

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.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 *Migration Initiatives* Background Information

The *Migration Initiatives – Appeal 2004* foreword states ‘*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*’ and that ‘*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*’.

These two statements summarize the principal objectives assigned to the document when it was first published in 1999 under the title *Migration Initiatives*, although these have evolved somewhat since. In an internal memorandum to IOM Field Offices on the preparation of *Migration Initiatives 2000*, they are more precisely described as follows:

- *‘MI 2000 needs to provide a comprehensive and yet a realistic overview of services for which total or partial funding is required;*
- *MI 2000 demonstrates clear political and programmatic links to donors/member governments’ interest in the field of migration;*
- *IOM’s mandate and technical expertise need to be reflected in the choice of programmes and projects, to highlight the Organization’s strategic direction either in service areas, in emergency management or through regional approaches to migration issues;*
- *MI 2000 will need to be flexible in order to accommodate the ever-changing migration challenges, new political realities and specific requests by member governments that align with IOM’s strategic interest.’*

IOM took the decision to publish a specific fund-raising and programmes prioritization document in 1997, when it was examining ways to improve its overall strategic planning and in particular the presentation of the yearly *Programme and Budget* document. The first publication in 1997 was named *IOM Fundraising Update* and was published every two months. Its objective was ‘*to provide up-to-date information on IOM’s major appeals and programmes in need of funding during the current financial year*’.

In 1998, following the first year’s experience, the Fundraising Support Division changed the document’s name to *Programme Priority Update – 1998*, presenting a selection of IOM’s programme and project priorities requiring funding. In 1999, the document was called *Migration Initiatives – Programmes to meet migration challenges*. As recorded in an internal document, the new title was intended to mean ‘*IOM initiatives to address migration issues*’. In 2000, the title was slightly changed, focusing on the notion of funding appeal - *Migration Initiatives 2000 – Funding Appeal*, and in 2002, it became *Migration Initiatives - Appeal 2002*. The change in titles also reflects the document’s evolving role and content, improving its scope and presentation based on annual feedback.

With the publication of *Migration Initiatives 2000*, DRD decided to publish an update of the programmes and priorities during the year, as part of the process; another objective was to start outlining priorities for the following year's publication. In 2000, it was called *Mid-year Review* and then *Mid-year Report* and finally *Mid-year Update*. The introduction of the 2004 mid-year update states that it '*provides an overview of funding received from September 2003 to June 2004. This includes programme activities as presented in the Migration Initiatives 2004 (MI 2004) as well as those activities developed after its publication*'.

In addition to *Migration Initiatives*, DRD also publishes special funding appeals, e.g. for the follow-up of the Bangkok International Symposium on Migration in 1999, Counter-Trafficking in 2002 and 2003 and Capacity Building and Assisted Return Projects in 2004. These initiatives, sometimes called an *Overview*, however remained separate from the *MI* process. They also differ from the *Flash Appeals* used in emergencies. IOM also actively participates in the UN Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) for resources mobilization in emergencies and transition periods.

## 1.2 Evaluation Scope and Methodology

The main objective of the evaluation, as agreed with the Donor Relations Division in the terms of reference,<sup>1</sup> is:

*'To evaluate IOM Migration Initiative process' in the framework of IOM strategic planning and resource mobilization. In particular, the evaluation will examine if the initial objectives and expectations of the process are met, and if regional and country strategic directions and key migration issues are properly presented and assessed in line with the Organization's strategic objectives and Member States' and Governments' expectations. It will also evaluate if resource mobilization is improved globally and if time and resources dedicated to the preparation of the MI is used effectively.'*

More precisely, Section 2 of this report examines the *MI* process in the context of the Organization's strategic directions and programmatic documentation; Section 3 examines *MI*'s relevance and effectiveness in terms of content and use, as well as the various management and improvement options that continue to be discussed within IOM.

The methodology consists of an internal and external documentation review and a series of interviews.<sup>2</sup> The Evaluator sent a written questionnaire to IOM field offices, including MRFs, (a total of 33 offices answered the questionnaire)<sup>3</sup>, and interviewed IOM Headquarters staff; selected IOM Member States' Permanent Missions in Geneva were also interviewed, according to DRD's suggestions and with additions from the Evaluator. A limiting factor in the initial sample of Member States selected for interview, mainly among the recipient countries, was that representatives had only recently been appointed and were not yet familiar with the document. DRD's Notes for the File on meetings it had organized with Member States were also used as reference material for the evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 2

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 3

## 2. MIGRATION INITIATIVES' OBJECTIVES

As explained in Section 1, *MI* is intended to fill various functions: firstly, to reflect IOM's regional strategic and programmatic approach; secondly, to act as a fund-raising or resource mobilization<sup>4</sup> document and, finally, to promote the Organization's work.

### 2.1 IOM's Strategic and Programmatic Approach

Since inception, the content of *Migration Initiatives* and the IOM strategies and programmes' priorities presented have evolved in response to feedback received from IOM field offices and/or Member States; it continues to evolve, to meet its objective as a strategic and programmatic tool as closely as possible.

For the first two years of its publication - 1999 and 2000 - *MI* was based on IOM Services' input and was a selection of project and programmes considered as funding priorities. As described by the Director General in the foreword of *Migration Initiatives 2000*: 'Migration Initiatives 2000 provides an indication of IOM's direction in the year 2000 and focuses renewed attention on IOM's current unfunded programme and project priorities. [...] We hope that Migration Initiatives will illustrate the strategic focus and programme emphasis of IOM's service activities in regions of the world with clear needs for a co-operative approach to migration management'.

The foreword was followed by a brief presentation on each of the Services, covering the 'needs', 'approach and direction' and 'future', highlighting major migration challenges, IOM's responses and longer-term plans for migration management. There followed a financial summary and brief presentation of the selected programmes and projects requiring funding. The 1999 edition of the document also contained a section 'Country and Regional Programmes', covering Consolidated Appeals for Emergencies. IOM's Appeal for the CIS countries and the 'Consolidated Inter-agency Appeals and CIS Conference Follow-up' appeared in 2000.

