

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

EVALUATION OF THE *MIGRATION INITIATIVES* PROCESS

November 2004



IOM International Organization for Migration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Abbreviations	i
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	4
1.1 <i>Migration Initiatives</i> Background Information	4
1.2 Evaluation Scope and Methodology	5
2. <i>Migration Initiatives'</i> Objectives	6
2.1 IOM's Strategic and Programmatic Approach	6
2.2 Fund-raising or Resource Mobilization Document	7
2.3 An Advocacy Tool for Promoting IOM Activities	7
3. Relevance and Effectiveness of <i>Migration Initiatives</i>	9
3.1 Management of Preparatory Process	9
3.2 Relevance of <i>Migration Initiatives'</i> Content	11
3.2.1 <i>Migration Initiatives'</i> Content	11
3.2.2 Updating Information and Using Electronic Tools	14
3.3 Effectiveness of <i>Migration Initiatives</i>	15
3.3.1 <i>Migration Initiatives</i> as a Strategic or Programmatic Tool	16
3.3.2 A Resource Mobilization Tool	18
4. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	21
Annex 1 Terms of Reference for the <i>Migration Initiatives</i> Process Evaluation	23
Annex 2 Interviews and Bibliography	26
Annex 3 Questionnaire	29

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAP	UN Inter-Agency Consolidated Appeals Process
DRD	Donor Relations Division
ERD	External Relations Department
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MMS	Migration Management Services Department
MPR	Migration Policy and Research Department
MRFs	Missions with Regional Functions
UNCT	UN Country Team

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation of the *Migration Initiatives* process was initiated at the request of the External Relations Department, which includes the Donor Relations Division (DRD), responsible for producing the document and its mid-year update, from document preparation to publication. *Migration Initiatives* appeared for the first time in 1999, since when it has been evolving based on the feedback received from IOM's Member States, Donors and Field Missions, as well as response to the Organization's structural changes, e.g. the move from a region- to a service-oriented structure.

The *Migration Initiatives – Appeal 2004* foreword summarizes the document's principal objectives as established in 1999: 'Migration Initiatives (MI) 2004 represents IOM's appeal for funding for country and regional programmes in 2004. This document also includes IOM's response to complex humanitarian emergencies as formulated under the respective UN Inter-Agency Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) for 2004.' It also states: 'MI 2004 reflects the scope and depth of IOM's operational role across the Organization's service areas as well as its policy advisory role'.

Using these objectives as the main reference, the evaluation examines the relevance of the document's content and its effectiveness as a programmatic, strategic and resources mobilization tool. It also analyses the preparation management, focusing on DRD's key role. *Migration Initiatives 2004* and the template for the preparation of *Migration Initiatives 2005* are the main basis for analysis, however keeping the evolution of the *MI* process as a background reference.

The evaluation considers that in managing the preparation of both *MI* and its mid-year update, DRD plays a key role in guaranteeing the quality of the final product; it is also effective in providing preparation guidance for the IOM field offices, data collection, coordinating input with Headquarters Departments and publishing it on time. This report also highlights possible improvements to the process, some of them, however, being outside DRD's responsibility. Improvements include a more proactive input role for the Missions with Regional Functions (MRFs) and the institutionalization of a yearly programming or planning process to harmonize IOM's programmatic approach to migration management, facilitating data collection and cross-checking by DRD. DRD is the Division that must continue to manage the *MI* process.

The report examines the evolution in *MI* presentation since 2000 and finds that the content of *Migration Initiatives 2004* in terms of programmatic information is relevant, properly reflecting country and regional strategic issues and migration needs. The template proposed for the 2005 edition allows for additional improvements, focusing on the programmatic dimension of the document and less on a detailed presentation of specific projects to be funded (a 'wish list' of projects). The introduction to be prepared by the Migration Policy and Research Department (MPR) should also provide information on IOM's global policy on migration management, highlighting key priorities for the year. Those Member States interviewed praised IOM for the quality of the document, its conciseness and focus. Some Member States, however, cautioned against too many changes in the presentation each year.

Again regarding content, the report discusses the problem of the information becoming obsolete during the year. It concludes, however, that this in itself is not a problem, as it is expected that projects receive funding, (fund-raising being one of the main objectives of *MI*), and as the publication of the mid-year update provides information on changes since the finalization of the main document. One update per year is considered sufficient; the evaluation recommends examining further the possible use of electronic tools to facilitate information updating, but also underlines that a printed version is still useful and worth the USD 20,000 investment, especially when asking for USD 300 million for projects and programmes.

As to its effectiveness as a strategic or programmatic tool, *MI* is the only document that highlights and summarizes IOM's programmatic approach by country and region for a given year, with funding requirements. It is complementary to the *IOM Programme and Budget* document that registers projects already funded, but listed by Service. The objective of publishing *MI* as one of the main references for presenting IOM's yearly programmatic vision by country and region must be maintained, keeping in mind, however, that *MI* is also a resource mobilization tool.

