law on exit and entry	
	— Suggestions on law on citizenship	
	— Draft regulations of Legislative Department of Migration Service	
	— Draft law on free movement and choice of settlement	

Comment: Considering the project purposes, very good progress has been made, but the draft legislation still needs to be passed by the authorities.

Overall, in terms of effectiveness, it would seem that progress towards the project purposes has been good, if somewhat uneven.

In general, the judgements made above have been rather more subjective in nature than is usual for an evaluation. This is due in part to the lack of verifiable indicators of achievements, which would have allowed a more objective assessment of the process towards the overall objective.

Recommendation: Objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification be developed at the overall objective and purpose levels.

f

3.2 AZERBAIJAN

History

IOM began activities in Azerbaijan in 1995 by posting a training officer to work with UNDP. Assistance was provided to the Government in developing its capacity to manage humanitarian aid. Activities were carried out in three general areas: language training; computer training; and general management. The earliest DHA reports, covering 1994-1995, show some US \$103.6 million flowing into the country (**Annex III**). Donors were then expressing some concern that there was insufficient information coming from the Government, identified a lack of organized and coordinated information as to what the exact needs were, where the existing aid was going, and whether there were duplication or gaps. It should be noted that the level of funding of IOM programmes designed to address this need (**Annex IV**) was quite modest compared to overall aid.

In 1996 the CBMMP, as it was being carried out in Georgia, was submitted to the Government of Azerbaijan to gauge its possible interest in such an approach. The necessary consultations with the Government were quite sporadic and progress was slow. Although interest was expressed at various stages, the Government's initial approval to the approach came only in April of 1997, with a final approval of the programme framework in November of that year.

There was little or no direct connection between the previous project, generally described as a training programme, and CBMMP. The only identified connections were the IOM staff, who had in many cases worked on both programmes, and a few Government officials who were cited as having participated in both. Although it might have been expected that those Government entities who had been assisted by IOM's previous project and who had an interest in migration would have been instrumental in getting CBMMP started in Azerbaijan, this was not the case. However, it was clearly this previous project that provided the IOM presence upon which CBMMP was built, even in the absence of a direct link.

Relevance

Relevance addresses the question of whether the programme continues to make sense or not, i.e., is it still responding to the needs that were identified when the programme was designed? One also needs to ask whether it continues to be relevant to the goals of IOM.

Given the context outlined in a previous chapter, there seems to be little question that there is a need for Azerbaijan to be able to manage migration. While most of the persons interviewed were involved with the programme, and thus could be assumed to have an interest in it, they were quite emphatic about the need for the programme.

The endorsement of the programme that was sought and recently received from the Prime Minister of Azerbaijan is a reasonable indicator of the continuing relevance of the programme to the country (**Annex VII**).

As the programme started only very recently in Azerbaijan, some work on drafting migration-related legislation had already been done. While interlocutors saw the programme's value in improving legislation and ensuring its adherence to international standards, they also noted that processing existing draft legislation through it could cause a considerable delay in having legislation in place. In some respects the delay in start-up may cause the programme — or perhaps the part of the approach that calls for a measured, comparative approach to legislation — to appear somewhat less relevant to the needs of the country.

CBMMP's is most directly relevant to IOM's strategic objective 4: ...“to offer expert advice and cooperation to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and others on migration matters”, but also promotes other IOM objectives, among them to be the reference point for information on migration and to provide a forum for debate on international migration issues.

Another way of looking at the relevance to IOM is to recognize that this is the programme on which IOM has based its presence in Azerbaijan, and indeed in many other parts of the region.

Recommendation: As the programme is relevant to both the needs of the country and the objectives of IOM it should be continued.

One concern is how this programme can support the promotion and development of IOM's own migration expertise. The management of the programme is careful to underscore that what IOM is providing through its own staff is really management expertise, rather than migration expertise, but IOM's name alone can lead interlocutors to expect staff to be somewhat knowledgeable about migration issues.

Generally speaking, staff in Azerbaijan were knowledgeable about migration at a basic level. This was due in large part to their own efforts, as there was no evidence of formal training having been provided. It would seem likely that, as the level of knowledge of migration issues among programme partners increases, IOM staff's level of knowledge should also be increased to keep pace.

Recommendation: Project management find ways to enhance the migration-related knowledge of key staff.

Similarly, experts that were brought in for specific purposes were almost exclusively external to IOM. Although IOM does not claim to be the source of all expertise on migration, there were some obstacles identified that may be preventing utilization of expertise that the Organization does have.

Firstly, there is the problem of identifying and defining what expertise IOM has on staff in a useful way. Although IOM is not so large an organization, there is no roster of internal expertise in activities related to technical cooperation that appears to promote the use of that expertise. To be useful this roster would have to include some appreciation of that expertise and the experts' ability to share it, including linguistic ability. The paper roster that does exist does not give any evidence of being utilized, and only contains 8 internal experts of 72 listed.