The 2001 edition included additional information on IOM's strategies and programmes, with a more detailed overview by the Director General on IOM's work in the previous year, a presentation of IOM Services and general information on IOM's work in each region. The section 'IOM Regions in Focus' also briefly described the projects and programmes submitted for funding. As in previous years, a separate section was devoted to 'Multi-regional Activities'.

In 2002, an important change was brought to the document by presenting IOM's strategies by sub-region, as well as by countries submitting projects for funding. The presentation consisted of single paragraphs on 'Migration Issues', 'IOM objectives' and 'Plan of action for 2002', followed by a presentation of the projects and programmes requiring resources. Grouping by sub-region corresponded in most cases to MRF coverage, the exceptions being Europe and Central Asia. The same format was maintained in 2004, excluding, however, the Services

---

<sup>4</sup> The evaluation will use 'fund-raising' and 'resource mobilization' interchangeably. There is however, some debate over this terminology where fund-raising is mostly used to denote direct appeals for financial support and is considered as a direct contribution for a specific event, while resource mobilization implies a process including both awareness raising and financial support.



presentation available as inserts in the 2002 and 2003 editions; in 2004, the global overview was also dropped, one of the reasons being printing costs.

Preparations are under way for the 2005 edition; again, there will be some presentational changes, to 'give *MI* a programmatic approach rather than the project based focus', as stated in DRD's cover memo sent to IOM's field offices. 'Migration Issues' will describe each country's key migration issues concisely, followed by a section on 'Programme Areas', presenting IOM's programmatic response by Service to the challenges, thus creating a closer link between the two. A list of project proposals by title, with funding requirements, will follow each programmatic response. The same format will be used for the regional section, presenting regional projects by Service. The programmatic approach avoids an extensive listing of small projects all linked to the same service, a weakness identified by DRD in the 2004 edition, which will be replaced by a comprehensive description of the strategy in the country. Following discussions at Headquarters, it was agreed that the MPR would prepare an introduction highlighting IOM's global policy outlook. However, the document was not yet available for review at the time of writing this report.

## **2.2 Fund-raising or Resource Mobilization Document**

The title and content of the *Migration Initiatives – Appeal 2004* clearly conveys that it represents IOM's yearly financial appeal document for projects and programmes, similar to those of many other international organizations. The mid-year update, for its part, focuses on financial data with tables highlighting funding received or pledged, revised priorities and donor response.

*Migration Initiatives* broadly summarizes financial needs for a given year, but the document and its mid-year update are not the Organization's only available tools for resource mobilization. The UN Consolidated Appeal Process for emergency and post-conflict activities, IOM flash appeals, special 'overviews' and discussions with donors in their capitals and the field on specific programmes and projects all contribute to IOM's resource mobilization strategy.

Annual data collection from the field for *MI* preparation starts in May, final coordination taking place around September or October; the document is published and distributed in December. A few projects may receive funding between the last uptake of data from the field in October and the distribution in December, but more frequent updates to avoid such inaccuracies were not considered useful or appropriate. More frequent publication would also require additional resources. The decision was also based on the experience with the *IOM Fundraising Update* in 1997, published every two months.

It is also important to note that fund-raising is not *MI*'s only purpose. The programmatic approach proposed for *Migration Initiatives 2005* does not focus on projects, but on country and regional strategic challenges and programme responses. In doing so, the fact that a project receives funds before the publication of *MI* does not necessarily render obsolete the information contained in the document, a point examined in more detail in Section 3.

## **2.3 An Advocacy Tool for Promoting IOM Activities**

The advocacy role of *Migration Initiatives* was not specifically mentioned as an objective at its inception; however, various internal and external documents refer to such a role: a document

prepared for an informal consultation with IOM Member States in April 2003 states '*The document serves as a tool for global advocacy and targeted outreach and, as such, reflects the ongoing project planning and development by IOM Field Offices and support units in Headquarters*'. DRD also emphasized this in an internal document sent to IOM field offices presenting suggestions for improving *MI* publication in 2005: '*We would then have a more focused, country and issues based document, to be used for general advocacy on behalf of IOM (as is increasingly the case) as well as resource mobilization*'. There is, however, no defined policy on how best to use the document for such a purpose.

### 3. RELEVANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF *MIGRATION INITIATIVES*

This Section contains more detailed analysis of the:

- Overall preparatory process of *MI*, including the role of DRD, MRFs, Regional Advisers and other participants;
- Relevance of *MI*'s content to regional and country strategic planning and key migration issues;
- Effectiveness in reaching its objectives, in terms of strategic and/or programmatic highlights and resource mobilization, including analysis of *MI*'s complementary nature to other IOM documents.

The analysis will be based principally on the *Migration Initiatives 2004* and the 2005 template, rather than previous publications.

#### 3.1 Management of Preparatory Process

DRD has the main responsibility for managing and coordinating the preparatory process of *Migration Initiatives* and its mid-year update. The tasks include:

- Establishing schedules and deadlines for all steps leading to final production of the *MI* document and ensuring that deadlines are respected;
- Requesting input from the field and compiling, reviewing and editing material received;
- Checking financial information and preparing summary tables;
- Coordinating in-house review with Headquarters Departments concerned;
- Editing final document and organizing printing, ensuring best quality output within established budget limits;
- Coordinating distribution to IOM Member States in Geneva and their capitals and following-up on specific requests.

Tasks for the mid-year update include:

- Tracking relevant information on funding received during the period and new initiatives and proposals;
- Preparing and cross-checking new text and funding tables with the Departments, MRFs and Country Missions concerned;
- Editing the final document and organizing its distribution.

