



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Organisation internationale pour les migrations (OIM)
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)

**EVALUATION OF THE IOM
MIGRATION EMERGENCY FUNDING MECHANISM (MEFM)
(2012–2015)**

September 2016

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Background and objectives of the evaluation	4
1.2 Evaluation scope and methodology	5
2. THE MIGRATION EMERGENCY FUNDING MECHANISM (MEFM)	7
2.1 MEFM under a historical perspective	7
2.2 MEFM operational criteria and administrative requirements	9
2.2.1 Objectives of the mechanism and operational principles	9
2.2.2 Administrative and reporting requirements	10
3. RELEVANCE TO OPERATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA	11
3.1 The link to migrants and international transport	15
3.2 Other operational, administrative and reporting requirements	17
3.2.1 Operational requirements	17
3.2.2 Administrative requirements	19
3.2.3 Reporting requirements	20
4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	20
4.1 Reaching the target balance and overall financial management	21
4.2 Effectiveness of reimbursements and replenishment	24
4.3 Efficiency, outcome and impact	27
5. THE FUTURE OF MEFM	28
6. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30

ANNEX 1	Resolution No 1229	33
ANNEX 2	Terms of Reference	36
ANNEX 3	Questionnaire for IOM Member States	40
ANNEX 4	IOM field survey questionnaire	44
ANNEX 5	Interviews and bibliographical references	48

ACRONYMS

CAR	Central African Republic
CCCM	Camp Coordination and Camp Management
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
COM	Chief of Mission
DOE	Department of Operations and Emergencies
DRD	Donor Relations Division
DRM	Department of Resources Management
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EU	European Union
FYRoM	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
HQ	Headquarters
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IDF	IOM Development Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MEFM	Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism
MICIC	Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative
NFI	Non-food Items
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODG	Office of the Director General
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development /Development Assistance Committee
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
OSI	Operational Support Income
PIU	Project Information Unit
SCPF	Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance
TCN	Third Country Nationals
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
WGBR	Working Group on Budget Reform

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

By 2011, the constant increase in the number of emergencies faced by IOM had highlighted the need to establish a funding mechanism to facilitate the Organization's rapid response and related interventions. IOM was being increasingly called upon to provide assistance to migrants who had nowhere else to turn and could become vulnerable in times of crisis, often being unable to access support networks or resources in either the host country or their country of origin. The lack of available financial resources prevented IOM from taking swift action; instead, the Organization had to await financial commitments from donors.

Aware of these limitations, IOM Member States, in the framework of the Working Group on Budget Reform, reviewed options for establishing an emergency funding mechanism to improve the Organization's rapid response capacity which would provide quick access to funding in order to provide life-saving assistance at the beginning of an emergency. The establishment of the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM) was approved through Resolution No. 1229 of 5 December 2011 at the 100th Session of the Council. MEFM was intended to be used as a loan mechanism to bridge the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding, which would be used to replenish the Mechanism.

Operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of Resolution No. 1229 specify how MEFM should be used. Operative paragraph 1 states that the Mechanism was established with "the purpose of bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding, thereby being complementary to other existing emergency funds", and operative paragraph 3 states that: "The Director General is authorized to expend funds ... to ensure a rapid response to an emergency involving migration, pending receipt of donor contributions". Paragraph 19 of document MC/2335 of 14 November 2011 further clarifies that requests for funds "should seek immediate financing for core emergency needs related to international transport". In terms of reporting, Resolution No. 1229 requests the Director General to "submit an annual report on the Mechanism and its activities and possible requirements to the Council".

Resolution No. 1229 also stipulates that an evaluation of the Mechanism should be conducted every three years. The Office of the Inspector General decided to include such an evaluation in its biennial workplan for 2015–2016. The aim of the evaluation was to conduct a strategic and operational analysis of the Organization's use of MEFM during the four-year period 2012–2015, as well as make recommendations on the criteria for its disbursements, on reporting and operational procedures and on challenges and successes, in particular regarding reimbursement.

With regard to how the Mechanism was used, when following a strict interpretation of the criteria for its use, only 4 of the 20 disbursements were directly linked to operations with international transport. However, it should be noted that, during the discussions of the Working Group on Budget Reform on the creation of an emergency funding mechanism, "evacuation" and "international transport" were not among the first elements justifying the establishment of such a fund. Only in subsequent debates had Member States expressed concerns that it could duplicate existing funding mechanisms, and, for this reason, the criteria were refined by including the link to international transport and evacuations.

Another element to be considered, and which was also part of the rationale behind the establishment of MEFM, was the need to create a presence rapidly and effectively at the start of a crisis to maintain IOM's effectiveness, flexibility and rapid response, which are often required in order to carry out life-saving interventions. However, it is not always possible to determine when disbursements are made in the first days of a crisis if the evacuation of migrants is urgently required or if only humanitarian assistance is required. It is also difficult to organize operations by differentiating between assistance provided to internally displaced persons and that provided to migrants. The evaluation also highlights the problem of disbursements made over a relatively long period of time, and suggested that IOM should reconsider its strategy when an emergency has become protracted or has turned into a chronic situation.

Funding requests did not exceed two pages and were in line with the requirements. The requests were also approved within the established 48-hour time frames, confirming that access to MEFM is easy and flexible and that the Mechanism can be used as one of the first and an immediate source of funding. In a few cases, detailed requests were not prepared as access to MEFM had been granted at the initiative of the Director General based on discussions with government officials and on his own assessment.

Other elements of Resolution No. 1229 are also analysed in the report. It was determined that the request to add the interest accrued to the MEFM balance had been respected, and that MEFM had not been subjected to a specific audit by the External Auditors – the use of MEFM is reviewed within the annual audit of IOM accounts. The Administration had also been authorized to charge an amount of USD 40,000 for administrative and operational support for the first year of operation of the Mechanism; however, according to the financial records, this amount had been deducted twice.

In terms of reporting, IOM adhered to Resolution No. 1229 and paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335. Indeed, a section on MEFM containing the elements requested in Resolution No. 1229 is included in the Financial Report and the Annual Report of the Organization, both of which are submitted to the Council. Some Member States suggested that more information could be included in the Annual Report on the different crises for which MEFM was activated, and on the status of reimbursements.

Resolution No. 1229 establishes a target balance of USD 30 million for the Mechanism, and fundraising efforts were made by IOM to reach this amount. The Mechanism benefited from contributions from 12 Member States which totalled USD 11.2 million, representing only 38 per cent of the target. However, this target shortfall did not prevent IOM from using MEFM for 20 emergencies during the period 2012–2015. Nonetheless, the remaining balance as at 31 December 2015 is low due to the difficulty in obtaining reimbursements.

Indeed, reimbursements pose the main challenge to the administration of MEFM. Moreover, if this aspect of the Mechanism does not function more effectively, the operational balance will soon be rendered ineffective. One of the main reasons for the difficulty in obtaining reimbursements is the lack of interest of IOM donors in reimbursing amounts used for evacuations, which represented 71 per cent of the funds to be repaid as at 31 December 2015. Another reason is the reluctance of donors to use their contributions for retroactive reimbursements of operations funded by MEFM. It is interesting to note that operations that were not fully in line with the criteria for the use of MEFM were more successfully reimbursed.

Based on the lessons learned in this initial phase, internal discussions are taking place on whether the structure of MEFM should be reviewed. For instance, consideration is being given to transforming MEFM into

a grant mechanism or an operational reserve fund. Regardless of what is decided, one of the key questions is that of how to replenish the Mechanism. Any discussion on changing the nature of the Mechanism would also require an assessment of the relevance of the current criteria, in particular whether they must be strictly applied or based on a broad interpretation of Resolution No. 1229, taking into account the historical background and experiences of this initial phase.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and objectives of the Evaluation

The constant increase in the number of emergencies faced by IOM in the beginning of the 21st century, such as the second Gulf War (2003), the crisis situations in Lebanon (2006), Côte d'Ivoire (2002, 2010–11), Yemen (2010–11), and the evacuation from Libya (2011), highlighted the need in 2011 for establishing a funding mechanism to facilitate IOM's rapid response and intervention. Owing to growth trends in international migration with over 200 million migrants globally, IOM was also increasingly called upon to provide assistance to migrants who had nowhere else to turn and who could become vulnerable in times of crisis, often unable to access support networks or resources either from the host country or their country of origin.

In most cases, the emergencies required an immediate response to assist people spontaneously escaping from dangerous zones and under difficult circumstances. However, the lack of available financial resources impeded a swift reaction by the Organization in line with its recognized values of effectiveness, flexibility and rapid response; IOM had no option but to await financial commitments from donors in the early stages of an emergency, when effective responses are required for saving lives. Conscious of the limitations of the Organization's Constitution and financial regulations, which authorize the Director General to incur obligations and make payments only within the limits of available funding, IOM Member States reviewed options for establishing an emergency funding mechanism to facilitate and improve the Organization's rapid response capacity.

The establishment of a predictable and flexible internal funding mechanism facilitating quick access to funding in order to provide lifesaving assistance at the start of emergencies was endorsed, and as a supplementary measure IOM agreed to negotiate standby agreements with donors and private sector actors to allow immediate activation of evacuation capacity. The proposed Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM) is to be used as a loan, or revolving fund, intended to bridge the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding.

Resolution No. 1229 establishing the MEFM was approved at the hundredth session of the Council on 5 December 2011. It is funded through voluntary contributions and is intended to maintain a balance of USD 30 million. The Resolution also specifies that its administration shall adhere to paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335 "Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism"¹. An internal instruction IN/207 was issued in March 2013 detailing the administrative and procedural requirements for the use of MEFM.

Taking into account the requirement of Resolution No 1229 to conduct an evaluation of the fund every three years, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) decided to include it in its biennial workplan for 2015–2016. The Evaluation is intended to provide a strategic and operational analysis of IOM's MEFM-funded interventions during the four-year period 2012–2015 (the use in 2012 was dependent of the initial disbursements of voluntary contributions from Member States and the fund was not yet to be considered fully functional). The evaluation aims at identifying:

¹ See Annex 1

- If, when and why MEFM has played a critical role to ensure that IOM could deliver its interventions in rapid response, in line with the scope and purpose of the funding mechanism;
- The best practices and constraints in the administration of the MEFM, including an analysis of the compliance with Resolution No 1229 and IN/207; and
- The strategic outcome of MEFM-funded interventions, in particular regarding accountability to affected populations and on mobilizing funds for IOM's emergency responses.

The evaluation provides recommendations on the strategic use of the fund, on reporting and operational procedures, as well as on challenges and success criteria for the use of the fund.

1.2 Evaluation scope and methodology

The evaluation is conducted using the OECD/DAC criteria² of relevance, connectedness, effectiveness, coverage, efficiency, outcome and impact, answering a series of related questions as detailed in the Terms of Reference³. Connectedness and coverage are criteria specifically used for humanitarian evaluations and are defined respectively as “the need to assure that activities of a short-term emergency are implemented in a way that takes longer-term and interconnected approaches into account” and as “the need to reach major population groups in life-threatening situations, wherever they are, with assistance proportionate to their needs, including protection”⁴. The Terms of Reference were coordinated with the Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE), the Department of Resources Management (DRM) and with the Office of the Director General (ODG), the final approval of the use of the fund being under the responsibility of the IOM Director General.

The evaluation is analysing the use of MEFM by classifying it according to the intent of Resolution No 1229 and through IOM operational sectors of implementation (movements, assistance to migrants and displaced populations, emergency assessments etc.), and is examining some specific situations selected according to criteria such as volume of disbursements, timing and replenishment.

In line with the three evaluation objectives mentioned under Section 1.1, the main focus will be on:

- The relevance of the strategic use of MEFM, and to its main purpose;
- The added value of using MEFM;
- The use of MEFM for a more timely response and an enhanced ability to reach affected populations;
- Determining if MEFM contributed to IOM's ability to support the humanitarian coordinated intervention, in particular through early emergency;
- The overall effectiveness of MEFM-funded intervention in meeting the objectives set by the mechanism and the emergency responses;

² MA/66, IOM Evaluation Guidelines.

³ See Annex 2

⁴ MA/66, IOM Evaluation Guidelines.

- The overall outcome and impact of the use of MEFM for bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding; and
- Whether the mechanism through which MEFM is being resourced and operated is conducive to achieving the objectives set forth upon the establishment of the MEFM.

Being a process and strategic evaluation, the methodology used sought to maintain a balance between a global analysis and a more specific assessment of selected cases, which properly illustrate the use of MEFM. The evaluation methodology also takes into account the four years covered by the analysis and the use in different regions and for different types of intervention.

