



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

**MIDTERM EVALUATION OF
IOM GENDER EQUALITY POLICY 2015–2019**

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

December 2017

Foreword

The mid-term evaluation is the result of a joint initiative of the Gender Coordination Unit (GCU) and the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), and it was included as a requirement of the IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019.

An external senior consultant, Ms. Inmaculada Barcia, was recruited to perform the evaluation due to her wide experience in gender evaluations, with the assistance of a junior evaluation consultant Ms. Rushda Abad Khan. OIG and GCU would like to thank them very much for their commitment to the conduct of the exercise. The consultants' fees were covered by GCU and travels and other costs by OIG.

The Office of the Inspector General was responsible for preparing the evaluation Terms of Reference, for supervising the consultants' work and for providing technical guidance for implementation of the evaluation, in line with IOM requirements. GCU provided all the material necessary for the desk review and relevant technical advice related to gender in IOM during the conduct of the evaluation. OIG is also in charge of the finalisation and publication of the report.

The evaluation received good attention from IOM offices and staff worldwide, who completed the three surveys implemented in the framework of the evaluation, actively participated to interviews and organized the field visits. Their contribution deserves also to be underlined.

Office of the Inspector General

Gender Coordination Unit

Table of contents

Executive Summary	5
1. Introduction	8
2. Evaluation background	8
2.1 Evaluation purpose and focus	
2.2 Evaluation methodology	
2.3 Team composition	
2.4 Limitations and their mitigation	
3. The main components of the Gender Equality Policy 2015-2019	10
4. Results against the OECD-DAC criteria	11
4.1 Relevance	11
4.1.1 The Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF)	
4.1.2. Inter-agency coherence	
4.2 Effectiveness	14
4.2.1 Project review	
4.2.2 The IOM Gender Marker	
4.2.3 Partnerships	
4.2.4 Gender-responsive performance management	
4.2.5 Knowledge generation and communication	
4.3 Efficiency	21
4.3.1 Institutional mechanisms for implementing the Policy	
4.3.2 Monitoring and reporting	
4.3.3 Evaluation	
4.3.4 Gender-responsive auditing	
4.4 Sustainability	29
4.4.1 Capacity assessment and development	
4.4.2 Gender-sensitive organizational culture	
4.4.3 Resource tracking and allocation	
4.5 Outcome and Impact	34
4.5.1 Strategic planning	
4.5.2 Gender equality results in humanitarian settings	
4.5.3 Gender balance in staffing	
5. Recommendations	39
6. Lessons Learned	40
Annexes are included in a separate document:	
Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference	
Annex 2: Evaluation Analytical Framework	
Annex 3: List of respondents	
Annex 4: Documents reviewed	
Annex 5: Questionnaires Institutional surveys	
Annex 6: Surveys analysis	

Acronyms

APB	Appointments and Postings Board
CCCM	Camp Coordination and Camp Management
CBI	Cash-Based Interventions
CO	Country Office
CoM	Chief of Mission
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
DOE	Department of Operations and Emergencies
EU	European Union
GCU	Gender Coordination Unit
GFP	Gender Focal Point
GCOMM	IOM's bi-annual Global Chiefs of Mission Meeting
HQ	Headquarters
HRM	Human Resources Management
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IDF	IOM Development Fund
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITC-ILO	International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex
MCD	Media and Communication Division
MiGOF	Migration Governance Framework
MCOF	Migration Crisis Operational Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PDI	Project Development and Implementation
PRD	Preparedness and Response Division
PRIMA	Project Information and Management Application
RBM	Results Based Management
RO	Regional Office
RTS	Regional Thematic Specialist
SES	Staff Evaluation System
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme
UN SWAP	UN System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank Christophe Franzetti, Theodora Suter and Lee Kanthoul for the support that they provided throughout the evaluation. Special thanks go to Vassiliy Yuzhanin (Regional Office (RO) Vienna), Sacha Chan Kam (RO Vienna), Evelyn Rainer (Country Office (CO) Vienna), Ester Ruiz de Azua (CO Kiev) and Alessia Schiavon (CO Kiev) for taking time out of their busy schedules to support the missions. Many thanks also to Rushda Abad Khan for her excellent research assistance.

Executive Summary

The midterm evaluation summarizes progress in implementing IOM's Gender Equality Policy (2015–2019). It highlights the policy's substantial contribution to the strengthening of institutional processes to mainstream gender into programming. It also draws attention to challenges in achieving gender balance in staffing and promoting a gender-sensitive organizational culture, as well as efforts that have been made to overcome these challenges. The evaluation identifies areas of both strength and weakness within IOM's Gender Policy implementation and concludes that more effort is needed to ensure that the policy spreads to all of IOM's programmatic work addressing the needs of all migrants.

Relevance

The Gender Equality Policy has contributed significantly to raise awareness among staff about gender mainstreaming and has revived the discussion at the institutional level. Interviews with respondents as well as the results from the three surveys sent to IOM staff confirm that the revised policy is very relevant to IOM's mandate towards gender equality. The policy has permeated IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF), which was adopted in 2015 as the new global strategic framework to guide IOM's work and mandate in capacity building, policy and programming.

The policy has reinforced the Organization's commitment to implementing the UN System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP). It is also an important reminder for IOM to follow through with other international commitments to achieve the goals established in the 2030 Agenda for sustainable Development and to leave no one behind.

Effectiveness

The evidence reviewed for this evaluation—including interviews with different stakeholders at Headquarters and in Regional (RO) and Country Offices (CO) as well as responses from the surveys—demonstrates IOM's progress towards promoting gender equality in both programming and human resources. IOM currently meets or exceeds six of the 15 UN-SWAP indicators, a significant improvement from the two indicators in 2014. Still, these achievements fall below the average number of indicators (11) met by other UN Funds and Programmes entities.¹

The development and implementation of gender-sensitive tools and strategies—such as the Project Handbook, the training of Regional Thematic Specialists (RTSs) and project developers and the roll-out of the IOM Gender Marker—have significantly advanced the integration of gender in project proposals. Gender, however, is not integrated in a systematic manner across IOM's programmatic work.

The IOM Gender Marker, which is currently being piloted in COs covered by the RO Nairobi² and RO Vienna³, brings both opportunities and challenges to this work.

¹ Overview of IOM's 2016 UN-SWAP, UN Women. IOM is not technically a Fund and Programme (it is a "Related Organization" according to the agreement with the UN) but it has been categorized as a Fund and Programme by UN Women since IOM agreed to implement the UN-SWAP because it is more similar to a Fund and Programme.

² The countries covered by RO Vienna (East and South East Europe, and Central Asia) are: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, FYR Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

³ The countries covered by **RO Nairobi (East and the Horn of Africa)** are: Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda.

Many staff will agree that the marker is strengthening the gender components of projects and interventions. Others, however, have raised concerns about gaps in capacities to ensure that the implementation of the marker becomes a meaningful exercise.

Efficiency

Overall the evaluation finds that the organizational arrangements to support the implementation of the Gender Policy are adequate and have contributed to advancing gender mainstreaming in the Organization although this is not done consistently. In the context of limited financial and human resources, the Gender Coordination Unit's strategic prioritization and use of resources have been very effective at achieving the intended results.

The technical expertise and support provided by the Gender Coordination Unit (GCU) has contributed substantially to improve capacities in Regional and Country Offices to mainstream gender. Many Gender Focal Points (GFPs) also play a key role operationalizing the Gender Equality Policy; however, a more strategic prioritization of their activities—both as individuals, as well as part of the GFP network—is needed to ensure that their role can effectively support further gender mainstreaming.

Concerning monitoring and reporting, IOM's capacity to measure gender equality results remains limited. However, recent measures taken by IOM in this area, including the placement of Monitoring and Evaluation Officers in ROs together with the development and promotion of gender related Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tools and guidelines, have the potential to significantly strengthen this work. Similarly, disaggregation of data is not consistent and a justification for not including disaggregated data in reports is not systematically required.

Sustainability

The policy has had a limited impact on IOM's capacity to conduct assessments and to develop a capacity-building strategy, also with a view of guaranteeing sustainability of IOM efforts. Despite shortcomings in capacity assessment, IOM's substantive efforts in capacity building have strengthened considerably staff's ability to mainstream gender across the Organization.

Training does not reach enough people. To build staff's capacity to systematically conduct gender analysis and to guarantee sustainability to mainstream gender into programmatic work, will require more consistent resources and a dedicated strategy targeting staff involved in project management as well as Chiefs of Mission. To ensure the long-term sustainability of gender equality work, IOM needs to commit long-term, dedicated human and financial resources to support this work.

The policy has contributed to sustainable changes in organizational culture. IOM is updating its policies that support family responsibilities and promote work/life balance, but there is a certain level of dissatisfaction with the way these policies are being updated and implemented, in particular how the rotation policy is being implemented. Some interviewees noted that the implementation of the rotation policy does not take into account the different impacts on men and women.

Outcome and Impact

Overall, the Gender Equality Policy, together with IOM's participation in the implementation of the UN-SWAP, has triggered the establishment of substantive

initiatives and processes that have strengthened gender mainstreaming in programmatic work, gender balance in staffing and a gender-sensitive organizational culture. The challenge now is to follow up on these achievements to ensure that IOM's interventions contribute to gender equality results. This will largely depend on the continued support from senior management, the engagement of staff at Headquarters (HQ) and Regional and Country Office levels, and the availability of resources in the coming years. Impact will be stronger with a better-resourced GCU and greater capacity to promote gender equality at the regional and country levels in both programming and staffing.

1. Introduction

In 1995, IOM acknowledged the strong links between gender and migration and endorsed the Staff and Programme Policies on Gender Issues (MC/1853), which committed the Organization to mainstreaming gender in its work. The 1995 policy codified “the Organization’s commitment to identifying and addressing the needs of migrant women in IOM’s projects and services, as well as to ensuring equality of opportunity and treatment of men and women within IOM.”

A decade later, an IOM evaluation of the 1995 Staff and Programme Policies on Gender Issues found that confusion about the differences between gender mainstreaming in programming and gender balance in staffing persisted among IOM staff.

Understanding how gender affects people’s experiences of migration is critical for IOM to address the specific needs of all its beneficiaries and ensure that its work does not perpetuate inequality. The rapid expansion of IOM funding and Member States, and recent increases and diversification of its operational activities have required further reinforcement of the inclusion of a gender-sensitive approach both in its internal procedures and rules and regulations for the recruitment and administration of staff, as well as its efforts to develop a proactive approach to mainstreaming gender in its programmes and projects.

Recognizing the need to update its policy on gender equality, IOM adopted a new Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019 that addresses programmes and activities, gender balance in staffing and gender-sensitive organizational culture. With the adoption of the new policy IOM intended to reinforce its “commitment to identifying and addressing the needs of all beneficiaries of IOM projects and services, and to ensuring equality of opportunity and treatment of all staff members within IOM.”

The revised Gender Equality Policy is closely aligned with the UN-SWAP. Thus, the implementation of the new policy has also strengthened IOM’s capacity to follow through with the commitments established in this UN global accountability framework.

The midterm evaluation report summarizes progress in implementing IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019, as required by the policy. The evaluation uses as baseline data IOM’s 2014 reporting under the SWAP framework.