Secondly, there is the problem of making the expertise available. At a time when resources are stretched to the limit, and when project-supported missions are focused on producing and implementing projects to support the mission, it is understandable that there is a reluctance to take the time to serve as an expert in another project.

Recommendation: To improve the ability of project management to utilize internal IOM expertise, it is recommended that, as part of the various enhancements in information sharing that are being developed, a profile of expertise of IOM staff be developed, including the ability to transmit that expertise. The ability and willingness to share expertise widely should be a consideration in the staff development process.

Efficiency

To address the question of efficiency, it is necessary to look at how well the inputs are being transformed into outputs.

Any examination of efficiency has to consider that these are not programmes that are fully 'owned' by IOM. They are instead national programmes implemented by IOM, which implies a certain loss of control. Unlike programmes carried out by IOM on a fee-for-service basis, IOM must rely much on much more persuasive techniques in moving the programmes along to accomplishing the purposes and objectives.

In respect to the efficiency of the Task Forces, although the groups had not yet started their work, there was evidence that project management was aware of the experiences of the similar programs in Armenia and Georgia. Project management is taking into account the impact on project efficiency that decisions about the contractual arrangements for Task Force members will have.

Recommendation: To the extent possible, given that IOM does not have full control over appointments, every attempt be made to gain support for the concept that

membership in Task Forces will be based solely on programme needs for expertise, which needs change over time.

Formal workplans have been prepared for use in the programme, particularly by the Task Force. However, there is a need to tie these workplans — which cover a 12-month period — for three-year programme purposes. Such a link would benefit this multi-year programme by allowing project management to plan work for the year in a way that would allow comparisons with progress needed under the overall programme. Existing workplans permit relatively easy comparisons at the end of the period between what was planned and what was accomplished, but a stronger link with the three-year programme would be helpful to:

- Divide work over the life of the programme
- Track progress made
- Make adjustments in work
- Facilitate comparison of planned vs. actual
- Serve as an indicator of progress
- Serve as a basis for recording achievements

Recommendation: Strengthen the use of workplans in the programme, by tying them explicitly to the project purposes, results, etc.

The availability and use of information on migration also has an impact on the efficiency of the programme. IOM is seen as a major resource for this kind of information within Azerbaijan, and indeed this is a role that IOM is promoting.

However, the information that is available to the office is somewhat limited. Even information that is produced by IOM is not necessarily available, nor does the office have resources to know what is available to them through IOM.

Recommendation: Project management should ascertain what resources are available to it from IOM, and ensure that copies of relevant publications are available for reference locally.

In looking at overall efficiency of the programme in Azerbaijan, a comparison of the length of time between CBMMP first being presented to the Government and its final approval may be instructive:

Country	CBMMP presented (multi-ministerial meeting)	CBMMP approved	No. Months
Armenia	March 1996	May 1996	2
Azerbaijan	June 1997	November 1997	5
Georgia	September 1995	October 1995	1

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a programme is determined by looking at whether or not it has achieved its objective, or, in the case of an evaluation conducted during the programme, the progress made towards the achievement of that objective.

The overall objective of the programme is: ...“to enable the establishment of a unified system and the operational capacity for the management of migration processes in the Republic of Azerbaijan”...

For the moment there are no objectively verifiable indicators established that provide measurements of progress towards the objective. Although an alternative to these indicators is to compare the current results to each project’s purposes, as the CBMMP was only agreed to in November 1997, the number of results reported so far is quite low. This would be normal for a three-year programme whose implementation has just begun. However, the project purposes and results to date are presented below, for purposes of comparison with similar programs in other countries, although the ‘comparison’ column is intentionally left blank. This should not be construed as a criticism. As mentioned above, implementation has just begun.

A. Policy and Management

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish a state migration policy of the Republic of Azerbaijan, and a complementary sector strategic plan, and to integrate into the policy and plan all appropriate areas of concern, including refugee and IDP concerns.	— Prime Minister established by Decree a State Commission for the development of the Unified Migration Management Programme on the basis of IOM capacity building programme framework.	
	— First session of the State Commission convened (June 1997) and identified migration management as priority area for GoAz. IOM framework for migration management accepted as basis for creation unified programme in Azerbaijan.	
2. To establish mechanisms		

for continual policy review and revision.		
---	--	--

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
3. To establish the administrative structures necessary for the effective implementation of migration policy, including a central state migration agency to coordinate all migration management.		

B. Border Control and Migration Information Systems

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish and make operational a border passage regime and supporting information system for regulation of entry and exit, and the presence of non-citizens of Azerbaijan and an integrated national migration data base.		

C. Legislation and Procedures

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To strengthen the legislative basis for the management of migration processes in the Republic of Azerbaijan.		

