



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

**CONFERENCE ROOM PAPER/19
RESTRICTED**

95th Session of the SCBF
Geneva, 10 May 2006

Original: English

SECOND EVALUATION OF THE IOM 1035 FACILITY

Office of the Inspector General
December 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	3
1.1 The 1035 Facility	3
1.2 Evaluation Scope and Methodology	4
2. Performance and Achievements of 1035 Projects	7
2.1 Types of Projects Funded by 1035	7
2.2 Outcome, Impact and Sustainability Analysis	10
2.3 Information Flow, Seed Money and Bridging Funds	13
3. Selection Criteria and Management Guidelines	15
3.1 Review and Discussions from 2002 to 2004	15
3.2 Selection Criteria and Management Guidelines	16
3.2.1. Eligibility and Regional Balance	16
3.2.2 Project Types	17
3.2.3 Funding Levels	20
3.2.4 Application Procedures	22
4. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	25
Annex 1 Second Evaluation of the 1035 Facility: Terms of Reference	27
Annex 2 Questionnaire to IOM Field Missions	31
Annex 3 Questionnaire to IOM Member States	38
Annex 4 1035 Facility Status Report 1 January to 31 March 2004	45
Annex 5 Bibliographical References	50

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX), adopted in November 2000, requested the Director General *'to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'*. The IOM Administration established criteria and guidelines for the management of the '1035 Facility', in co-ordination with Member States, allocating it a yearly amount of almost USD 1.4 million.

In order to assess the Facility's management, the IOM Administration proposed conducting its evaluation in 2003; the report was formally presented at the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance (SCBF) in October 2003. The new criteria and guidelines for using the funds, derived from the evaluation, were formalized in 2004. The IOM Administration presented them to the Member States in document SCBF/265 of March 2004. The evaluation also recommended a follow-up evaluation in 2005, focusing on impact analysis.

In 2003, a group of Member States led by Canada started informal discussions on the Facility, in parallel with the evaluation. They issued a document entitled 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' in June 2004. The IOM Administration noted that many points in the document mirrored or complemented the evaluation published in 2003, but pointed out that some of its recommendations ran counter to the views and preferences of most Member States, and risked duplicating existing structures and processes. The Administration suggested that the second evaluation of the Facility, already scheduled for 2005, be used as an opportunity to review any relevant issues raised.

The SCBF endorsed IOM Administration's proposal in November 2004 to re-examine the selection criteria and management guidelines during the second evaluation, which would also examine the outcome and impact of the Facility, as initially planned. IOM sent questionnaires to its field missions, covering the analysis of the impact and sustainability, and to its Member States, including both the impact and sustainability analysis and the review of the criteria and guidelines. There was little feedback from Member States, but it was useful as a source of information for cross-checking data.

The 1035 Facility database has recorded a total of 128 projects approved since its creation to July 2005, for a total of USD 6.8 million; 40 per cent were regional projects, representing 46 per cent of the total allocated, and 60 per cent were national projects, representing 54 per cent of the total. Since 2001, a total of 79 eligible Member States have benefited from the 1035 Facility. An analysis of the projects approved showed that the categories and related projects, as presented under the 1035 Facility's newly-created web page accorded with the selection criteria, except for a few projects that might be considered as borderline for acceptance.

IOM offices responding to the questionnaire's section on impact analysis considered that 71 per cent of projects surveyed reached the expected outcome and/or impact to varying degrees. In some cases, the outcome was seen as exceeding expectations, but in most cases it was considered in line with expectations. Some offices confirmed that the projects achieved the expected outcome but had certain doubts on longer-term impact. Other IOM offices considered that 15 per cent of the projects surveyed did not achieve the expected outcome or impact, the main reasons being disagreements among benefiting governments on project implementation or follow-up action and poor project design.

Results of the IOM offices survey is less positive regarding sustainability, but still encouraging: only in 18 per cent of the projects surveyed was sustainability not guaranteed. Reasons were not specified, except for a few cases, e.g. government changes affecting the entity in charge of the 1035-funded project and therefore its sustainability. Contrary to outcome and impact, sustainability is not necessarily a major indicator for measuring the success of a project, even if it is a sign of positive achievement. Some projects may have a strong impact without being sustained, for instance research leading to the approval of new migration legislation: as soon as the government or parliament approves it, the project can be closed.

The surveys also included a question on the Facility's overall impact. Eighty-two per cent of the IOM offices considered that the 1035 Facility met its objective and had a positive global impact. The percentage was confirmed by Member States responding to the questionnaire and in statements made during the Governing Bodies' meetings. The reasons given for a negative rating were mainly the limited funds and therefore action, absence of government response and interest and regional dispersal affecting implementation. The evaluation made recommendations to address weaknesses identified through the impact and sustainability analysis, particularly regarding the role of benefiting governments.

There was too little feedback from Member States concerning the review of the selection criteria and management guidelines to draw conclusions or make recommendations from it. In order to complement data, the evaluation took into account the findings of the first evaluation, statements made during the Governing Bodies' meetings and the results of the impact and sustainability analysis. The evaluation also analysed the proposals made by the informal group of Member States and the IOM Administration's related comments.

The evaluation concludes that no major changes should be made to the selection criteria and management guidelines, in order to keep the flexibility required for the Facility and avoid heavy approval mechanisms, such as the 'Project Approval Board' proposed by the informal group that at this stage do not guarantee more effective management of the Facility or better project performance. Sound management of the Facility, as is now the case, prevents abuse and potential problems regarding allocation of funds. Regional and country balance is well respected. Introduction of the 1035 Facility web page also ensured more detailed information on the Facility's overall management. The evaluation also confirmed that priority was given to capacity building projects, as specified in the criteria.

Recommendations for improvement are, however, made in this report for the approval of broad regional projects, in order to guarantee stronger commitment from benefiting Member States, some of them acting as project leaders or promoters, and to reinforce expected impact and follow-up. The 1035 Facility Management should also clarify some of the exclusion criteria, particularly in the Emergency and Movement areas, to avoid possible confusion. The evaluation considers that exclusion measures for countries falling under the Article 4 of the Constitution for non-payment of their contribution may be examined, but should be part of the overall debate on measures to address arrears rather an isolated measure within the Facility's operation.

The evaluation not only asks benefiting Member States to participate more actively in the 1035 Facility projects for greater effectiveness, but also encourages donor Member States to support projects funded by the Facility financially where appropriate and to examine possibilities for co-funding and for funding follow-up projects further, which would also improve the Facility's performance and impact. The evaluation took note of the views expressed by most of the Member States responding to the questionnaire that they were not ready to allocate funds to the Facility in addition to the amount set aside by the IOM Administration.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 1035 Facility

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) paragraph five, adopted at IOM's 432nd meeting on 29 November 2000, requested the Director General 'to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'. The IOM Administration allocated a total of USD 1,430,000 for the Facility in 2001; in 2002 the final allocation was lower at USD 1,380,000, but increased again to USD 1,430,000 in 2003; in 2004, USD 1,427,000 was allocated and in 2005 the level rose to USD 1,435,000.