A questionnaire to IOM Member States was coordinated with IOM headquarter departments responsible for MEFM and sent to all Member States in the three official languages, with the assistance of the IOM Meetings Secretariat⁵. The rate of return was low despite a reminder and deadline extensions: eleven Member States⁶ replied, with interesting views and suggestions that will be used and referred to in the analysis. As the reply of one Member State was not detailed, in that it only informed OIG that it was not in a position to answer, the analysis will be based on the ten remaining contributions. Percentages will also be used for easy reading though they are not very relevant in view of the low number of replies.

A questionnaire for Chiefs of Mission (COM) and other IOM officials having used MEFM during emergencies was coordinated with DOE, as well as the selection of persons to whom it should be sent.⁷ The number of IOM officials was limited to twelve as only twenty emergencies activated the use of MEFM for the period 2012–2015 and some of the officials were involved in more than one emergency; five staff answered the questionnaire, bringing useful perspectives from the field. It should be noted that the low amount of feedback is not problematic for the evaluation due to the managerial structure and approval process of MEFM, which is centralized at IOM Headquarters.

The methodology also consists of interviews with IOM officials at Headquarters, including the Director General, of a documentation review of reports to the Governing Bodies on the creation of MEFM and on its use, of financial records, press releases, e-mail exchanges, concept notes, and of desk research on specific emergencies⁸. The documentation related to the management of MEFM was mainly provided by DOE, DRM as well as by the Donor Relations Division (DRD).

The evaluation started in January 2016 and a final report was expected to be made available externally, in particular to IOM Member States in line with Resolution No 1229 point 7, before the autumn 2016 session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF) planned on 2–3 November 2016.

⁵ See Annex 3.

⁶ Burundi, El Salvador, Guatemala, Holy See, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

⁷ See Annex 4.

⁸ See Annex 5.

2. THE MIGRATION EMERGENCY FUNDING MECHANISM (MEFM)

In order to properly frame the analysis of the relevance, performance and success of the mechanism, it is important to understand the rationale of the establishment of MEFM, the main characteristics of the fund and the requirements for its use, as specified in Resolution No. 1229, in paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335, in the internal instruction IN/207, as well as through the discussions held in the framework of the Working Group on Budget Reform (WGBR).

The fund was created in 2011 and being the first one in IOM focussing on humanitarian assistance with a financial target of USD 30 million, the four-year period 2012–2015 covered by the evaluation can also be considered as a pilot phase. When needed in the analysis, a comparison will be made with another IOM specific fund created for capacity building activities in migration and with a target balance of USD 10 million, the IOM Development Fund (IDF).

2.1 MEFM under a historical perspective

The first discussions on the creation of a fund took place at the fourth meeting of the IOM Working Group on Budget Reform (WGBR) of 22 February 2011, during which IOM Member States expressed concern in finding a way to move forward in the discussions on “possible alternative funding, new budget structures and possible ideas for the consolidation and revision of existing budget resolutions”.⁹ The WGBR also considered that there were steps consistent with the principle of projectization that the Council could take in order to provide the Administration with greater flexibility in addressing financial challenges faced by the organisation. Any new structure was also expected to create incentives to encourage increased voluntary un-earmarked contributions from Member States as well as from the private sector.

Among the ideas discussed was the creation of an “International Migration Emergency Operations Reserve Fund”, the purpose of which would be “to facilitate IOM’s emergency response capacity by providing a source of bridge financing while more stable donor funding is sought to stand up operations in areas such as emergency migration evacuations or movements for which Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)¹⁰ funding is not accessible”, using the Libya crisis as an example of recent problems faced at that time by the Organisation to implement its operations pending receipt of donor funding.

At its sixth meeting, some Member States questioned the relevance of discussing the establishment of such a fund in the framework of the WGBR, not bringing a real change to the budget structure, but others considered that “it would help stabilize the Organisation’s budget and financial situation during major emergencies”, noting that “emergencies often require spending funds prior to receiving confirmed donor contributions, thereby introducing an element of financial insecurity”. The fund was also expected to put “less pressure on the Organization’s limited internal resources and core funding”¹¹.

⁹ WGBR, Concept Paper on a Framework for IOM Budget Reform, 5 April 2011.

¹⁰ CERF: Central Emergency Response Fund, also called sometimes UN CERF being a United Nations funding mechanism.

¹¹ WGBR, Concept Paper on a Framework for IOM Budget Reform, sixth meeting, 3 May 2011.

At the hundred and eighth session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF) of May 2011, Member States shared comments on the progress report from the WGBR regarding the establishment of the fund, with diverging views.¹² Some reiterated their support for the establishment of a fund based on voluntary contributions, without placing a burden on the core structure and with clear guidelines to distinguish it from existing mechanisms such as CERF. They also considered that it was needed to deal with “unavoidable realities”, with emergencies becoming more frequent, involving large scale movements of people and with the number of migrants rising every year, putting them at risk in the countries in crisis or, if crossing the borders for finding safe places, being then considered as irregular. IOM being increasingly involved in emergency situations, at times expected to take the lead of operations, its effectiveness would be measured “not only in terms of migrants assisted or evacuated, but even more in terms of timeliness of its response”.

Other Member States expressed the views that the establishment of the fund should take into account other options available in the international community, the work done on humanitarian financing within the UN System and how the fund will fit into the general humanitarian architecture, avoiding overlap with existing mechanisms and wasteful competition. They commented that the WGBR was not the right place to discuss it, and that it should be examined when analysing lessons learned from emergencies as part of other discussions at the SCPF. One Member State considered that more consideration should be given on how the fund would be financed, given that only few countries were willing to make unearmarked contributions.

For its seventh meeting of 29 June 2011, the WGBR prepared a specific paper on the establishment of the fund clarifying issues raised at the SCPF and providing additional elements on its operational use and other administrative requirements¹³. In particular, it underlines the obligation of the Director General to make payments within the limits of available funding, impeding a swift reaction to assist people in emergencies requiring an immediate response. It also highlights the difficult situation faced by migrants in times of crisis, having limited access to assistance and support both from the country of origin and the host country, and that IOM is increasingly called to assist them, requiring a timely surge capacity for an effective response.

The document confirms its use as a bridging fund pending receipt of donor funding and specifies that the “aim is to enable early assessment of situations on the ground and very short response times in providing the initial required assistance”. Its use will primarily be to cover the costs of international transport for migrants affected, as well any arrangements for the support of travel. It also clarifies that CERF funding is to be used only in the country in crisis and is not adapted to put in place structures in various countries involving international transportation. The paper also proposes administrative steps and reimbursement modalities, including costs for the administration of the fund, to be covered by voluntary contributions.

At its eighth meeting, the WGBR provided an update on the discussions on the establishment of the fund¹⁴, including additional elements on the limited use of CERF, in particular due to the country-specific decision making process relying on the UN Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator, the Humanitarian Country Team and Clusters, underlining, however, that CERF has provided funding to IOM for migration emergencies in specific

¹² MC/EX/712, Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance on the Eighth Session, 14 June 2011.

¹³ WGBR, Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, 29 June 2011.

¹⁴ WGBR, Update on the Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, 27 September 2011.

countries but for non-transport related assistance. The document also recognizes that IOM can count on generous support from many donor funding sources, sometimes with very rapid responses, but the time required to prepare an IOM appeal for funds, to have the decisions from the donor community and the funds disbursed require several days that have their importance in such crises. It includes a draft Resolution to be submitted to the IOM Council.

Document SCPF/67 was prepared including the proposals discussed in the framework of the WGBR and was presented at the informal consultations on Standing Committee matters of October 2011. Discussions took place on the draft Resolution, which required some changes that were reflected in document SCPF/67/Rev.1 “Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism”, presented at the ninth session of the SCPF in November 2011. The document including a draft Resolution was then submitted as document MC/2335 to the IOM Council of December 2011 for approval.

2.2 MEFM operational criteria and administrative requirements

The operational criteria and administrative processes for the use of MEFM, as approved by Member States, are detailed in Resolution No. 1229 and in paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335; the mandatory internal instruction IN/207 for IOM officials further clarifies them. The section will focus on key requirements for the use of MEFM and for disbursements, which will be analysed mainly through the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency under Sections 3 and 4.

2.2.1 Objectives of the mechanism and operational principles

The objectives of MEFM are specified under operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of Resolution No 1229. Paragraph 1 states that the mechanism is established with *“the purpose of bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding, thereby being complementary to other existing emergency funds”*, and point 3 that: *“The Director General is authorized to expend funds [...] to ensure a rapid response to an emergency involving migration, pending receipt of donor contributions”*. Paragraph 19 of document MC/2335 further clarifies that *“the request should seek immediate financing for core emergency needs related to international transport”*.

Document MC/2335 provides additional details on the objectives and activities to be supported by the mechanism under paragraphs 6 and 7: *“the aim is to enable early assessment of situations on the ground and very short response times for providing the initial required assistance”*. It also states that the mechanism is primarily used to cover the costs of international transport for migrants affected by emergencies, any arrangements to prepare for or support their travel in the place of origin, departure, transit or arrival, as well as the staff and office capacity to support these activities.

The main operational principles governing the fund are contained in paragraph 19 of document MC/2335, which instructs that the requests for funding, including purposes, objectives and budget, should be reviewed by DOE *“to ensure that their intended use meets the established objectives and criteria”*. The requests should be initiated by an IOM Office and if coming from another source (for instance from DOE as clarified in the

instruction IN/207), it should be confirmed by an informed IOM Field Office. After review of the request, DOE makes a recommendation to the Director General for consideration and approval.

Instruction IN/207 further clarifies that DOE manages the operational administration of MEFM and DRM the financial aspects, and that a joint recommendation from DRM and DOE should be made to the Director General, rather than only from DOE as mentioned under MC/2335. The recommendation should be made within 48 hours of receiving the request and the Director General, in turn, should decide within 48 hours of its receipt, resulting in a maximum of 4 days between the initial request and final approval. According to the 'IOM Evaluation of CERF funded Interventions (2006–2012)' conducted by OIG in 2013, "IOM data for 2011 to 2012 indicate that the usual period between countersignature of the approval letter and funds disbursement to IOM is between 3 to 10 working days; however, the preparatory work in the field and coordination within UNCT can increase this interval". Document IN/207 also states that "*under no circumstances will a request be authorized without an appropriate written application*", which should describe the nature of the crisis, the needs to be addressed, the anticipated use of the budget, the status of relevant donor appeals and that MEFM funding will apply equally to all vulnerable groups.

Resolution No 1229 operative paragraph 4 specifies that "*the Director General will replenish the mechanism upon receipt of donor contributions*" and paragraph 20 of document MC/2335 states that "*advances from the mechanism will be repaid as a first charge on contributions to be received*", and "*if donor funding is not received within one year, a charge will be made against the mechanism*". Instruction IN/207 also mentions that "*DOE will track all MEFM fund approval programs and liaise with COMs and Project Managers as appropriate, in coordination with DRD, to monitor opportunities and actions for the MEFM replenishment*".

The fundraising for replenishment of loans should be differentiated from the fundraising for reaching the balance of USD 30 million as established by Resolution No 1229, point 1. Under point 2 of the Resolution it is specified that the mechanism should be funded from voluntary contributions, "*including from Member States, the private sector and individuals*", and interest accrued is to be retained within the mechanism.

2.2.2 Administrative and reporting requirements

In terms of administrative management, Resolution No 1229 specifies that the mechanism is governed by IOM financial regulations and subject to the annual audit of IOM's External Auditors. Paragraph 21 of document MC/2335 authorises IOM to allocate an amount of USD 40,000 for the administration (both financial and operational) of the mechanism; it is also mentioned that the amount should be covered by voluntary contributions and that it represents the annual budget for the first year. The paragraph does not specify whether the same amount can be charged for subsequent years.

Instruction IN/207 further clarifies that MEFM cannot operate on a negative cash basis and that all funds disbursed are to be fully reimbursed prior to the end of operations and no later than one year after the authorisation for use. Standard project activation forms must be completed for release of a project ID number, noting however that the number is not MEFM specific and the same ID will be used for funds received from IOM funding appeals of a given crisis.

In terms of reporting, Resolution No 1229 asks the Director General to submit an annual report on *“the Mechanism and its activities and possible requirements to the Council”*. Paragraph 22 of document MC/2335 further specifies that the report to the Council should disclose the size and activity of the fund, a list of contributors and indicate the purpose of its use. IOM also has to report on the status of MEFM in its annual financial report. In addition, instruction IN/207 asks DOE, in coordination with DRM, to generate an internal monthly status report.

3. RELEVANCE TO OPERATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA

In line with the objectives of the evaluation, Section 3 will analyse the relevance of the strategic use of MEFM according to its objectives, criteria and administrative requirements. Reference Section 2.2, the key criteria for the use of MEFM can be summarized as follows: the mechanism is to be used for a start-up of an emergency and to ensure a rapid response; it needs to be complementary to other existing emergency funds; and it is for emergencies involving migration, in particular for needs related to international transport.