Contrary to *MI*, the mid-year update is not sent outside IOM for printing, mainly for budgetary reasons, but also because the document's content dictates that quality of presentation is a secondary consideration.

According to interviews conducted with DRD staff, the most time-consuming tasks for the Division are data collection and standardization of the presentation by region and country to ensure coherence of the content. As for many other processes, reminders must be sent frequently in order to receive the field's input in time. Data cross-checking must then be done with other departments, e.g. MMS, to guarantee the validity of information. Requests to the field for clarification are sometimes necessary when the input is unclear or incomplete. The editing of the content, including text standardization, is also time-consuming, but remains necessary for coherent presentation.

In general, DRD receives support from the MRFs and HQ Regional Advisers. Assistance and coordination of inputs varies depending on diverse factors such as time and resource constraints, knowledge of programmes submitted in the region or the perception of the MRF's or HQ Department's role in programmatic approach. No conclusion can be drawn on ways to improve the situation without examining each of the participant's terms of reference and workload in more depth and without assigning clear roles in the process. DRD can only advise, having no responsibility for clarifying specific roles for the establishment of a comprehensive programmatic approach or for the respective mandatory contributions to the process. Such issues are not limited to the *MI* process and it will be difficult to save time and resources at this level. Requests from DRD for inputs and coordination are the only current means to address such constraints, pending a more precise institutional approach for *MI* preparation. A suggestion to combine *MI* and *IOM Programme and Budget* data collection was discussed internally. However, asking the field missions to present a single summary document of projects and programmes funded and those requiring financial resources will not improve overall data collection and standardization by DRD, neither will it save time for the field missions, as the information required is different in the two cases.

A suggestion to facilitate *MI* data gathering, which arose from both interviews in IOM and responses to the questionnaire, would be either to introduce a mandatory, standardized, country strategic planning or programming yearly process for the field missions, or a similar regional and sub-regional process to be implemented by the MRFs. DRD would save time by avoiding extensive input cross-checking and coordination; data would only need to be transferred or amended when preparing *MI*, to have a global view of IOM activities and funding requirements. Some countries and MRFs prepare strategic planning documents, but it is not standard practice. Implementing such a programmatic process in IOM could also be useful for field offices participating in the UNCT, or for liaison and resources mobilization with governments, but it is not within DRD's capacity to take such a decision, which would also require comprehensive analysis of needs and resources in the field for effective introduction.

The written questionnaire sent to field missions included a question about the time spent in preparing and updating information for *MI* and whether they considered it worth the investment; of 27 offices who answered the questionnaire, 74 per cent considered it worthwhile, two of them stressing the fact that *MI* was the Organization's only strategic document presenting its future activities around the world and that it also helped 'critical thinking'. Nineteen per cent of field offices answered negatively, three of them maintaining that it was ineffective in fund raising; one respondent commented that the country was mainly implementing post-conflict activities and *MI* was rapidly becoming obsolete; another stated that the problem did not lie

within *MI* itself, but was due to the document existing in a vacuum in terms of programmatic approach for project implementation in the Organization; the point was briefly discussed above. Seven per cent did not answer the question.

When asked if HQ guidance for preparing *MI* (in particular from DRD), was sufficient, of the 26 missions who answered the question, 88 per cent considered it sufficient and 12 per cent answered negatively; in the same context, when asked if they considered they were being kept sufficiently informed of how to promote *MI*, of feedback received from Member States and Donors, and of how effective *MI* was, only 45 per cent out of 27 respondents considered they were being sufficiently informed by DRD and 55 per cent answered negatively.

### Conclusion

*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 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.*

### Recommendation

**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*.**

## **3.2 Relevance of *Migration Initiatives'* Content**

The relevance of *MI*'s content will be examined according to regional and country strategic planning and key migration issues. As mentioned in previous sections, *MI*'s presentation and content has been continually evolving in response to feedback from field offices, donors and IOM Member States and on developments in the Organization's projects and programmes. Financial constraints for printing the document also required a detailed analysis of what key information should be kept and how it should be presented.

### **3.2.1 *Migration Initiatives'* Content**

Since inception, the *MI* document has presented IOM's projects and programmes both by country and region as well as by Services, as presented, for example, in the Organization's *Programme and Budget* document. The focus was initially on Services, with summary tables by region, then by country and region, with short references to Services. In 2004 there was no reference to the Services, the project title and summary being self-explanatory. A good balance seems now to have been found for *Migration Initiatives 2005*, through the use of a programmatic approach; there will be a brief description of the migration issues for each country and region, the programme areas will be presented according to Services and the projects requiring funding will be listed accordingly.

MPR will prepare an introduction for 2005, highlighting IOM policy and strategic directions for the year as covered by *MI*, based on the four-box chart.<sup>5</sup> During the interviews, it was suggested that the four-box chart be used as a basis for the entire document; however this could be problematic due to the numerous activities listed and because it is not yet used as an official reference in IOM, contrary to the Service approach, for example.

Two questions in the field questionnaire focused directly on the relevance of *MI*'s content to the country and regional plans and migration issues. Asked if they considered that the information in the document accurately reflected their country and region, 80 per cent of the 25 respondents considered it accurate and 20 per cent did not; not all gave a reason for a negative rating. There was a comment on the lack of clarity on how the priorities for funding were established by DRD and to what extent the projects listed conformed to them. A suggestion was made to focus on country needs under the section Migration Issues, and not to limit it alone to what was perceived as IOM's role and response.

On the question of whether they considered the format and various sections appropriate, 73 per cent answered positively and 27 per cent negatively; there were five suggestions to include a presentation by Service, (which should be addressed by the *Migration Initiatives 2005* format), two of them suggesting following the presentation of the IOM Programme and Budget. Another comment was to keep the CAP separate from *MI*, as other channels, including the UN, were disseminating the information. Finally, one suggestion was to include a global presentation of the previous year's achievements and another to add a programmatic section with a longer-term perspective. DRD has already examined these last suggestions, but they were difficult to implement due to the financial constraints on the size of the document and problems in gathering data on the previous year's achievements, e.g. feedback from each MRF and Country Mission and unavailability of required information at HQ.