2. Evaluation background

2.1 Evaluation purpose and focus

Paragraph 36 of the IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019 specifies that “the Office of the Inspector General/Evaluation will conduct a mid-term evaluation two and a half years into the implementation of this policy, and a final evaluation will take place after five years. Both evaluations will evaluate gender mainstreaming, gender equality results, and the linkages between the two.” Hence, the overall objective of the evaluation is *“to evaluate the mid-term overall performance and achievements of IOM in mainstreaming gender in its programme activities, including an assessment of the mid-term outcome of IOM’s gender policy on migration management, in creating a related organisational culture and in promoting gender balance in its staffing structure.”*

2.2 Evaluation methodology

The evaluation methodology consisted of an extensive desk review of key documents, including planning and reporting documents from Headquarters and Regional and Country Offices. A review of a representative sample of projects and programmes was also conducted to examine the inclusion of the gender component in IOM programming activities. (See Annex 4 for a list of documents.)

The methodology also included in person and Skype interviews with a representative sample of staff from HQ. The external evaluator conducted missions to the Regional Office in Vienna and the Country Offices in Vienna and Ukraine to examine concrete samples of gender related work and initiatives implemented by a Regional Office and two Country Offices. For each mission relevant planning and reporting documents were reviewed, including, strategies, project proposals, reports to donors and publications. During the missions the external evaluator conducted in person and Skype calls with relevant staff from different units and departments. Some limited interviews with IOM external partners and beneficiaries were also conducted. (See Annex 3 for a full list of respondents).

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted three web surveys to assess the knowledge related to the policy, the level of implementation and its effectiveness. Survey 1 targeted all IOM staff worldwide (between 11% and 18% or 1166 out of 6161 to 10,000 responded);⁴ Survey 2 was sent to gender focal points (29% or 58 out of 198 staff responded);⁵ and Survey 3 was sent to Regional Directors, Chiefs of Mission and Heads of Office (23% or 44 out of 188 staff responded). Further details regarding the institutional surveys are provided in Annexes 5 and 6.

The evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) are included as Annex 1. The evaluation was also guided by an analytical framework (Annex 2) that was used to develop questionnaires for the various stakeholders.

2.3 Team composition

OIG/Evaluation and Monitoring, an external consultant based in Geneva, and a Junior Evaluation Consultant formed the evaluation team. OIG provided support to the external evaluator throughout the process and prepared and administered the global institutional surveys with the support of the Junior Evaluation consultant. The external consultant prepared the mid-term evaluation report.

2.4 Limitations and their mitigation

Coverage. The external evaluator only visited one out of nine ROs. Visiting other regions was beyond the scope of the evaluation. However, the external evaluator interviewed eight out of nine Regional Directors by phone/Skype and reviewed all regional strategies to assess gender mainstreaming in other regions.

Online surveys. A limitation of the findings of the three online surveys is the low response rate. Between 11% and 18% for the survey sent to all IOM staff worldwide, 29% for the survey sent to gender focal points, and 23% for the survey sent to

⁴ This survey was sent through the e-mail address 'All the Missions Worldwide' that has 6161 recipients but includes also country Departments/sub-offices e-mail addresses, which then dispatch the message to staff registered under those 'sub-addresses'. The coverage for this survey oscillates between 6,161 and 10,000.

⁵ It should be noted that many of the recipients of the GFP mailing list are not official GFPs and would not have been expected to complete the survey. There were approximately 125 GFPs in the GCU's records at the time of the survey and it is possible that some of these had left IOM or changed offices without GCU knowing.

Regional Directors, Chiefs of Mission and Heads of Office. Despite the low response rate, the overall sample size of 1268 respondents is still statistically relevant for the analysis.

3. The main components of the Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019

The Gender Equality Policy provides the foundation for IOM's work on gender equality. Updating the former gender policy was necessary to clarify gender-related concepts that have been causing confusion among staff, to broaden the focus on gender as opposed to only women and girls, to align the policy to the UN-SWAP and to strengthen accountability.

The policy also establishes a clear path to make sure that "IOM's external and internal activities contribute to gender equality and address the specific needs and capacities of all beneficiaries and staff members, regardless of sex and gender."

The policy was developed by the GCU in consultation with key departments at Headquarters and Regional and Country Offices and the support of an external gender consultant. A broad consultation process including various departments has ensured that the policy is relevant across different units and departments in the Organization. For example, consultations with the Department of Operations and Emergencies (DOE) ensured that the policy included commitments in the humanitarian settings and that the policy was taken into account in the drafting of the humanitarian principles and other operational and emergency frameworks.

The adoption of the new policy also enjoyed the support of senior management. The policy was endorsed by IOM Policy Coordinating Committee and presented to Member States for approval at the 106th Session of the Council in November 2015.

The following elements underpin the Gender Equality Policy:

1) A comprehensive approach that includes a focus on equality in programming and staffing. The policy incorporates promoting gender equality in human resources and organizational culture, as well as gender mainstreaming in programming. Addressing these two components in specific sections of the policy has been positive to help clarify the two very different aspects of gender equality. While "the aim of gender mainstreaming is to support the achievement of programmatic results [...] gender balance in staffing is intended to ensure equitable staffing practices."

2) A dual focus on strengthening institutional processes and on achieving gender equality results. The policy is aligned with the 15 UN-SWAP performance indicators, which cover strengthening accountability; monitoring, evaluation and reporting; resource tracking and allocation and capacity development as well as measures to enhance results-based management. The connection to the UN SWAP ensures that the policy is linked to practical actions and results, and to related reporting requirements.

"The UN-SWAP framework has been instrumental to IOM's work on gender, and we continue to use it as a guiding and motivating tool as we push ahead towards fully implementing the framework."⁶

⁶ Message from the Director General concerning the IOM UN-SWAP Report Letter and Analysis.

3) A strategic change from a women centred focus of its predecessor to a gender focus model that reflects on the needs of all migrants. The policy recognizes that “a person’s sex and gender shape every stage of the migration experience” and provides a clear rationale for the need to address the linkages between gender and migration. The policy however, does not include references to persons who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex (LGBTI) because of opposition from some Member States.

This omission has not prevented IOM from addressing specific needs of persons who identify as LGBTI, both inside and outside the organization. For example, the Organizational Effectiveness Report includes practices linked to the inclusion of LGBTI staff members and a set of recommendations to improve diversity and inclusion. The Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF) also includes references to “other diversity characteristics” and specifies that this includes sexual orientation. The Director General has also reaffirmed IOM’s commitment “to IOM LGBTI staff members and migrants, and to having an equal and inclusive workplace for all.”⁷

To align the policy with IOM’s international commitments to the principles of equality and non-discrimination, as well as commitments to leave no one behind, IOM should approach those Member States that had expressed reservations to find a compromise and ensure that the new policy to be issued after 2019 is inclusive of people who identify as LGBTI. It should be noted that at the 106th Session of the Council in 2015, other Member States expressed regret over the decision to remove references to LGBTI persons without having had the opportunity to further discuss it. According to a survey sent to all IOM staff, a good majority of staff (64.43 per cent) favour inclusion of specific reference to LGBTI persons in the Gender Equality Policy, 17.32 per cent of staff respondents do not favour it and the remaining 18.24 per cent of respondents do not know or have no opinion on it.

Concerning IOM staff, the Diversity and Inclusion Report also stresses the need to support staff who identify as LGBTI, stating: “LGBTI staff members were less likely than heterosexual staff to consider that IOM’s global workforce reflects the diversity of its beneficiaries, that they were treated fairly at work and that they were respected for the unique skills and experiences they bring to IOM.”

IOM should also consider joining the UN statement on Ending violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people. So far, 12 UN entities (ILO, OHCHR, UNAIDS Secretariat, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, UN Women, WFP and WHO) have joined this call.

4. Results against the OECD-DAC criteria

4.1 Relevance

- 1) Are IOM’s gender policy and related strategy relevant to IOM’s mandate and to other international engagements and commitments (for instance recommendations of international conferences, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development or gender guidance published by UN Women)?
- 2) Are the various means, gender markers and targets selected for implementation relevant to the policy and its goals?

⁷ “IOM Observes the International Day against Homophobia, Transphobia & Biphobia (IDAHOT)” email sent to staff by William Lacy Swing, Director General, 17 May 2017.

3) Are the policy and related interventions relevant to address the drivers of exclusion, discrimination and unequal power relations and to challenge established gender beliefs and norms (for both staffing and programming)?

4) Are IOM institutional processes, frameworks and guidance, such as the Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF), the Migration Crisis Operational Framework (MCOF), the organizational effectiveness report or IOM budgeting processes, properly integrating a gender dimension?

“The Gender Policy has helped institutionalize gender. It is no longer about my personal interest. Now, there is a policy that requires gender to be part of the conversation.”

This section assesses the overall relevance of IOM’s policy in supporting gender mainstreaming in its work, including how it has influenced IOM’s Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF). It also focuses on the contribution of the policy to IOM’s commitment to the implementation of the UN SWAP.

The revised policy has raised awareness among staff about gender mainstreaming and has revived the discussion at the organizational level. Interviews with respondents as well as the results from the survey sent to all IOM staff confirm that the revised Gender Equality Policy is very relevant to IOM’s mandate towards gender equality and the empowerment of all.

According to the survey, 92% of IOM Staff respondents are familiar with the IOM Gender Equality Policy. Of these, 7.68% are very familiar with the policy and have contributed to its development and implementation in their respective programmes/projects; 43.94% are familiar with the content of the policy; and 40.20% recall being somewhat familiar with the policy. The same survey shows that slightly more than half of respondents rated as high their interest in different components of the policy (52% for gender parity and 51% for gender mainstreaming in programmes).

The policy has helped clarify what gender mainstreaming means and consequently to improve responses to the needs of migrants. As numerous respondents noted, the policy has underscored the need to look at the differential impact of migration on the needs of women, men, girls and boys, and IOM’s role in ensuring that those needs are fully addressed in the context of migration. For example, a respondent noted that the policy has helped staff to understand that gender issues are also related to men. In the counter-trafficking work, for instance, IOM has reached out to men who are being trafficked in the context of labour exploitation to help identify and address their specific needs.

Several other respondents pointed out that the momentum generated by the policy revision has contributed to changing the thinking about how IOM provides services. For example, to ensure that staff working with migrants understand the specific needs of women and don’t limit their interactions to interviewing the heads of household who tend to be men. Other respondents highlighted that the revised policy has not added so much to the way they do programming, but it has formalized the recognition that IOM needs to address specific needs of all migrants.

“Inside IOM I have learned that gender equality means rights for everybody, including men and children. Equality means that not everybody has the same needs and accordingly the response needs to be adjusted.”

Despite progress, confusion about what gender mainstreaming means still persists among many staff members. In some cases, responses from interviewees indicated some confusion about the difference between gender mainstreaming and gender parity. A respondent noted: “Management lacks understanding. They think that if it is all women working in a project, then it is fine. [To them,] that equates to gender mainstreaming.” Another interviewee said that “for many staff female migrant equals migrant with a vulnerability, like sick people, or unaccompanied children.”

“IOM is doing a better job. The policy provided a systematic approach to accelerate gender mainstreaming.”

4.1.1 The Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF)

The revision of the policy and the endorsement by member states has provided a strong justification for strengthening the inclusion of gender in IOM's institutional processes, frameworks and guidance. For example, **the discussions on the issuance of a new policy have influenced the drafting of gender related sections of the IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF)**, which was adopted in 2015 as the new global strategic framework to guide IOM's planning in capacity building, policy and programming.

The MiGOF requires adherence to international standards, including the principles of equality and non-discrimination, and recognizes the need for specific gender-sensitive approaches. It encourages States “to mainstream gender considerations into policy and programmes; consider how the migration process differs based on gender, age and other diversity characteristics and address these differences; collect and use sex- and age-disaggregated data; and provide equal and non-discriminatory access to support, social services and justice.”⁸

The policy has also influenced the MiGOF's results framework that monitors IOM's external efforts to mainstream gender equality and includes gender-related outcomes, outputs and two indicators to measure the percentage of projects with explicit gender components and the establishment of an IOM-wide gender marker.