Table 1 below has been prepared taking into account those criteria in its columns, mentioning the number of movements, if evacuations were considered in the requests for funding, the target groups assisted, as well as the fundraising status in the field; in addition it also takes into account the administrative requirements, for instance the level of detail included in the requests, the dates and deadlines regarding the approval processes and disbursements, and the dates of the reimbursements, when done. During the period under review (2012–2015), the mechanism has been activated for twenty emergencies, which are presented in chronological order.

Summary of Operations funded by MEFM 2012–2015 (Table 1)

	1) Request: Project document, e-mail, other	2) Targeted beneficiaries as specified in the request	3) Evacuation of TCN/migrants specified - other	4) Amount (USD)	5) Date of the request (e-mail)	6) Date registered in PIU ¹⁵ or accounts	7) Date reimbursed
1) Syria Crisis - IOM Regional Response (number of evacuations: 7300 ¹⁶)	1)e-mail (detailed ¹⁷) 2) e-mail (detailed) 3) e-mail (level of funding only) 4) e-mail (level of funding only)	Displaced, Third Country Nationals, vulnerable IDPs. Migrants in crisis, flows on borders. Not specified. Not specified.	Yes – set-up of office & transit centres in Jordan, Lebanon. Yes - with confirmed commitments for funding evacuations. Yes - for ops continuation, with clear instructions for evacuation only. No - for ops continuation in country.	100,000 500,000 300,000 500,000	23.7.12 1.8.12 10.8.12 16.2.13	31.7.12 31.7.12 31.10.12 18.2.13	29.4.13 (all reimbursed)
2) Emergency Appeal for Returnees in South Sudan (number of returnees: 700)	e-mail (detailed)	Stranded South Sudanese in Sudan – most vulnerable.	No – for returns: airlift operation from Sudan to South-Sudan, pending funding receipt (CERF).	500'000	1.11.13	26.11.13	28.2.14
3) Return Intention Survey in Dadaab (no movements)	e-mail (detailed)	Return of Somali: intention survey.	No - only starting-up of the survey with funding commitment confirmed.	100,000	17.12.13	3.1.14	11.9.15
4) Emergency in Central African Republic (CAR) (number of evacuations: 12000+)	1) e-mail (level of funding only) 2) e-mail (detailed but for IOM Chad) 3) e-mail (detailed) 4) e-mail (detailed) 5) e-mail (detailed) 6) Memo (not detailed but with funding balance of MEFM checked).	Humanitarian emergency Assistance upon arrival to migrants evacuated. Stranded migrants of various nationalities. Chadian nationals. Stranded migrants of various nationalities. Not specified (on-going operations).	No - only setting-up of IOM office (no presence in CAR). Yes - confirmed assistance for evacuation. Yes – organization of evacuation flights. Yes – evacuation flights from Bangui, and staff and office costs. Yes – assistance for evacuations, including from Cameroun camps. Yes – in the overall review of MEFM funding balance before disbursement.	300,000 200,000 800,000 1,000,000 1,000,000 800,000	18.10.13 31.12.13 4.1.14 26.1.14 18.2.14 23.1.15	12.12.13 27.2.14 27.2.14 27.2.14 27.2.14 31.12.14	No amounts reimbursed¹⁸.

¹⁵ Project Information Unit.

¹⁶ The numbers reported in that column are not the number of evacuations funded by MEFM, such data not being available, but evacuations done through IOM operations in the countries in crisis.

¹⁷ 'Detailed' means that it includes a short context (some with explanations on UN collaboration), scope or objectives of the use of MEFM, targeted beneficiaries (not necessarily with numbers), urgency level, MEFM funding level, expected donor contributions for IOM operations. The e-mails do not however exceed one page of justifications.

¹⁸ 'No amounts reimbursed' does not mean that additional funding was not received for IOM emergency response; in most cases, donors disagreed to allocate funds for reimbursing the loan.

	1) Request: Project document, e-mail, other	2) Targeted beneficiaries as specified in the request	3) Evacuation of TCN/migrants specified - other	4) Amount (USD)	5) Date of the request (e-mail)	6) Date registered in PIU ¹⁵ or accounts	7) Date reimbursed
5) Emergency Return Assistance from Saudi Arabia (no movements)	e-mail (detailed)	Assistance to deported Ethiopians from Saudi Arabia.	No - assistance upon arrival	1,000,000 ¹⁹	23.11.13	31.3.14	No amounts reimbursed.
6) Post Arrival Assistance from Saudi Arabia (no movements)	e-mail (detailed)	Assistance to deported Somali from Saudi Arabia.	No - assistance upon arrival - Request from the Government of Somalia.	200,000	18.1.14	5.2.14	23.7.14
7) Emergency Assistance for DRC (no movements)	e-mail (detailed)	Assistance to deported Congolese from Congo.	No – assistance upon arrival	200,000	9.5.14	26.5.14	14.8.14
8) Transit Assistance for Libyan Crisis 2014 (number of evacuations: 58)	e-mail (detailed)	Stranded migrants (various nationalities).	Yes - funding discussed with governments asking for assistance.	200,000	31.7.14	20.8.14	31.12.14
9) Nigeria Emergency Response (no movements)	1) e-mail (detailed, + regional coverage)	IDPs and cross-border displaced.	No – technical set-up of offices in Nigeria and neighboring countries with experts’ deployment in DTM, CCCM, Shelters/NFI. No – continuation of operations pending donor’s disbursement.	1,000,000	16.2.15	1.3.15	Partial - 250,000: 3 tranches, first on 10.6.15. 5.10.15
	2) e-mail (funding level and donor’s commitment only)	Displaced persons.		500,000	19.9.15	5.10.15	
10) Vanuatu Emergency Response (no movements)	e-mail (only funding level and urgency)	Assistance to victims – natural disaster.	No – costs for staff deployment and purchase of equipment.	100,000	14.3.15	16.3.15	25.3.15
11) Marshall Island Emergency Assistance (no movements)	e-mail (only funding level and urgency)	Not specified.	No – logistics, to start operations.	100,000	1.4.15	1.4.15	26.5.15
12) Yemen Emergency Response (number of evacuations: 28000)	1) e-mail (detailed)	Stranded migrants and migrants fleeing to Djibouti and Somalia.	Yes – focus on evacuations and assistance upon arrival in Djibouti and Somalia. Yes - To benefit from the five days humanitarian pause for evacuations.	1,000,000	31.3.15	8.4.15	10.7.15 No amounts reimbursed.
	2) e-mail (at DG’s initiative - urgency)	Stranded migrants in Yemen.		2,000,000	27.7.15	28.7.15	
13) Nepal Emergency Assistance (no movements)	e-mail (only funding level and urgency)	Not specified.	No – deployment of IOM teams (NFI, CCCM, health) and supplies.	1,000,000	27.4.15	28.4.15	13.5.15

¹⁹ The financial reports mention the amounts of USD 1.5 million disbursed with USD 0.5 million reimbursed; however, this is due to an accounting adjustment on financial movements as no reimbursement by donors was made and only USD 1 million was allocated to field operations by MEFM.

	1) Request: Project document, e-mail, other	2) Targeted beneficiaries as specified in the request	3) Evacuation of TCN/migrants specified - other	4) Amount (USD)	5) Date of the request (e-mail)	6) Date registered in PIU ¹⁵ or accounts	7) Date reimbursed
14) Andaman Sea Emergency Assistance (no movements)	e-mail (strategic objective only)	Stranded migrants at sea.	No – assistance to migrants at sea pending disembarkation agreement.	1,000,000	14.5.15	25.5.15	4.6.15
15) PNG Emergency Assistance to TF (no movements)	e-mail (short DG's proposal)	Enslaved Burmese fishermen stranded in PNG.	No – special caseload and assistance.	100,000	26.7.15	28.7.15	No amounts reimbursed.
16) Myanmar Emergency Response (no movements)	e-mail (at DG's initiative, pending receipt of CERF)	Not specified.	No – emergency/flood assistance: request of assistance from the Government.	100,000	4.8.15	10.8.15	14.8.15
17) Western Balkans Emergency Assistance (no movements)	1) e-mail (detailed)	Migrants in crisis and refugees flows in Serbia.	No – support to Government's response to crisis.	50,000	17.8.15	21.8.15	Partial -124,205: in 3 tranches, first on 30.9.15
	2) e-mail (detailed, with concept note)	Syrian migrants/refugees on Kos Island, Greece.	No – setting up of sub-office and processing of migrants.	50,000	19.8.15	21.8.15	
	3) e-mail with concept note	Migrants/refugees flows, FYRoM.	No – registration and awareness raising.	50,000	19.8.15	21.8.15	
	4) e-mail with 2 concept notes	Migrants/refugees flows, FYRoM and Serbia.	No - support to Governments' responses to crisis.	100,000	13.9.15	14.9.15	
	5) e-mail (ref. discussions held)	Migration crisis Croatia.	No – no other details.	200,000	23.9.15	24.9.15	
	6) no records traced	<i>No records.</i>	<i>No records.</i>	50,000	-	-	
	7) no records traced	<i>No records.</i>	<i>No records.</i>	50,000	-	-	
18) Early Warning Information from Greece to Serbia (no movements)	e-mail with concept note	Migrants flow along migration route from Greece to Serbia.	No – set-up of a regional early warning system.	50,000	28.8.15	31.8.15	No amounts reimbursed.
19) Field data on Migration flows to Europe (no movements)	e-mail with concept note	Migrants flows (global).	No – roll out of an Information Management system for the Mediterranean crisis (multiple countries)	50,000	21.9.15	22.9.15	No amounts reimbursed.
20) Emergency Response The Commonwealth of Dominica (no movements)	Letter proposing support: at DG's initiative.	Victims of natural disasters.	No – emergency relief and post-emergency operations	100,000	28.8.15	1.11.15	No amounts reimbursed

3.1 The link to migrants and international transport

As mentioned in the first column of Table 1, five out of twenty emergencies include the organization by IOM of movements of persons or international transport, and in one case they are not related to evacuations but to the return of South Sudanese citizens from Sudan to South Sudan, the vulnerability of the returnees and the urgency of the operation being nonetheless specified in the request. The number of persons moved ranges from 58 to 28,000, noting that the numbers cover the overall IOM intervention in a crisis, with various funding sources, and are not merely linked to the use of MEFM as specified in footnote No 14; there is no such data available on movements that can be exclusively attributed to MEFM resources. When the organisation of evacuations was considered as strategically necessary, it was specified in the request for funding, as stated under column 3 of the table.

When evacuations are not mentioned in funding requests, there are references to a migration crisis with the need to assist vulnerable migrants (in some cases considered as life-saving measures), to the support to governments in assisting them as is the case in the European and Western Balkans migration crisis, or to the set-up of offices and deployment of technical experts for early assessments on the ground, the latter being included in paragraphs 6 and 7 of document MC/2335 as specified under Section 2. Paragraphs 6 and 7 are not mentioned in Resolution No. 1229, but have operational elements that are part of the background presented at the Council for justifying the creation of MEFM.

In terms of assistance to vulnerable migrants in situations where evacuation assistance was not provided, disbursements were made at the request of the governments of the country of origin of the migrants, for assisting migrants upon arrival when deported under difficult circumstances from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and from Congo; in cases of cross-border displacements such as for the Nigeria crisis; and for the return of stranded and enslaved migrants at sea (see column 2). In five cases there was no such reference to vulnerable migrants, being requests for early responses to natural disasters, for instance in Nepal, Dominica or Marshall Islands, and only with the criteria of rapid response being among the MEFM criteria, albeit to provide emergency assistance to displaced populations. It should be noted however that four of them were rapidly and duly reimbursed. The case of assistance to the Commonwealth of Dominica, which was not reimbursed, was an initiative of the Director General and the amount was of USD 100,000. The issue of reimbursement of MEFM, including the latter case, will be analysed later in the report.

In making a narrow interpretation of the objective and criteria for the use of MEFM, only four disbursements out of twenty are directly linked to evacuations of migrants. However, there are other elements worth adding to the discussion on the interpretation of the criteria for its use. In looking at the historical background under Section 2.1, the reference to 'evacuation' or 'international transport' was not the first element for justifying the creation of an emergency funding mechanism; the evacuation from Libya was taken as an example of situations where rapid access to funding was not evident for providing assistance to vulnerable migrants in need, for instance through UN CERF.

The discussions were also taking place in the framework of the Working Group on Budget Reform, which was created to examine possible alternative funding and new budget structures, and more importantly to provide the Administration with greater flexibility in addressing financial challenges of the organisation. Only

in subsequent discussions, Member States expressed concerns that it could duplicate existing funding mechanisms, therefore requiring to refine criteria by including among others the close link with international transport and evacuations.