To facilitate and streamline allocation of these funds, document MC/EX/631 outlined the criteria and guidelines established by IOM's Administration, on which Member States were invited to comment. In June 2001, the criteria were completed to take into account additional suggestions made by Member States. In 2003, IOM's Administration, with the agreement of its Member States, requested the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to conduct an evaluation of the Facility, focusing mainly on the relevance of its selection criteria and management guidelines.

The evaluation exercise was completed in September 2003, endorsed by the Director General, and the report formally presented to the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance (SCBF) in October 2003. The new criteria and guidelines for utilizing the funds, derived from the evaluation, were formalized in 2004. The IOM Administration presented them to the Member States at the 91st Session of the SCBF in document SCBF/265 of March 2004.¹ The evaluation also recommended a follow-up evaluation in 2005, focusing on impact analysis.

In 2003, a group of Member States led by Canada started informal discussions on the Facility, in parallel with the evaluation process. It issued a document entitled 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' in June 2004, which was discussed at the Informal Consultation of 15 September 2004. As a result of the discussion, the Member States invited IOM's Administration to share its comments further in writing with all Member States and document IC/2004/9 'Administration's Comments: Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' was distributed on 29 September 2004.

In this document, the Administration noted that many points in the document mirrored or complemented the evaluation published in 2003, but pointed out that some of its recommendations ran counter to the views and preferences of most Member States, and risked duplicating existing structures and processes; the Administration suggested that OIG's second evaluation of the Facility, already scheduled for 2005, also be used to review the 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' document. The SCBF decided at its 92nd session of November 2004 that all relevant issues should be examined during the second 1035 Facility evaluation in 2005, which would however also examine the outcome and impact of the Facility, as initially planned.

¹ For further references, see Annex 4.

As of July 2005, the 1035 Facility database had recorded a total of 128 projects² approved since its creation, for a total of USD 6.8 million. Of the 128 projects, 40 per cent were regional projects, representing 46 per cent of the total amount allocated, and 60 per cent were national projects, representing 54 per cent of the total amount. Since 2001, a total of 79 eligible Member States had benefited from the 1035 Facility.³ Only one eligible Member State had never benefited from the 1035 Facility but the 1035 Facility Management was already planning corrective action.

1.2 Evaluation Scope and Methodology

Based on the SCBF decision of November 2004, the Office of the Inspector General prepared the terms of reference (ToRs)⁴ for the evaluation and presented them at the Informal Consultation of April 2005 (IC/2005/2). These framed the analysis of the impact and sustainability of the projects implemented and the overall impact of the Facility, and the analysis of the criteria and guidelines with a view to proposing solutions to outstanding points. The overall objective of the evaluation was, according to the ToR:

"To evaluate the performance and achievements of projects implemented within the framework of the Facility, with a major focus on their impact and sustainability. Conclusions will also be drawn on the Facility's overall impact. In addition, the evaluation will address issues related to criteria and guidelines, taking into account the Facility's terms of reference and its original intent."

More specifically, the evaluation analyses and presents recommendations in the following areas:

- Performance and achievements of funded projects, particularly their impact and sustainability, in line with the Facility's objectives;
- Effectiveness of the Facility in achieving its overall goals and meeting IOM Member States' expectations;
- Selection criteria and management guidelines and procedures in line with the first evaluation, the document presented by the group of Member States and the impact and sustainability analysis.

At the April 2005 Informal Consultation, a Member State suggested focusing the analysis more on the outcome than the impact of the projects. The outcome may be defined as "the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effect of an intervention's outputs" and the impact as "the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended".⁵ The Office of the Inspector General took note of the suggestion, which is relevant for the type of analysis covered by the evaluation, and makes the distinction when appropriate.

² The projects implemented in two phases and the projects with an extension, are counted as one project.

³ In 2005, 77 Member States are eligible. The number has varied depending on the status of countries (for instance those having joined the EU and having lost their eligibility) and on new Member States joining the Organization and becoming eligible countries.

⁴ See Annex 1.

⁵ OECD/DAC, 'Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management', 2002.

Concerning the methodology for conducting the evaluation, the outcome and impact analyses require surveys against which the outcome and impact of specific projects and the overall impact of the Facility may be assessed. A survey questionnaire was sent to IOM Missions having implemented projects (Annex 2) and another to Member States having participated in projects funded by the Facility (Annex 3).⁶ A total of 35 IOM Missions with Regional Functions and Field Offices replied, covering 46 eligible countries and representing 58 per cent of Member States having benefited from the Facility; the sample respects the regional balance.

The number of Member States having completed the impact and sustainability questionnaire was lower: only 17 countries (22 per cent of the benefiting countries) answered that part of the survey (Part II) and several replies were incomplete. The regional distribution is again well balanced. It would have been interesting to receive more feedback from benefiting Member States to measure the outcome and impact, especially as the deadline was extended to allow four months in which to complete the questionnaire.

Cross-checking analysis was performed through documentation review and through random reviews of 1035-funded projects by OIG staff travelling to the field. Relevant documentation included the list of projects, activity and project performance reports, evaluation reports, OIG rapid assessments, financial data, correspondence with Member States and IOM field offices, specific agreements and/or sub-agreements signed under selected projects, follow-up projects, information on the newly created 1035 web page and other documentation relevant to the exercise.

In summary, of a total of 128 projects recorded, 83 were covered by the questionnaires sent to Member States and IOM field offices, representing 65 per cent of the projects funded by the 1035 Facility, a valid sample. Generalizations on the outcome, impact and sustainability can be drawn from the findings of the evaluation, based on the level of replies to the questionnaires, the valid sample of projects surveyed, cross-checks of data and the representative regional distributions.

All Member States were invited to complete Part I of the questionnaire to enable the evaluator to draw conclusions concerning the second aspect of the evaluation, re-examination of the selection criteria and management guidelines. As for the impact questionnaire (Part II), OIG stressed the importance of Member States' contribution. A total of 23 Member States replied, representing 21 per cent of the total of Member States before June 2005.⁷

Taking into account the limited feedback from Member States, OIG examined various sources and references to complement the analysis: the original intent of the Facility, information collected through the interviews of the first evaluation conducted by OIG, the questionnaire sent to Member States during the first evaluation, the conclusions and recommendations of the first evaluation, the document presented by the group of Member States (including the IOM Administration's comments),

⁶ The questionnaire was sent to all IOM Member States and was divided in two parts: Part I on the criteria and guidelines to be completed by all Member States, and Part II on the impact and sustainability analysis to be completed by Member States having benefited from the 1035 Facility.