The MiGOF results framework is complemented by the Organizational Effectiveness results framework, which contains eight indicators to measure the implementation of the Gender Equality Policy internally (i.e., capacity building, organizational culture, staffing and recruitment, Gender Focal Points, and so forth).

4.1.2 Inter-agency coherence

The Gender Equality Policy has also been very relevant for IOM to follow through with other international commitments towards gender equality and the empowerment of women. **The policy is a reminder of IOM's international commitments to leave no one behind to achieve the goals established in the 2030 Agenda for sustainable Development.**

The close alignment of the revised Gender Equality Policy with the UN-SWAP has also reinforced the Organization's commitment to implement this accountability framework. The main components of the policy mirror the 15 UN-SWAP performance indicators, facilitating IOM's position to report on and fulfil its mandate towards gender equality. Similarly, the policy, together with the UN-SWAP has allowed IOM to better align with UN practices and institutional commitments in relation to staff practices and policies. IOM is perceived by other agencies as implementing good practices in relation to gender-responsive auditing, communications and coherence.

⁸ IOM SWAP Report 2016.

Additionally, IOM was one of the pilot agencies for both the original UN-SWAP framework and UN-SWAP 2.0.

IOM is an active participant in inter-agency meetings. For example, the GCU participates in the Geneva-based SWAP focal point meetings that take place approximately every three months, as well as the global SWAP meetings that take place at least once a year. This has been a good platform to share experiences and has influenced some strategic decisions. In 2015–2016, IOM participated in a SWAP peer review of all the SWAP performance indicators with UNOPS. Last year, IOM participated in a peer review for the performance indicator on evaluation with UN-Habitat. These peer review exercises have highlighted a number of good practices in the Organization and also help identified future areas to work on.

As part of the UN-SWAP requirements, the GCU, in close collaboration with colleagues working in other units, has been leading the work on the IOM Gender Marker that will be mandatory for all IOM projects in 2018. The newly launched marker tracks how many of IOM's projects contribute to gender equality by categorizing each project according to the degree to which gender considerations are taken into account throughout project development cycle. It also measures how much of IOM's budget is being allocated to these projects.

The piloting of the gender marker started in July 2017 in all offices under RO Nairobi and RO Vienna. The IOM Gender Marker will be mandatory for all offices and projects in 2018. To support the pilot, the GCU has developed detailed guidance for determining the code as well as training sessions and other support for relevant staff of the pilot COs and ROs in Vienna and Nairobi, and for relevant staff in HQ. The GCU also organized a validation workshop in early November with all pilot COs, ROs and relevant HQ divisions, which will lead to refining the guidance and roll out process for the full launch of the gender marker. Examples of the maker's concrete impact are included in the Project Review section.

4.2 Effectiveness

5) How effective is IOM in institutionalizing and implementing the gender policy and related strategy, in guidelines, procedures, networks, programmes and other mechanisms developed in the framework of the policy?

6) To what extent did the projects and programmes selected address the root causes of gender inequality, exclusion and discrimination? Did they bring changes beyond the immediate beneficiaries needs? Are the collaborative efforts necessary for an effective implementation of the policy and strategy, both at Headquarters and in the field? Is there an organizational culture conducive to gender mainstreaming and gender parity?

7) Are IOM's external partnerships effective for the promotion of gender equality?

8) Is IOM's overall management of gender mainstreaming for reaching gender parity in staffing effective, including regarding recruitment, promotion and other aspects that are relevant to gender parity such as granting of flexible working time or reports of harassment cases? What is the overall perception of the Organization towards gender, in particular for a top-down supportive approach?

This section focuses on the degree to which IOM has achieved the mid-term plans for gender mainstreaming as set out in the Gender Equality Policy. It first looks at whether the project review and endorsement process ensure adequate attention to gender considerations; then outlines IOM's performance in relation to gender-

responsive performance management, partnerships and knowledge generation and communication.

Interviews with different stakeholders at HQ, Regional and Country Offices as well as the documentation reviewed provide evidence of IOM's progress towards achieving gender mainstreaming across the Organization. The evaluation uses as baseline data IOM's 2014 reporting under the UN-SWAP framework. As the table below illustrates, **IOM has achieved considerable progress in the last three years and currently meets or exceeds six indicators, a significant improvement from meeting only two indicators in 2014.**

On the other hand, IOM "meets/exceeds" requirements for only 40% of the performance indicators; compared to an average 73% met by other UN Funds and Programmes entities, and the overall 64% met by the overall United Nations system.⁹ To put these numbers into context, projections indicate that the United Nations system "can expect to achieve "meets" or "exceeds" ratings for all requirements only by 2020, three years after the original deadline of 2017."¹⁰

IOM SWAP Performance – Comparative table 2014-2016¹¹

Performance Indicator	2014	2015	2016
1. Policy and plan	Approaches	Meets	Meets
2. Performance management	Approaches	Meets	Meets
3. Strategic planning	Missing	Approaches	Approaches
4. Monitoring and evaluation	Missing	Approaches	Approaches
5. Evaluation	Approaches	Approaches	Approaches
6. Auditing	Meets	Meets	Exceeds
7. Programme review	Approaches	Approaches	Approaches
8. Financial tracking	Missing	Approaches	Approaches
9. Financial allocation	Approaches	Approaches	Approaches
10. Gender architecture/parity	Missing	Approaches	Approaches
11. Organizational culture	Approaches	Approaches	Approaches
12. Capacity assessment	Approaches	Approaches	Approaches
13. Capacity development	Approaches	Approaches	Meets
14. Knowledge generation and communication	Approaches	Approaches	Meets
15. Coherence	Meets	Exceeds	Exceeds

4.2.1 Project review

"Before the policy we did not have many ideas on how to integrate gender into programming."

The development and implementation of gender-sensitive tools and strategies—such as the Project Handbook, the Gender and RBM Guidance, the

⁹ Overview of IOM's 2016 UN-SWAP, UN Women.

¹⁰ Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system, Report of the Secretary-General, E/2017/57, 6 April 2017.

¹¹ Table prepared by the GCU.

training of relevant staff and the roll-out of the gender marker—have significantly advanced the integration of gender in project proposals. Gender, however, is not yet integrated in a systematic manner across IOM’s programmatic work.

The responsibility for project review and endorsement rests mainly on IOM’s nine Regional Offices through their Regional Thematic Specialists (RTSs). These specialists play a critical role in ensuring that all proposals fulfil IOM standards, including the commitments established in the gender policy. For projects in Level 3 humanitarian crisis settings, project endorsement is the responsibility of DOE located in Headquarters.

The policy establishes that the project review and endorsement process will “ensure adequate attention to gender considerations” and identifies the GCU as the entity to provide guidance in this area. The policy also identifies the need to train thematic specialists and other relevant staff on gender mainstreaming.

The GCU has contributed significantly to develop detailed guidance to mainstream gender into IOM projects. The newly revised IOM project handbook was launched earlier this year and includes gender mainstreaming as a cross-cutting issue in all phases of project development. The “Gender and RBM Guidance” focuses on developing gender-sensitive results statements and indicators. This guidance was distributed to staff worldwide in January 2017. Both tools provide step-by-step guidance; including templates, checklists and examples to support relevant staff to develop gender sensitive projects through the project cycle, with a particular focus on project development. Both documents focus on gender rather than only on women and girls, and include numerous references to those identifying as LGBTI. IOM has also updated the Project Development training to include gender.

“Things are changing, no longer the project comes from one person sitting in the office but more and more is developed in consultation with different groups. This needs to become a normal way of doing things.”

These guides and tools are raising awareness and sensitizing RTSs, project developers and other staff about IOM commitments to strengthen gender analysis in the project cycle. The evidence reviewed shows that projects are becoming more gender-sensitive, but gender mainstreaming remains inconsistent and it is not yet perceived as a core component of the work.

In preparation for the regional and country field visits, the evaluator reviewed 12 project proposals submitted by COs in Ukraine and Vienna and some proposals endorsed by RO Vienna. In reviewing the proposals, the evaluator looked at the overall integration of gender considerations, the inclusion of the differential needs of men, women and other relevant groups and sex-disaggregated data, the use of gender sensitive indicators, and the inclusion of partner’s gender related experience.

Although the number of proposals reviewed is too small to be used as evaluative evidence, the desk review together with numerous interviews with staff at the regional and country level provide some qualitative information about the obstacles and enabling factors to mainstreaming gender into programming, including:

- **Narrow understanding of what gender analysis means is an obstacle to adequate integration of gender in projects.** As an interviewee stressed “there is an assumption that if women are involved, gender is mainstreamed.” Similarly, gender indicators tend to focus on numbers rather than measuring qualitative results.

- **Conducting gender assessments¹² leads to projects more tailored to the needs of beneficiaries.** For example, the counter-trafficking programme in Ukraine has developed surveys to collect disaggregated data and analyze specific vulnerability for men and women. This has enabled them to adapt their programming over time to the new realities of beneficiaries and shift the focus from sexual exploitation mainly assisting women, to labour exploitation, which includes men and women. This has also impacted the messages and visuals in their materials.

However, the projectized nature of IOM was cited by many interviewees as a major impediment to conducting more gender assessments. Interviewees noted that not all donors would agree to integrate assessments into project proposals. Other staff highlighted time constraints, particularly in relation to IOM's emergency work, as a constraint to carry out this work. "Staff is under pressure to develop project proposals quickly."

- **Institutional support and commitment to gender integration is a critical factor to strengthen the gender components in projects.** For instance, several interviewees noted that gender is high on the agenda of the RTS tasked with reviewing their projects, which has influenced their motivation to include gender in their projects proposals. Another interviewee noted: "Staff will not be pushing for the integration of gender if management does not require it."

- **Gender mainstreaming is not perceived as mandatory.** According to some interviewees, the integration of projects seems to be more driven by donor requirements than institutional commitments to gender equality. In contrast, project proposals submitted to the IOM Development Fund (IDF) will not be approved for activation unless they mainstream gender. The fund has set a target of expending 5% of its budget on gender specific activities, but has not been able to reach it in the last two years.

Similarly, all proposals submitted through the DOE have been using the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Gender Marker for all projects in humanitarian appeals process. The new IOM Gender Marker that will be mandatory for all IOM projects beginning in 2018 will similarly contribute to mainstream gender into projects.

4.2.2 The IOM Gender Marker¹³

The gender policy, together with the UN-SWAP, has prompted the launching of IOM's gender marker, which according to all evidence reviewed, is a relevant and adequate tool to further the implementation of the policy and its goals. Most interviewees agree that **the new marker is strengthening the gender components**

¹² "Gender Assessment examines how a program or project addresses and responds to gender disparities and inequalities through its objectives, activities, and policies". Available at Gender concepts and definitions: <https://gender.jhpiego.org/analysis/toolkit/gender-concepts-and-definitions/>.

¹³ The IOM Gender Marker uses the following coding:

· 2b: Project where a particular group is targeted in order to address a specific disadvantage or discrimination, and therefore whose principal objective is to contribute to/advance gender equality, and where the needs assessment, project activities and outputs include adequate attention to gender.

· 2a: General project with gender sufficiently mainstreamed so that it will likely make a significant contribution to gender equality, and where the needs assessment, project activities and outputs include adequate attention to gender.