Another element to be considered, which is also in the rationale of MEFM, is the need to build an IOM presence rapidly and effectively at the start of a crisis, to maintain IOM's assets of effectiveness, flexibility and rapid response. As underlined previously, there are references mentioning the possible use of MEFM for the set-up of offices, assessments of needs and the deployment of experts at the onset of an emergency in document MC/2335 and in the discussions held at the WGBR. All IOM officers who replied to the questionnaire confirmed not having had any problems in accessing MEFM funding, even when not fully in line with the criteria applied with a restrictive interpretation.

The five disbursements made for IOM's response to natural disasters, considering its recognized mandate in that field, were done with those additional elements in mind, as specified in the documents reviewed and during interviews: it was not possible to know either when the disbursements were made in the first days of the crises, if evacuations of migrants from the affected zones were urgently required or if only humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons and migrants was to be provided. It is worth underlining, as already mentioned, that most of these amounts were reimbursed to MEFM as soon as other funding sources were made available, sometimes within a couple of weeks.

In the case of returns, cross-border assistance to displaced persons and post-arrival assistance to deported migrants, there was a migration crisis in all the situations, though these were not necessarily to be considered the 'start-up' of an emergency as discussed by Member States in the Working Group. However, the urgency to assist migrants in a desperate situation was there. The disbursement for the return intention survey in Dadaab was done in the same dynamic, to speed up the assessment process on the ground following the declaration by the Kenyan Government to close the camp, which was perceived as having the potential to create a major refugee and migration crisis.

It is also interesting to note in Table 1 that the emergency responses, including evacuations of migrants, were the ones that were hardly and sometimes not reimbursed, and that for the Syria and Central African Republic (CAR) crises, amounts have been disbursed over a 'long period' of time as highlighted in red under column 5 with the dates relating to the first and last funding requests. The notions of 'start-up' or 'early stage' of an emergency also deserve to be further clarified as the discussions in the WGBR and at the SCPF tend towards an interpretation that disbursements should not exceed a month for instance. The only time limit is dictated by the "subsequent receipt of donor funding" as per Resolution No 1229.

In the survey sent to Member States, a question was asked on the need for the Director General to adopt a more conservative and rigorous approach in approving disbursements: 40% of them do not consider it necessary, one suggesting instead to examine a new format for MEFM or a new mechanism, and another one considering that awareness raising on MEFM and for reimbursement of its loans would be more effective. Among the 60% of responding Member States considering that a more rigorous and conservative approach should be adopted, two of them suggest that additional appeals or new parameters to mobilize funds should be examined instead. Three of them are however ready to consider disbursements in cases of life-threatening

situations faced by migrants, without necessarily being related to evacuation, pending receipt of other funding; one Member State suggests also that refined criteria should be submitted by the Director General to Member States for consideration in order to avoid interpretations which could be considered as an unauthorized use.

The Director General raised his concern to the Directors of DOE and DRM in an e-mail exchange related to the CAR crisis, on the issue of approving funding after several months and without having received any reimbursements in between, noting that life-saving assistance is still an element to be considered in his decision; he also expressed his willingness to be accountable to Member States on the use of MEFM. One Member State calling for a more rigorous approach also highlighted the problem of disbursements over a relatively long period of time in its response, mentioning that IOM should reconsider its strategy when an emergency becomes protracted or turns into a chronic situation.

Conclusion: The Director General should have considered mentioning in his reporting to the Council that he had had to approve some disbursements that were not strictly in line with the criteria and intent of Resolution No. 1229, and that he had noted that other crises had also required immediate funding and rapid response. For instance, two years after the Mechanism had been fully operational, dialogue could have been entered into with Member States to seek their guidance on a more precise definition of the types of emergencies that would qualify for funding from the Mechanism and to discuss the problems being faced owing to the limited scope of MEFM and how they could have been addressed. Resolution No. 1229 also refers to the possibility of reporting to the Council on the “possible requirements” of the Mechanism. The Director General could have proposed solutions vis-à-vis the authorization of disbursements for assisting both displaced populations and migrants in serious life-threatening situations, or vis-à-vis the restricted use of the Mechanism through a strict interpretation of the requirement pertaining to the evacuation of migrants, taking into account the increasing number of other types of migration crises requiring immediate actions without guaranteed access to immediate funding.

3.2 Other operational, administrative and reporting requirements

3.2.1 Operational requirements

Regarding other operational requirements, the requests for funding mainly consisted of a detailed e-mail sent to the Director of DOE (in some cases a concept paper was presented instead of the e-mail), specifying the objective(s) of the use of MEFM, the targeted beneficiaries (not necessarily with numbers), the urgency status, the level of anticipated MEFM funding and in many of them the expected donor contributions towards the IOM operation. The e-mails and concept papers did not exceed one to two pages of justification, as it was also confirmed by the IOM officers who replied to the questionnaire, and they are in line with the requirements as presented under Section 2. The requests were also approved within the 48-hour deadline mentioned in instruction IN/207.

In the questionnaire sent to IOM officers, all agreed that access to MEFM is easy and flexible, available within 24 hours as mentioned by one respondent, and it can be one the first and immediate sources of funding. In

the same questionnaire, they also confirmed that the field initiates the requests, with some exceptions for Level 3 emergencies where IOM Headquarters suggests resorting to the use of MEFM, but with the confirmation from the field on the opportunity to do so.

As per Table 1, only in 25% of cases²⁰ (9 out of 36 disbursements), the information was not 'detailed' as shown under columns 1 and 2, for instance with multiple disbursements in the Syria and CAR crises when the additional requests were in line with previous demands, and for responses to natural disasters (Marshall Islands, Nepal or Myanmar). In four of those cases, access to MEFM was at the initiative of the Director General based on discussions held with Government officials and on his own assessment of the situation. If the purpose of a detailed request is for the Director General to take an informed decision for the allocation of funds, then he does not need it in such situations.

MEFM being a loan to an operation that is formally launched through the IOM appeal documents submitted to donors, there is no need to have a project document specific to MEFM pending receipt of donor money; only a summary of the information that will be contained in the subsequent appeal suffices. The same logic applies to the analysis of connectedness: the criteria is contained in the IOM and inter-agency humanitarian appeals and IOM is known for working closely with governments, partners in the field and in the framework of the inter-agency mechanisms in order to guarantee that interconnected, medium and longer term approaches are well taken into account. The same is true for cross-cutting issues such as gender, cultural and institutional aspects; at the stage of MEFM requests, there is no need for in-depth detail.

Since its creation in December 2011 and until December 2015, MEFM has been activated for twenty emergencies as listed in Table 1. The amounts disbursed ranged from USD 50,000 to USD 2,000,000 and in most cases were based on a rapid assessment of the situation on the ground and on an evaluation of IOM needs. In five cases, multiple disbursements were made for the same crisis, noting however that for one emergency the amounts were mainly at the level of USD 50,000 and covered more than one country within a region, while for the other four crises the amounts ranged from USD 100,000 to USD 2,000,000, with four disbursements of USD 1,000,000. There is no limit imposed in the criteria on the level of amounts authorised for disbursement and there is no specific remarks about it in the documentation reviewed, other than it was considered historically that operations for evacuations, or possible evacuations, were costly and requiring important disbursements.

Recommendation: Instruction IN/207, which provides guidelines on how the Mechanism's funds should be requested and managed, states that: "Under no circumstances will a request be authorized without an appropriate written application." This rule should still apply. Justifications for the release of funds are important for the management of the subsequent loan and for monitoring reimbursements and are not required to be very detailed. Exceptions, for instance when the request emanates directly from the Director General, should be kept to a minimum, even if there be good reason to not strictly apply the rule.

²⁰ The two lines in the table with 'no records traced' are not included in the total of nine as requests seem to exist but could not be found in the various files related to MEFM, being at DRM or DOE levels.

3.2.2 Administrative requirements

Most of the disbursements made were in line with the administrative requirements mentioned under Section 2.2.2. They were not done with MEFM having a negative cash balance and this was checked and confirmed by the Director of DRM before submitting the request to the Director General, and standard project activation forms were completed for release of a project ID number; it was never a specific MEFM ID due to the same ID also being released for funds received from IOM appeals (see also Section 3.2.1 on project proposals). Being a loan attributed to a given intervention and to be reimbursed, it was not considered relevant to issue a different ID for MEFM.

The main administrative problem lies in the requirement that all funds disbursed are to be fully reimbursed prior to the end of operations and no later than one year after the authorisation for use: this issue will be examined later in the report, under the analysis of the effectiveness of financial management, which includes reimbursements (Section 4.2).

Two other administrative issues are to be mentioned under the analysis of relevance. First, and according to financial records, the requirement to add the interest accrued to MEFM balance has been respected, and secondly, the Administration is authorised to charge an amount of USD 40,000 for administrative and operational support for the first year, expected to be covered by voluntary contributions. In the financial records, such an amount has been deducted twice, respectively in 2014 and 2015, though not in 2012, the first year of MEFM.

It is not clear however if MEFM, which is also based on 'voluntary contributions' (some Member States having argued that unearmarked contributions should not be used to increase MEFM balance), can be considered as a valid financial source for charging this amount. The authorisation for covering "the first year" is clear and it is not because nothing is mentioned for the following years, that the amount could be charged for more than a year. Should the Administration be interested to propose an amendment for an annual deduction, then the use of USD 40,000 should be well justified and more detailed than what is currently the case in paragraph 22 of document MC/2335, as also requested by some Member States.

No records were found on MEFM being specifically audited or included in the audit plans of the External Auditors. The financial use of MEFM was reviewed together with other financial issues when auditing IOM accounts for each financial year. The evaluation leaves it to the External Auditors to further examine audit requirements based on Resolution No. 1229, including the conduct of a specific audit of MEFM.

Recommendation: Unless otherwise instructed by Member States, for example should they decide to examine the possibility of amending Resolution No. 1229 to allow for charging administrative and operational support costs every year, the Administration should reimburse the amount of USD 40,000, which was charged for a second year. The IOM Administration should consider how the amount could be reimbursed through other voluntary contributions, as specified in Resolution No. 1229.

3.2.3 Reporting requirements

In terms of reporting, IOM adhered to the requirements of Resolution No. 1229 and of paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335: a section on MEFM is included in the annual financial reports to the Council containing the elements requested in the Resolution, as well as in the annual report of the Director General on the work of the Organisation. In addition and for information purposes, a short section on MEFM is added in the IOM Programme and Budget submitted to the Council, as well as in specific reports to the SCPF for instance in the 'Report on IOM Response to Migration Crisis' (S/16/4) presented in 2015, and in the 'Report on IOM's Application of the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and other Related Humanitarian Matters' (S/14/5) of 2014.

In the questionnaire sent to Member States, Question 5 is related to reporting requirements, asking if they consider them relevant and sufficient or if more detailed mandatory reporting requirements would be needed²¹. Eight out of ten Member States consider that reporting is relevant and sufficient, one that it is not and one does not express an opinion but only shares a suggestion, that a specific annual report and overview of MEFM's use would be relevant, or an overview of a three-year period (2012-2014). Concerning the last point proposed, it should be noted that an evaluation is mandatory every three years as per Resolution No. 1229.

A Member State suggests that more information on the different crises which benefited from MEFM should be included in the Director General's annual report, while another Member State suggests more information on the status of reimbursements or on the costs associated with managing MEFM. Instruction IN/207 requests DOE and DRM to produce an internal monthly MEFM Status Report, a requirement which has not been fulfilled, but which may be useful for providing additional information to the Member States who ask for more detailed feedback on the use of MEFM.

Conclusion:

There is a case for adding more mandatory information in the annual reports submitted to the Council, or for issuing an annual report on MEFM. It should be noted, however, that Member States should not, and do not wish to, micromanage the use of MEFM. Having a specific report on MEFM or adding information to existing reports should be considered when necessary, for instance as suggested in the conclusion of Section 3.1 regarding the Director General's experience and the challenges he faced in the application of the MEFM criteria and any adjustments that could be considered.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

This section will analyse the effectiveness of the use of MEFM under different perspectives. It will mainly examine the effectiveness of the overall administrative and financial management of the fund, including

²¹ Question 6 of the same questionnaire to Member States is also on reporting but in the framework of fundraising efforts, on the use of MEFM for operations and on accountability to affected populations; there are no mandatory requirements for such reporting and the issue will be examined later in the report.

fundraising and reimbursements, and of operational and reporting processes. Some analysis may also complement the analysis of relevance covered under Section 3.

4.1 Reaching the target balance and overall financial management

One of the first issues that can be examined is the effectiveness in reaching the balance of USD 30 million that was set as a target for the fund. As shown in Table 2 below listing the contributions of 12 Member States for the period 2011-2015, USD 11.2 million have been registered representing only 38% of the target and an average of USD 2.8 million per year (including interest income).