Two other questions focused on migration issues in the country or region and IOM's response: the first asked if IOM's mandate and technical expertise were well addressed and if *MI* highlighted the Organization's strategic directions.<sup>6</sup> Of a total of 27 respondents, 41 per cent fully agreed with the statement and 44 per cent partially agreed, the main reasons for a partial agreement concerning the Organization's strategic directions, considering that *MI* was more reflective of field opportunities or donors' priorities than responsive to pre-established strategic directions, both IOM's and government-assisted. It was thought that the projects listed might not necessarily align with IOM's strategic directions. Fifteen per cent of respondents disagreed, considering *MI* as a shopping list that often became rapidly obsolete.

---

<sup>5</sup> A table presenting *Migration Management* and main areas of intervention under four main headings, see document MC/2117 *Programme and Budget for 2004*.

<sup>6</sup> The exact statement in the questionnaire was: 'IOM's mandate and technical expertise is reflected in the choice of programmes and projects, and *MI* highlights the Organization's strategic direction either in service areas, in emergency management or through regional approaches to migration issues' – see also Annex 3.

The second question asked if *MI* reflected the scope and depth of IOM's operational and policy advisory roles. Twenty-seven per cent of responses fully agreed with this statement, while 62 per cent partially agreed, major disagreement being related to the policy advisory role, considering that it was not reflected in the document. Only 11 per cent disagreed, mainly because they considered that *MI* did not reflect the scope and depth of IOM's operational role, as many projects, services, or countries were not being listed; again there was a reference to the 'shopping list'.

During the interviews with Member States and in the Summary Records of IOM Council Sessions,<sup>7</sup> in the years when *MI* was still presented at the Council together with the IOM Programme and Budget, there was some criticism of the document's content. Member States felt there was an imbalance between some countries and regions in terms of number and type of projects listed, while facing the same kind of migration problems. This raised queries as to the criteria for a project being recorded in *MI* and whether the view reflected in the section on migration issues and programmatic response was IOM's, the Donor(s)' or the Government(s)'.

Some Member States were not clear whether *MI*'s objective was only to list projects requiring funding or also to highlight strategic directions and document IOM's work. One donor country noted that if the purpose were to list projects requiring funding, a project had been included despite an agreement with IOM that no other donor should participate; in another case, projects requiring funding were not listed. One country considered that regional migration issues could be presented in more detail, especially in view of migration's cross-border dimension. Member States also suggested having an overview of funding received the previous year for projects remaining on the list, as well as additional summary tables.

However, most Member States considered the document's current content as good quality, informative and in an interesting format; they also preferred not to have the format change every year. In order to answer some of the concerns raised, the Missions with Regional Functions could assist DRD more actively in guaranteeing that data collected in their regions accurately reflects the situation.

In terms of investment for *MI* publication, savings had already been made in previous years when the decision was taken to produce it in English only, rather than in all three official languages. This measure was not always well received by the Spanish- and French-speaking Member States interviewed and raised questions among English-speaking Member States. The issue of translating documents in IOM's three official languages has a political dimension, in addition to the practical, that cannot be addressed by DRD alone; DRD simply responded to IOM management's request for savings, justified by the Organization's overall financial constraints.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Annex 2 for reference.

## Conclusion

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.

## Recommendation

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.

### 3.2.2 Updating Information and Using Electronic Tools

One issue arising from the questionnaires and some interviews was the content's rapid obsolescence. MI is finalized each October and distributed in December, or January of the following year. Some projects may have received funding during the preparation or after printing; for most projects listed, however, funding is still required. The mid-year update in June is published to inform the donors and countries of the current situation; in addition, MI is not only a fund-raising tool, but also presents strategic programming within countries and regions. Migration problems can change, but certainly not so rapidly, except during emergencies. One comment is worth noting here, as it highlights a key issue regarding the number of updates and information sharing from the donor's perspective: *"Unfortunately slow bureaucracy in donors' countries and their own internal procedures do not allow in many cases for repeated sessions to plan the donors' allocation to IOM needs. In my own experience, a 'cycle per year' is all what we can hope for, and other emerging and unforeseen requirements can be brought to the attention of donors through ad hoc appeals"*.

Issuing three or four updates a year is time-consuming, requires regular exchange of information with the field offices, reduces the value and impact of the main document and is certainly not a cost-effective solution. An alternative would be to use electronic systems, but this needs examination in a broader context, first addressing key questions: what would be the main support (i.e. IOM web, CD, intranet); how would it be shared outside IOM; who would update the data (country missions, MRFs, DRD); when would Member States and Donors be informed of changes, etc. Internal discussions on the possible use of electronic tools has already started in IOM, but should be continued before any decision is taken.



During interviews with Member States Representatives and IOM Officials, the question was raised as to their preference between an electronic version and a hard copy. The response was mixed: Some considered that being able to offer a printed version to someone was preferable and more effective than a suggestion to visit the IOM web to find out what type of projects and programmes required funding, and that a printed copy was a good vehicle for IOM's image, easily sharable and available for quick consultation; however, as underlined by a Member State Representative, in ten years time people would automatically ask for an electronic version and find the printed copy outdated and useless. In terms of advocacy and presentation of the product, an electronic version could be as attractive as a printed document; for the time being, however, there is still a demand for hard copies and the investment of USD 15,000 to 20,000 is minimal and still worth expending.