· 1: Project that includes some but not sufficient attention to gender issues and therefore will likely contribute in a limited or marginal way to gender equality.

· 0: Project that does not include any attention to gender issues and is therefore not expected to make a noticeable contribution to advancing gender equality.

of IOM’s projects and interventions. A key concern, however, is to ensure that all relevant stakeholders have the technical capacity and receive the necessary support to put the marker into practice. Some concrete examples of the piloting of the gender marker include:

The gender marker has added a layer of accountability to the implementation of the gender policy. According to many interviewees, it has created a shift in the way staff perceives gender as an institutional approach and no longer only as a matter of personal interest. In this context, some staff noted that there has been a noticeable difference observed “before and after” the marker. While before, gender was not included as a key aspect in the project review and endorsement process, now it has become staff’s responsibility to ensure that gender is factored in from the start, with concrete criteria to be met.

“When the IOM Gender Marker policy was piloted in RO Vienna, there was a period of adjustment as project development staff get used to paying more attention in highlighting gender issues and concerns in their project proposals. I remember that on one occasion, a very well experienced project management staff who also designs projects and writes proposals came back asking why I assigned a “0” score on the project proposal that I reviewed and approved for submission to the donor. After explaining the lack of data or activities on gender in the proposal that would contribute to advancing gender equality, and providing the staff with a copy of the guidelines, the staff made corrections to the proposal that eventually made me change my recommendations to “1” for the Gender Marker of the project. Unfortunately, while the proposed project does address the health issues and concerns of migrants, it does not significantly contribute to gender equality as there was no specific action to increase participation of women.”

“A similar case also happened with another country mission, but this time the project developer copied a gender focal point in HQ on our exchange where she pointed out all the valid points where gender has been duly addressed in the first phase of the project. Unfortunately, these points were not pointed in the proposal for the second phase of the project, but with the intervention/guidance of the HQ Gender Focal Point it was eventually incorporated and highlighted in the project – earning the classification of “2A” for her project.”

The piloting of the gender marker has triggered discussions between HQ, ROs and COs on how to better integrate gender considerations in some aspects of the project proposals. For example, since the piloting of the gender marker in July 2017, IOM Kiev submitted four project proposals that included the gender marker. Of the four, three were classified as gender marker code 2A and one as gender marker code 1. All suggested gender marker codes were confirmed by the RO during the endorsement process, as indicated in the table below.

PROJECT TITLE	COMMENTS	GENDER MARKER CODE IOM UKRAINE	RO VIENNA ENDORSEMENT
WASH rehabilitation and winterization support in conflict-affected communities of Donetsk (NGCA)	Project Activated	2A	Approved 2A
Promoting Cohesion and Sustainable Community Development in Conflict-Affected Communities in the Donbas	Project proposal sent to donor	2A	Approved 2A

Integration and Stabilization support through livelihoods for IDPs and conflict affected population in Ukraine	Project proposal sent to donor	2A	Approved 2A
EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine Phase 12 (EUBAM 12)	Project Proposal sent to RO for endorsement	1	Not yet endorsed/gender marker code confirmed by RO

The EUBAM project is an example of a project proposal that is quite challenging to achieve a gender marker code 2A or 2B because of the specific nature of the project—the activities planned and respective outputs are defined by the European Union (EU). The CO evaluated this project as a gender marker 1 and is waiting feedback from the RO. Despite the low marking, this was presented as an important example “because it sparked discussions with the RO on how to better integrate gender considerations into the planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation activities as well as how to better mainstream gender throughout this action and with the project beneficiaries, particularly considering the specific nature of this project.”

The gender marker has prompted the inclusion of gender specific elements into existing or new projects. For example, following information sessions and trainings on the gender marker, staff have included in project proposals focus group discussions with women; indicators requesting data disaggregation by sex; and gender-specific trainings for beneficiaries.

"Supporting Recovery and Sustainable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons and the Conflict-Affected Population in Ukraine"
 After attending a presentation about the IOM's Gender Marker Pilot, which was conducted by the Gender Focal Point, the team decided to include a specific training on gender for the communities taking part in the project. The objective of the training is to address pervasive societal stereotypes and the traditional roles assigned to men and women in the community, which have resulted in increasing tensions and miscommunication. In order to do this, the manager sent a request to the donor to amend the current Agreement to include a training workshop on gender.

"Assessing and Understanding Drivers and Resiliencies to Violent Extremism in Sub-national Areas of Tajikistan"
 The gender marker training triggered the inclusion of a gender analysis in the conceptualization of the project. The project now indicates main reasons for males and females to migrate and to join extremist groups. The project also includes women's participation in focus groups and sex disaggregated data indicators.

Despite the positive momentum generated by the implementation of the gender marker, several concerns remain about the real impact of the marker on IOM's programmatic work. Many interviewees raised questions about next steps, including: What are the plans to follow up on implementation? How will the gender marker impact monitoring, reporting and evaluation? Is the gender marker going to be used to grade the performance of the offices? What are the consequences of having a poor gender marker? To ensure that the gender marker process is meaningful, it is critical to see the marker not as an isolated exercise, but rather as the first step of a larger process.

Another key challenge identified during the piloting phase were coding errors. About 50% of the projects appear to be coded at a higher level than they should be. This is

not particular to IOM Gender Marker and has been identified “as one of the primary obstacles to establishing effective gender marker systems.”¹⁴ Coding errors seem to be in part linked to a lack of staff’s capacity to code accurately, particularly to code higher than a project should be coded. Other possible contributing factors include lack of awareness of the marker, lack of attention given to the marker (due to time constraints or disinterest) and high staff turnover.

The GCU has developed detailed guidance on how to use the IOM Gender marker that includes examples for each of the markers. The feedback about the information and training provided by the GCU has been extremely positive. The GCU has sent information to all IOM relevant staff detailing specific roles and responsibilities for Project Development Officers, RTSs and all endorsers of projects developed by the above offices. The GCU has also organized training sessions for relevant staff in the Regional Offices in Vienna and Nairobi, and in HQ.

Participants highlighted the quality of the training received in relation to the gender marker. All interviewees found the practical exercises very useful to gain the necessary skills to assign the marker. According to the information received, the regional trainings provided to RTSs, project developers and other project staff in Vienna and Nairobi are being replicated in the COs in both regions.

“The gender marker and the gender policy have contributed to institutionalize gender into IOM’s work, but that doesn’t mean that staff knows how to do it.”

While the feedback related to the trainings and guidance provided by the GCU have been extremely useful, **the majority of interviewees stressed the need for IOM to invest more resources on capacity development.** For example, many staff identified the capacity to carry out gender analysis as a weakness in some programmatic areas. Strengthening staff’s capacity to assess the differential impacts of migration would allow IOM to tailor interventions to the needs of beneficiaries and to measure specific impacts. The ongoing consultations between the GCU and the staff involved in the piloting of the gender marker should help identify capacity gaps and the necessary steps to establish a proper system for quality assurance.

4.2.3 Partnerships

“We are changed by our partners.”

The Gender Equality Policy highlights IOM’s pledge to actively seek partners with demonstrated commitment to gender equality and establishes that “future agreements with partners will seek to include commitments on gender equality in relation to relevant cooperation or joint programming.”

IOM often works with a wide range of implementing partners, including governments, the private sector and non-governmental organizations. While numerous interviewees indicated that they actively seek implementing partners with commitment to gender equality, there is no requirement for partners to adhere to gender specific commitments in calls for proposals or contractual agreements. The only requirement is including a reference related to Preventing and Responding to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, which all contracts must include. To ensure that partners contribute to gender equality results, IOM should look at existing procurement guidance from other UN agencies in this area.

¹⁴ IOM Gender Marker Guide For Piloting, June 2017.

4.2.4 Gender-responsive performance management

The gender policy identifies performance assessment as a key factor to ensure accountability. As reported in the 2016 UN-SWAP report, IOM has included specific competency indicators on gender equality in the existing Staff Performance Evaluation System (SES) that applies to all staff members. The SES is intended to ensure that managers in particular are held accountable for mainstreaming gender in programming and staffing.

Even though the institutional processes are in place, staff is not systematically held accountable for integrating gender in their work. The majority of staff interviewed during the evaluation did not include a gender-related objective in the SES appraisal. Neither was gender a part of the discussion with their supervisor. Many interviewees highlighted that in practice this is not a rigorous and meaningful exercise. As an interviewee noted “everyone does it in their corner and then they get the approval.” Another interviewee said, “I don’t believe that he [my manager] can really judge my ongoing performance. For the last year I rated myself as ‘fully satisfactory’ on gender in staffing and ‘needs improvement’ on gender in programming. My supervisor ticked the same boxes.”

4.2.5 Knowledge generation and communication

“The [Gender Equality] Policy provides authority to request from HQ changes in communication.”

The collaborative work between the Media and Communication Division (MCD) and the GCU has contributed to the revision of IOM’s Media and Communications Strategy and a significant integration of gender considerations into press briefings, social media stories and videos, websites and publication. For example, 46% of the profiles submitted for 2016 the “I am Migrant” campaign are women and girls. The MCD is also conducting regular reviews of how gender is being mainstreamed into IOM communication materials.

The collaboration between the MCD and the GCU has also resulted in the Gender and Communication Toolkit, which provides comprehensive and concrete guidance for staff to ensure that any communication materials are gender sensitive.

In terms of global knowledge generation and communication, it is important to note the work done by GCU, Gender Focal Points and other staff in IOM offices worldwide in preparing special events and innovative initiatives, for instance for International Women’s Day, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women, and other occasions. Interactive exhibitions on gender and migration were also organized for the Pan-African Forum on Migration held in Kampala in May 2017, for the Human Rights Council held in Geneva in September 2017, and to celebrate International Migrants Day in Cairo in December 2017.

4.3 Efficiency

9) Are the investments made sufficient to implement the gender policy (including for instance dedicated staffing, training, research, attendance to conferences etc.)?

10) Are the investments made adequate to position IOM as a leading organization on gender and migration?

11) Are the measures taken for implementation cost-effective?

12) Have the organizational arrangements used to support the implementation of the gender policy and implementation plan been adequate to achieve the intended results?

This section looks at whether IOM's institutional mechanisms, the GCU and the network of GFPs, have supported the implementation of the gender policy and have used resources effectively. It also looks at how effectively IOM monitors, reports on and evaluates results.

4.3.1 Institutional mechanisms for implementing the Policy

Overall the evaluation finds that the organizational arrangements to support the implementation of the Gender Policy are adequate and have contributed to advancing gender mainstreaming in the organization although this is not done consistently. In the context of extremely limited financial and human resources, the Gender Coordination Unit strategic prioritization and use of resources have been very effective at achieving the intended results.

i) The Gender Coordination Unit

The Technical expertise and support provided by GCU has contributed substantially to improve capacities in Regional and Country Offices to mainstream gender. IOM has adopted a decentralized gender-mainstreaming model, with relevant departments taking the lead in their respective areas of responsibilities and the GCU providing technical advice to departments on all migration and gender issues as well as a coordinating and facilitative role. The GCU also coordinates IOM's network of GFPs and plays a key role leading IOM's inter-agency work on gender equality and the UN-SWAP.