Contributions 2011–2015 (Table 2)

United States of America	7,500,000
Norway	1,056,785
Bangladesh	1,002,175
Sweden	849,021
Australia	399,975
Turkey	200,000
South Africa	123,367
Philippines	70,000
<i>Interest income 2012-2015</i>	<i>21,217</i>
Romania	20,000
Malta	13,831
Mauritius	10,000
Namibia	3,000
Grand Total 2011–2015	11,269,371

Initial target : **USD 30,000,000**
 Level of contributions : **38% of initial target**
 Average per year (4 years) : **USD 2,817,342**

One contribution represents 66% of the total, three contributions 26% (each being around 8% of the total), and the nine remaining contributions reach 8% of the total. Of particular interest are the contributions of Member States that are not among IOM traditional donors. Every contribution, irrespective of its size, has its importance; yet more Member States need to contribute to the fund in order to reach the target.

The generous contribution of one Member State to support the initial years of the mechanism's functioning, together with the first contribution already announced at the approval of the Resolution in 2011 as an encouragement to contribute, have not been sufficient to help reach the expected balance. The Resolution

also makes reference to other funding sources, such as from the private sector or individuals, without however registering any success.

Fundraising efforts were made by IOM to reach the amount of USD 30 million, beyond highlighting it at Governing Bodies meetings, for instance by including a short section on MEFM in the annual Migration Initiatives, by launching specific appeals on MEFM underlining the importance of its use, and by including MEFM in appeals for IOM funding mechanisms, which also include the Rapid Response Transportation Fund, the Humanitarian Assistance to Stranded Migrants fund, the Global Assistance Fund and the IOM Development Fund. However, according to documentation review, specific fundraising efforts for MEFM do not appear to have been done on a regular basis, three out of ten Member States having also mentioned under Question 1 that they were not aware of those fundraising initiatives. There is no indication of private sector or individuals being targeted with specific fundraising initiatives to contribute to the mechanism as committed by IOM.

Nonetheless under Question 1, seven out of ten Member States²² answered that they do not have sufficient resources to contribute to the fund or that they do not consider contributions to MEFM as a priority, some privileging direct funding of IOM emergencies, despite the fact that the establishment of the MEFM specifically sought to address the delays and difficulties faced by IOM in relying exclusively on earmarked contributions to carry out its emergency activities. The Member State who contributed the highest amount stated that it does not plan additional contributions to capitalize MEFM, while another Member State mentioned that any decision relating to a possible contribution could not be announced at the time of completing the questionnaire. Three Member States consider that the reporting in itself does not sufficiently highlight the benefits of MEFM, which does not encourage contributions, and finally one Member State is considering a possible contribution to MEFM.

In a separate interview, a Member State mentioned that they are now examining a specific project funded by them that could facilitate rapid disbursements of funds in emergencies; they are therefore not considering additional contribution to MEFM, which, according to the Member State, remains limited to evacuations. In a SCPF report to the 2011 Council, the representative of the EU announced at that time that EU rules prevent them from contributing to MEFM but that they are ready to examine solutions with IOM to speed-up disbursements of EU funded projects²³. However no progress has been made in this regard as confirmed by DOE.

The question '*Is it needed to reach the target of USD 30 million to be operationally effective?*' deserves further analysis. In Table 3 below, it is possible to note that with the repayments, the disbursements made are higher than the contributions from Member States, reaching USD 15.8 million on 15 December 2015, with repayments having totaled USD 7.2 million²⁴. Out of 20 emergencies, full repayment represents 31% of total disbursements, partial repayment 15% and the emergencies with no repayment 54%, a majority of the funds

²² Question 1 offers the possibility of multiple answers, making the total of comments higher than the 10 Member States having replied.

²³ MC/2334, Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance on the Ninth Session, November 2011.

²⁴ If we consider the Member States contributions totalling USD 11.2 million and the USD 7.2 million that have been reimbursed, the total funds available for disbursement for the same period have reached USD 18.4 million.

disbursed, leaving a balance of funds still to be reimbursed at USD 8.5 million on 15 December 2015²⁵. As of 31 December 2015, the remaining balance of MEFM for new disbursements is USD 2,613,577 and as of 2 June 2016, it is down to USD 463,577, showing continuous difficulties in 2016 to replenish the fund.

Transfers and Repayments 2011–2015 (Table 3)

	Transfers	Repayments	Balance
Andaman Sea Emergency Assistance	1,000,000	-1,000,000	0
Early Warning Information from Greece to Serbia	50,000		50,000
Emergency Appeal for Returnees in South Sudan	500,000	-500,000	0
Emergency Assistance for DRC	200,000	-200,000	0
Emergency in Central African Republic	4,100,000		4,100,000
Emergency Response to Dominica	100,000		100,000
Emergency Return Assistance from Saudi Arabia	1,000,000		1,000,000
Field data on Migration flows to Europe	50,000		50,000
Marshall Island Emergency Assistance	100,000	-100,000	0
Myanmar Emergency Response	100,000	-100,000	0
Nepal Emergency Assistance	1,000,000	-1,000,000	0
Nigeria Emergency Response	1,500,000	-750,000	750,000
PNG Emergency Assistance to TF	100,000		100,000
Post Arrival Assistance from Saudi Arabia	200,000	-200,000	0
Return Intention Survey in Dadaab	100,000	-100,000	0
Syria Crisis - IOM Regional Response	1,400,000	-1,400,000	0
Transit Assistance for Libyan Crisis 2014	200,000	-200,000	0
Vanuatu Emergency Response	100,000	-100,000	0
Western Balkans Emergency Assistance	550,000	-124,206	425,794
Yemen Emergency Response	3,000,000	-1,000,000	2,000,000
Totals	15,850,000	- 7,274,206	8,575,794

Full repayment: USD 4,900,000 representing **31%** of total disbursements

Partial repayment: USD 2,374,206 representing **15%** of total disbursements

No repayment: USD 8,575,794 representing **54%** of total disbursements

The problem of reaching a target for an IOM funding mechanism is not specific to MEFM as the IDF has established a target of USD 10 million to reach through voluntary and unearmarked contributions, which was never reached, remaining on average at 80% of its goal. However, the IDF is a grant that has to be replenished every year with fresh contributions, and its funding structure also benefits from the Operational Support Income (OSI) budget and unearmarked contributions.

²⁵ The table was prepared for analysis early in the evaluation process, with data available as of 15 December 2015. The financial movements and the percentages that can be extracted are however the interesting figures for the analysis of the overall period.

Conclusion: Failure to reach the targeted balance of USD 30 million did not necessarily hinder the effective use of MEFM; operations relating to many emergencies were funded by MEFM and reimbursed. The main difficulty faced by the Mechanism was the high level of non-repayment of disbursed funds, particularly in relation to evacuation operations, which leads to shortages in available funds when there is not a regular injection of fresh contributions. Although IOM made fundraising efforts to reach the target, the evaluation did not detect a high level of interest, including from Member States, in financing MEFM (12 Member States contributed to the Mechanism). It is also important to note that IOM operations, in particular evacuations, can be costly, which is justification for maintaining the USD 30 million target, despite the fact that such expensive operations were not conducted during the reporting period.

4.2 Effectiveness of reimbursements and replenishment

The mechanism is a loan that has to be reimbursed and this is clear for everybody as noted in the documentation review, during the interviews and in the answers to the questionnaires. However, reimbursement of MEFM loans is not functioning effectively, leaving an operational balance that may soon render it ineffective. Some important considerations deserve to be mentioned in the analysis in order to cover all issues having an impact on the effective functioning of MEFM, some of them having been already briefly mentioned under Section 3.

As it can be noted in the first column of Table 1, only four emergencies out of twenty include international transport but the disbursements are amongst the highest and amount to USD 8.7 million on a total of around USD 18.4 million of 'cash flows'²⁶, representing 47% of the overall amount available for the entire period 2011-2015, and 56% of disbursements made as of December 2015. Around half of the funding of MEFM was therefore made available for emergencies with evacuations, which is in line with the intent, but not necessarily respecting all the requirements for the use of MEFM as developed below.

On the USD 8.7 million, only 2.6 million has been reimbursed leaving a deficit of USD 6.1 million, representing 71% of the remaining balance of funds to be repaid (the USD 8.5 million mentioned in Table 3 above). The first operation was for the Syrian crisis, which was fully reimbursed (USD 1.4 million); this was promising as it also was the first operation funded by MEFM. The second operation was implemented in the Central African Republic (CAR) with a disbursement of USD 4.1 million, but without any reimbursement. The third operation was in Yemen with USD 3 million disbursed and only USD 1 million reimbursed as of December 2015. The fourth case was for assistance provided in Libya but for a smaller amount of USD 200,000, fully reimbursed on time.

Another characteristic of three of these operations is the number of disbursements made and the period covered as shown under Table 1: for Syria four disbursements on a seven-month period, CAR six disbursements on a period of four months but with a payment made again eleven months later, and Yemen two disbursements on a four-month period. In all cases, the period covered does not necessarily correspond

²⁶ The amount of USD 18.4 million is the sum of USD 11.2 million of contributions from Member States and USD 7.2 million of repayments made during the period 2012–2015.

to what is commonly understood as the 'early stages of an emergency', which may go against the intended use of MEFM.

Disbursements for maintaining IOM's operations over a longer-term period of time than the initial days or weeks during which MEFM could be activated, could have been examined in an IOM internal committee similar to the one examining under-funded IOM offices to be sustained financially by other sources such as the Operational Support Income (OSI) as IOM cannot work being on deficit with its operations. Resolution No 1229 was not considering to use MEFM as a financial source for underfunded emergencies, with limited prospects of reimbursements.

Some reasons can explain why the operation in Syria was fully reimbursed, while the ones in CAR and Yemen were not. According to documentation review and interviews, the overall funding received by IOM for the Syrian crisis through the appeals was more important than for the other crises, with the agreement of some of the donors to use it for reimbursing MEFM. For Yemen, there was a low level of interest from IOM traditional donors to fund evacuations of migrants from Yemen, for many of them to Ethiopia and Somalia but also to Europe and North America, and announcements made by one country for contributions to humanitarian assistance in Yemen did not fully materialize. There was however no firm commitment from that Government.

In CAR, evacuations were undertaken by IOM at the request of the Government of Chad, whose nationals represented the largest caseload, and of governments from the Sub-Saharan African and South-East Asian regions. MEFM was first used to establish an IOM presence in the country as the Organization had never operated within CAR prior to the crisis, so that movement operations could get under way in autumn 2013. Evacuation operations were integrated into the coordinated inter-agency response framework as well as into a Regional Refugee Response Plan. The extent of donors support towards IOM evacuations remained however limited, in line with persistently low funding levels of the overall humanitarian response.

Later in 2014, donors also made it clear that circumstances on the ground had evolved and evacuation operations were no longer considered a priority; the humanitarian focus had shifted towards supporting efforts to stabilize and reinforce the cohesion of local communities, being consequently reluctant to use their contributions for retroactive reimbursements of evacuations funded by MEFM. Difficulties were also faced in receiving funds for assisting the returning migrants with their reintegration into the country of origin (Chadians in particular), for which MEFM was also used in conformity with the criteria.

As shown in Tables 1 and 3, three other important amounts were not reimbursed respectively of USD 1 million for assistance upon arrival of Ethiopian migrants deported from Saudi Arabia, of USD 750,000 in support of displaced populations in the context of the Nigeria crisis and of USD 525,794 for the Western Balkan and European migration crisis.

For the Nigerian and the Western Balkans and European crises, the amounts allocated by MEFM were partially reimbursed (50% of the total amount allocated for Nigeria and 19% for the Western Balkans and Europe) and there is not much information available on the reasons for non-reimbursement: they consist mainly of problems in receiving funding from donors for such operations or in identifying donors who accept

to charge their projects for retroactive reimbursements (even with the same objectives and type of assistance), especially if not taking place within days after MEFM's disbursement. The same reasons are put forward for non-reimbursement of the remaining crises, when MEFM was activated following natural disasters (Papua New Guinea and Dominica as listed under Table 1).

Paragraph 20 of document MC/2335 states that: "advances from the mechanism will be repaid as a first charge on contributions to be received", raising the point of an obligation from donors to accept to reimburse MEFM with their contribution, in particular with the same objectives and scope of operations. This issue also deserves to be clarified with IOM Member States on the interpretation of Resolution No. 1229.

In the questionnaire sent to IOM officers, four respondents confirmed having negotiated reimbursements with success, one underlining that the donor was happy to reimburse, having made it clear since the beginning of discussions that there was a need to use the funds for replenishing MEFM. However, in two cases the donors stated that they do not agree to cover past costs and one IOM officer commented that it was less appealing to replenish a fund than to support directly a rapid response, also for accountability on the use of funds for their government. One IOM officer mentioned that he negotiated but without success.