D. Refugees and Internally Displaced

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To increase the capacity of the GoAz migration agency to manage refugee, IDP and asylum cases, including legal and social protection for that migrant population.		

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
2. To confirm the roles, functions and effective coordination of the existing State refugee and IDP departments with the Central Migration Agency, with the assistance of UNHCR.		

E. Labour Migration

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1 To identify the lead Government agency for overseeing and coordinating labour immigration and emigration initiatives and activities, and elaborating policy and strategy.		
2. To establish the policies, standards, legislation and procedures governing int. movement of Azerbaijanis for overseas work, and for labour immigrants into Azerbaijan.		
3. To delineate the functions of all involved Government agencies and the private sector		

Comment: As with CBMMP in other countries, the use of workplans and development of indicators will help to establish ways in which an assessment of effectiveness can be more concrete.

Recommendation: Objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification be developed at the overall objective and purpose levels.

3.3 GEORGIA

History

IOM began activities in Georgia in 1993. Those activities provided training to Government officials to develop their capacity to manage humanitarian emergencies. Subsequently an IOM report showed a need for better coordination of the humanitarian aid which was flowing into the region in relatively large amounts at that time. The earliest DHA reports, covering 1994-1995, show some US \$ 52.4 million in aid flowing in to the country (see **Annex III**). Donors expressed concern that the Government was not providing sufficient information on the country's needs, on how the existing aid was being utilized and whether it was being distributed evenly. IOM's first proposal for activities in Georgia (22 September 1993) covered "capacity building activities with the Government of Georgia, to develop and strengthen their ability to manage and to deliver humanitarian assistance within the country"... IOM undertook a number of activities to assist in the process, including help in developing a database, management structures, etc. It should however be noted that the level of funding of IOM programmes (**Annex IV**) was quite modest compared to overall aid.

IOM staff in country at the time did not consider these projects to be particularly successful, and there is no apparent direct programmatic connection between the previous projects and CBMMP. The only connections identified were the IOM staff who had in many cases worked on both, and a few Government officials who were cited as having participated in both. However, it was these previous projects which supported the IOM presence that allowed the CBMMP to be developed.

On the other hand, there is evidence in IOM's files at Headquarters that demonstrates a strategic link in thinking of project management at the time (1994) that existing programmes were being called into question. There was clearly a determined effort to take what existed and gradually shift it to focus on developing capacity in migration as opposed to developing capacity in managing humanitarian aid.

Relevance

In addressing the question of relevance, it is necessary to determine whether the programme continues to meet the needs identified at its inception, and whether it maintains its relevance to IOM's goals.

It was clear from discussions that the need to manage migration is widely recognised. While admittedly most of the persons interviewed were involved in the programme, and so have an interest in it, nearly all of them were able to explain why the programme was important for their country. In particular they were able to draw very specific connections between migration

and other development activities in Georgia, notably the EU's TRASECA project (development of a trade corridor between Central Asia and Europe, which passes through Georgia).

In addition, there was an extraordinarily strong connection made between the goal of eventual membership in the European Union and action that must be taken by the Government on many fronts, including migration. The Parliament has in fact passed legislation requiring that all Georgian legislation be in conformity with international norms.

Representatives of other international organizations and donors, while perhaps not assigning the importance to migration that those directly involved in the programme did, agreed that it was one of the many issues that needed to be addressed. These representatives reported that Government interlocutors did not raise the subject of migration with them, which could well indicate that the Government knows that IOM is the appropriate organization with which to discuss these issues. Indeed, the representative of one international organization mentioned that in his view there was at least a potential that the country would suffer in the mid-term from a labor shortage, a view that may be somewhat supported by the substantial emigration for work purposes mentioned by other interlocutors.

The programme has been operating in Georgia for over a year now and some of those interviewed expressed their keenness to move from the theoretical to the practical phase. There was a sense that they had been discussing long enough, and now it was time to be doing. It is worth noting, however, that those who voiced their opinions most strongly on this point were associated with the Ministry deemed to be the most likely location for whatever migration service might eventually be set up.

As far as the programme's relevance to IOM is concerned, it is most directly related to Objective 4: ...“to offer expert advice and cooperation to Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and others on migration matters”... Another way of looking at the relevance to IOM is to recognize that this is the programme on which IOM has based its presence in Georgia, and indeed in many other parts of the region.

The programme also furthers other IOM objectives, such as to be the reference point for information on migration and to provide a forum for debate on international migration issues.

Recommendation: As the programme is relevant to both the needs of the country and the objectives of IOM it should be continued.

One concern is the way this programme can be used to support the promotion and development of IOM's own migration expertise. Programme management is careful to underscore that what IOM is providing is expertise in the management of the programme, with migration expertise being provided as an input, either through IOM staff or external experts. Nevertheless, even IOM's name naturally leads interlocutors to expect staff to be somewhat knowledgeable about migration issues.