⁷ Three new Member States joined the Organization in June 2005 and did not receive the questionnaire sent in May.

statements made at the informal consultations and formal sessions of the Governing Bodies' meetings and the conclusions and recommendations of the impact and sustainability analysis of the current evaluation. OIG did not interview the Permanent Missions of IOM Member States in Geneva, as meetings with a representative number of Member States were organized during the relatively recent first evaluation.

Section 2 briefly presents the types of projects funded by the Facility and discusses the outcome and impact analysis, sustainability of projects and effectiveness in achieving the Facility's overall goal. The section also covers any relevant issues stemming from the questionnaires, e.g. collaboration between IOM Field Offices and Governments, information sharing on project performance, or concepts such as seed money, co-funding, and bridging funds, which are part of the selection criteria and which can provide useful information on the outcome, impact and sustainability of the 1035 projects. Section 3 covers the re-examination of the criteria and guidelines, in line with the methodology described above.

2. PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF 1035 PROJECTS

This section first gives a brief description of the projects funded by the Facility and their relevance to established criteria. It then analyses the outcome, impact and sustainability of the projects as well as the overall effectiveness of the Facility in meeting its objectives and the expectations of Member States. A third part briefly presents specific issues highlighted in the questionnaires that may influence the impact and sustainability of the Facility and their relevance to the selection criteria.

2.1 Types of Projects Funded by 1035

The 1035 Facility Management provides information on the types of projects funded by the Facility through the newly created 1035 web page of IOM's website available in the three official languages. The creation of the web page meets demands from Member States for more detailed information on the types of projects approved, especially under the Capacity Building criteria. The database used to provide the information on projects on the web page also assists the 1035 Facility Management in keeping track of the Facility's coverage.

The categories used for recording the 1035-funded projects correspond to the IOM service areas and to some specific fields of technical assistance, including capacity building; they are in line with the criteria established for the selection of projects for 1035 funding. The categories matching the service areas, but excluding 'Technical Cooperation on Migration Management and Capacity Building' which is treated separately below, are the following (with the percentage of projects approved under the category since the creation of the Facility):

- Assisted Voluntary Return and Integration – 4 per cent;
- Counter-Trafficking – 5 per cent;
- Labour Migration – 6 per cent;
- Migration and Health – 9 per cent.

The following sub-categories have been established in the Technical Cooperation service area, including the percentage of projects funded; the sub-divisions by activities used in the 2005 Programme and Budget (MC/2144 – § 242) appear in parenthesis:

- Enhancement of Inter-governmental Dialogue and Cooperation ("establishment or enhancement of multilateral dialogue and planning processes for migration management") - 11 per cent;
- Migration Management Systems ("technical assistance in enhancing key administrative and operational systems") - 26 per cent;
- Policy and Legal Framework Development (two corresponding sub-categories can be recorded here: "assessment and, if necessary, revision and reformulation of migration policies, laws and administrative structures" and "support for the coordination and integration of migration policies within affected regions") - 7 per cent;
- Research and Assessment ("diagnostics on causes, characteristics and effects of migration") - 8 per cent;

- Training Activities and Training System Improvements (“professional and technical training for government officials”) - 9 per cent.

The focus areas mentioned in the Programme and Budget for 2005 also apply to the 1035 projects recorded under the technical cooperation and capacity building sub-categories: “improving migration data and border management systems; improving the integrity of travel documents and their issuance system; establishing or strengthening national or regional training programmes for migration personnel; special programmes to enhance respect for the human rights of migrants; and improving services to vulnerable migrant groups”. Projects approved under the technical cooperation category represent 61 per cent of 1035-approved projects since the Facility’s creation, confirming that priority has been given to capacity building,⁸ as per the selection criteria.

Two remaining categories merit separate mention:

- Migration and Development: there has been no specific service area in IOM covering this; it includes activities from several areas. It is growing in importance in the migration debate (it features in the 2006 IOM Administration Structure) and is consistent with the 1035 selection criteria - 13 per cent;
- ‘Others’ includes the administrative costs for the management of the Facility and a project related to the Tsunami response - 2 per cent.

The project related to the Tsunami response is certainly among the few projects that might not be obvious for inclusion among the 1035 approved projects, emergency being excluded from 1035 Facility criteria. The justification given is that it was funded from the ‘Sasakawa Endowment Fund’, which was merged with the 1035 Facility but which authorizes funding projects in emergencies. The same logic partially applied to a post-conflict project in the Democratic Republic of the Congo funded in 2002: ‘Small Arms Collection and Repatriation and Reintegration of DRC Ex-combatants from the Congo’. However, IOM Administration intends to keep the two funding sources separate in 2006, avoiding unnecessary confusion in the future, and will try to complement the 1035 Facility with other sources of finance.

The projects that may give rise to questions, aside from the two projects mentioned above, represent 12 per cent of the total of projects approved. This does not mean, however, that they should not have been funded on the grounds that they fell under the exclusion criteria, but clarifications should be provided in order to avoid confusion. The first group, (2 per cent), is linked to post-conflict activities that could be considered under the exclusion category of ‘Emergency’ but that could also be seen as a move towards stabilisation, reconstruction and development, without a continuing link to an emergency situation. One project in Angola, implemented in 2002, focused on programme development and was also used as bridging funds for projects with good prospects for future funding; the other, in Sudan in 2003, being on a socio-economic survey among IDP populations, fell under the research category.

⁸ Reference is made to capacity building in its broad sense. A more restrictive definition of capacity building would focus on training activities only, or similar events.

The second group representing 3 per cent of all funded projects is linked to return activities, with project titles mentioning 'return' as the main objective. All projects were implemented between 2001 and 2003, except one project in 2005. The projects could also cause confusion if considered under the exclusion criteria of 'Movement', but they are included under the 'Assisted Voluntary Return and Integration' service area, with a major focus on policy implementation and assistance to governments. Clarifications to the titles could avoid confusion in the future.

The third group representing 3 per cent refers to HIV/AIDS focal points or regional coordinators; related projects were implemented between 2001 and 2003. Clearly, the projects belonging to the IOM 'Migration and Health' service area can be funded, but funding specific positions could be considered as falling under the exclusion criteria preventing the funding of projects that exclusively cover IOM staff and office costs. However, the projects stemmed from an agreement signed between IOM and UNAIDS in 1999, including co-financing of projects in the field of HIV/AIDS prevention and migration, and recruitment of focal points. The topic was relatively new at that time and the focal points were appointed to explore initiatives and fields of assistance to governments (with successful outcomes according to information collected). The link with the 1035 Facility's original aim to facilitate the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition prevails in this case.