The questionnaire contained a specific question on the relevance of the mid-year update: of 27 respondents, 67 per cent agreed that the update summarized programme updates, reflected revised priorities and measured achievements in outreach and resource mobilization; 22 per cent disagreed and 11 per cent did not answer the question, mainly because they did not know the document or had not studied it in detail. Some additional negative comments were that the content rapidly became obsolete and that an electronic update should be considered.

### Conclusion

*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 the 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.*

### Recommendation

**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.**

### **3.3 Effectiveness of Migration Initiatives**

This section analyses MI's effectiveness in achieving two main objectives, in acting as: 1) a strategic or programmatic document<sup>8</sup> and 2) a resource mobilization tool.

---

<sup>8</sup> No differentiation is made here between 'strategic' and 'programmatic', both being used to describe the process of highlighting key overall directions in which the Organization is going in a given country and region for a given year, in response to migration challenges.

### 3.3.1 *Migration Initiatives as a Strategic or Programmatic Tool*

As already emphasized in the analysis of the content's relevance, *MI* accurately reflects the strategic directions that IOM intends to follow in a country or region for a given year, based on its migration assistance needs. The 2005 *MI* is expected to refine the presentation and information about these issues, including IOM's global policy for migration management. Effectiveness can also be examined, answering the following questions: should *MI* be the Organization's main strategic reference tool? If it has a strategic or programmatic function, is it effectively used?

Few IOM documents provide governments and external partners with a detailed, global picture of its activities in any given year. (The analysis excludes documents that are too general and not linked to a given time frame, country or region, i.e. the four-box chart explaining migration and its various challenges, the IOM Constitution, Council Document MC/1842 of 1995 *IOM Strategic Planning: Toward the Twenty-First Century*, or specific strategy papers detailing the work of IOM Services.) Three other documents can be mentioned here: the *Report of the Director General*, the *IOM Programme and Budget*, and the *Project Compendium*. The first two are submitted officially to the IOM Governing Bodies each year and the third is an informal document. The *Report of the Director General* gives a good summary of what IOM has been doing in a given year, but does not cover future strategic directions. The *Project Compendium* lists all funded and current projects, but does not include an analysis of migration issues, nor try to present IOM's strategic response by country or region and is not restricted to a given year. Projects requiring funding are not listed.

The annual *IOM Programme and Budget* also presents useful information on strategic directions for a given year and where duplication of work and information with *MI* could be found. The *IOM Programme and Budget* presents IOM's Administrative Part of the Budget including information on the Organization's structure, it details the Operational Part of the Budget, discretionary income (DI) and special funds available in the Organization; it also records current projects and programmes for which funds are already secured. It is presented by Service, which is an interesting approach, as the links with the Administrative Part of the Budget (including the use of DI) and IOM's structure can easily be made.

If summary tables on country and regional distribution of programmes and projects are included, the document does not, however, include a programmatic approach by country and region that would highlight key migration issues; neither does it record programmes and projects requiring funding. The *Programme and Budget* and *MI* can therefore be considered fully complementary, each meeting specific objectives: in studying both documents, the reader will have a full picture of IOM's policy and structure, its country, regional and Service strategies and directions and funding requirements to achieve these objectives. They give a broad vision of IOM's work for a given year from different perspectives. Sending information from the field for both processes does not involve duplication of work. Seventy-six per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire considered *MI* complementary to the *Programme and Budget*, a view shared by most of the Member States interviewed.

## Conclusion

*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.*

The questionnaire included a series of questions covering the effectiveness of *MI* as a document focusing on IOM's strategic directions. On whether *MI* was regularly used as a strategic or programmatic document with the governments or donors, only 31 per cent answered positively. However, in the 69 per cent who answered negatively, one-third used it occasionally as an information document on IOM's work, a background document for preparing meeting with donors or simply printed only the pages covering their country and region. Answering a subsidiary question, 33 per cent used it as a reference for preparing their projects and programmes.

Concerning one of *MI*'s initial objectives of demonstrating clear political and programmatic links to donors' and member governments' interests in migration, 28 per cent of the respondents fully agreed, 61 per cent partially agreed and 11 per cent disagreed. Major disagreements concerned the political link, it being considered that this could only be presumed.

As to the objective that *MI* be flexible in order to accommodate the ever-changing migration challenge, new political realities and specific requests by member governments, 52 per cent agreed, 41 per cent partially agreed and 7 per cent disagreed. Some of the main problems lie in the contradiction between flexibility and the yearly publication and the fact that *MI* does not include all the programmes and projects.

Some Member States interviewed considered that it gave an accurate picture of IOM's work and formed a good basis for discussion, the country and regional approach being particularly appropriate to that end. This was especially true for the donor countries, as was also highlighted in the notes for the files for meetings organized by DRD in donor capitals.

However, some Member States were still questioning the effectiveness of the strategic dimension, pointing out that not all countries facing migration challenges were listed, nor were projects listed for some countries; it was wondered if the migration issues listed were IOM's viewpoint or stemmed from governments. The Member States benefiting from IOM assistance focused more on their country and region, without paying much attention to other regions, except where there was a need to compare IOM's response. Some Member States also considered that the *Programme and Budget* was more complete and effective in presenting strategic and programmatic issues.

## Conclusion

*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.*

## Recommendation

**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.**

### **3.3.2 A Resource Mobilization Tool**

Two questions in the questionnaire concerned *MI's* effectiveness as a resource mobilization tool. Sixty-four per cent of respondents to the first question fully agreed that the document provided a comprehensive and a realistic overview of services requiring funding and 36 per cent partially agreed, with no one disagreeing. Partial disagreement mainly related to the notion of 'realistic', some projects which required funding not matching the description of migration needs or, in some countries, too many projects being submitted compared to those needs.