Staff in Georgia generally did have a basic knowledge of migration. However, this level was mainly due to their own efforts rather to any attempt on IOM's part to provide training. There was no evidence of formal training being provided to IOM staff under this programme. It would seem likely that as programme partners acquire more knowledge of migration, IOM staff's knowledge of the issue should be enhanced to keep pace.

Recommendation: project management find ways to enhance the migration-related knowledge of key staff

Similarly, experts that have been brought in for specific purposes were almost exclusively external to IOM. While IOM has never aspired to being the source of all expertise on migration, some barriers to utilizing the expertise we do have were identified.

Firstly, there is the problem of identifying and defining IOM's in-house expertise. Although IOM is not so large an organization, there is no readily usable roster of internal expertise. The paper roster that does exist at Headquarters is not used, and has only 8 internal experts of the 72 total. Eventually such a roster of expertise would naturally have to include a rating system and evaluate the ability to share the expertise, including linguistic ability.

Secondly, there is the problem of making the expertise available. At a time when resources are stretched to the limit, and when project-supported missions are under substantial pressure to produce projects to support the mission, there is a perhaps natural reluctance to take the time to serve as an expert in another project.

Recommendation: To improve the ability of project management to utilize internal IOM expertise, it is recommended that, as part of the various enhancements in information sharing that are being developed, a profile of expertise of IOM staff be developed, including the ability to transmit that expertise. The ability and willingness to share expertise widely should be a consideration in the staff development process.

Efficiency

When examining programme efficiency it must be remembered that these are not strictly speaking IOM-"owned" programmes, but rather national programmes implemented by IOM. Consequently, IOM has less control than in its programmes carried out on a more fee-for-service basis. IOM must rely on good-will and persuasion to enable the programme to eventually achieve its purposes and objectives.

One of the specific ways in which this has affected the efficiency of the programme is in the composition of the Task Forces, where the bulk of the work of the programme is carried out. Project management does not have full control over the composition of the Task Forces.

Members are designated by the Government, based on qualifications established through the programme. Task Forces have terms of reference, objectives, etc, and in principle participation in the groups is contractually based, with contracts for a limited period. In practice it proved difficult for project management to make adjustments in the Task Force composition. The need for such changes arise for various reasons, including changes in qualifications and expertise required as the work of the groups moved through various phases.

It also must be noted that the fact that Task Force members were paid a stipend for their participation in the groups has also had an affect on the ability of the programme to make necessary changes in the members.

While project management has now agreed with the Government on a contract based on output, rather than attendance, to deal with this problem, it is too soon to determine whether this new approach will have the desired effect.

Recommendation: To the extent possible, given that IOM does not have full control over appointments, every attempt be made to gain support for the concept that membership in Task Forces will be based solely on programme needs for expertise, which needs change over time.

A general 1998 workplan was part of the 1997 report to donors and specific workplans for the Task Forces have been produced. However, there is a need to link more concretely these workplans with the progress needed to reach the objectives foreseen for this three-year programme. Such a link to the programme would be beneficial in a number of ways: It would not only allow project management to plan work for the year in a way that would allow comparisons with progress needed under the overall programme, but it should also permit relatively easy comparisons at the end of the period between what was planned and what was accomplished. Tying them more specifically to the project document would be helpful to:

- Spread work over the life of the programme
- Track progress made
- Make adjustments in work
- Facilitate comparison of planned vs. actual
- Serve as indicators of progress
- Serve as a basis for recording achievements

Recommendation: Strengthen the use of workplans in the programme by tying them explicitly to the project purposes, results, etc.

The availability and use of information on migration also has an impact on programme efficiency. IOM is seen as a major resource for this kind of information within Georgia, and indeed this is a role that IOM is promoting.

However, the IOM office appears to have limited access to migration information and even that produced by IOM is not always available

Recommendation: Project management should ascertain what resources are available to it from IOM, and ensure that copies of relevant publications are available for reference locally.

Effectiveness

A programme’s effectiveness cannot be finally determined until it has come to an end, at which time it is possible to determine whether the objectives have been achieved or not. In the case of an evaluation being conducted during the lifetime of the programme, it is only possible to assess the effectiveness of the progress being made towards achievement of the objectives.

The overall objective of the programme is: ... “to contribute towards the establishment of a unified system and operational capacity of the management of migration processes and migratory flows in the Republic of Georgia”...

In the absence of objectively verifiable indicators established that would provide measurements of progress towards the objective, the current results reported by project management were compared to each project’s purposes in the project document. As the project document foresees that the project is of three years’ duration beginning in mid-1996, and the evaluation is being done in early 1998, it was assumed that the project is approximately half-over.