Another point to underline, though not being a formal requirement, was the absence of fundraising approaches focussing specifically on the reimbursement of MEFM for those crises, by presenting for instance appeals including key elements on the effectiveness and impact of the loan on affected populations, similar to the IOM situation reports produced during crises but specific to MEFM funding. In the project documents and appeals submitted for fundraising, there was neither a reference to MEFM and possible use of the contributions from donors for reimbursement, including also the budget lines that will be concerned. A dialogue with Member States on the constraints for reimbursement could have been useful too, similar to the one proposed in the conclusion under Section 3.1 regarding the interpretation of criteria.

Question 6 of the questionnaire to Member States was raising the issue of more detailed reporting on MEFM funded operations that could improve fundraising for reimbursement: 60% of Member States having answered consider that it would be useful to promote transparency and accountability, in particular to better understand which sectors or activities were supported with the use of MEFM and which populations were targeted. The remaining 40% consider that it would not be useful, some having already mentioned under Question 1 that funding MEFM is not a priority. Regarding Question 2 and the signature of an agreement to assist IOM for fundraising purposes and reimbursement, 50% are not ready to do it, some mentioning that benefiting Member States should do it; 30% consider it as a possible alternative especially to show the readiness for collaboration on migration matters in a given region; 20% do not have opinion.

In the reply to their questionnaire, all IOM officers consider that the reporting requirements are clear and should not be more demanding, with the exception of one staff who is of the view that reporting should be more elaborated to facilitate fundraising for the reimbursement of the loan. He added that it should be more detailed "also for the missions to understand, that this is not the first source of funding to look at during the emergency but rather in parallel to other donor contributions. It has to be clearly understood that the MEFM funds should be reimbursed within 12 months period. This is a loan not a grant".

Contrary to the IDF, MEFM was not formally intended to be used as 'seed money' for attracting donor funding, but it guaranteed an IOM presence and the set-up of operational activities. The IOM officers who answered the questionnaire considered that MEFM helped receive additional contributions, except in two cases, one mentioning that he asked for MEFM funding only when he was sure that he would be receiving other funds to reimburse. All agreed that it facilitated coordination and partnership.

Conclusion: The Mechanism is currently facing shortfalls due to the non-reimbursement of loans, sometimes due to diverging strategic priorities and other times due to external factors such as funding announcements and commitments that have not been fulfilled; furthermore, there is donor disinterest and reluctance to use the contributions to reimburse MEFM. IOM management could have examined other options for financial support for some operations to avoid relying on MEFM over long periods of time. Fundraising efforts focusing on MEFM for specific crises were not formally required and dialogue with Member States and donors on the challenges faced concerning reimbursements should have been proposed by IOM.

Recommendation: IOM should consider creating a decision-making mechanism or an operations support committee to review operations that are underfunded and that are benefiting from MEFM support beyond the first few months after the start of a crisis. The committee could explore alternative sources of funds for sustaining the IOM office (including the use of Operational Support Income), examine the possible downsizing of the IOM operations, recommend an exceptional continuation of the use of MEFM when there is a good chance that the funds will be reimbursed, and play a more proactive role in fundraising and in finding solutions for the reimbursement of MEFM in support of the IOM office in the field.

4.3 Efficiency, outcome and impact

One of the characteristics of MEFM is that no specific reporting on the operations and financial management is required as previously mentioned. The loan is supposed to be allocated for short periods of time and for funding activities that are then included in the IOM fundraising initiatives, appeals and programmes. Any monitoring and reporting on disbursements and operational activities funded by MEFM are included without distinction in the normal reporting processes used for IOM appeals and projects. No data are available at first glance on what can be attributed to MEFM in terms of movements funded, staff and office costs or other operational needs such as the set-up of offices or sub-offices. Even when MEFM is used on a longer-term basis, no such reports are available and submitted, for instance to the Director of DOE or the Director General.

Financial management of MEFM by DRM at Headquarters was consisting of recording contributions from Member States and donors, as well as disbursements and reimbursements made, with the guarantee that MEFM administrative and operational requirements were met (with the exception of disbursements approved directly by the Director General without the e-mail or concept paper describing the objectives, target groups, reimbursement prospects and budget). There is no requirement for DRM to check if projects approved in the framework of a crisis could be charged systematically to reimburse MEFM, which according to a strict interpretation of the Resolution could be the case as already mentioned in the report. The management of

the use of funds for a possible reimbursement of MEFM is the responsibility of IOM Field Offices or of DOE in case of Level 3 emergencies.

As already brought up in the evaluation, detailed financial recording of disbursements for operations were left to the responsibility of IOM Field Offices as per normal project procedures, adding MEFM related transactions to records of disbursements from other donors contributions or from multiple donor sources in the case of a global appeal. The same problem of reporting applies to the outcome and impact analysis on affected populations, operational reports not attributing specifically an action to MEFM but to the projects or appeal having received funding. The fact of not having such reports available, also for the promotion of the use of MEFM, has already been covered in the report.

Another analysis of the impact of MEFM could cover the credibility of IOM's response related to its effectiveness, flexibility and rapid response; it proved to remain an IOM's strength through the effective use of MEFM for providing life-saving assistance. Concerning the impact on attracting contributions to IOM appeals and projects, the evaluation does not have sufficient elements to conclude, but it certainly facilitated discussions and coordination processes with partners and donors as underlined in the responses to the questionnaire to IOM field staff.

According to IOM officers who replied to the questionnaire, all considered that MEFM was successful for a rapid and effective set-up of operations, for assisting targeted populations at the early stage of the intervention, including for opening sub-offices in remote places without UN or NGO presence, and that it had a positive impact on the situation of migrants and other beneficiaries, contributing also to saving lives. One staff commented that it could be even more effective if it was a grant instead of a loan, IOM offices being put under additional pressure to reimburse it as soon as possible or within the requested twelve-month period.

5. THE FUTURE OF MEFM

The status of MEFM after the initial four-year period raises the following considerations and conclusions, as developed under Sections 3 and 4 above: MEFM was not only used for evacuations but also for other types of IOM emergencies; the mechanism was not only used at the start of an emergency as bridging fund pending donors contributions, but in a few cases some months after the first disbursements to support the continuance of IOM operations; in December 2015, 54% of the funds were not reimbursed and the prospects of full reimbursements remain a challenge, with the risk of rendering the fund more or less ineffective; disbursements were made without clear prospects of reimbursements; and IOM donors are often not willing to reimburse funds disbursed by MEFM.

There have been internal discussions on the benefits of reviewing the funding structure of MEFM in view of the situation, considering also the transformation of the mechanism into a grant, arguing that other international partners have access to important operational reserve funds for supporting the set-up of their emergency assistance. Reimbursement of loans is often challenging as is also the case with another IOM loan fund, the Emergency Preparedness Account, or with the loan component of CERF.

In the 'IOM Evaluation of CERF funded Interventions (2006–2012)' conducted by OIG in 2013, a section mentions the problem of the loan that is one of the components of CERF funding mechanism, stating: "Since CERF restructuring in 2005, the loan facility has fallen into relative disuse and its accumulated interest caused the loan window to rise to USD 76 million. Based on recommendations from the CERF Advisory Group and the Five-year Evaluation, the loan component was reduced to the current level of USD 30 million by General Assembly Resolution A/66/L.28; use of the loan still appears limited". The loan component was not used by IOM and other beneficiaries of CERF also due to problems of reimbursement.

One of the key questions, regardless of the decision on the possible revision of the nature and scope of the mechanism, will be how to replenish it: as a loan with difficulties in receiving reimbursements and in replenishing it, or as a new grant that will require fresh annual contributions and recurring and predictable resources as is the case with the IDF. As it stands, the reliance on voluntary contributions from donors has not proven its efficiency.

Question 4 of the questionnaire to Member States asks the following: "would you be ready to consider discussing again Resolution 1229 (C) and amending it in a way for MEFM to become a grant mechanism to be funded by voluntary, un-earmarked contributions or by other relevant sources, yet still keeping the possibility of reimbursing the amounts granted?". Five out of ten Member States answered yes, one specifying 'in principle' as more discussions are needed; three answered no, one mentioning that they do not have sufficient information on how MEFM has been used and it would be premature to discuss ways of amending the fund until Member States have a better understanding; and two Member States did not express an opinion commenting that they prefer to fund directly IOM emergencies.

Any discussion on changing the nature of the fund would also require to examine the relevance of the current criteria, in particular if they must be strictly applied in a cumulative way or with a broad interpretation of Resolution No. 1229 based on historical background and lessons learned of this initial pilot phase. The evaluation hopefully helps to frame such a discussion, taking into account the constraints and gaps identified in the structure of MEFM and in IOM's management of the funds, but also the reality of emergencies funded as well as donors' interest in reimbursing loans.

Regarding more specifically the focus on evacuation, it will also be important to see the progress of the discussions on the 'Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative' (MICIC), a state owned process that includes a series of guidelines and practices on protecting migrants in the recently published "Guidelines to Protect Migrants in Countries Experiencing Conflict or Natural Disaster", including for the organisation of evacuations. The Guidelines will be discussed in September 2016 and some principles for funding evacuations could also be agreed upon. For instance, the Guidelines suggest that emergency clauses could be added in employment contracts that require employers to cover evacuation costs of migrant workers in crisis situations. At the SCPF of June 2016, after the presentation of the update on MICIC, IOM Director General underlined the creative solutions implemented by some Member States to fund evacuations of their migrants, one having activated a loan from the World Bank to reimburse IOM and another one having envisaged the creation of an insurance reimbursing such costs.

Recommendation: The evaluation brought to light elements for discussion concerning the criteria, scope and reimbursement modalities of the Mechanism. Member States should agree with the IOM Administration to enter into discussions on a possible amendment to Resolution No. 1229, including on whether MEFM should be a grant mechanism, an operational reserve fund – similar to those used in other partner agencies – a loan mechanism or a mixed system. It is also recommended that the notion of “rapid deployment for immediate life-saving assistance” be central, instead of evacuation being the *raison d’être*. The IOM Administration should also propose various options to replenish the Mechanism, at least for the start of a second three-year period, given the challenges associated with relying on voluntary contributions from Member States.

6. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions:

- The Director General should have considered mentioning in his reporting to the Council that he had had to approve some disbursements that were not strictly in line with the criteria and intent of Resolution No. 1229, and that he had noted that other crises had also required immediate funding and rapid response. For instance, two years after the Mechanism had been fully operational, dialogue could have been entered into with Member States to seek their guidance on a more precise definition of the types of emergencies that would qualify for funding from the Mechanism and to discuss the problems being faced owing to the limited scope of MEFM and how they could have been addressed. Resolution No. 1229 also refers to the possibility of reporting to the Council on the “possible requirements” of the Mechanism. The Director General could have proposed solutions vis-à-vis the authorization of disbursements for assisting both displaced populations and migrants in serious life-threatening situations, or vis-à-vis the restricted use of the Mechanism through a strict interpretation of the requirement pertaining to the evacuation of migrants, taking into account the increasing number of other types of migration crises requiring immediate actions without guaranteed access to immediate funding.
- There is a case for adding more mandatory information in the annual reports submitted to the Council, or for issuing an annual report on MEFM. It should be noted, however, that Member States should not, and do not wish to, micromanage the use of MEFM. Having a specific report on MEFM or adding information to existing reports should be considered when necessary, for instance as suggested in the first conclusion (above) regarding the Director General’s experience and the challenges he faced in the application of the MEFM criteria and any adjustments that could be considered.
- Failure to reach the targeted balance of USD 30 million did not necessarily hinder the effective use of MEFM; operations relating to many emergencies were funded by MEFM and reimbursed. The main difficulty faced by the Mechanism was the high level of non-repayment of disbursed funds, particularly in relation to evacuation operations, which leads to shortages in available funds when there is not a regular injection of fresh contributions. Although IOM made fundraising efforts to reach the target, the evaluation did not detect a high level of interest, including from Member States, in financing MEFM (12 Member States contributed to the Mechanism). It is also important to note that IOM operations, in particular evacuations, can be costly, which is justification for maintaining the

USD 30 million target, despite the fact that such expensive operations were not conducted during the reporting period.

- The Mechanism is currently facing shortfalls due to the non-reimbursement of loans, sometimes due to diverging strategic priorities and other times due to external factors such as funding announcements and commitments that have not been fulfilled; furthermore, there is donor disinterest and reluctance to use the contributions to reimburse MEFM. IOM management could have examined other options for financial support for some operations to avoid relying on MEFM over long periods of time. Fundraising efforts focusing on MEFM for specific crises were not formally required and dialogue with Member States and donors on the challenges faced concerning reimbursements should have been proposed by IOM.