The second question asked if the field missions already used *MI* as a resource mobilization tool: 48 per cent answered positively and 52 per cent negatively, 83 per cent of those who answered positively considering that it was 'useful', although many were unsure if it could be considered 'effective' in influencing the final decision for project funding. The high level of negative answers was not surprising; the main reason given was that field offices submitted the full project documents directly to donor embassies for fund-raising and preparatory meetings were often organized to provide the donors with sufficient information. Field offices therefore considered that although they did not need *MI* to support their fund-raising efforts, it was a useful tool for the capitals to use in making informed funding decisions.

It is important to note here that there are other fund-raising tools that can also be used by the field missions to approach donors, for instance the CAP process in emergencies and transition periods, special flash appeals or the *MI* Overview, covering specific services. Also, a certain number of funded projects never appear in *MI*, as they are discussed and funded in the interval between publication of one *MI* and before issuance of the next: as an example, in the summary table of the mid-year update an amount of USD 74 million was received 'outside *Migration Initiatives 2004*', representing 55 per cent of total funds received (funds for projects submitted under *MI* represents 45 per cent of the total).

Drawing conclusions on the effectiveness of *MI* without examining the overall IOM fund-raising strategy and available tools would be inappropriate. An analysis of fund-raising in IOM was excluded from the evaluation's terms of reference in order to maintain focus on *MI*.

It is also not possible to draw conclusions based on the data presented in the mid-year update, or from other data such as the percentage of funds received through *MI* compared to the overall amount of funds requested and received by IOM during a year (*MI* and non-*MI*). Not all of the financial data is available in DRD, and to present an accurate picture of funding received versus pledges would require considerable investment in human resources and time to collect it.

It is also well known that the funding received often falls below that requested: many examples with the CAP show that only 50 to 60 per cent of funds required are received, but it does not mean that resource mobilization through the CAP is ineffective, or that the agencies are over-estimating their requests. This evaluation will not elaborate further, as the matter is not linked to *MI*'s effectiveness, but rather to fund-raising policies, approaches practicalities.

For all these reasons, it is difficult to determine exactly *MI*'s effectiveness as a resource mobilization tool; as stressed in the questionnaire, the criterion of usefulness seems more appropriate. One respondent pointed out an important element regarding its effectiveness or usefulness: even if the decision were taken based on a project document, many donors formally required a tool such as *MI* for a comprehensive view of IOM's work, to make an informed decision and to make their contributions available.

This was also confirmed during the interviews with Member States: many said that the donor capitals use *MI* to find out what IOM was planning in a given country or region and then ask for more detailed information and project or programme documents on which to make decisions; alternatively, if a project were submitted for funding, they studied *MI* in order to have a clearer picture of the framework within which the project would operate. It is evident that they could not make decisions based on *MI*'s content, but it could raise interest in a project or programme; this is especially true for IOM's non-traditional donors.

### **Conclusion**

*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.*

### **Recommendation**

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.

## 4. 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.



## EVALUATION OF IOM *MIGRATION INITIATIVES*

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### 1. BACKGROUND

In 1997 and 1998, a series of discussions took place on ways to improve IOM's overall strategic planning, including the IOM *Programme and Budget* document (Blue Book) and what at that time was called the *Fundraising Update*, since renamed the *Programme Priority Update*. IOM Member States were questioning the relevance of Part III of the Blue Book's *Operations – Funding Requirements* and asked for a separate document on programme prioritization and fund-raising requirements to be presented at the Council session. At the end of 1998, a *Programme Priority Update* for 1999 was prepared, to be presented at the yearly Council session. The document was well received and it was decided in 1999 to repeat the experience, with improvements based on feedback from IOM Member States, donors and the field.

For the year 2000, the document's name was changed to *Migration Initiatives* (MI), reflecting IOM's initiatives in addressing migration issues. It was not intended simply as a fund-raising tool, but also an internal strategic planning document and information tool. Part III of the Blue Book was formally cancelled in the *Programme and Budget for 2000*. In a document sent to all IOM Missions in July 1999, *Migration Initiatives 2000* and its objectives were described as follows:

- 'MI 2000 needs to provide a comprehensive and yet a realistic overview of services for which total or partial funding is required;
- MI 2000 demonstrates clear political and programmatic links to donors/member governments' interest in the field of migration;
- IOM's mandate and technical expertise need to be reflected in the choice of programmes and projects, to highlight the organization's strategic direction either in service areas, in emergency management or through regional approaches to migration issues;
- MI 2000 will need to be flexible in order to accommodate the ever-changing migration challenges, new political realities and specific requests by member governments that align with IOM's strategic interest.'

*Migration Initiative Update*, an interim report for measuring achievements in outreach and resource mobilization, was published in 2002. The introduction to the MI for 2004 describes it as "reflect[ing] the scope and depth of IOM's operational role across the Organization's service areas as well as its policy advisory role". The document presents information by region and also includes two specific sections: 'Multi-regional' and 'Consolidated Appeals 2004'. The Donor Relations Division (DRD) has management of the MI. At the end of 2003, the Office of the Inspector General was approached to examine the possibility of evaluating the Migration Initiative process.

## 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The main objective of the evaluation is:

"To evaluate IOM 'Migration Initiative process' in the framework of IOM strategic planning and resource mobilization. In particular, the evaluation will examine if the initial objectives and expectations of the process are met, and if regional and country strategic directions and key migration issues are properly presented and assessed in line with the Organization's strategic objectives and Member States and Governments expectations. It will also evaluate if resource mobilization is improved globally and if time and resources dedicated to the preparation of the MI is used effectively".