GCU is located in the Office of the Director General and consists of two full time-staff (P-4 and P-3), a full-time consultant and occasionally a full-time intern. One external senior-level gender consultant also supports the work of the Unit. The two full-time staff are the only positions in IOM with ToRs dedicated exclusively to gender. IOM's GCU is particularly small compared with other units with similar functions in the UN system. For example, the World Food Programme (WFP) has a Gender Office with eight staff members and regional gender advisers in each regional bureau. It also has ten dedicated gender officers in country offices.¹⁵

The GCU is not adequately resourced to fully carry out its functions. Since its establishment the Unit has received funding from IOM Discretionary Income for carrying out gender-specific projects. This allocation has changed minimally during the last decade. This is particularly challenging considering that in 2012 IOM committed to the UN-SWAP, which has required the GCU to take the lead on an increasing number of initiatives and processes. This is an area, however, where most UN entities are facing challenges, as "only 25% of entities [have] reported having a fully resource gender unit or equivalent."¹⁶

"Their [GCU] support is professional and swift. If I need materials for a presentation, I get the materials in one day [...] their work is very inspiring."

¹⁵ World Food Programme, Update on the Gender Policy, WFP/EB.A/2017/5-D, 5 May 2017.

¹⁶ Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system, Report of the Secretary-General, E/2017/57, 6 April 2017.

Despite the limited financial and human resources, the Unit has effectively contributed to the establishment of institutional processes and the development and strengthening of tools to build up the Organization's capacity to mainstream gender in its work. The GCU has achieved this by working in partnership with other departments and focusing on its advisory and coordinating role instead of project implementation. Many interviewees characterized the unit as very active and highly valued its work in the following areas:

- 1) **Responding to requests and sharing gender related information with staff regarding trends, processes and training materials.** An interviewee drew attention to the fact that focal points for other areas in the Organization do not have that level of support.
- 2) **Sponsoring the participation of relevant staff in gender related capacity building activities.**
- 3) **Developing training and guidance materials in cooperation with other departments.**
- 4) **Providing leadership and support in the piloting of IOM's gender marker;**
- 5) **Mainstreaming gender into internal processes,** such as providing input to guidance materials related to project development, gender auditing and communications.
- 6) **Advocating for gender in an innovative way.** Interviewees highlighted the work on unconscious bias as an example of this work. A staff member noted, "learning about gender mainstreaming is more fun and has become easier."

ii) Gender Focal Points

As part of its gender architecture, IOM has appointed gender focal points in each Regional and Country Office. Currently, there are about 130 GFPs in the Organization. The position of GFP is voluntary and each focal point is expected to carry out his or her GFP duties in addition to official duties. **GFPs can play a key role operationalizing the Gender Equality Policy; however, a more strategic prioritization of their activities—both as individuals, as well as part of the GFPs network—is needed to ensure that their role can effectively support gender mainstreaming.** The challenges facing GFPs are common to many UN agencies.¹⁷

The gender policy establishes that GFPs should "have written terms of reference and allocate a minimum of 10% working time to the gender focal point role." The policy requires GFPs to have gender-related knowledge or experience and to be appointed from staff employed at P3 or National Officer C (NO-C) levels and above.

In 2016, 34% of GFPs were at the P3/NOC level and above. Some of the constraints to having GFPs at P3/NOC level is the fact that many COs do not have staff above P2 and others do not have any staff other than G staff. Gender knowledge and experience among GFPs varies depending on the office. Some GFPs seem to be very active and have been appointed or have volunteered based on previous gender experience and personal interest, while others seem to have been more randomly appointed. According to the survey sent to GFPs, 72% of GFP respondents have already worked on gender issues in their previous jobs, had undertaken projects related to gender during their academic studies or have higher degrees in a gender related field.

Regarding the role of GFPs, their capacity to fulfil the 10% time allocation to the differs widely, with some spending less than 10% and some spending considerably

¹⁷ Status of Women in the United Nations System 2016, UN WOMEN.

more than 10% of their time on GFP functions. According to respondents to the survey, 63% of the GFP devote between 0 – 8 hours (one working day) on average every month; 22% spend between 9 to 16 hours (up to two working days); and 15% more than three working days. Time, however, was often cited as a constraint and most interviewees underlined that the role of GFP is often not integrated into their position, but rather added to an already full time job.

“She [the GFP] needs to work 100% on the projects. The donor does not pay for this role and most likely would not to tolerate this even if it sympathizes with gender. The priority is responding to the migration crises.”

A considerable number of interviewees noted that the role of GFPs is not sufficiently clear. According to the survey, 37% of GFPs did not receive TORs upon appointment and 8% could not recall if they have received it. In addition, the TOR list a myriad of activities (17) in the areas of advocacy, capacity development, gender parity, Knowledge Management, Networking and promoting gender issues externally. This list of activities seems unrealistic given the time constraints and the voluntary nature of the GFP role.

The ability of GFPs to perform is determined by a number of enabling factors and obstacles. Strong institutional commitments, including capacity building, funding, a gender sensitive culture and clear TORs, were cited as the main enabling factors. According to survey, 43% GFP respondents receive adequate support from their senior management regarding their work as GFP. Another 41% somewhat receive active support from them. About 15% of respondents said that they do not receive active support from management to mainstream gender in their work.

Concerning obstacles, most GFPs mentioned cultural factors, attitude of colleagues and senior staff, time constraints and lack of training as major obstacles to carrying out their tasks more effectively as GFPs. 78% of the survey respondents as well as many interviewees underlined the need for more capacity building to carry out their tasks as GFPs.

“Before the training [GFP training at the ITC-ILO] I did not have an understanding of my role as GFP. I just attended some meetings [...] but did not do much in the office. After the training, I understand my role much better.”

The lack of clarity in relation to their role is reinforced by the lack of accountability. For example, the GFPs don't appear to have workplans with clear deliverables and their responsibilities are often not referenced in the main ToR of the staff carrying out this function. The majority of interviewees noted that the role of the GFP is not included in the SES. Moreover, there is no official recognition or reward attributed by the Organisation for the work done or for special personal investments.

iii) The Gender Focal Points Network

The Gender Equality Policy tasks the GCU with establishing an online GFP network “to ensure regular communications between gender focal points, and monitor implementation of gender focal point workplans.” The network is comprised of country and regional level GFPs. This is an area that needs to be further strengthened, as internal networking doesn't seem to be very efficient. **The lack of regular communication and coordination between the GCU and the GFPs network has prevented the network from evolving into a more cohesive structure to facilitate knowledge exchange between Country Offices and regions.**

The GCU has made significant efforts to support the network of GFPs. According to survey respondents, the GCU has provided guidance or coaching to 60% of respondents. The GCU also provides regular training to some GFPs. For example, in 2016 and 2017, a total of 13 GFPs from Regional and Country Offices participated in the ITC-ILO/UN Women Training Centre's annual course "Empowering UN System Gender Focal Points" in Turin, Italy.

Interviews as well as survey responses indicate a high level of satisfaction with the support provided by the GCU. For example, 93% of GFP respondents found resource materials (reports, emails, documents) and support from GCU useful (69%) or partially useful (24%) to facilitate their work. The evidence reviewed also indicates a good level of communication between the GCU and a significant number of GFPs. According to the survey, 87% of GFPs maintain contact with GCU whether regularly (24%), sometimes (22%) or occasionally (41%).

However, the GCU's role facilitating communication and networking among GFPs has been limited and communication between the GCU and the GFP network as a structure appears to have been ad hoc. According to the survey 70% of GFPs have had only occasional or no contact with other GFPs. Of the remaining 30% who have contact (regularly or sometimes), two-thirds only get in touch with other GFPs on a needs basis. Maintaining regular communication will facilitate sharing of experiences and knowledge exchange between GFPs and bring coherence to the GFPs network.

4.3.2 Monitoring and reporting

"IOM does well in monitoring the implementation of activities, but monitoring results is far more complex."

As is common within the UN system, **IOM's capacity to measure impact, in particular related to gender equality results, remains limited.** However, recent measures taken by IOM in this area have the potential to significantly strengthen this work. These measures include the placement of Monitoring and Evaluation Officers in ROs, the roll-out of the Project Information and Management Application (PRIMA) and the development of gender specific tools on results-based management and on monitoring and evaluation.

To track its performance, IOM has developed a global online institutional questionnaire to request data from regional and country offices. The questionnaire is based on the MiGOF results framework and requires all key data to be disaggregated by sex and age. It also requires reporting on the MiGOF indicators on implementation of the Gender Equality Policy. Information gathered through these questionnaires is used to monitor and report on organizational practices (Organizational Effectiveness Report) and programming work (IOM Annual Report). This reporting is useful, but tends to be at the activity level only.

The Organizational Effectiveness Report provides an important baseline to track progress against the implementation of the gender policy and the UN-SWAP. The report includes a comprehensive review on gender in staffing issues and organizational culture, and gaps on gender parity within IOM. The research also includes practices linked to the inclusion of LGBTI staff members and a set of recommendations to improve diversity and inclusion.

In contrast, the Annual Report provides a limited overview of IOM's gender mainstreaming into programming. The report lists the number of offices that have reported to mainstream gender in their work and provides some basic information on

gender-related thematic areas where IOM is implementing projects, such as gender-based violence, border management and trafficking. It also includes a specific section on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse describing the Organization's leadership role in this area.

To strengthen reporting in this area, the online questionnaire needs to shift the focus from reporting on activities to reporting on gender equality results. With the gender marker initiative, this is a step in the right direction. Gender could also be mainstreamed in all thematic areas in the questionnaire and reflected accordingly in the Annual Report. A good example, even if brief, is the reference to women's participation in camp governance structures in the emergency response section of the report.

“Generally IOM has not had a lot of focus on long-term impact but it has been rather reactive, especially when it comes to humanitarian work.”

Beyond the online institutional questionnaire, IOM doesn't currently have an organizational-wide monitoring and reporting system. The capacity to capture gender equality results differs greatly depending on the specific office's commitment to gender and the available resources. For example, Ukraine CO has developed its own monitoring automated system to monitor quantitative results and report at the output level. The system collects information on indicators, implementation of activities and budget expenditure for each project and enables the office to produce monthly reports with disaggregated data.

Staff in CO Kiev pointed to commitment from management, resources and capacity as enabling factors. This CO has almost 30 active projects, which enables the inclusion of a budget line in every proposal to support this function. “A donor may find it acceptable to include 2% or 3% in a budget line to cover this function, but not necessarily 30%.” The CO in Ukraine has four staff dedicated to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), two staff for the Stabilization and Emergency programme and two other staff to cover the office. This, however, does not seem to be the case in many other COs with fewer active projects. CO Vienna, for example, does not have any dedicated staff to carry out this function.

The recent appointment of Regional M&E Officers in eight out of nine of the Regional Offices provides a significant opportunity to integrate gender into this work. For example, the M&E Officer in RO Vienna has provided support to the M&E Officers in Ukraine by reviewing proposals, revising indicators and raising gender concerns. IOM M&E Officers worldwide also interact through an online network, where they can post questions and share information. Staff found this network very useful to get an external perspective and check on new material in this field.

The “Gender and RBM Guidance” developed by the GCU also provides detailed guidance in this area. Additionally, all Regional M&E Officers have participated in the one-week face-to-face ITC-ILO training course “Gender Equality and Results-Based Management” in Turin, Italy, in November 2016. Regional M&E Officers have also been encouraged to become familiar with the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines for the integration of gender analysis in all evaluations (see also section 4.3.3).

IOM's capacity to report on gender equality results should also improve considerably with the roll-out of the Project Information and Management Application (PRIMA), which is planned to start in 2018. PRIMA is a web based project management system that captures the project cycle and monitors on project results against

indicators. So far, 83 IOM offices have been using a pilot PRIMA platform for IOM Development Fund projects. The evaluator received very positive feedback about the input provided by the GCU to ensure that the system captures gender requirements through the project cycle. The PRIMA system will be an important tool to track the gender marker and ensure that the marker is applied correctly.

