



# EVALUATION BRIEF

January 2020

## SECOND EVALUATION OF IOM'S MIGRATION INITIATIVES

This evaluation brief presents a summary of key findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as identified by the evaluator for use by key stakeholders, including internally by IOM staff and externally by Member States. More details can be found in the full evaluation report.

**Evaluation type:** Central-Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

**Evaluator:** Elma Balic Colak, Oversight Officer, OIG, IOM Headquarters

**Evaluation period:** 2015-2019

**Final report date:** January 2020

**Commissioned by:** OIG

**Managed by:** Donors Relations Division (DRD)

**Evaluation purpose:** To evaluate the relevance of IOM's Migration Initiatives process and its overall effectiveness and value for money as a strategic planning and resource mobilization tool. The effectiveness of incorporating both IOM and Member States global, regional and country strategic expectations, objectives and key migration issues will also be evaluated along with its potential to reach the intended impact.

**Evaluation criteria:** Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

**Evaluation methodology:** Desk research, key informant interviews and online surveys.

### IOM Migration Initiatives Information:

**Geographical coverage:** Global

**Priorities funded:** Migration management and development

## BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

The Migration Initiatives (MIs) publication is a key annual, planning and strategic document covering IOM's worldwide programmatic interventions and funding requirements since 1999.

The publication details the Organization's strategic plans in terms of developing interventions that support and strengthen the implementation of migrant rights and evidence-based policymaking, relying on partnerships, improving the well-being of migrants, addressing crises and enhancing safe and orderly migration.

The main purpose of the document from 1999 was to improve IOM's strategic planning and to complement the IOM *Programme and Budget* (Blue Book) aiming to:

- I. Provide a comprehensive and yet a realistic overview of services for which total or partial funding is required by IOM;
- II. Demonstrate clear political and programmatic links to donors/member governments' interest in the field of migration;
- III. Reflect IOM's mandate and technical expertise in the choice of programmes and projects, to highlight the Organization's strategic direction either in service areas, emergency management or through regional approaches to migration issues; and

- IV. Be flexible to accommodate the ever-changing migration challenges, new political realities and specific requests by member governments that align with IOM's strategic interest.

The Migration Initiatives kept its scope aligned with the annual feedback from donors, Member States (MS) and IOM field offices, and changed its content and template's presentation to accommodate the end-user needs and to fulfil its three-fold purpose, as noted in the first evaluation conducted in 2004, of:

- i. Providing Organization's global, regional, country, strategic and programmatic approach;
- ii. Acting as a fundraising or a resource mobilization tool; and
- iii. Advocating IOM's ongoing and future migration interventions.

The ownership of the MI preparation and publication lays with the DRD, which has the institutional responsibility for donor and private sector liaising, donor reporting, appeals submission, development of resource mobilization strategies and coordination of IOM inputs into multilateral funding mechanisms.

Apart from publishing the MI report, DRD is also responsible for the Partnerships in Action "Photobook" and the maintenance of the Humanitarian Compendium website, currently being redesigned into the Global Crisis Response Platform (GCRP) which will become available at the beginning of 2020.

## KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

The MI publication retained flexibility over the years, altering its focus per demands of end-users. But, no matter whether the focus was on global (strategic) or country (project) specific programming, the presentation of accomplished versus planned interventions was incoherently mixed throughout the document, making the final product bulky and unappealing to end-users.

In addition, the original multi-fold purpose for the publication appears no longer to be valid. Ninety-three per cent of survey respondents confirm that donors and MS do not make funding decisions based on the MI. All interviewed donors maintain that this is due to an ambiguity noted as the MI content does not clearly display which of the planned interventions are IOM's priorities for the forthcoming year. As the funding requirements are not clearly systematized per country thematic needs but per Migration Government Framework (MiGOF) principles and objectives, donors conclude that the document is intended for internal use only.

In its present format the MI cannot be used as a promoter of IOM's work, or a fundraising tool, or even as a reference book by donors and programming officers, as it does not provide a clear migration management situation or profile per country or region. When compared to other internal tools and publications (the GCRP for instance), the MI lacks the ability to track the planned versus pledged financial requirements, thus having no concrete evidence to support its effectiveness as a fundraising tool.

In terms of overlap, the short, medium and long-term goals are currently elaborated under the Strategic Vision, with the goal to develop regional strategies that follow the same five-year cycle (2019–2023). The first draft of the five-year implementation plan is planned to be circulated by the end of 2019, and this is where the potential overlap with MI as a strategic tool might co-exist.

The findings on MI visibility reveal that the global, regional and country level visibility efforts remain modest. The official launching and fundraising events are not organized at either HQ or regional levels, and limited amounts of printed copies are distributed to the Regional and Country Offices. A missed opportunity is addition noted as IOM Country Offices do not approach the beneficiary institutions and raise awareness on the MI publication among national stakeholders. During discussions and consultations, IOM field offices could elaborate further on MI priorities with the national governments, who would potentially include such prior-

ities in their strategic frameworks, discuss them with donors to support the funding of some or all of these initiatives.

The conclusions on the impact are not based on the concrete financial evidence but rather on the qualitative evidence and opinions of the publication's producers and end-users. Survey respondents confirm that the publication might have an impact, but the impact is not presently apparent as an inventory of planned versus realized MIs has never been done. Impact is also not apparent as the MI is not linked to RO and CO strategies.

The evolution of the document entails a visually appealing brochure in combination with an interactive website tailored to the needs of end-users, per country and regional thematic and financial requirements fed via IOM's online programme management solutions (Project Information and Management Application/PRIMA and Process and Resources Integrated Systems Management/PRISM).

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

IOM Management and DRD are advised to:

1. Analyze the MI in view of new strategic documents (DG Strategic Vision 2019–2023 and five-year implementation plan) and consider to: **(a)** Discontinue *the use of MIGOF to frame the MI (for external presentation purposes)*; **(b)** *In case of significant overlap, abolish the MI or rework its content around the identified gaps that are not covered by other strategic documents to present feasible prioritized migration management interventions per region and country, fully aligned with other internal institutional processes (i.e. Programme and Budget, Strategic Objectives Implementation Plan) and external ones (i.e. UNSDCF, inter-agency response plans).*

Following the decision on MI future, IOM Management and DRD are further advised to:

2. In case the MI publication is continued, improve the efficiency and effectiveness of MI preparation process by focusing on prioritized migration interventions to rationalize data collection process.
3. Allocate additional resources to enable a complete reorganization of its format and presentation into an appealing combination of an interactive website and a brief and informative brochure.
4. Start organizing informative and fundraising sessions for IOM field missions, donors and national partners to raise awareness on MI purpose.