The fourth group, representing 3 per cent, may also create confusion due to the exclusion criteria preventing the funding of conferences and similar events that were a continuation of dialogue and similar well-established activities.⁹ One project funded in 2001 supported the follow-up of the newly established South American Conference on Migration, in line with the 1035 Facility criteria due to its innovative dimension. In 2003, the Facility funded another project entitled 'Priority Actions on Migration in South America'. It is not a conference or similar event, but could be interpreted as a continuation of the well-established South American regional process. Its objective, however, was to contribute to the consolidation of a South American integral approach on migration, as discussed during the South American conferences and technical consultative meetings, by committing the governments of the region to implementation of a series of prioritized actions. Neither project exceeded the limit of USD 200,000 applied to regional projects. The same logic was used for the Migration Dialogue in the Western Mediterranean. This fourth group is certainly the one that may be considered as the most problematic in terms of exclusion criteria interpretation. The 1035 Facility Management's position regarding those cases is that "1035 will not fund on-going processes, but will consider funding specific activities that spin off these processes. To exclude the latter is to put the participating countries at a disadvantage in gaining 1035 support for otherwise-eligible initiatives".¹⁰

A fifth group representing 1 per cent of all funded projects is less problematic, as the projects accord with agreed criteria but include an extension of the project, approved at the end of an initial phase. Due to the limited level of funds available, such a

⁹ One project is not included in the percentage even if recorded under the 1035 Facility as it was fully funded by the Sasakawa Endowment Fund, which authorizes such disbursements.

¹⁰ From comments on the draft report of the evaluation.

decision could be perceived as affecting a proper balance in allocating funds. However, the projects are marginal and the issue of extension will be discussed in more detail under Section 3.

As mentioned, the projects identified as having questionable inclusion status are not projects that should have been refused funding. The selection criteria were properly applied, even if the projects were sometimes borderline for inclusion. It is also important to note that the majority of the projects mentioned above were implemented before the first evaluation exercise that brought further clarification on the criteria to be used for approving projects.

Conclusion:

The types of projects approved for the first five years of existence of the Facility are in line with the agreed selection criteria, apart from a very few approved cases, mainly at the beginning of the implementation of the Facility. The clarification provided as a result of the first evaluation contributed to reducing such cases. The different categories and sub-categories presented under the 1035 Facility web page of IOM website also bring useful clarification on the areas covered by the selection criteria of the Facility and on the priority given to capacity building projects, as formally agreed in the selection criteria and as requested by Member States.

2.2 Outcome, Impact and Sustainability Analysis

As mentioned under the evaluation methodology, differentiation between outcome and impact is made where appropriate. OIG did not include the element 'outcome' in the questionnaires in order to avoid confusion in the answers; reference to impact is commonly used for covering both elements. The questionnaire completed by IOM offices will be used as a main reference. The feedback received covers nearly 65 per cent of projects funded by the Facility and 58 per cent of benefiting countries. Other data complements the analysis as explained under Section 1.

Concerning the outcome and impact analysis, IOM offices consider that 71 per cent of projects surveyed attained the expected outcome and/or impact to varying degrees. In some cases, the outcome was seen as exceeding expectations (14 per cent of the positive answers), but in most cases, it was considered to be in line with expectations. Some offices confirmed that the projects achieved the expected outcome but had doubts about the longer-term impact, due to governments' lack of follow-up initiatives, changes in government structures or the low financing of follow-up initiatives developed within the 1035-funded project.

Other IOM offices considered that the longer-term impact was guaranteed (13 per cent of the positive answers) as the projects led to the creation of new governmental structures, funding of longer-term projects or signature of regional agreements. For projects focusing on training, most of the feedback referred to the outcome of the project, confirming the level of satisfaction from the governments, but could not elaborate on the impact of the training, for instance in terms of multiplying effects inside the government. The issue of the impact of training activities is discussed further in Section 3 under the selection criteria. Most of the Member States who answered the questionnaire considered that the projects had reached the expected outcome, except in one case where the government considered that the project completely failed in attaining its objective and therefore its expected impact.

Some IOM offices considered that 15 per cent of the projects surveyed did not achieve the expected outcome or impact, the main reasons being disagreements among benefiting governments on implementation of the project or on follow-up actions, or because the project was poorly designed, leading to little or no impact.

In the case of 14 per cent of the projects surveyed, IOM offices did not answer the question or said that they could not make an assessment, the main reasons being that projects were continuing; projects were co-funded and it was not possible to isolate the outcome or impact of the 1035 portion; or the IOM offices were not properly kept informed of the results or outcome of the project by the benefiting governmental entity.

It is also interesting that in a few cases (4 per cent of the total of projects surveyed), mainly for regional projects involving numerous countries, the IOM office in charge of coordinating the implementation and some benefiting governments considered that the project had had a positive impact, while other participating IOM offices and governments stated the contrary. An OIG officer encountered the same divergence of views during a field visit: a government complained of being included in a regional project without having been properly informed, saying that it would have preferred to have funding for its own project. The issue is further examined under Section 3 when examining the selection criteria for regional projects and information flow.

There is no causal relationship between stand-alone projects (38 per cent of projects surveyed), complementary projects (56 per cent) and outcome and impact.¹¹ There is no reason to give priority to one category.

The results of the IOM offices survey were less positive concerning sustainability, but still encouraging. To the question as to whether discussions or follow-up actions were or had been taking place with governments to guarantee the sustainability of the projects, 63 per cent of the projects surveyed included or were including such a dimension, but this provided no guarantee (due, for instance, to lack of funds or donor interest). Some offices stated that discussions were taking place but that the process was lengthy; in three cases, another agency took the lead in the follow-up of the projects; in other cases (12 per cent of projects surveyed) co-funding was considered a guarantee for sustainability, even if this point of view could be questioned, as sustainability mainly falls under the responsibility of benefiting governments and does not depend on donor interest.

Sustainability is not guaranteed or expected to be guaranteed in 18 per cent of the projects surveyed, but reasons were not specified, except for a few cases, e.g. government changes affecting the entity in charge of the 1035-funded project and therefore its sustainability; also, research activities or workshops were not expected to be sustained.

A 'no answer' category applied to 19 per cent of cases, mainly from IOM offices not having developed or managed the project and not knowing if sustainability was discussed between the benefiting governments. Contrary to outcome and impact,

¹¹ The 6 per cent remaining covers IOM offices not having developed/managed the project and not knowing its status.

sustainability is not necessarily a major indicator for measuring project success, even if a sign of positive achievement. Some projects may have a strong impact without being sustained, for instance research leading to the approval of new migration legislation: as soon as the government or parliament takes the decision, the project can be closed.