In addition to robust monitoring and reporting systems, gender equality results require substantive gender analysis in the conceptualization and project development phases. Limited gender analysis in projects, consequently leads to gender equality issues not being addressed in monitoring and reporting.

The vast majority of staff interviewed during this evaluation agrees that there is more awareness in the Organization about the need to integrate gender in all phases of the projects. However, capacity and resources to do it are still limited, which leads to the perception that carrying out a gender analysis is an additional burden or remains limited in scope. According to some interviewees, unless the project is gender specific, gender tends not to be included in the reporting. A recent internal evaluation reached a similar conclusion: “Unless specifically required by selected donors gender issues are only seldom taken into consideration when elaborating projects, monitoring, etc.”¹⁸

Concerning disaggregation of data, the documentation review and interviews with staff provided evidence of IOM’s efforts to strengthen the collection of disaggregated data.¹⁹ For example, the Mixed Migration Flows in the Mediterranean and Beyond initiative under the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), provides data disaggregated by sex and age. This initiative covers information on countries of the central and eastern Mediterranean migration routes, including countries of origin and final destination.

In Ukraine, IOM adapted the DTM and designed the National Monitoring System to support the government in collecting and analyzing information on the socioeconomic characteristics of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and households. Although not all data is disaggregated, it provides valuable information, for example, on the gender and age distribution of IDP households as well as disaggregated data by sex in relation to employment needs. CO Kiev has also developed an advice hotline (the DONBAS SOS Hotline) to provide up-to-date information for IDPs on document processing and access to different services. The hotline collects statistical data and produces information disaggregated by sex and age.

However, disaggregation of data is not consistent and a justification for not including disaggregated data in reports is not systematically required. Several interviewees noted that in many cases disaggregation of data is driven by donor requirements rather than complying with IOM commitments in this area. For example, the Global Activities 2016 report, which collects information from 88 COs related to IOM activities in shelter, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), Cash-Based Interventions (CBI), Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) operations and capacity building, sectoral coordination, and displacement, does not include disaggregated data by sex or age.

Similarly, the 2016 Annual Report only includes sex-disaggregated data in relation to victims of human trafficking and migrants assisted for voluntary return. However,

¹⁸ Internal Audit SN201603 – Participatory Gender Audit– IOM Dakar (Regional Office) – 26-30 September 2016.

¹⁹ IOM’s Annual Report for 2016 includes a section describing efforts in this area.

most data included in the report—such as number of people being trained (government officials, NGOs, journalists) and numbers of victims and beneficiaries assisted by different programmes—is not disaggregated by sex. As the IOM-SWAP 2016 Report points out “Systematic collection of disaggregated data still requires efforts in missions with low human resources or in emergency contexts (where households rather than individuals are the denominator for beneficiary numbers).”

4.3.3 Evaluation

IOM has not fully implemented the United Nations Evaluation Group requirements on integrating gender in evaluations. The assessment provided in the 2016 UN SWAP report in this area stills remains valid. The report specifies: “unless the project strategy deals directly with gender issues or women’s empowerment, a gender equality perspective will not be adopted in the external evaluation frame of mind. [...] The same implies for the evaluation section of the project document in order to raise the requirements to have gender components more specifically addressed in the evaluations.” Similarly, two other meta-evaluations of IOM projects have concluded that gender is not systematically included in analyses and evaluation reports and more gender specific evaluations are needed.²⁰

The 2016 UN-SWAP report highlights that the inclusion of a gender perspective in evaluation should improve with the revision of the IOM Project Handbook. The new handbook includes several references to gender in its evaluation module. For example, the guiding questions for incorporating cross-cutting themes into the evaluation phase include a section on gender mainstreaming that addresses the inclusion of gender in the evaluation terms of reference, data collection instruments, analysis of sex-disaggregated data, and participation of beneficiaries. Gender is also included in the template for evaluating terms of reference and the template for calls for applications for evaluators. Other guidance notes are currently under development within M&E guidelines and training initiatives, including gender specific guidance.

The revised handbook provides helpful guidance on this topic, but according to several interviewees, it assumes that the evaluation will be carried out by someone external and does not provide enough guidance on how to mainstream gender in this aspect of the work. The UNEG guidelines on integrating gender in evaluation are not yet sufficiently known inside IOM to become a systematic reference for the conduct of IOM external evaluations. The majority of interviewees who commented on this topic noted that if the project does not include gender in the conceptualization and analysis of beneficiaries, it is hard to include it at a later stage during the evaluation phase. Evaluations, however, should provide an opportunity to assess gender integration in project development and implementation and to provide recommendations in this area.

4.3.4 Gender-responsive auditing

As recorded in the UN SWAP rating, IOM has moved from “meets” to “exceeds” this requirement. The IOM Internal Audit processes include a set of gender-specific risks for all internal audits conducted worldwide (43 in 2016). IOM has been recognized as “one of the few organizations integrating gender-related risks in its general audit protocol.”²¹

²⁰ “A meta-evaluation following UNEG scoring tool was conducted in 2014,” IOM/UNOPS peer review on the UN-SWAP for gender equality, UNOPS report. See also, “A formal written meta-evaluation was conducted for 2016 on six published external evaluations,” IOM SWAP Report 2016.

²¹ IOM/UNOPS peer review on the UN SWAP for gender equality, UNOPS report.

This is in part due to the collaboration between GCU and the Internal Audit team of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The GCU continues to provide inputs to OIG/Internal Audit's annual risk-based planning exercise. The newly launched gender marker now provides an opportunity to include those projects that are not gender marked as a risk.

OIG/Internal Audit and GCU have also conducted two specific gender audits of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok in 2014 and the Regional Office for West and Central Africa in Dakar in 2016.

4.4 Sustainability

13) Does the policy include sufficient elements to guarantee the sustainability of the measures implemented to mainstream gender in programmes and gender balance in staffing?

14) Has the policy contributed to sustainable changes in gender roles and relations (transformative change), especially in terms of gender sensitizing among IOM staff, at programmatic level and in organizational culture?

This section assesses whether IOM has invested adequate resources to ensure that staff has the necessary capacity to sustain its work on gender equality. It looks at whether the gender policy has contributed to sustainable changes in attitudes towards gender issues. It then addresses the sustainability of IOM's gender programmes in terms of financial and human resources.

4.4.1 Capacity assessment and development

“Staff was not aware of gender bias and the need for a cultural shift. A training session will not change behaviours immediately, but the fact that they had a good attendance at managerial level [...] will help to cascade knowledge and raise awareness of certain needs.”

IOM's gender policy has had a limited impact on its capacity to conduct assessments and to develop a capacity-building strategy. Presently, IOM has not conducted an organization-wide capacity assessment of all staff. Assessments have only been done on an ad hoc basis. For example, the GCU bases its capacity-building activities and plans on past needs assessments, requests from field offices and conversations with HQ and field staff. The gender audits conducted in the ROs in Dakar and Bangkok have also provided an opportunity to identify some gaps in this area.

The recommendation to strengthen work on this area provided by UN Women in the context of IOM's 2016 UN-SWAP reporting results is still valid. UN Women has made available a generic capacity assessment tool that all entities can use. So far, “31 entities have developed and administered gender responsive capacity assessments of staff.”

Despite shortcomings in capacity assessment, **IOM's substantive efforts in capacity building have strengthened staff's ability to mainstream gender across the Organization.** The GCU has strategically targeted GFPs, development officers and thematic specialists at ROs with tools and training to support staff to mainstream gender throughout the project cycle. In terms of capacity building for senior-level staff, a separate session on gender continues to be part of the standard five-day Chiefs of Mission training.

The Project Development Training has been expanded to incorporate gender equality. Also, the revised IOM Project Handbook now includes stronger references to gender to guide staff throughout all phases of the project cycle. By the end of 2016, 80% of staff has completed the mandatory online training course “I Know Gender: An Introduction to Gender Equality for UN staff.” The online training “Different Needs – Equal Opportunities: Increasing Effectiveness of Humanitarian Action for Women, Girls, Boys and Men” is also mandatory for all staff on the Emergency Deployment Roster.

The IOM Project Handbook

“It is a written standard that can be used as the basis for discussion. Without the handbook my work will be difficult.”

The IOM Project Handbook, originally published in 2011 was recently revised and re-launched in 2017. The new handbook reminds users of IOM’s commitments to gender in the revised gender policy and includes guidance on how to incorporate gender mainstreaming as a cross-cutting theme in all phases of a project cycle, from development to implementation.

In addition, an online training based on the handbook will also be launched and will include gender as a cross-cutting theme. IOM has also updated its 3-day Project Development training delivered to IOM staff through its Regional Offices, and has created a new Project Management 4-day training which ensures that gender is included, to the extent possible, in each of the 16 modules.

As highlighted by many staff in the course of the evaluation, the handbook is an important tool to enable gender mainstreaming into projects. Many interviewees noted that the new handbook represents a great improvement on the previous one in this specific area and describe it as a core document that provides strong guidance for their work.

However, the handbook alone cannot make a difference. At present, gender doesn’t seem to be included in projects in a systematic way, but rather based on staff’s personal interest and capacity. To ensure the integration of gender in all phases of the project cycle, management needs to send a clear message to all relevant staff about the mandatory nature of gender mainstreaming and ensure staff’s capacity to use the manual through regular training.

IOM has also provided training to improve the work environment and to promote gender parity. For example, IOM has organized sessions on unconscious bias for senior-level staff at Headquarters as well as for Regional Directors, Chiefs of Mission and Heads of Office at IOM’s bi-annual Global Chiefs of Mission Meeting (GCOMM). Regional follow-up sessions have also been organized. The Organization has also played a key role in capacity building efforts to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse in its response operations and has designed different training programmes to build the capacity of camp management and shelter staff to address protection concerns of women and girls.

All the above trainings and capacity building activities have contributed to increase awareness in the Organization and provided staff with useful knowledge to promote gender in their work. Many interviewees particularly praised the role of the GCU in disseminating information and tools, providing in person and online trainings, and videos, such as the one on unconscious bias.

Notwithstanding these commitments, IOM has 165 Country Offices and the GCU has very limited human and financial resources to support staff development in this area. **The vast majority of interviewees noted that staff’s capacity to conduct gender analysis is limited and training does not reach enough people.** Staff identified a

number of capacity needs that range from generic training related to applying gender analysis skills in project development to more specific guidance, including: how to mainstream gender in border control; how to develop qualitative indicators to measure equality results; how to mainstream gender into monitoring and evaluation processes; and exploring power relations in management and leadership approaches. However, without a more robust budget allocation for training, it is challenging for the GCU to develop and plan this work.

Although staff is well aware of the difficulties to implement specific trainings, vis-à-vis more generic training that is relevant to all staff, many interviewees stressed the need for guidance on how gender mainstreaming applies to their specific area of work. Inter-regional sharing of experiences and lesson learning on how staff is applying gender in relation to specific programmatic areas was suggested as a way to develop more specific knowledge and skills. This could be done through webinars, conference calls or other online platforms.

Building staff’s capacity to guarantee sustainability to systematically conduct gender analysis and to mainstream gender into programmatic work will require more consistent resources and a dedicated strategy targeting staff involved in project management as well as chiefs of mission. IOM should ensure that gender is systematically mainstreamed in all the general project management and project development training materials. Increasing the use of webinars and Training of Trainers (TOT) would also maximize the number of staff receiving training.