Comparisons were not made with the expected results of the projects, even though these results were stated in quite concrete ways, which would enable a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. As the results will only be achieved at the end of the project, it is not possible to evaluate them yet. Consequently the project purposes were used, as lending themselves more readily to this type of analysis in that they refer to a process.

Policy and Management

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish an initial overall migration policy of the Government of the Republic of Georgia.	— Conception of State Migration Policy (created through Task Force and adopted through Pres. Decree).	— Appears that purpose fulfilled, as policy adopted.

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
2. To establish mechanisms and processes for continual policy review and revision.	— Establishment of Task Forces on: Border Control; Information Systems; Policy Conception; Law on Refugees and International Conventions; and Labour Migration	— Although Task Forces are programme entities, it is possible to see them as a step towards the purpose.
3. To establish the administrative structures necessary for the effective implementation of migration policies, including: a) central Govt. migration agency to coordinate migration management b) delineation of functions of all entities involved	— Refinement of programme structures as a result of new Constitution and Govt. reorganization	— Results have not yet arrived at the establishment of a structure, but establishment of training centre indicates progress.
	— Establishment of Migration Management Training Centre for Government Ministries.	

Comment: It would appear that satisfactory progress has been made on this purpose, with a policy adopted and some indication of movement to establishment of structures. However, given the likely contentious nature of deciding on structural arrangements, attainment of purposes 2. and 3. is by no means assured.

B. Migration Information System

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish and make operational an information system for the regulation of entry and exit, and the presence in-country of non-citizens	— Research on visa regimens of selected countries for presentation to GoG	— More results reported here than under any other purpose, so may be assumed to be current main focus of programme. Excellent progress towards purpose.
	— Analysis Georgia border point data system needs – review of	

	hardware/software.	
--	--------------------	--

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
	— Provision assistance establishment border management regimens by int. expert: policy & ops. overview.	
	— Development and prototyping border data system software with int. assist. – integration with new policy/leg. Foundations.	
	— Software/data system prototyping for central migration data base within MRA.	
	— Improvement visa issuance system Tbilisi airport through equipment provision/upgrading.	
	— Planning new systems integration: MFA with Border Guards	

Comment: While excellent progress has been made towards this purpose, it is not clear whether the resources to make the information system ‘operational are contemplated by the programme. This wording may imply the provision of a large number of physical resources, e.g., computers, which are not currently found in the programme document.

C. Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To establish a Refugee and IDP Department within the central migration agency through the direct assistance of UNHCR	— IDP law developed by Min. Refugees and Accommodation (1997) and enacted by Parliament	— Although not directly related, presumably the law was necessary to the establishment of a department
2. To increase the capacity of the migration agency to manage population movements and repatriation, legal and social protection for refugees and IDPs, including emergency	— Implementation Plan Framework for Return IDPs to Abkhazia (created by Task Force, reviewed GoAbkhazia)	— It is not clear what relation there is between this result and the establishment of a department and increasing its capacity.

preparedness/early warning.		
-----------------------------	--	--

Comment: The results provided in the documentation do not indicate progress towards the purposes which relate to both the establishment of a department to deal with refugees and IDPs and the enhancement of its capacity to function. Based on the results reported, no progress towards the purposes can be ascertained.

However, under the Task Force on Legislation and Procedures, programme management reported that the Parliament adopted a refugee law, which would presumably form at least the legal basis for the work of the department.

D. Legislation and Procedures

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
1. To strengthen the legal basis for the management of migration processes in Georgia	— Decree passed and draft Law on Migration Inspection created.	— Good progress made towards the purpose.
	— Groundwork on Law on Asylum Seekers initiated by Task Force.	
	— Draft Law on the State Border of Georgia (created by Parliamentary Committee – to be reviewed by IOM).	
	— Under guidance UNHCR, Refugee law developed by Task Force- third reading and final adoption (March 1998)	

Comment: While the extent of the original need for the legal underpinnings for managing migration is not clear, and so the extent of progress cannot be determined, there certainly has been progress towards this purpose.

E. Labour Migration

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
(No project purpose was found – this task force was set up after the project was	— Development and articulation of Georgia labour migration policy and operational roles in	

started.)	Government.	
-----------	-------------	--

Project purpose	Reported Results	Comparison
	— Decree on Importation of Labour Force into Georgia, and Concept on Labour Migration in Georgia signed by President.	

Comment: As no project purpose was found, no comparison could be made. However, in general the results reported would seem to be necessary steps to be taken, assuming that the project purposes are similar to those established in the other two countries.

In general, the judgments made above have been rather more subjective in nature than is usual for an evaluation. This is due in part to the lack of verifiable indicators of achievements, which would have allowed a more objective assessment of the progress towards the overall objective.

Recommendation: Objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification be developed at the overall objective and purpose levels.