Recommendations:

- Instruction IN/207, which provides guidelines on how the Mechanism's funds should be requested and managed, states that: "Under no circumstances will a request be authorized without an appropriate written application." This rule should still apply. Justifications for the release of funds are important for the management of the subsequent loan and for monitoring reimbursements and are not required to be very detailed. Exceptions, for instance when the request emanates directly from the Director General, should be kept to a minimum, even if there be good reason to not strictly apply the rule.
- Unless otherwise instructed by Member States, for example should they decide to examine the possibility of amending Resolution No. 1229 to allow for charging administrative and operational support costs every year, the Administration should reimburse the amount of USD 40,000, which was charged for a second year. The IOM Administration should consider how the amount could be reimbursed through other voluntary contributions, as specified in Resolution No. 1229.
- IOM should consider creating a decision-making mechanism or an operations support committee to review operations that are underfunded and that are benefiting from MEFM support beyond the first few months after the start of a crisis. The committee could explore alternative sources of funds for sustaining the IOM office (including the use of Operational Support Income), examine the possible downsizing of the IOM operations, recommend an exceptional continuation of the use of MEFM when there is a good chance that the funds will be reimbursed, and play a more proactive role in fundraising and in finding solutions for the reimbursement of MEFM in support of the IOM office in the field.
- The evaluation brought to light elements for discussion concerning the criteria, scope and reimbursement modalities of the Mechanism. Member States should agree with the IOM Administration to enter into discussions on a possible amendment to Resolution No. 1229, including on whether MEFM should be a grant mechanism, an operational reserve fund – similar to those used in other partner agencies – a loan mechanism or a mixed system. It is also recommended that the notion of "rapid deployment for immediate life-saving assistance" be central, instead of evacuation being the *raison d'être*. The IOM Administration should also propose various options to replenish the

Mechanism, at least for the start of a second three-year period, given the challenges associated with relying on voluntary contributions from Member States.

ANNEX 1

RESOLUTION No. 1229 (C)
(Adopted by the Council at its 516th meeting on 5 December 2011)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MIGRATION EMERGENCY FUNDING MECHANISM

The Council,

Having received and examined document MC/2335 submitted by the Director General on the establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism,

Mindful of the vulnerability of international migrants in times of crisis, and the need to respond rapidly with immediate life-saving assistance and evacuation,

Recalling the first activity of the IOM Strategy, to provide secure, reliable, flexible and cost-effective services for persons who require international migration assistance,

Desiring to reinforce the Organization's response capacity by providing funds to bridge the gap between the initial emergency response and receipt of donor funds,

Complementing the United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund and other funding mechanisms to provide rapid funding in emergencies involving international migration,

Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (MC/2334),

Resolves that:

1. A Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (the Mechanism) with an intended balance of USD 30 million is hereby established with the purpose of bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding, thereby being complementary to other existing emergency funds;
2. The Mechanism is to be funded from voluntary contributions on as broad a basis as possible, including from Member States, the private sector and individuals and any interest income accrued will be retained within the Mechanism;
3. The Director General is authorized to expend funds from this Mechanism to ensure a rapid response to an emergency involving migration, pending receipt of donor contributions for the said emergency;
4. The Director General will replenish the Mechanism upon receipt of donor contributions, and within the limits of funds allocated for the said emergency;

5. The Mechanism is governed by the Financial Regulations of the Organization, and will be subject to an annual audit by the Organization's External Auditors;

6. The Director General will submit an annual report on the Mechanism and its activities and possible requirements to the Council;

7. The Mechanism will be subject to evaluation every three years and the report will be presented to Member States for their consideration;

8. The administration of the Mechanism shall adhere to paragraphs 19 to 22 of MC/2335.

Administration of the mechanism

19. All requests for funds will be reviewed by the Department of Operations and Emergencies to ensure that their intended use meets the established objective and criteria. The request should clearly outline the purpose and objective of the intervention and include a budget to support the request. The request should normally be initiated by an IOM Field Office with front-line knowledge of the unfolding emergency. If the request comes from another source, then the validity of the appeal should be confirmed by an informed IOM Field presence. The request should seek immediate financing for core emergency needs related to international transport. Following a review of the request, the Department of Operations and Emergencies will make a recommendation to the Director General for his consideration and approval.

20. The approved funding for each intervention will be determined by the anticipated level of activity. As the mechanism is expected to serve as a facility to bridge the funding gap, advances from the mechanism will be repaid as a first charge on contributions to be received in order to maintain its balance. If donor funding is not received within one year, a charge will be made against the mechanism up to a maximum of the unrecoverable amount. Unspent amounts approved for a project will be returned to the mechanism and not channeled towards other initiatives.

21. Costs for the administration of the mechanism are expected to be minimal. The annual budget for the first year of operation will be USD 40,000 and will be covered from voluntary contributions. The details of the budget are as follows: (a) reporting – USD 24,000 (staff time and office costs to prepare/distribute reports); (b) monitoring – USD 8,000 (staff time and communications); and (c) donor outreach – USD 8,000 (staff time, communications, postage, office costs). The total staff time will not exceed 30 per cent of a full-time staff equivalent.

22. The Administration will prepare an annual report on the mechanism and its activities. This report will disclose the size and activity of the reserve fund; it will also feature a list of contributors and indicate the purposes for which the fund was used. The Administration will also report separately on the status of the mechanism in the annual financial report, highlighting all contributors.

ANNEX 2

Evaluation of the IOM Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism – MEFM (2012-2015)

Terms of Reference

1. Background

A constant increase in major emergencies faced by IOM in the beginning of the new century, such as the second Gulf War (2003), the crisis situations in Lebanon (2006), in Côte d'Ivoire (2002, 2010–11), in Yemen (2010–11), and the evacuation from Libya (2011), has highlighted the need in 2011 for establishing a funding mechanism to facilitate IOM's rapid response and intervention. Owing to growth trends in international migration with over 200 million migrants globally, IOM was increasingly called upon to provide assistance to migrants who had nowhere else to turn and who could become vulnerable in times of crisis, often unable to access support networks or resources either from the host country or their country of origin.

In most cases, the emergencies required an immediate response to assist people spontaneously escaping from difficult circumstances. However, the lack of available financial resources impeded a swift reaction by the Organization; IOM had no option but to await financial commitments from donors in the early stages of the emergency, when effective responses is required for saving lives. Conscious of the limitations of the Organization's Constitution and Financial Regulations, which authorize the Director General to incur obligations and make payments within the limits of available funding, IOM Member States have reviewed options for establishing an emergency funding mechanism to facilitate and improve the Organization's response capacity.

The establishment of a predictable and flexible internal funding mechanism facilitating quick access to funding in order to provide rapid assistance at the start of emergencies was endorsed, and as a supplementary measure IOM agreed to negotiate standby agreements with donors and private sector actors to allow immediate activation of evacuation capacity. The proposed Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM) is intended to bridge the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding and to complement, rather than substitute, existing funds both within and outside the Organization such as the UN-CERF, where delivery mechanism is not suited for immediate funds disbursement.

The aim is to enable early assessment of situations on the ground and very short response times for providing the initial assistance. The mechanism is primarily used to cover the cost of international transport for migrants affected by emergencies, any arrangements in the place of origin, departure, transit or arrival to prepare for or support their travel, as well as the staff and office capacity to support these activities. It is funded through voluntary contributions and is intended to maintain a balance of USD 30 million. The Administration is required to prepare an annual report on the mechanism and its activities, disclosing the size and activity of the reserve fund, the list of contributors and the purposes for which the fund was used.

Resolution No 1229 (C) was approved at the hundredth session of the Council on 5 December 2011 establishing the MEFM. The Resolution also specifies that the Mechanism will be subject to evaluation every three years with the report presented to Member States for their consideration, that it is governed by the Financial Regulations of the Organization and subject to an annual audit by the Organization's External Auditors, and that its administration shall adhere to paragraphs 19 to 22 of document MC/2335 "Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism". An internal instruction IN/207 was issued in March 2013 detailing the administrative and procedural requirements for the use of MEFM.

2. Objective of the evaluation

The Evaluation is intended to provide a strategic and operational analysis of IOM's MEFM-funded interventions during a four-year period 2012-2015 (the use during the first year was also dependent of the level of initial voluntary contributions from Member States). The evaluation aims at identifying:

- If, when and why MEFM has played a critical role to ensure that IOM could deliver its interventions in rapid response, in line with the scope and purpose of the funding mechanism;
- The best practices and constraints in the administration of the MEFM, including an analysis of the compliance with Resolution NO 1229 (C) and IN/207;
- The strategic outcome of MEFM-funded interventions, in particular regarding accountability to affected populations and on mobilizing funds for IOM's emergency responses.

The evaluation will provide recommendations on the strategic use of the fund, on reporting and operational procedures, as well as on challenges and success criteria for the use of the fund.

3. Scope of evaluation

The evaluation will analyse IOM MEFM by classifying its use and administration through IOM operational sectors of implementation (such as movements, shelter, CCCM, logistics, health, etc.), as well as by reviewing situations when not used. The evaluation will also undertake an analysis of a limited number of case studies, selected according to specific criteria in terms of volume of disbursement, sectors and geographical area.

The main focus of the evaluation will be on:

- The relevance of the strategic use of MEFM, and to its main purpose,
- The added value of using MEFM,
- The use of MEFM for a more timely response and enhanced IOM's ability to reach affected populations,
- Determining if MEFM contributed to IOM's ability to support the humanitarian coordinated intervention, in particular through early emergency,

- The overall effectiveness of MEFM-funded intervention in meeting the objectives set by the mechanism and the emergency responses,
- The overall outcome and impact of the use of MEFM for bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding,
- Whether the mechanism through which MEFM is being resourced and operated are conducive to achieving the objectives set forth upon the establishment of the MEFM.

More specifically, the evaluation will answer the following questions:

Relevance and connectedness

- Is IOM's use of MEFM strategically relevant to meet the requirements of an emergency operation in line with IOM's mandate and the objectives set-up by the funding mechanism?
- Are the criteria for the use of MEFM relevant to all IOM emergency operations?
- Do specific IOM's policies, standard procedures and fundraising guidelines facilitate a systematic, strategic and relevant use of MEFM?
- In terms of connectedness, how does MEFM assure that activities are implemented in a way that takes medium, longer-term and interconnected approaches into account?
- Are external partners, such as national governments and the private sector, and factors, such as administrative capacities, gender, institutional and cultural aspects considered when examining the use of MEFM?

Effectiveness and coverage

- Do MEFM-funded interventions include monitoring mechanisms to report on performance and on recommendations for future strategic moves, in particular for development and coordination of projects and donors appeals?
- What are the roles of IOM's Country Offices, Regional Offices and Headquarters in deciding on the use of MEFM and how effective they are in addressing financial and reporting responsibilities?
- Is IOM developing MEFM-funded interventions in collaboration with other donors, UN agencies, NGO partners and the private sector?
- How timely and effective is the decision-making process for disbursement of MEFM funds?
- How globally effective has IOM been in reaching the objectives and in achieving expected results of MEFM-funded activities? Was the initial coverage of and assistance to affected populations adequate?
- How effective is the current operating modality of the fund, relying on Member States/donor contributions to reach the USD 30 million target, and should alternative funding mechanisms be explored to render MEFM more predictable a tool for IOM operations?

Efficiency and financial management

- How do IOM financial rules and regulations facilitate the use of MEFM, in particular in regard to the ability for IOM Country Offices to use donor funding to replenish MEFM resources?
- How are expenditures monitored to guarantee transparency and to ensure solid base line data for further financial analysis and reporting in line with operational requirements and MEFM criteria?

Outcome and impact

- What is the outcome and/or strategic impact of MEFM use on IOM as a bridging fund and as catalyst for resource mobilization vis-à-vis other donors?
- How has donors' perception evolved over time since 2012, in particular for assigning voluntary contributions to MEFM or for reimbursing MEFM funding through projects?
- What can be concluded on the use of MEFM regarding short and medium-term impact on beneficiaries and the overall humanitarian response?

4. Methodology and timeframe

Being a process and strategic evaluation, the methodology will maintain a balance between a global analysis and a more specific assessment of selected cases, which can properly illustrate the use of MEFM. The evaluation methodology will also take into account the four year period covered and the use in different regions and for different types of intervention. The Terms of Reference will be coordinated with the Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE), the Department of Resources Management (DRM) and with the Office of the Director General (ODG), the final approval of the use of the fund being under the responsibility of the IOM Director General.

The selection of case studies will be determined at the start of the evaluation exercise based on representation of regions, the financial size of the disbursement, as well as the type of emergency. The methodology will mainly consist of documentation reviews, desk research on case studies selected and interviews. DOE will be in charge of providing the necessary documentation specifically related to the management of MEFM as well as any documentation that can be considered relevant to the evaluation exercise, such as donors' agreement for reimbursement, financial reports of complementary projects or memorandum of understanding.

The evaluation is expected to start in January 2016 and a final report should be made available in June 2016. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG), DOE, DRM and ODG will discuss options for sharing the evaluation report with IOM Member States in line with Resolution No 1229 (C), point 7, including a presentation at the Autumn session 2016 of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF).

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) will be responsible for the overall implementation of the evaluation exercise. The budget will be covered by the OIG.