4.4.2 Gender-sensitive organizational culture

“It is great to have a policy but changing mindsets is more difficult.”

The majority of interviewees and respondents to the survey agree that **the policy has contributed to sustainable changes in organizational culture**. For example, 55.6% of GFP respondents to the survey agree that they have observed positive changes in attitude towards gender. In the past several years, IOM has also seen significant progress in promoting a healthy, gender-sensitive working environment. Comparative data from 2011 and 2015 show that 62%/75% reported a respectful work environment, 70%/76% reported an environment free of harassment, 35%/52% reported fair and equal treatment of staff, and 46% /54% reported good work-life fit.²² However, challenges in this area remain.

As established in the gender policy, IOM is updating its policies that support family responsibilities and promote work/life balance with best practice provisions to support working parents, including provisions for travelling with breastfeeding infants. IOM is also drafting a policy on part-time work that institutionalizes what is already possible in practice. IOM has recently issued its Policy and Procedures on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. Additionally, in 2016, the Ethics and Conduct Office and the Gender Coordination Unit delivered face-to-face training on IOM’s Standards of Conduct to approximately 700 IOM staff in several country and regional offices. The mandatory online ethics training was launched earlier this year.

Updating and implementing these policies should be a priority given the impact that work is having on female staff at senior management level. The Diversity and Inclusion report underlines: “At the P4 and higher levels, compared to their male counterparts, females were more likely to be divorced, separated or single (16% of

²² IOM Diversity and Inclusion Report, May 2016.

males vs 40% of females), and less likely to have children under 25 years (77% of males vs 52% of females).”

Some interviewees, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the way these policies were being updated and implemented. One respondent, for example, stated: “The current family policy reflects a conservative notion of the family as it is easier for women to take maternity leave than for men to take paternity leave. There is little recognition for fathers to be able to take on more responsibilities.” Another interviewee noted that although there has been a consultative process with relevant departments to update these policies, not all concerns have been included.

During the evaluation, a considerable number of interviewees also highlighted challenges concerning the current rotation system. The Rotation Guidelines 2016–2017 include gender sensitive considerations related to pregnancy of a staff member or a staff member’s spouse; recent birth of a child; complications due to family reunification, special needs of dependents (medical or educational) and divorce with shared custody; and the staff member’s gender identity and/or sexual orientation, which in specific duty stations, may put him/her at particularly heightened risk. Despite these considerations, several interviewees stressed that rotation practices do not take into account the different and often unequal impacts on men and women, and are often perceived as not addressing their needs in an equitable way.

The evaluator also received several examples describing situations dealing with harassment, discrimination or inappropriate comments in the workplace. In the examples received, the staff showed dissatisfaction with the way in which management handled the incidents. The Diversity and Inclusion report highlights this as a critical area that needs to be improved and notes that “in cases of discrimination, harassment or bullying nearly half of IOM staff believed that IOM will not take appropriate actions.”

“Some managers do not take issues of sexism or gender equality within the office environment seriously.”

To strengthen an inclusive work environment within IOM, the Diversity and Inclusion Work plan has set the following targets: 80% report a respectful work environment, 80% report an environment free of harassment, 65% report fair and equal treatment of staff, 65% report good work-life fit, and 70% of LGBTI staff feel they are treated fairly. The workplan also includes some specific outcomes to achieve these targets, including a respectful work environment campaign and training.

An important example of how an inclusive work environment is being promoted includes the production of the video “Making Women Visible”, which showcases female IOM staff contribution from around the world and highlights challenges and opportunities for women working for IOM.

IOM should also put a system in place to evaluate the implementation of these policies and ensure that the information collected is used to strengthen an inclusive work environment. For example, the system should track refusals from management in relation to gender sensitive working arrangements. This information can then be used to review current practice and ensure transparency in its implementation.

4.4.3 Resource tracking and allocation

“The lack of resources is a recurrent challenge [...] and is jeopardizing the possibility for IOM to meet all of the SWAP indicators.”

IOM commits in the Gender Equality Policy to “track its resource allocations for the promotion of gender equality, and ensure that these allocations are adequate to meet its gender-related mandate.” The IDF has set a target of expending 5% of its budget on gender specific activities, but has not been able to reach it in the last two years. Additionally, projects funded through the IDF represent a small portion of all IOM projects.

More generally, IOM does not have a wide system in place to track spending on gender equality initiatives. The IOM gender marker, however, will be able to track expenditures on promoting gender equality. A new field for the IOM Gender Marker Code has been added to the IOM financial resources tracking mechanism (PRISM) to systematically track gender related resources once the marker is operational. The Gender Marker is currently being piloted and will be mandatory for all IOM projects beginning in 2018.

Only 45.66% of respondents to the IOM survey sent to all staff consider the investments made by IOM “sufficient” for the implementation of the policy as well as gender mainstreaming within the Organization. Around 28% of respondents do not consider the investments sufficient and the remaining 26.46% are not aware or have no opinion on the investments made by IOM for implementation of the policy and gender mainstreaming within the Organization.

In terms of resource allocation, many interviewees drew attention to the limited resources available for gender mainstreaming and follow up activities. As highlighted in the UN-SWAP 2016 report “IOM’s projectized nature makes it difficult to set a global financial benchmark for gender equality.” Setting and meeting a financial benchmark is a common area of weakness across the UN system.²³ However, to ensure the long-term sustainability of gender equality work, IOM needs to commit long-term dedicated human and financial resources to support this work.

For example, the GCU is not adequately resourced to carry out its functions in addition to its staffing budget. Since its establishment the Unit receives a sum from the IOM Discretionary Income to fund gender specific projects. This allocation has hardly changed in over a decade. In 2006, the GCU received USD 80,000. In 2016, the Unit’s operational budget was USD 228,500, but only USD 60,000 was allocated from IOM’s budget. The rest were contributions received from several government donors (Belgium (Euro 100,000), Sweden (USD 60,000 + USD 65,000 explicitly for PSEA) and the United States (USD 3,500) for specific activities).

IOM should also commit funding to place gender advisers in each Regional Office. This support will be specifically needed during the roll-out of the gender marker, as it is difficult to add gender responsibilities to the work of staff fully engaged with other responsibilities. Regional gender advisers could provide training to staff in the Regional and Country Offices, promote coordination between different units to ensure that gender is part of the work, provide technical support for projects and strategies, and coordinate CO GFPs in the region.

²³ Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system, Report of the Secretary-General, E/2017/57, 6 April 2017.

4.5 Outcome and Impact

15) What has been the outcome and impact of the implementation of the policy and strategy at the programming level in terms of migration management? What changes did the policy bring on migration management after two years?

16) What has been the outcome and impact of the implementation of the policy and strategy on gender balance in IOM staffing?

This section looks at the extent to which the Gender Equality Policy and its strategy are likely to make a significant contribution to changes in programming and staffing.

Overall, the Gender Equality Policy, together with the implementation of the UN-SWAP, has triggered the establishment of substantive initiatives and processes that have strengthened gender mainstreaming in programmatic work and gender balance in staffing. The challenge now is to follow up on these achievements to ensure that IOM's interventions contribute to gender equality results. This will largely depend on support from senior management, the engagement of staff at Headquarters and Regional and Country Office levels, and the availability of resources in the coming years. Impact will be stronger with a better-resourced GCU and greater capacity to mainstream gender at the regional and country levels.

4.5.1 Strategic planning

As discussed in section 4.1.1 under Relevance, the Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF) is the global strategic framework to guide IOM's planning in migration capacity building, policy and programming. The MiGOF, which forms the basis for the current institutional results framework (2016–2020), recognizes the need for specific gender-sensitive approaches and connects them to concrete gender outcomes, outputs and indicators. All the new regional and country strategies need to be aligned with the MiGOF. **The analysis of the regional strategies shows that while gender has been included in all regional strategies, the approach and depth in formulation can vary from one region to the next. Overall, gender is insufficiently addressed in the regional contextual analysis and the use of disaggregated data is weak.**

Currently, six out of nine regional offices have developed new strategic plans following the adoption of the IOM Gender Equality Policy in 2015. Of the three remaining ROs, Brussels and Vienna are still implementing strategies that were developed prior to the adoption of the Gender Equality Policy (2014 to 2020) and the RO in Pretoria is currently developing a new strategy that should be finalized at the end of 2017.

Concerning gender analysis in the migratory context of the respective regions, all regional strategies include references to gender, however the quality of the analysis is generally weak and tends to focus on migrant women as a vulnerable group instead of looking at differential impacts and needs. Some good examples can be found in the regional strategy for the Middle East and North Africa, which refer to gendered migration patterns and outcomes, including the feminization of migration. Similarly, the regional strategy for South America refers to the specific risks for women, girls, boys and adolescents and the need for differential responses, including in relation to prevention in the context of trafficking.

Similarly, the approach across regional strategies is different in the way that gender is included in objectives, priorities and key areas of interventions. While all regional

strategies include gender as a cross-cutting issue, some strategies contain more specific references. For example, the Regional Strategy for South America mainstreams gender in the three MiGOF principles with a focus on: approving and strengthening policies and laws to promote gender equality and empowerment of women and girls; producing high quality data disaggregated by sex and age; protecting labour rights of female migrant workers; and eliminating sexual exploitation and all forms of violence against women and girls. To a lesser extent, the Regional Strategy for West and Central Africa also includes references to gender under the three MiGOF principles.

The Regional Strategy for EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland, in addition to including gender as a cross-cutting issue, establishes gender related targets in relation to two strategic areas: 1) Migration for Economic Growth and Development and 2) Migration Crises. Similarly, the Regional Strategy for Middle East and North includes two gender specific objectives: 1) To improve gender mainstreaming throughout the project cycle; and 2) To institute gender focal points in all MENA offices and ensure that all staff in MENA has taken the 'I Know Gender' training.

Finally, the use of disaggregated data by sex/age in regional strategies remains weak. Strategies either do not include disaggregated data at all or only include a brief reference in relation to number of beneficiaries or describing trends in relation to feminization. Disaggregated data should be included in the contextual analysis and provide the rationale for gender specific interventions in the regional strategy. Several ROs, including Buenos Aires, Nairobi and San Jose, include in their strategies a commitment to develop this area of work in the coming years.

"The policy has contributed to a major change on how gender is discussed in the organization, but more resources are needed to support gender mainstreaming at the country level."

Regarding Country Offices, reviewing all national strategic plans was beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, the evaluation reviewed four CO strategies that were adopted after implementation of IOM Gender Equality Policy to look at some examples that could illustrate best practices. The evaluation reviewed: the CO UK Strategic Plan 2016–2020, the Belize National Strategy 2016-2017, the Port of Spain Country Strategy 2016–2018, and the Draft Country Strategy for Zambia 2017–2021.

As with the regional strategies, the review shows the need to strengthen gender mainstreaming throughout national strategies. However, it also provides some good examples that could be replicated when formulating new strategies. For example, the UK Strategic Plan includes gender, together with human rights and monitoring and evaluation, as one of the three strategic approaches that must "underpin each IOM project, ensuring the highest level of effectiveness, inclusiveness, and quality in migration programming." The Plan devotes a section to explain these approaches.

The Country Strategy for Zambia includes a well-developed contextual analysis supported by sex disaggregated data. It also highlights gender mainstreaming as a cross-cutting issue that needs to be mainstreamed in all country interventions and establishes that gender equality will guide its internal and external operations. Similarly, the National Strategy for Belize offers a good example of the use of sex disaggregated data to analyze the migratory context of the country.