More precisely, the evaluation will:

- Analyse the overall preparatory process and its requirements for receiving relevant information from the field, including for the mid-year update;
- Analyse the changes to the document to meet evolving demands from IOM Member States and donors for a comprehensive strategic planning and resource mobilization tool;
- Based on the information/data received and processed at Headquarters, evaluate the relevance of the MI content to regional and country strategic planning and key migration issues, including the funding needs, focusing on the Organization's strategic objectives,
- Evaluate the complementary nature of the MI to other strategic and resource mobilization tools, in particular the annual Programme and Budget document and the UN Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP);
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the Migration Initiative in the overall resources mobilization mechanisms currently in place in the Organization (e.g. at EU level);
- Evaluate the role of Missions with Regional Functions (MRFs) and of Regional Advisers in organizing inputs during the process, in particular for the regional strategic prioritization, as well as for the promotion of the MI in their region;
- Analyse the role of Headquarters, in particular DRD, in promoting the Migration Initiative in the field and the donor community;
- Analyse the role and input of the newly created Migration Policy and Research Department, in particular of the Strategic Policy and Planning Unit vis-à-vis the Organization's strategic directions;
- Analyse the feedback received from the IOM Missions on how they perceive and use the MI for strategic planning and resource mobilization, including project/programme planning and prioritization;
- Make recommendations on maintaining the Migration Initiatives as a strategic planning and resources mobilization tool, and on improvements that can still be made to the process.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology will mainly consist of a documentation review and a series of interviews with IOM Headquarters and Field Mission staff, and with IOM Member States. Similar documents prepared by other organizations will also be examined within the documentation review.

Interviews with Member States will be organized through the Permanent Missions in Geneva, especially with DRD's contact persons. Capitals will be contacted by phone when necessary. Focus will be placed on donor countries, but selected benefiting Member States will also be interviewed, in particular to examine if key migration issues in their country or region are addressed in the document. Interviews will also be organized with other donors, such as the European Union and the UN, insofar as they are aware of the document's existence. Written questionnaires will be sent to IOM field missions, with a specific section for the MRFs. The written questionnaire will be shared with DRD for comments.

DRD will provide the necessary support for preparing the documentation and for supplying the names and addresses of their contact persons in Geneva and in the capitals.

### **4. RESOURCES AND TIMING**

The cost of the evaluation, which should be minimal since no travel is foreseen, will be borne by the Office of the Inspector General. A draft report should be made available for comments by mid-May 2004 at the latest.

## INTERVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

**Interviews in IOM:**

- Helke Jill, Executive Officer, Office of the Director General,
- Buschman-Petit Anne-Marie, Special Adviser/Special Assistant to the Director General, Office of the Director General,
- Paiva Robert, Director and Senior Regional Adviser for Europe, External Relations Department,
- Oropeza Jose Angel, Senior Regional Adviser for the Americas, External Relations Department,
- Abdel Moneim Mostafa Hassan, Senior Regional Adviser for the Middle-East/South-West Asia, Egypt/Sudan and Special Envoy to the Gulf States, External Relations Department,
- Usher Erica, Head, Strategic Policy and Planning Division,
- Kaag Sigrid, (former) Chief, Donor Relations Division,
- Azkoul Clarissa, Senior Donor Relations Officer, Chief a.i., Donor Relations Division,
- Reber-Hashemee Patricia, Donor Relations Officer, Donor Relations Division,
- Umar Mayana, Donor Relations Assistant, Donor Relations Division.

**Interviews with IOM Member States:**

Representatives of the following Member States have been interviewed:

Australia	Egypt
Germany	Islamic Republic of Iran
Italy	Japan
Kenya	New Zealand
Switzerland	Uruguay
United States of America	

The Notes for the Files of bilateral meetings with the following Member States were also used as a reference: Belgium, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America (PRM).

**IOM written questionnaire:**

A written questionnaire was sent to IOM field offices – see Annex 3. The following offices answered:

## 1. Missions with Regional Functions:

Budapest	Manila
Buenos Aires	New York
Dhaka Islamabad	Rome
Helsinki	San Jose

## 2. IOM Missions:

Almaty	Minsk
Amman (Iraq Ops.)	Montevideo
Bern	Moscow
Chisinau	Paris
Dili	Phnom Penh
Dushanbe	Pristina
Guatemala	Teheran
Kabul	Tunis
Lusaka	Zagreb

## 3. The following offices sent some comments but without completing the full questionnaire:

Hanoi, Kiev, Pretoria, Riga, Yerevan, Vienna (TCC).

N.B. DRD launched a parallel initiative in April/May 2004 asking the MRF's Heads for suggestions for improvement of *Migration Initiatives*. The short exchange of e-mails was also used to complement some of the information received through the written questionnaire.

**Bibliographical references:**

IOM, *IOM Fundraising Update*, March 1997

IOM, *Programme Priority Update – 1998*, May 1998

IOM, *Migration Initiatives, Programmes to meet migration challenges – February 1999*, Feb. 1999

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2000 – Funding Appeals*, MC/INF/241, November 1999

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2001 – Funding Appeals*, MC/INF/243, November 2000

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2002 - Appeal*, MC/INF/246, November 2001

IOM, *Migration Initiatives – Appeal 2003*, MC/INF/250, December 2002

IOM, *Migration Initiatives – Appeal 2004*, December 2003

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2005*, template document, July 2004

IOM, *Mid-year review - Migration Initiatives 2000*, June 2000

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2002 – Mid-year report: September 2001 - May 2002*, June 2002

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2003 – Mid-year update: September 2002 – May 2003*, June 2003

IOM, *Migration Initiatives 2004, Mid-year update: September 2003 - June 2004*, June 2004

IOM, *Overview: IOM Counter-Trafficking Projects (Migration Initiatives 2002)*, April 2002

IOM, *Overview: IOM Counter-Trafficking Projects*, January 2003

IOM, *Overview: Capacity Building and Assisted Return Projects – MI 2004*, October 2003

IOM/DRD, *MI Evaluation 2004*, compilation of e-mail exchanges, letters, draft papers, reports, notes for the files, training material for the period 1999-2004

IOM/DRD, *DRD – Focus and role*, Internal Memorandum, June 2004

IOM, MC/C/SR/426, *Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Meeting*, 78<sup>th</sup> session of the Council, December 1999