IOM offices and governments also took initiatives to discuss follow-up activities or project extensions, in order to build on results achieved with the 1035 projects, which shows commitment to make the best use of the Facility, however taking into account that not all projects were expected to be continued, for instance in the case of some training events. To the question of whether governments contacted IOM offices to discuss an extension or follow-up project, a positive answer was given for 37 per cent of projects surveyed, the answer was negative in 46 per cent of cases; there was no answer for 17 per cent of the projects. To the question of whether IOM offices contacted benefiting governments to propose an extension or follow-up initiative, 52 per cent of projects led to a positive outcome, 30 per cent did not result in follow-up action and 18 per cent were in the 'no answer' category.

The fact that half the projects did not generate follow-up dialogue or that sustainability was not guaranteed, or expected to be guaranteed, for nearly 20 per cent of the projects, is further discussed under Section 3 in terms of ownership of 1035-funded projects and leadership in their implementation.

The surveys also included a question on the overall impact of the Facility. Of the 35 IOM offices that answered the question, 82 per cent considered that the 1035 Facility met its objective and had a positive global impact. Only 5 per cent answered negatively and 13 per cent did not know or did not answer. The reasons given for a negative rating were mainly: a limited level of funds and therefore of action, the absence of government response and interest, and regional dispersion affecting implementation. Two out of the 12 Member States that answered the question considered that the overall impact was not measurable for lack of available information or because the 1035 had lost its initial intent. However, due to Member States' limited feedback, it is not possible to draw conclusions from the questionnaire on the effectiveness of the 1035 Facility in meeting Member States' specific expectations.

The issues of benefiting governments' interest, regional dispersion and original intent are further discussed under Section 3 under selection criteria and management guidelines. Information flow is specifically discussed under Section 2.3.

Conclusion:

Based on a relevant sample of projects examined and on the detailed feedback received from IOM offices and some benefiting Member States, the majority of projects have achieved their expected outcome and/or impact. In terms of sustainability, action taken by IOM offices or governments may be considered satisfactory. Recommendations under the selection criteria and management guidelines analysis, however, propose measures that may lead to improvements in outcome, impact and sustainability. The Facility is perceived as having a positive overall impact in line with initial expectations and original intent.

2.3 Information Flow, Seed Money and Bridging Funds

The three issues in this section's title offer additional information on the 1035 Facility's achievements in terms of outcome/impact and sustainability, as well as on the relevance of some of the selection criteria and management guidelines. The information flow discussed here does not cover reporting between the IOM Administration and Member States' Permanent Missions in Geneva,¹² as the issue was already covered by the first evaluation.

IOM offices considered that for 77 per cent of projects surveyed, they had properly and regularly informed the government of project implementation status and final outcome, in many cases highlighting close links and constructive discussions with government counterparts. The flow was not perceived as satisfactory for 7 per cent of the projects, the main reasons being: lack of information on project implementation status; lack of government interest; only partial information sharing during the life of the project, e.g. transmission of reports without further discussions, or information received only in the initial implementation stage. All benefiting Member States that completed the questionnaire confirmed having been kept properly informed by IOM.

IOM offices did not provide any information for 16 per cent of the projects surveyed; one of the main reasons given was that the person in charge of the 1035 project during implementation had left the office and records were no longer available. Some IOM offices were surprised to learn of government participation in a 1035 Facility project, or being unaware of the project's existence (5 per cent of the total projects surveyed). This is not to say, however, that the government was unaware of the 1035-funded project; the information could have been exchanged through the IOM Permanent Missions or directly through the IOM office in charge of implementation. The poor information flow highlighted here concerns only regional projects.

Regarding seed money, which may be used as an indicator for measuring the outcome and impact of some projects, IOM offices considered that 27 per cent of 1035 projects surveyed led to the funding of a new project by a donor or the benefiting government, without IOM necessarily being an implementing partner. The percentage represents an interesting level, as many projects were not designed to be seed money projects and it does not include co-funded projects, which were part of the 53 per cent of projects not having led to a new project funded by external sources. Among the projects recorded within that 53 per cent, there were also extension proposals and follow-up projects still under discussion. No answer was given for 20 per cent of the projects surveyed, mainly involving countries having participated in regional projects but without control over the development and management of new projects or extension proposals.

The questionnaires asked if follow-up activities or another project should have been funded by the 1035 Facility where it had been used as bridging funds for projects with good prospects for future funding; IOM offices considered that 53 per cent of projects surveyed could have benefited from an extension. This was especially valid

¹² Mainly through the Informal Consultations and SCBF meetings, as well as through the opening of the 1035 Facility web page.

for projects that were considered as 'pilot projects' or for strengthening results and guaranteeing sustainability. Some IOM offices considered, however, that the extension should be offered only if a stronger commitment from the benefiting government(s) in project support and implementation were guaranteed. For 14 per cent of the projects, there was no need for follow-up activities funded by the Facility; no answer was given for 33 per cent of projects covered by the questionnaire.

3. SELECTION CRITERIA AND MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

This section examines sequence and issues in the review and discussion of selection criteria and management guidelines. It analyses some points that have been highlighted under Section 2 of the report, for instance the diverging views on the impact of regional projects and commitment from benefiting Member States to project implementation and follow-up, and makes a series of recommendations on the selection criteria and management guidelines.

3.1 Review and Discussions from 2002 to 2004

At the SCBF Sessions of May 2002 and November 2002, the IOM Administration recommended that it conduct an internal evaluation of the 1035 Facility; this recommendation was supported by IOM Member States. OIG was tasked to conduct it in 2003 and the report was officially presented to Member States in September 2003, its recommendations being implemented at the beginning of 2004. In 2003, Canada decided to organize and lead a parallel process for reviewing the criteria and guidelines and invited Member States to participate.

The OIG Officer in charge of the evaluation was invited in June 2003 to join one of the first meetings organized by Canada and attended by nine Member States.¹³ During an interview under the first evaluation with the Canadian Representative as the Chair of the informal group, the OIG Officer asked him if some information, conclusions and recommendations could already be shared in order to include them in the evaluation report. The Canadian Representative informed him that discussions were at an early stage and that no definite information could be shared at that time. The report of the informal group entitled 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' was submitted to Member States in June 2004, nine months after the publication of the evaluation report.

The informal group's paper was discussed at an Informal Consultation in September 2004 at which the IOM Administration made comments. The Member States requested the Administration to submit its comments in writing and this was done on 29 September 2004 (IC/2004/9). In the discussions that followed at the informal consultations and SCBF Sessions, there was no consensus among Member States on implementing the recommendations proposed by the informal group. IOM Member States instead approved the IOM Administration's proposal to include an analysis of the selection criteria and management guidelines again in the second evaluation, as presented under Section 1 of the report. The IOM Administration also noted in its comments that some of the recommendations of the informal group were similar to the recommendations made in the first evaluation report; they are not re-examined here.¹⁴

Numerous Member States have insisted that any changes to the Facility must take into account the Facility's initial terms of reference, in order to preserve its initial intent: the Representative of the African Group recalled this point at the 88th Session of the IOM Council in December 2004. Some of the recommendations in the 'Proposals' paper, if implemented, would lead to more restrictive coverage by the

¹³ For more details, see Annex 2 of the first evaluation report.