4.5.2 Gender Equality results in humanitarian settings

“The Policy has brought IOM up to standards with other key international partners working in the humanitarian sector and has increased IOM standing vis-à-vis other UN partners and donors.”

The Principles for Humanitarian Action, officially launched in March 2016, “reaffirm IOM’s commitment towards the internationally agreed core humanitarian principles in the delivery of its humanitarian response, and the need for all those engaged in humanitarian action to promote and fully respect these principles.”²⁴

Interviewees working in this sector highlighted that both the principles for humanitarian action, as well as the gender policy were drafted at the same time and describe the process as a mutually reinforcing exercise. Accordingly, the humanitarian principles make explicit reference to IOM Gender Equality Policy and acknowledge the different needs and experiences of persons affected by humanitarian crises and commits to respond to the different protection and assistance needs of women, men, girls, boys and LGBTI individuals.

Several interviewees highlighted that IOM’s engagement with key UN partners in the global humanitarian clusters has exposed the Organization to gender integration into humanitarian programming long before the Gender Equality Policy was in place. For instance, the Preparedness and Response Division (PRD) of DOE has been using the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Gender Marker for all projects submitted to the humanitarian appeals process.

Despite the use of the IASC marker, gender mainstreaming continues to be weak in the humanitarian sector. Several interviewees stressed the need for all UN agencies to carry out more assessments and involve women and civil society groups to understand better the needs of different beneficiaries. For example, to ensure that hygiene kits are not all the same and take into account the specific needs of girls, women, people with disabilities and the elderly.

In this context, the institutional arrangements sparked by IOM’s Gender Equality Policy, including IOM’s own gender marker, represents an opportunity to strengthen the quality of gender mainstreaming in this sector.

4.5.3 Gender balance in staffing

In 2016, IOM launched a report on Diversity and Inclusion together with a workplan that included a particular focus on gender parity within IOM. The research included an assessment of IOM’s workforce, a global staff survey, interviews with key staff, focus group discussions, and an assessment of current practices. The research draws attention to the issue of gender disparity as an area of concern. “While the global workforce was almost gender balanced (54% male staff vs 46% female staff), there was an imbalance at the P level - in particular at grades P4 and above.” This imbalance was particularly noticeable “at the P5 and D1 grades with only 26% and 24% of female representation respectively.” Regarding parity at the level of the global workforce, it is important to note that P and D staff represents only 12% of IOM total staff (approximately 10,000).

²⁴ IOM’s Humanitarian Policy—Principles for Humanitarian Action, C/106/CRP/20, 12 October, 2015.

Achieving gender parity overall and in particular at higher grades remains a challenge for all United Nations entities.²⁵ Projections suggest “that parity would likely be expected for the UN system overall between the years of 2028 and 2051, depending on the level. Currently, the UN system has achieved parity at only its lowest two professional levels, P-1 and P-2.”²⁶ The newly adopted System-Wide Strategy on Gender Parity establishes that “the overall goal for parity across the system at all levels should be set for 2026. Recognizing that there will be some outliers who owing to starting point will have a steeper slope of change, for these few the goal for parity will be 2028.”²⁷

As a result, one of the outcomes of the Diversity and Inclusion workplan is to have 45% female representation at the P4 and higher levels by 2022. The workplan also includes the recruitment of a Diversity and Inclusion Officer to support the implementation of diversity and inclusion activities in the Organization. The Officer was just recruited at the time of the evaluation.

“The higher you get within IOM the less women being promoted. The statistics show improvement but the reality is that few women are being promoted at higher levels.”

According to data issued by Human Resources Management (HRM) in August 2017, IOM is making some progress in relation to gender parity within its workforce. Compared with data from 2014 and 2016, the number of female staff in IOM has increased by 1% in relation to global staff, by 1% at the international Professional (P) levels, and by 4% at the senior management levels (P4 and higher). The most significant change at the P level was an increased by 8% at P5 level. However, to achieve gender parity in P4 to D level positions in 7 years (by 2022) an annual selection rate of 70% females is required.²⁸ Notably, the majority of staff interviewed during the evaluation perceived that gender parity policy measures are being pushed too aggressively “to improve the numbers”.

Many interviewees showed a negative perception in relation to special recruitment measures that IOM has put in place to give priority to qualified female applicants (e.g. allowing female external applicants to be considered “Tier 1” candidates when applying for P4 and higher positions). These measures are monitored by the Appointments and Postings Board (APB), which is gender balanced and includes the Head of GCU as an ex officio, non-voting member. However, many interviewees felt that women were being recruited because they were female and not necessarily based on merit. This is supported also by the staff survey results included in the Diversity and Inclusion report, which highlights that “only 38% of respondents (strongly) agreed that career development opportunities are given fairly and are based on individual merit.”

Additionally, some respondents mentioned cases in which male candidates were rejected by the DG during recruitment processes in favour of women that, in their opinion, were not as qualified for the specific position. Yet, again, according to recent statistics, the DG has agreed with panel recommendation in 95% of cases (136 out of 143).

The IOM Diversity and Inclusion Plan includes adequate outcomes and outputs to address gender parity goals and recruitment practices. However, the disparity

²⁵ See UN-SWAP, A plan to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women across the UN system.

²⁶ Status of Women in the United Nations System 2016, UN WOMEN.

²⁷ System-Wide Strategy on Gender Parity, 2017.

²⁸ Gender Parity within IOM info sheet, August 2017.

between the statistics and the staff's perception in relation to recruitment policies is a challenge that IOM also needs to address. **Measures related to gender parity and recruitment policies need to be closely linked to other organizational initiatives aimed at changing organizational culture and deconstructing stereotypes and biases.** The recent work on unconscious bias is a step in the right direction. A video on unconscious bias in the recruitment process, developed in partnership between IOM and OHCHR, shows how bias influences decisions in recruitment and provides suggestions for mitigating this influence in recruitment and hiring practices. This is often illustrated by the belief that women are less inclined to work in emergencies and hardship posts.

Staffs' perceptions illustrate the need to strengthen communication and to disseminate information to staff at headquarters and regional and country offices to ensure that there is no misinformation concerning IOM's commitments on gender parity and the reasoning behind the measures that need to be taken to achieve them, including in relation to recruitment processes.

To improve the management of gender parity, IOM should analyze further the correlations between the recruitment based on merit of female candidates and the pool of female candidates who apply for given posts compared to the number of males. Some research has highlighted for instance the tendency for women to be stricter in their self-assessment of their capacities, sometimes preventing them from applying for higher-grade positions, thereby reducing the number of female applicants. Encouraging female candidates who have capacities for given posts to apply for a given Vacancy Notice (VN) could be part of a gender pro-active career development policy, which does not exist in IOM.

5. Recommendations

1. Capacity assessment and development

Carry out gender capacity assessments at the global, regional and country levels. Based on these assessments, develop a capacity building strategy to adequately develop staff capacity so they are able to effectively integrate gender analysis in their respective areas of responsibility.

All initiatives in this area should follow a cycle of capacity assessment, planning, implementation and follow up, as recommended by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG). The capacity building strategy should include a plan to ensure the sustainability and long-term institutionalization of initiatives. This is critical considering the high turn over of staff at IOM.

IOM should hire/train additional gender experts at HQ and the regional levels to ensure that staff has access to gender expertise.

2. Organizational arrangements

IOM should appoint dedicated gender advisers to each RO to build the capacity of project developers, RTSs and M&E officers, as well as gender focal points in COs in the region. Being closer to field operations, the regional advisers would be a more efficient mechanism to coordinate an active network of GFPs in each region, facilitating also an improved use of the time that the GFPs are voluntarily dedicating to gender.

The regional adviser should develop a workplan to strengthen the GFP network and increase its focus on sharing knowledge, experiences and concerns. Monthly or bimonthly calls should be organized to assess specific capacity needs and ensure transferring of experiences between countries in each region.

GFPs should review and update their TORs to clearly articulate what gender specific results they need to achieve. To ensure accountability, the specific gender results should be linked to the evaluation of their gender performance (see recommendation 4).

3. Resource allocation to gender mainstreaming

IOM needs to increase its dedicated budget allocation to support gender-mainstreaming processes. The budget of the GCU needs to be reviewed to ensure that the unit is adequately resourced to carry out its functions. This is particularly relevant during the roll-out of the gender marker, as staff will need additional support to implement it.

4. Gender-responsive performance management

Gender-related responsibilities for all staff should be clearly incorporated in TORs and specifically mentioned in their Staff Evaluation System (SES). Managers need to ensure that all staff is assessed on their gender performance. In particular, project developers, project endorsers and GFPs, should either include a gender-specific objective in their SES or mainstream gender in other objectives, activities and indicators. IOM needs to ensure that managers are held accountable for doing so.

5. Gender parity and culture

The Diversity and Inclusion Officer should develop a communication strategy to disseminate information to staff at headquarters and regional and country offices concerning gender parity targets, IOM achievements vis-à-vis commitments in this area and recruitment policies adopted to achieve it. The communication strategy

should also include information on the Rotation Guidelines and the way they are being implemented.

HRM should develop a career development strategy specifically encouraging IOM female staff identified as having competencies for higher grades to apply to VNs offering promotion options. Managers should also proactively encourage female staff in their departments to apply to higher grade VNs.

Senior managers at Headquarters, and Regional and Country Offices should ensure that all staff participates in the mandatory online ethics training that was launched earlier this year. Management should also remind staff periodically of the Organization's zero tolerance policy for discrimination and harassment in the workplace and the need for all staff to ensure a fair and respectful work environment.

6. Engagement with Partners

Partnerships are critical for IOM to achieve gender equality results. IOM should review its partners' gender related policies and commitments as a prerequisite to enter a contractual agreement. This requirement should be made clear in all calls for proposals. IOM should look at existing procurement guidance from other UN agencies in this area.

6. Lessons learned

Capacity development. Building the capacity of staff to systematically conduct gender analysis and mainstream gender into programmatic work requires consistent resources and a dedicated strategy targeting staff involved in project management as well as Chiefs of Mission. To ensure the relevance of capacity-building initiatives to specific staff, training needs to be contextualized to specific areas of work. All initiatives in this area should follow a cycle of capacity assessment, planning, implementation and follow up, as recommended by the UNDG. The capacity building strategy should include a plan to ensure the sustainability and long-term institutionalization of initiatives.

Gender architecture. A well-resourced gender architecture, including increased human and financial resources for the GCU and the placement of gender advisers in ROs, sends a strong message to all staff from senior management indicating support towards gender equality. If this is not done, IOM risks not being able to meet its commitments towards gender equality.

Gender parity and culture. The Diversity and Inclusion report and workplan provide strong evidence for staff to learn about the progress and the challenges ahead for IOM to achieve gender parity, but evidence alone will not bring about change. Changing negative perceptions and improving selection mechanisms in relation to recruitment policies needs to link this evidence with other organizational initiatives aimed at changing organizational culture and deconstructing stereotypes and biases.

Strategic collaborations. The collaborative work between the Gender Coordination Unit and other departments, like the Media and Communication Division (MCD) and the Internal Audit function of OIG, ensures the ownership and engagement of a wide range of internal stakeholders in gender mainstreaming.

Gender integration in toolkits and trainings. Mainstreaming gender in guidance tools, such as the Project Handbook, and generic trainings to RTSs, project developers and M&E Officers is an effective strategy to integrate gender across IOM's programmatic work.

IOM Gender Marker. The gender marker has huge potential to further the implementation of the policy and its goals. To ensure that the roll-out of the marker is a meaningful exercise that leads to gender sensitive projects and interventions, IOM needs to provide staff with the necessary capacity.