One possible indicator of the effectiveness of the programme is the evident knowledge of migration issues which interlocutors possessed. This is similar to the observed ability of interlocutors to explain the relevance of the programme to the country. While project management reports that this ability to discuss migration issues knowledgeably is a recent development due in part to the programme, it was not possible to verify this independently.

4. REGIONAL

Programme

CBMMP programmes are based on a single design and adapted to the needs of each country in which it operates. On paper there is little difference between the programmes, although there are differences in execution, such as the variation in the role of the National Programme Officer from an active participant in the Work Groups in Armenia to an observer at the Task Force meetings in Georgia. Each programme is designed to be a Government programme with implementation through IOM, in collaboration with UNHCR. Regional aspects of the programmes come through the IOM structure, and through IOM-planned activities, rather than from the design of the programmes themselves.

The programme documents do not place a great deal of emphasis on regional aspects. For example, in the 16-page programme document for Armenia, the word ‘region’ or ‘regional’ is used only four times, not indicative of a regional focus. In the similar document for Georgia, fully half of the 14 ‘regional’ references in the document are to the IOM Regional Representative.

Programme reporting gives somewhat more emphasis to regional aspects, with the report on 1997 activities in Georgia stating that “IOM has promoted the regional character of the programmes whenever possible.” In a similar, one-page report produced by IOM Azerbaijan, although the word ‘regional’ was only used once, four of the ten items listed in the report had a regional component; primarily visits to other countries in the region. In Armenia, in the activities section of the list of results and activities, there were nine activities, of which four were regional. There are also a number of activities which included participants from more than one of the three countries and which could be assumed to have a regional component. A list of these activities, taken from project records, is found in **Annex VIII, page 3**.

The IOM structures in the three countries are headed by a Regional Representative in Georgia, plus a Programme Officer in Georgia, and Heads of Office in both Yerevan and Baku. The Regional Representative is supported by funds from all three programmes.

One of the primary reasons for IOM’s structural regional focus has been to mirror the traditional regional focus of the donor community. It is also the expressed belief of programme staff that the donor community has a strong interest in the programmes being regionally-focused, because of common borders and similar problems. Certainly the above-mentioned reports are programme actions in support of that belief.

These points outlined above all tend to support the notion that IOM regularly attempts to promote the regional aspects of these programmes, despite the lack of regional focus in the documents themselves.

Development of programmes

There was a difference among the three countries in the way in which the transition was made from the humanitarian aid coordination projects to CBMMP. This ranged from relatively deliberate in Georgia to somewhat difficult in Azerbaijan. There were two identifiable factors at work: 1) the relatively dependable funding from a single donor in Georgia and Armenia (USAID) vs its lack in Azerbaijan (**Annex IV**) and 2) the relative strengths of the staff in charge of the projects in the various countries. For example, in Armenia, there was no internationally-recruited staff member from mid-1993 to the beginning of 1995.

IOM staff

Although it has been common for internationally-recruited staff to travel within the region and to meet with one another, the first meeting of National Programme Officers from the three countries took place only in February of this year. Recommendations resulting from this meeting are attached in the report found in **Annex IX**. If IOM intends to continue to emphasize with donors the regional aspects of these programmes, then such opportunities for exchanges should be increased.

Recommendation: Contacts and exchange of information among the three offices in the Trans-Caucasus be strengthened at all levels, to both enhance programme performance and as a staff development tool.

While contacts among the internationally-recruited staff in the three offices were frequent, there was less evidence of contact with other IOM offices and programmes that might be of interest to CBMMP. For example, given the history of the region, it would seem beneficial to enhance contacts with the IOM office in Moscow. Although the programme in Russia is not as extensive as those in the Trans-Caucasus countries, there are still similar discussions with the Russian Government on migration-related matters, and an exchange of views between IOM offices leading to mutual learning may be useful. This may particularly be of interest in that the Federal Migration Service of Russia was mentioned several times during the course of the evaluation as a possible model for migration services in the region, and IOM Moscow's experience with the FMS model should be shared with offices in the region.

IOM Moscow has also been in the past a source of migration-related information in the Russian language. While recognizing that links do exist — particularly via the TCC in Vienna and to a certain extent via the Regional Office in Tbilisi — strengthening those links may be worthwhile.

Similarly, a strengthening of existing links with IOM offices in Ukraine, the Central Asia Republics and the Baltic States, where IOM is developing CBMMP, would also be desirable. While initially these links may be via the TCC, direct links between programme managers also need to be encouraged.

One example of a linkage that IOM may wish to parallel and that further supports the need for IOM to strengthen its own linkages mentioned by one interlocutor is a CIS-wide consultative body. This body covers, among other things, migration issues, and is one through FMS may be proposing a regime to regulate labour migration within the CIS countries. IOM needs to ensure that its own network in the CIS is aware of such initiatives, and that a common response is developed.

Recommendation: Develop and strengthen direct linkages between the offices in the Trans-Caucasus and offices engaged in similar programmes in other countries.