¹⁴ In particular Recommendations 1, 3, 4, 18, 21, 28 and 32 – for further reference see IC/2004/9 'Administration's comments: Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' which properly highlights similarities.

Facility and diminish flexibility in the approval process; Member States also considered some of the recommendations as micro-management on their part. Some Member States referred to the recommendations of the informal group in their reply to the questionnaire; answers to the questionnaire also contained new proposals.

The recommendations of the informal group's paper covered all aspects of the selection criteria and management guidelines presented in the official reports of the IOM Administration to the SCBF, for instance in document SCBF/277 of 18 April 2005. Part I of the questionnaire to Member States was developed using the same sections as the SCBF reports, also used as a reference for the analysis. The evaluation conducted its analysis taking into account the initial intent of the Facility, the conclusions and recommendations of the first evaluation, the proposals made by the informal group, the comments from the IOM Administration, the views expressed by Member States at the governing bodies meetings and in the questionnaire, and the results of the impact and sustainability analysis of Section 2.

3.2 Selection Criteria and Management Guidelines

3.2.1 Eligibility and Regional Balance

Answering the question of whether Member States agreed with the present procedure of endorsement by a minimum of two eligible and benefiting Member States for submission of a regional project, 91 per cent of the respondents agreed with the procedure and 9 per cent disagreed. All agreed that the majority of beneficiaries in a regional project should be eligible Member States. One of the main reasons for disagreement was the low number of eligible Member States needed for project endorsement. However, requiring a larger number could be counter-productive, as it might imply that all countries should agree to the project proposal: this, as pointed out by a Member State, could render the agreement on the content of the project more difficult and the approval process cumbersome.

Regional projects with a small group of Member States are easy to organize and implement, the information flow is more effective and follow-up actions by IOM offices and governments are facilitated. Strong commitment from most or all benefiting Member States to guarantee success is less necessary before approval and two eligible Member States may encourage active participation from the other benefiting countries. The two Member States endorsing the project can act as the sponsors or leaders of the initiative and actively promote the project among their counterparts in the region.

However, with some broad regional projects there is a need to address the weaknesses identified under Section 2, for example the low interest or sense of ownership of some benefiting Member States participating. For regional projects with more than 10 countries for instance, the 1035 Facility Management could ask for additional commitments from eligible Member States participating in the project and demand that the project developer include more information on expected impact, follow-up actions by all participants and sustainability when applicable. The endorsement from more than two eligible Member States might be required by the 1035 Facility

Manager if effectiveness did not seem guaranteed, without necessarily fixing a number. The need for a more pro-active role of the governments, with some of them playing the role of sponsors or leaders for more effective follow-up and better information flow between governments themselves, between IOM offices, and between IOM offices and governments could be addressed by strengthening the approval procedures as proposed above.

On the question of equitable regional balance, 95 per cent of the respondents agreed to allocate funds based on the number of eligible Member States in each of the four main regions. The 1035 Facility Management had already taken action on the request from African Member States to provide more information on the projects specific to Africa and the Middle East. A Member State answering the questionnaire suggested allocating funds according to the overall assistance/funding received by a region from the international community, on the basis that some regions received less attention than others. However, to enter into such calculations could become very problematic and it is not sure that an equitable balance would be respected.

Recommendation:

The criterion of a minimum of two eligible Member States formally endorsing regional projects for submission to the Facility should not be changed. However, for broad regional projects and if deemed necessary, the 1035 Facility Management could ask for additional commitments and letters of support from eligible Member States participating in the projects, and demand that the project developer include more information on the expected outcome/impact, a plan for follow-up actions by all participants and sustainability when applicable. The measure could also be applied to smaller regional projects at the discretion of the 1035 Facility Management, especially if effectiveness and expected impact as presented in the project proposal were uncertain.

Benefiting Member States endorsing the project could also act as leaders in the implementation of the regional projects for encouraging commitment, sense of ownership and participation from other participating Member States.

3.2.2 Project Types

Seventy-seven per cent of respondents considered that the selection criteria for capacity building projects were sufficiently precise, while 23 per cent did not. Most of the comments asked for more details on the types of project, a request now met through the introduction of the 1035 Facility web page on IOM's website and publication of a 1035 brochure. As highlighted under Section 2, different categories have been established, matching the definitions of technical cooperation presented in IOM's official Programme and Budget document. It is also possible to note if priority is given to capacity building projects, as percentages of funded projects are recorded.

Several recommendations were made in the 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' section encouraging the implementation of training activities in various fields, including equipment purchase. Training is certainly an effective capacity building tool and 1035 Facility Management does not exclude it (nine per cent of projects funded), but training activities also have limitations,

for instance the capacity to use what has been learned in the daily tasks or the multiplying effects of the training. Limiting the funding to training activities could become counter-productive, but training coupled with research activities, feasibility studies, establishment of migration control mechanisms, development of policies and legislation, and follow-up to seminars can be very effective in capacity building.

One proposal made in two recommendations asking IOM to develop a strategy for assisting eligible Member States in developing training activities is worth considering and could be applied to both training and capacity building in general. It is, however, important to take into account that the Facility was established to meet the needs of eligible Member States and formalizing a strategy would certainly reduce the capacity of the Member States to present their choice and to meet identified needs. The 1035 Facility Management could however propose fields of activity to the Member States that merit attention, according to IOM's priorities and existing programmes.

A Member State underlined the comment made in the informal group's paper that "while capacity building assistance is a valuable tool to assist a state, in the end a state's ability to manage migration effectively will be dependent upon it being able to finance the operational needs of administering any given policy". The statement is certainly valid and it is why the 1035 Facility is not an end in itself, but was established to help governments to develop migration projects and initiatives that could then be submitted to donors for funding, or funded through their own resources; it is, however, clear that the commitment from benefiting governments to project implementation and follow-up activities is essential to the successful achievement of migration management capacity. They can also play a key role in mobilizing donor funding for follow-up activities.

Responding to the first question related to the exclusion criteria, 95 per cent of respondents considered them relevant and well defined and only 5 per cent felt that they were not. Two Member States suggested revising the exclusion criteria from time to time, but did not make specific proposals; this may be discussed at the SCBF Sessions if there is a clearly justified need. Another Member State asked for clarification on 'Movement'. In previous official papers it was clearly stated that resettlement programmes are not covered by the Facility. It could be appropriate to remind it and to add that assisted return projects should not be funded if only covering movement operations, without a strong capacity building component.