Finally, the report examines *MI*'s effectiveness as a resources mobilization tool. The document is only one of the tools used for fund-raising and donors do not take decisions based on it alone; however, it is useful in presenting IOM's programmatic approach; giving donors an informed view of IOM's role in a country and region; the resources required to meet key objectives in migration management and organizing annual meetings with main donors or new ones. The Member States and donor community would find it inappropriate to abandon the publication of an IOM appeal document, especially as it is considered useful, informative, comprehensive and as having an attractive format.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. DRD's management of the preparatory process can be considered effective in terms of data collection and presentation, in providing guidance to the field, coordinating input from Headquarters departments and in terms of DRD time management. DRD is the right Division to manage the process and without its professional involvement MI would certainly not meet the standards expected for such a document. MI preparation would certainly benefit from the introduction of a yearly programming or planning process and from an extended, clear role for the MRFs and Regional Advisers, but the decision cannot be taken by DRD.*
- 2. Most of the IOM officials answering the questionnaire considered that MI's content was relevant and accurately reflected country and regional strategic issues and migration needs. The Member States interviewed also expressed their satisfaction with MI's content, the quality of the information and the format used in 2004. DRD's efforts to produce a coherent, attractive and informative document deserve mention.*
- 3. The rapid obsolescence of information on funding requirements is inevitable and not widely considered a problem. It affects only a small proportion of the programmes and projects listed in MI, while the mid-year update provides useful information on funding received. In addition, as one of the objectives of the MI process is to raise funds, it is expected and even important that the information become obsolete during the year. One update per year is considered sufficient.*
- 4. Migration Initiatives is the Organization's only document highlighting and summarizing IOM's strategic or programmatic approach by country and region for a given year, with the funding required to meet its stated objectives and the migration issues needing to be addressed. It is a useful tool and does not duplicate other existing IOM publications. It is complementary to the IOM Programme and Budget document, detailing by service those programmes and projects already funded, in line with IOM's structure.*
- 5. There are many justifications for stating that MI is effective in presenting IOM's strategies and programmes in a given country and region for a given year, especially in the 2004 format and that planned for 2005. MI is one of the Organization's few official publications showing its response to evolving migration challenges by country and region. Effort should continue to publish it as a comprehensive, programmatic document, avoiding it being only a 'wish list' of projects to be funded. However, it is also evident that the strategic dimension is not the only justification for publishing MI; the document is also an information tool for resource mobilization.*
- 6. It is inappropriate to draw definite conclusions as to Migration Initiatives' effectiveness as a resource mobilization tool without clearly specifying what is in fact expected from it in this context. If its goal is raising attention on migration issues and IOM's proposed response and to provide a framework for the donors (new or traditional) within which to initiate discussions, then MI can be considered effective. If it is purely in terms of quantitative data – funds received versus overall funds pledged – then it becomes more complicated and even impossible to conclude without also analysing the effectiveness of IOM's global fund-raising strategy. The criterion of usefulness is, in that case, more appropriate. The analysis could also be made from the following perspective: would the fact of not having such a tool raise doubts on IOM's*

capacity and professionalism in planning and organizing its fund-raising strategies? The answer would certainly be yes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. DRD should encourage discussions whenever possible on the benefits of implementing formal programming or planning processes, not only for the preparation of *MI*, but also for general resources mobilization and promotion of IOM's work. It should also clarify with the field that the information sent out, for instance through the reports on bilateral donor meetings, should also be read in the context of *MI*.
2. In order for IOM management to make informed decisions on financial disbursement for *MI* publication, DRD should again make a detailed analysis of the human and financial resources required to implement some of the improvements highlighted in this report, e.g. summary information on the previous year's funding (similar to that in the mid-year update), or an overview of yearly achievements in terms of programme implementation; MRFs' and Regional Advisers' contributions should also be examined in this context. Other improvements concerning strategic directions for some countries and regions should be introduced with the new format chosen for *Migration Initiatives 2005* and the policy advisory role through the introduction to be prepared by MPR. Improvements are, however, constrained by IOM's own definition as a 'service organization', being more responsive than pro-active in terms of strategic directions. The use of the four-box chart as a reference should be considered once it has been more formally institutionalized.
3. Production of an electronic version of *MI* merits further study as the main solution for keeping the information up to date, as it would be possible to amend data directly and print regular updates on financial requirements. However, in the meantime producing a hard copy of the main document is still useful and worth the USD 20,000 investment, especially when asking for project and programme funding of USD 300 million.
4. Considering that some countries do not need or feel the need of such a publication for mobilizing resources or promoting IOM activities, DRD should explore additional ways to promote the use of *MI* as a strategic or programmatic reference document by all IOM field offices. The possibility should be considered of including summary information on all countries facing migration challenges where IOM is already operating or could operate, with the assistance of the MRFs, however taking into account the constraints already identified for improving the content.
5. Even if some weaknesses have been identified in *Migration Initiatives'* effectiveness in presenting IOM's programmatic or strategic directions and as a tool for mobilizing resources, there are many valid justifications for continuing its publication. The format is attractive, the content informative and it is one of the Organization's few comprehensive documents that can be used to promote IOM's image worldwide. The donor community and many Member States expect the publication of *Migration Initiatives*, or a similar document.