IOM, MC/C/SR/431, *Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-First Meeting*, 80<sup>th</sup> session of the Council, January 2001

IOM, MC/C/SR/439, *Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Ninth Meeting*, 82<sup>nd</sup> session of the Council, December 2001

IOM, MC/C/SR/446, *Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-Sixth Meeting*, 84<sup>th</sup> session of the Council, January 2003

MC/2126, *Draft Report on the Eighty-Sixth Session of the Council*, January 2004

IOM, *Migration Initiatives (MI), Informal Consultations on the 1035 Facility and Migration Initiatives (MI)*, April 2003

Office of the Auditor General of Norway, *Audit of financial reporting to donors and financial control of donor payments*, draft, October 2003

UNESCO, *Migration Initiatives 2004*, letter to the Director General, April 2004

ICRC, *Emergency Appeals 2001*

UNHCR, *Global Appeal 2003, Strategies and Programmes*

UNOCHA, *OCHA in 2004 – Activities and extra-budgetary funding requirements*

UN, *Angola 2004 – Consolidated Appeal for Transition*

## EVALUATION OF IOM *MIGRATION INITIATIVE* QUESTIONNAIRE TO IOM FIELD OFFICES

The External Relations Department requested the Office of the Inspector General to conduct an evaluation of the 'Migration Initiative' process, focusing on its effectiveness as a resources mobilization and strategic tool and on its overall usefulness. The overall objective of the evaluation is defined as follows:

"To evaluate IOM's Migration Initiative process in the framework of IOM strategic planning and resource mobilization. In particular, the evaluation will examine if the initial objectives and expectations of the process are met, and if regional and country strategic directions and key migration issues are properly presented and assessed in line with the Organization's strategic objectives and Member States' and Governments' expectations. It will also evaluate whether resource mobilization is improved globally and if time and resources dedicated to the preparation of the MI are used effectively".

The views and comments from the field are an invaluable source of information for this kind of exercise. To assist in performing it, I would very much appreciate your taking the time to complete this questionnaire as fully as possible and returning it by 24 April 2004. Comments on all questions are welcome, even if not specifically requested. Your response will remain confidential and will be used only for the purposes of this evaluation (It can be send by fax or by e-mail to Evaluation/Office of the Inspector General; fax number: 0041-22-798.61.50; email address: [eva@iom.int](mailto:eva@iom.int), or to Christophe Franzetti, Evaluation Officer, [cfranzetti@iom.int](mailto:cfranzetti@iom.int)).

**In the cover note sent out to IOM field offices in July 1999 in preparation for the first edition of the Migration Initiative (MI), a number of statements and objectives were mentioned as presented below. Could you please tell if you agree with them and comment them?**

**1.1 MI provides a comprehensive and yet a realistic overview of services for which total or partial funding is required**

1. fully agree                       2. partially agree                       3. disagree

Comments:

**1.2 MI demonstrates clear political and programmatic links to donors/member governments' interest in the field of migration**

1. fully agree                       2. partially agree                       3. disagree

Comments:

**1.3 IOM's mandate and technical expertise is reflected in the choice of programmes and projects, and MI highlights the organization's strategic direction either in service areas, in emergency management or through regional approaches to migration issues**

1. fully agree                       2. partially agree                       3. disagree

Comments:

**1.4 MI is flexible in order to accommodate the ever-changing migration challenges, new political realities and specific requests by member governments that align with IOM's strategic interest**

1. fully agree                       2. partially agree                       3. disagree

Comments:

**1.5 MI reflects the scope and depth of IOM's operational role across the Organization's service areas, as well as its policy advisory role**

1. fully agree                       2. partially agree                       3. disagree

Comments:

**2. In most of the statements above, MI is described as a strategic and programmatic tool. In your 'daily' work, do you often use it as such?**

- Yes                       No

- *If yes, how often and with whom (donors, embassies, government institutions, partners, others – please specify):*

**3. As a strategic and programmatic tool, do you use it as a reference for preparing projects/programmes in your country and/or region (region especially for MRFs)?**

- Yes                       No

**4. Do you consider that the MI, as a programmatic tool, is complementary to the Programme and Budget (Blue Book)?**

- Yes                       No

**5. MI is also considered as a 'resources mobilization' tool;<sup>9</sup> fund-raising have you already used it as such?**

- Yes                       No

**If yes, was it useful and effective?                      Yes                       No**

**If no, why?**

---

<sup>9</sup> Resource mobilization encompasses processes and channels through which organizations raise awareness and thus potential financial support. The approach is both direct, e.g. appeals, as well as indirect, e.g. information, advocacy and promotion. The concept includes others such as 'fund-raising', 'funding requirements', 'funding needs'. Differences are made between these concepts, but here they will be considered as synonyms.



6. In 2002 and 2003, an interim report *Migration Initiative Update* was published to summarize programme updates, reflect revised priorities and measure achievements in outreach and resource mobilization. Do you think the objective was reached and that it was a useful document?

Yes  No

If no, why?

7. Do you consider that the time you spend on the MI and MI Update for sending information to Headquarters, answering requests, amending information is worth the investment?

Yes  No

If no, why, and what suggestions do you propose?

8. Do you consider that the information on your country/region is accurately reflected in its final version?

Yes  No

9. Do you receive sufficient guidance from Headquarters, in particular from DRD and/or from the Regional Adviser, for sharing information in the framework of the preparation of the document?

Yes  No

If no, why, and what could be improved?

10. Are you kept sufficiently informed by DRD on how they promote the MI, including the update, how effective it is for resource mobilization for your country and what feedback they receive from IOM Member States and donors?

Yes  No

11. The document is divided by regions and also includes two specific sections: Multi-regional and Consolidated Appeals 2004. Do you consider the format appropriate?

Yes  No

If no, why, and what could be improved?

Thank you for your contribution.