Regarding the second question on exclusion criteria, 77 per cent considered that no further activities should be excluded and 23 per cent thought that other fields of activity should be excluded, for instance counter-trafficking or projects considered as being a state's continuing operational activities. Member States again raised objections in the questionnaire to having the Facility fund projects related to conferences or similar events and considered that no exception should be made, even for launching new regional processes. A justification given by the informal group is that "the multilateral system currently expends large amounts of funds on conferences that take

place at the regional and multi-lateral level each year. We do not believe that the limited funding available in the 1035 Facility could make any significant additional contribution in this regard". The position of the 1035 Facility Management regarding the statement has been highlighted under Section 2.1.

It is true that some regions have sufficient resources for organizing regional processes such as the Puebla Process in North and Central America or the Bali Process, but other regions do not necessarily receive adequate support. The few events conducted with 1035 Facility support, e.g. the 5+5 Dialogue, the South American Conference and the MIDA Workshop, contrary to the informal group's perception, produced positive results, even with limited resources, and some had significant impact.

In addition, the number of 1035 projects funding such events was limited and most of them were co-funded by donors; the 1035-funded projects helped to mobilize those funds. Such events require a strong commitment from Member States to be successful but the concern can be addressed before approving the project, through implementation of the recommendation proposed above for approval of broad regional projects. It is also important to note that the 1035 Facility now tends to focus on follow-up action and implementation of priorities established and agreed during conferences or follow-up technical meetings. The criterion should not be changed, but more attention could be paid to further co-funding opportunities and potential outcome.

Another recurring discussion is the exclusion of eligible Member States falling under the provision of Article 4 of the Constitution. The point of view expressed in the first evaluation remains valid: a measure should not be taken within the evaluation of the 1035 Facility but should rather be part of the overall debate on measures to address arrears. It is reasonable to include the 1035 Facility in the debate, but not to use the exclusion of eligibility to its funds as the sole alternative measure to the application of Article 4. Also, before taking such a decision, it would be appropriate to analyse the implications and effects in more detail.¹⁵

Concerning 'Emergency', clarification should be brought to projects in the 'post-emergency' category, to avoid confusion. 'Post-emergency' is by definition no longer 'emergency', but the 1035 Facility Management should guarantee that the situation is sufficiently stable before funding projects in such situations. Exclusion of post-emergency projects could be counter-productive, as the need to assist governments in developing migration

¹⁵ For instance, the exclusion from regional projects of eligible countries falling under Article 4 can negatively impact project effectiveness and a country's non-participation could affect the benefits of neighbouring eligible countries paying their dues. Using the same broadly accepted logic, non-Member States may participate in regional projects, thus it would be illogical to penalize Member States falling under Article 4. If an exclusion measure is agreed upon, it should be for national projects only. However, some 1035 national projects can also directly or indirectly benefit other Member States, for example in the implementation of assisted returns from a given country to countries not paying their dues. Instead of completely excluding the eligible Member States from the Facility, partial restrictions could therefore be discussed: for example, the projects submitted could be held pending until the end of the year and approved only if sufficient funds remained.

management projects is high, both in managing large population movements and in defining future migration policies strongly affected by the emergency situation, especially following a conflict.

Conclusion:

The request for more information on the types of projects funded by the Facility has been met through the opening of the 1035 Facility web page and publication of the 1035 Facility brochure, in addition to formal reporting to the SCBF. Such initiatives must be continued, as they clarify the approval process and types of project funded. The evaluation does not consider it appropriate to use 1035 funding to establish strategies or action plans for training activities or capacity building projects, unless specifically requested by an eligible Member State. The Facility has been established to meet the needs of eligible Member States and they are best placed to define and frame their needs. The 1035 Facility Management can, however, discuss fields of activity that deserve to be addressed with eligible Member States, also in accordance with IOM priorities.

Recommendation:

The 1035 Facility Management should clarify the 'Movement' and 'Emergency' exclusion criteria, for example specifying what could be excluded in post-emergency situations. It is not recommended to change the criterion 'Conferences and Similar Events', but the 1035 Facility Management may apply the recommendation made in this evaluation for endorsing broad regional projects. Exclusion of eligible Member States falling under the provision of Article 4 from access to 1035 funding is a decision for the membership as a whole, taking into consideration the overall debate on measures to address arrears.

3.2.3 Funding Levels

On the question as to whether Member States agreed with the established funding levels, 86 per cent of the respondents agreed with the existing levels and 14 per cent disagreed. Some Member States underlined the limited funding and the need for establishing priorities or ceilings, mainly at two levels: on a proper regional and country equitable balance and on the types of projects, focused mainly on capacity building. This is, however, already the case. The regional balance is properly respected and the 1035 Facility Management pays attention to equitable distribution for both national and regional projects; priority for capacity building is part of the selection criteria and the percentage allocated to such projects since the creation of the Facility confirms adherence to the criterion.

Concerning the establishment of ceilings, one country recognized the limited funding level of the Facility and suggested changing ceilings if the amount available for the 1035 Facility increased. Unfortunately, Member States have not responded positively to the question asking if they were ready to allocate additional funds to the Facility. Another country suggested increasing the limit for national projects, as the amount was low and insufficient for meeting the numerous demands and achieving effective results. Existing criteria allow the limit to be increased to USD 100,000 in exceptional cases. The 1035 Facility should also continue to be used to generate further interest and attract funds from other sources, as it has done for many projects since its creation. A valid alternative to changing the limit would be a more pro-active role of

benefiting Member States in co-funding the project and advocating to donors for funding to build on the results achieved by the 1035 projects.

Regarding the question of establishing ceilings for funding received by an eligible Member State, 68 per cent considered this unnecessary, 27 per cent felt that it was and 5 per cent had no opinion. A recommendation made in the 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' suggested fixing a limit of USD 350,000 for a country over five years, with a maximum of USD 150,000 during any year. One country proposed two projects for a maximum of USD 100,000. Those levels have never in fact been reached: the maximum allocated to one country over five years has been USD 310,000, including regional projects initiated by the country.

Careful management easily prevents abuse, as shown in practice, and no special measures should be added for the time being. In order to assist eligible Member States lacking an IOM presence in their country to develop projects, the 1035 Facility Management specifies in the 1035 Facility web page how it intends to remove obstacles in the application process for countries with limited capacities: "It is acceptable, but not necessary, for an eligible Member State to create the project documentation for consideration. Representatives from the eligible Member States can discuss with, or otherwise relay their areas of interest to, the nearest IOM Mission or office or to IOM headquarters. The relevant IOM unit will then be tasked to work with the government to shape and finalize the documentation and project design. IOM takes these steps to ensure that eligible Member States access to the Facility is not constrained or limited by their capacity to create project documentation". Other eligible or non-eligible Member States can also help those countries in developing projects, as suggested by a Member State in the questionnaire.