In the course of the interviews, there was substantial reference made to the regional aspects of the programmes. This was particularly notable in Georgia and Azerbaijan. For instance, at the meeting of the Initial Task Force in Baku, a question was raised on the status of the programmes in both Armenia and Georgia.

This regional linkage that has been promoted by programme managers, particularly vis-à-vis the donors, and the resulting regional nature of some programme activities has had some perhaps unintended consequences for the programmes as well. One concrete example is a map that was produced by an NGO in Armenia which has received support from IOM. This map, although intended to be informative as to refugee and IDP flows, was objected to by some in Azerbaijan because of the way in which geopolitical boundaries were presented. Even though IOM was neither consulted on the production of the map nor authorized the use of its name on the map, our connection with the NGO was sufficient to cause the matter to be raised with IOM Officials in Azerbaijan. Similarly, there were some comments from interlocutors indicative of the potential for difficulties if all regional activities continued to be based only in Georgia. Regional activities and regional sensitivities combine to make the job faced by the project managers more delicate than perhaps normal, and require that in some fashion these be taken into account even in these national programmes.

Role of Regional Representative

The history of CBMMP in the region shows that they all follow the model developed in Georgia. Such a history supported the designation of a regional representative with the relevant expertise in capacity-building. The reported regional orientation of donors also provides an argument for a regional structure, as the programmes themselves are not regional in design. For IOM to effectively reinforce regional aspects, close coordination of activities is needed. This

coordination also ensures that costly resources, particularly external consultants, are used for the benefit of more than one programme, wherever possible.

However, with the expansion of this type of programme into a large number of countries in the region, some further thought should be given to how well the role of the Regional Representative fits current programme needs. There is clearly a need to ensure that there is an ongoing exchange among project managers handling similar programmes, which perhaps the Regional Representative could fill.

Recommendation: The role of the Regional Representative needs to be re-examined, taking into account current needs of the programmes in the Trans-Caucasus, particularly vis-à-vis similar programmes being developed in other parts of the former Soviet Union and beyond.

Programme Design

There could be considered to be a design flaw in the programme in the overlap that exists among the working groups. This is due to the two ways in which the areas of responsibility are divided. Of the five groups that are set up, three are process-oriented (Policy and Management; Migration Information System; and Legislation and Procedures), and two cover a particular kind of migration (Refugees and Displaced Persons; and Labour Migration). With this cross-cutting division, there can be confusion over, for example, where legislation on labour migration is considered. This is reflected in how programme results are reported.

While in actual management of the programme, solutions are found to these problems, such as joint meetings of groups, it does indicate a problem in the original design of the programme. While alternatives to this approach may have been originally considered, there is no evidence of this.

Adaptation by project management

There was impressively strong evidence that project management was keeping careful watch on developments in the country, both those internal and external to the programme, and responding to problems that develop within the programme by adapting as circumstances change. This can be most clearly seen in the way in which problems encountered in the composition of the working groups were met, and experiences shared amongst offices.

Financial

Another aspect of programme efficiency that can be considered is how well the programme has managed to stay within the budget foreseen. For the CBMMP programmes, however, this particular analysis has not proved particularly enlightening. For 1997, there was no budget submitted for CBMMP by the three offices concerned, as at the time budget submissions were due, the programmes did not exist. What happened instead was that, during the course of the year and as contributions were received, there was an allocation made of funds based on programme needs. This was particularly important when funding received was simply for projects related to the CIS Conference. Those funds then needed to be allocated by IOM among a number of countries and many projects.

A complicating factor is that project coding was totally changed for the three countries during mid-1997, from a single project code to multiple ones, although actual coding changes did not take place until November. Finally, during the process of closing the accounts for 1997, adjustments were made to bring the income allocations in line with expenditures.

Thus the preliminary results for the three countries in 1997 are:

Country	Income (USD)	Expenses (USD)	Result (USD)	Result (%)
Armenia	(272,477)	354,360	81,883	23.1% shortfall
Azerbaijan	(267,973)	200,481	(67,492)	33.7% excess
Georgia	(755,424)	776,776	21,352	2.7% shortfall
All	(1,295,874)	1,331,617	35,743	2.7% shortfall

The programmes thus achieved a reasonable result overall, although at the end of the year expenses still slightly exceeded income. Lower expenses than expected in Azerbaijan — where the programme was later getting started — were balanced by increased spending in programmes in other countries. Given that the funding for the programmes was uncertain in the initial stages of the year, and that expenditures could only be incurred as income was foreseen, the financial results would support the contention that the programmes were being managed within available resources and that they were attaining their results within those same resources.

Additionally, the way in which funding (that which was not earmarked for a specific programme) was allocated and reallocated among the three countries is an indication that IOM was managing the programmes regionally.