ANNEX 3

EVALUATION OF THE MIGRATION EMERGENCY FUNDING MECHANISM

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IOM MEMBER STATES

Resolution No 1229 (C) approved at the hundredth session of the Council on 5 December 2011 established the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM), a predictable and flexible internal funding mechanism facilitating quick access to funding in order to provide rapid assistance at the start of emergencies, to bridge the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding and to complement, rather than substitute, existing funds both within and outside the Organization.

The mechanism is primarily used to cover the costs of international transport for migrants affected by emergencies, any arrangements in the place of origin, departure, transit or arrival to prepare for or support their travel, as well as the staff and office capacity to support these activities. It is funded through voluntary contributions, is intended to maintain a balance of USD 30 million and is subject to replenishment as soon as donor funding is allocated to the emergency having benefited from the MEFM.

The Resolution specifies that the Mechanism will be subject to evaluation every three years with the report presented to Member States for their consideration; the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) included it in its Evaluation 2016 workplan. The evaluation will conduct an analysis of IOM's MEFM-funded interventions during a four-year period 2012–2015 (the use of the Fund in 2012 having been limited due to time required for receiving the first contributions from Member States), and will provide recommendations on the strategic use of the Fund, on reporting and operational procedures, as well as on challenges and success criteria for its use.

OIG takes pleasure in sending IOM Member States a short questionnaire that will be essential in conducting the evaluation. The questions will seek the views of IOM Member States on key issues related to the functioning and future of the Fund. Queries regarding the questionnaire can be sent to Mr. Christophe Franzetti, IOM Evaluation Officer, at the following e-mail address: cfranzetti@iom.int or to Evaluation, OIG: eva@iom.int.

The questionnaire should be completed and returned before **22 April 2016** to the same e-mail address or by fax to the following number: (41) 22 798 61 50. Full confidentiality will be guaranteed.

Thank you in advance for your contribution.

Office of the Inspector General
IOM Headquarters, Geneva

Funding the MEFM

The targeted level of the Fund was established at USD 30 million based on IOM experience of high disbursement rates for operations that could benefit from the MEFM. In December 2015, and since December 2011, contributions to the Fund have reached a total of USD 11.2 million. Twelve Member States contributed to the MEFM, with one Member State having covered approximately two thirds of the total of the contributions. IOM has regularly highlighted the importance of those contributions, also through specific fundraising, but the number of contributions remains limited.

- 1) In order to analyse possible reasons for a limited number of contributions to the MEFM, please tick the box(es) that could explain this situation, or share additional views in the comment box below:

- The reporting to Member States on the use of MEFM does not sufficiently highlight its benefits and impact, which does not encourage our country to contribute to the MEFM.
- As a revolving fund having to be replenished, the level of contributions as of December 2015 is sufficient.
- Our country was not aware of regular fundraising initiatives asking for more contributions.
- Our country does not have sufficient resources for contributing to the fund.
- Our country is not considering contributions to such a fund in its funding priorities.
- Our country is planning to contribute to the MEFM in the coming year.
- Other, please explain – or any additional comment:

Reimbursing the MEFM

As a revolving fund, it has been possible to transfer approximately USD 15.4 million to IOM Country Offices facing crisis during the period 2012–2015 (totalling twenty interventions). Out of those USD 15.4 million, USD 6.8 million have been replenished leaving a balance of USD 8.6 million to be reimbursed as of December 2015. If we consider the Member States contributions totalling USD 11.2 million and the USD 6.8 million that have been reimbursed, the total funds available for the same period have reached approximately USD 18 million. With USD 15.4 million transferred for operations, the remaining balance available as of December 2015 is USD 2.6 million, which drastically limits the use of the fund.

- 2) As a benefiting Member State, would you agree to sign an agreement/MoU with IOM specifying that your country is committed to working closely with IOM for identifying donors/funding sources that could allocate funds for reimbursement?

Yes No

Please comment:

- 3) Considering the difficulties encountered to reimburse the loan for two major emergencies due to lack of donor interest (totalling a pending reimbursement of approximately USD 7 million as of December 2015), do you believe that IOM's Director General should adopt a more conservative and rigorous approach in approving disbursements, with the risk of refraining, at a certain point, from assisting migrants in life threatening situations?

Yes No

Please comment:

- 4) Considering the difficulties for reimbursing such loans (as also experienced years ago with CERF loans), would you be ready to consider discussing again Resolution 1229 (C) and amending it in a way for MEFM to become a grant mechanism to be funded by voluntary, un-earmarked contributions or by other relevant sources, yet still keeping the possibility of reimbursing the amounts granted?

Yes No

Comments if any:

Managing the fund

In addition to an evaluation to be conducted every three years, the Resolution also specifies that “the Director General will submit an annual report on the Mechanism and its activities and possible requirements to the Council”.

- 5) Do you consider that the reporting on the use of MEFM through the IOM Financial Report to the Council, the Report of the Director General on the Work of the Organization and in the framework of other specific reports to the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (for instance on

the implementation of the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and other related humanitarian matters) is relevant and sufficient?

Yes

No

Comments if any:

6) In order to support fundraising efforts for reimbursing the MEFM loans, do you consider that more detailed reports on the use of MEFM and on IOM accountability to affected migrants in specific crisis would encourage your country to allocate funding for such reimbursements?

Yes

No

Comments if any:

ANNEX 4

IOM Evaluation of the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (2012-2015)

IOM Field Survey Questionnaire

Resolution No 1229 (C) approved at the hundredth session of the Council on 5 December 2011 established the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM), a predictable and flexible internal funding mechanism facilitating quick access to funding in order to provide rapid assistance at the start of emergencies, bridging the gap between the start-up of emergency operations and the subsequent receipt of donor funding and to complement, rather than substitute, existing funds both within and outside the Organization.

The mechanism is primarily used to cover the costs of international transport for migrants affected by emergencies, any arrangements in the place of origin, departure, transit or arrival to prepare for or support their travel, as well as the staff and office capacity to support these activities. It is funded through voluntary contributions, is intended to maintain a balance of USD 30 million and is subject to replenishment as soon as donor funding is allocated to the emergency response that benefited from the MEFM.

The Resolution specifies that the Mechanism will be subject to evaluation every three years with the report presented to Member States for their consideration; the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) included it in its Evaluation 2016 workplan. The evaluation will conduct an analysis of IOM's MEFM-funded interventions during a four-year period 2012–2015 (the use of the Fund in 2012 having been limited due to time required for receiving the first contributions from Member States), and will provide recommendations on the strategic use of the Fund, on reporting and operational procedures, as well as on challenges and success criteria for its use.

OIG considers the views of IOM staff having used MEFM as a very important contribution to the evaluation exercise and is pleased to send out this short questionnaire. Queries regarding the questionnaire can be sent to myself at the following e-mail address: cfranzetti@iom.int.

The questionnaire should be completed and returned before Friday **29 April 2016** to the same e-mail address. Full confidentiality will be guaranteed.

Thank you in advance for your contribution.

Christophe Franzetti
Evaluation Officer
Office of the Inspector General
IOM Headquarters, Geneva

1. Is access to MEFM funding easy and flexible enough to be used among the first and immediate sources of funding to respond in a timely manner to identified humanitarian needs?

(please note: 1 means that you completely disagree, 2 you disagree somewhat, 3 you neither agree or disagree, 4 you agree somewhat, and 5 you completely agree)

If rated 1 to 3, why and what other alternatives would you privilege? (any other comments on the rating 4 and 5 are also welcome):

2. Was the decision to ask for MEFM funding coming from your own initiative based on IOM assessment, from a specific request of a benefiting Member States, from IOM HQs or from migrants?
(please tick the box(es) that could apply)

- It is an IOM field office initiative and decision, based on our own assessment
- From a request of Member State(s) having migrants caught/blocked in emergency situation
- As a L3 emergency from a decision of IOM HQs in consultation with the field
- From stranded Migrants approaching IOM Office
- Other – please specify:

Additional comments:

3. What document/request did you submit to receive MEFM funding?

- A short project document with budget
- A one page description of the intended use with the amount required
- An exchange of e-mails with IOM HQs explaining the situation
- A phone call with the Director of DOE to explain the situation

Comments if any:

4. Did you encounter problems in accessing MEFM funding for some categories of IOM interventions and beneficiaries, as falling outside of the criteria listed in the Resolution (see introduction above)?

Yes

No

Comments if any:

5. Do you consider that the use of MEFM had an impact:

- On IOM receiving other contributions to continue funding its operations?

Yes

No

Please comment:

- On facilitating coordination and partnership with the UN System and other stakeholders (Member States, Government(s))?

Yes

No

Please comment:

6. In terms of MEFM financial and reporting requirements, do you consider that:
(Please tick all the box(es) that could apply or share additional views in the comment box below)

Reporting requirements are clear and should not be more demanding

Only financial reporting is required and is sufficient for the management of MEFM

Reporting should be more elaborated to facilitate fundraising for reimbursement of the loan

As an immediate lifesaving loan mechanism, no need for reporting on operations

Other, please explain – or any additional comment:

7. What initiatives did you take for identifying financial sources to reimburse the loan?

- No specific measures taken as left to the initiative of DRD and DOE
- I negotiated with success the possibility to use project funds to reimburse MEFM
- I negotiated but without succes the use of project funds to reimburse MEFM
- I received clear messages from donors that they will not fund or allow reimbursment from their projects
- Other, please explain – or any additional comments:

8. Do you consider that the use of MEFM was effective in setting up the operations and that it had a positive outcome on the situation of migrants?

- Yes No

- On the situation of other beneficiaries?

- Yes No

- Would you consider that it contributed to saving lives?

- Yes No

Please elaborate:

ANNEX 5

INTERVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Interviews and respondents to IOM field questionnaire:

- William L. SWING, IOM, Director General.
- Mohammed ABDIKER, IOM, Director Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE).
- Bruce REED, IOM, Director Department of Resources Management (DRM).
- Vincent HOUVER, IOM, Head Preparedness and Response Division (PRD/DOE).
- Monica GORACCI, IOM, Chief Donor Relations Division (DRD).
- Ali GOVORI, IOM, Resources Management Officer (DRM/DOE).
- Selma EL KHAWAD, IOM, Preparedness and Response Officer (PRD/DOE).

- Giuseppe LOPRETE, Chief of Mission, IOM Niger.
- Stuart SIMPSON, Chief of Mission, IOM Micronesia.
- Brian KELLY, Head of Community Stabilization Unit, IOM Washington DC.
- Giovanni CASSANI, CCCM Cluster Coordinator, IOM Regional Office (RO) Dakar.
- Suhrob SHANSHOEV, Senior Regional Resources Management Officer, IOM RO Bangkok.

Bibliographical References:

- WGBR, Concept Paper on a Framework for IOM Budget Reform, fifth meeting, 5 April 2011.
- WGBR, Concept Paper on a Framework for IOM Budget Reform, sixth meeting, 3 May 2011.
- WGBR, Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, seventh meeting, 29 June 2011.
- WGBR, Update on the Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, eighth meeting, 27 September 2011.
- SCPF/63, Working Group on Budget Reform - Progress Report, eighth session, May 2011.
- SCPF/66, Working Group on Budget Reform Report, ninth session, October 2011.
- SCPF/67, Establishment of a Migration Funding Mechanism, ninth session, October 2011.
- SCPF/67/Rev.1, Establishment of a Migration Funding Mechanism, ninth session, October 2011.
- S/14/5, Report on IOM's Application of the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and other related Humanitarian Matters, SCPF, fourteenth session, April 2014.
- S/16/4, Report on IOM Response to Migration Crises, SCPF, sixteenth session, April 2015.
- S/18/6, Report on IOM Response to Migration Crises, SCPF, eighteenth session, April 2016.
- MC/EX/712, Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance on the Eighth Session, 14 June 2011.
- MC/2334, Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance on the Ninth Session, November 2011.

- MC/2335, Establishment of a Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, hundredth session, November 2011.
- IOM, Programme and Budget documents, from 2012 to 2015 (Council document).
- IOM, Revision of the Programme and Budget documents, from 2012 to 2015 (SCPF document).
- IOM, Report of the Director General on the Work of the Organization for the years 2012 to 2015 (Council document).
- IOM, Financial Report for the years 2012 to 2015 (Council document).
- IOM, IN/207, Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM), March 2013.
- IOM, Migration Initiatives, from 2012 to 2016.
- IOM, IOM Evaluation of Cerf-funded Interventions (2006-2012), OIG, April 2013.
- MICIC, Guidelines to Protect Migrants in Countries experiencing Conflict or Natural Disaster, Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative, 2016.

Various newsletters and funding appeals with reference to MEFM:

- IOM, Funding Status of IOM Global Initiatives and Funding Mechanisms – global appeal.
- IOM, IOM Funding Mechanisms, Newsletter.
- IOM, Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism (MEFM), an Overview: 2012-2014.
- IOM, Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, appeal.