Other International Organizations

Where it was possible to interview representatives of other international organizations, those representatives did have a general understanding of what IOM was trying to accomplish and supported the programme objective. UNHCR — where information could be obtained — with whom IOM implements the programme, clearly considers that this is overall an IOM programme, with one part in which they have an interest, i.e., the group on refugees and displaced persons. While good cooperation exists, in this programme it does not extend beyond this one area, which is what the design implies.

What next?

In many of the countries of the CIS, CBMMP is IOM's basic programme. IOM Kyiv is now in the process of implementing the CBMMP in Ukraine. As a programme, it fits well with IOM's objectives, is certainly in line with the CIS Conference Plan of Action, and, at least in the three countries where it was evaluated, continues to meet a need of the countries concerned. CBMMP, as a basically well-designed programme, had a beginning, and will have an end, in principle after three years of activities. As reasonable progress is being made towards the programme's objectives, it should be considered that the programmes in Armenia and Georgia could be brought to a conclusion in another 18 months. Therefore it is none too soon for project management to be considering what, if anything, will be the next needs that IOM should be prepared to meet, and how fundable projects can be developed to meet those needs, which are substantial.

While in Armenia and now in Georgia additional projects have been developed, IOM's projectization policy requires that new projects be continually developed. Project management in all three countries has given evidence of this, and seems to have it firmly in mind for the future.

Currently, IOM is operating or developing CBMMP in eleven countries of the former Soviet Union, plus having related activities in two more (Russia and Ukraine). It will eventually prove interesting to evaluate how well, and with what country-specific adjustments, a programme developed for one region can be replicated outside of that region. Such an assessment is outside of the scope of this particular evaluation. The large number of countries in which CBMMP is being replicated indicates a strong reliance on one particular type of programme.

IOM needs to be aware that development of other well-designed, fundable programmes will provide a necessary diversification from a dependence on one model. Certainly the migration needs of the countries in the Trans-Caucasus are vast and IOM is uniquely positioned to both act as a bridge among those countries and to serve their migration needs more completely.

Gender considerations

There is no evidence that gender issues were considered in programme design or execution.

It was notable that nearly all interlocutors met were men. In Georgia, they were all men, in Azerbaijan one of the NGO representatives was a woman, and in Armenia two of the interlocutors were women.

The National Programme Officers (the senior locally-recruited staff) were men in Georgia (1) and Azerbaijan (2) and women (2) in Armenia. Of four internationally-recruited staff in the region, one was a woman. Thus although there was overall regional balance in NPOs and internationally-recruited staff, at this level no office was at all balanced. When staff at all levels in the office are considered, the gender balance among the staff is in rough parity.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations common to all three countries:

- As the programme is relevant to both the needs of the country and the objectives of IOM, it should be continued.
- Project management should find ways to enhance the migration-related knowledge of key staff.
- Strengthen the use of workplans in the programme, tying them explicitly to the project purposes, results, etc.
- To the extent possible, given IOM's lack of control over appointments, every attempt be made to gain agreement at highest levels that membership in Work Groups or Task Forces will be based on programme needs, and not needs of individuals.
- Project management should ascertain what resources are available to it from IOM, and ensure that copies of relevant publications are available for reference locally.
- Objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification should be developed at the overall objective and purpose levels.

Armenia

- The office should switch to an Internet server that will enable it to make efficient use of available information resources.

Regional

- Contacts and exchange of information among the three offices in the Trans-Caucasus should be strengthened at all levels, to both enhance programme performance and as a staff development tool.
- The direct linkages between the offices in the Trans-Caucasus and offices engaged in similar programmes in other countries should be developed and strengthened.
- The role of the Regional Representative needs to be re-examined, taking into account current needs of the programs in the Trans-Caucasus, particularly vis-à-vis similar programs being developed in other parts of the former Soviet Union and beyond.

Headquarters

- To improve the ability of project management to utilize internal IOM expertise, it is recommended that — as part of the various enhancements in information sharing that are being developed — a profile of expertise of IOM staff should be developed, including the ability to transmit that expertise. The ability and willingness to share expertise widely should be a consideration in the staff development process.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

There is a need for IOM to develop its own staff expertise, particularly in the field of migration. The ability of the management of any one project or programme to make progress towards this goal is limited, as it would generally be outside of the stated objectives of any project to develop IOM's expertise. This is more an organizational imperative, which must be seen as supporting the Organization's development. Necessary staff development activities will need to be supported by funds supplemental to those in the project. These needs must be explicitly considered in development of projects where the level of migration expertise of IOM staff, particularly at the local level, may need to be enhanced during project implementation.

IOM's wealth of information and expertise is not at this point sufficiently available to project management. The need for this has long been recognized, and initiatives are underway to enhance this availability. This evaluation should serve to reinforce the need for developing ways to increase the availability to all IOM staff of internal migration information and expertise.