One country suggested dividing the overall allocation of funds into four periods per year for better administration of the equitable distribution (a maximum of one project per country per quarter). This could be problematic, for instance if a region encountered delays in submitting projects: almost no projects were presented by eligible African Member States in the first six months of 2004. Again, sound management of funds allocation and country-by-country follow-up, as is the case now, is the best option.

There were no major objections to reallocating unspent funds to the Facility, as is done currently, or to respecting the deadlines for project implementation. Due to limited resources, it is not appropriate to freeze funds for years if a government is not ready to implement the project. In such a case, the 1035 Facility Management may take action, informing the eligible Member State(s) accordingly. The informal group proposes a twelve-month implementation deadline as soon as the project is approved, which could be a good time frame. However it also proposes a six-month period for completion. There is no major reason for this, as project duration can be for a year, as with most of IOM projects.

Conclusion:

There is no need for the time being to establish new ceilings or further priorities in allocating funds. Sound management for equitable distribution is the best option, especially as it has proved effective during the first five years of implementation of the Facility. Attention is paid to eligible Member States lacking IOM presence in the country, for assessing their needs in terms of national projects and not only regional projects.

Recommendation:

Benefiting Member States should play a more pro-active role in attracting new funds and building on the results of 1035-funded projects, to support the Facility's limited resources and ceilings. A stronger commitment from donor Member States to fund follow-up activities and co-fund 1035 projects would also help maximize the use of the limited resources available.

3.2.4 Application Procedures

Ninety-five per cent of the Member State respondents agreed with the present guidelines for the submission of project proposals, while 5 per cent disagreed. To the question of the appropriateness of the procedures in place for the project approval by IOM and related reporting requirements as per IOM procedures, 91 per cent answered positively and 9 per cent disagreed. The percentages corresponded again to the findings of the first evaluation report.

One disagreement with the present guidelines related to the need to establish a deadline for project submission, as also proposed in the informal group paper. The rationale is that approving projects throughout the year and the absence of deadlines permits only a limited ability to evaluate one project against another. However, the hypothesis is not validated when analysing the existing process over the five years' implementation of the Facility and only a few problems emerged at the end of some years when all funds had already been allocated. In such cases, the project proposals submitted and approved were transferred the following year for funding. Establishing deadlines will not improve the feasibility analysis of each project taken individually.

There are also informal deadlines for reviewing the project submission and approval process, for example the SCBF sessions. The example mentioned before, of the low level of projects submitted by eligible African Member States during the first six months and the invitation sent by the 1035 Facility Manager for proposals, shows that flexibility is not an obstacle to proper evaluation of the equitable distribution of projects, and that reporting to the SCBF is a good opportunity to discuss funding levels and equitable distribution. Clearly, if the number of unfunded project proposals is increasing sharply at the end of each year, constraining deadlines could be a solution for eliminating some projects submitted after the deadlines. A mixed approach, establishing deadlines for the majority of the funds of the Facility but keeping a portion of funds for responding to urgent needs or for addressing inequities throughout the year, is another option.

Responding to the questionnaire some Member States referred to the recommendations in the 'Proposals for Re-structuring the 1035 Facility' that focus on the establishment of formal focal points for project submission and approval and of a project approval board. The main concerns behind the proposals are addressed in the current evaluation, calling for instance for a stronger commitment and follow-up and better information flow between eligible and benefiting Member States.

Establishing formal focal points, as presented in the informal group's paper, is not a practical suggestion. Migration projects funded by the Facility are not located in one ministry alone: the ministries of foreign affairs, justice, the interior, nationals abroad, health, etc., may be involved and benefit from 1035 Facility-funded projects. Nomination of focal points in the IOM Permanent Missions in Geneva is not necessarily a solution, as most projects are developed in the field. The lack of human resources in some of the Permanent Missions and their workload is another obstacle, as pointed out by some Member States on various occasions, not only concerning the 1035 Facility.

Close follow-up from IOM Missions and the 1035 Facility Management, and discussions with benefiting governments and ministries certainly remain better options in the case of lack of commitment. Flexibility and effectiveness would no longer be guaranteed if the focal point mechanisms as proposed by the informal group, were established for project submission and approval. The 1035 Facility Management suggests, however, that Member States designate a focal point for the implementation of each project approved, a measure guaranteeing that the government is fully involved and that the project has an operational location within the government.

The appointment of a project approval board could be a valid proposal for managing important funds, but becomes questionable for an amount of USD 1.4 million per year that already possesses control mechanisms for its management. Apart from the small amount of funds in the Facility, it is uncertain that all Member States invited to participate in such an approval board would have sufficient time and resources to dedicate to project analysis. It would be unfair to name only Member States with adequate resources for meeting such responsibilities; many of them would not be eligible Member States.

Before implementing an approval board, Member States would also have to establish and agree on clear rules and regulations detailing how the board would function in order to avoid, for example, political issues becoming involved in the approval process. If the approval board did not function properly, it could negatively impact the Facility's effectiveness. Many Member States also pointed out that they considered the measure as micro-management of the 1035 Facility. There was also the hypothesis related to the approval board of submitting all projects together, which does not seem realistic and which acts against flexibility and the initial intent for responding to emerging needs.

Additional controls, if really needed, could still be introduced through other means, e.g. more regular performance audits or financial audits; more detailed reporting to Member States, in particular on the implementation status of the projects or on follow-up by countries supporting the initiatives; yearly reporting on lessons learned, best practices or implementation difficulties as proposed by one Member State.

Eighty-two per cent of respondents stated they were satisfied with reporting requirements, 9 per cent were not and 9 per cent did not express a clear opinion. The problem of information flow was the main reason mentioned for a negative rating and has already been addressed. Ninety-five per cent of respondents were satisfied with measures taken by the IOM Administration to evaluate the Facility; 5 per cent did not give an opinion.

Conclusions:

Proposals made by some Member States and the informal group met some concerns also raised in the evaluation, but the mechanisms proposed by them (formal deadlines, focal points, project approval board) are heavy, there are potential problems for their formal functioning and their effectiveness is not guaranteed. Focus on stronger commitment and ownership from benefiting Member States during project implementation and for follow-up action and on better information flow between benefiting Member States seem valid alternatives. Existing controls and reporting are effective but could still be improved, if needed.

Recommendation:

The 1035 Facility Management should take note of the concerns expressed by Member States in their requests for stronger control and transparency of the approval process, even if the evaluation clearly shows, in line with the views of several Member States, that current systems are effective and sufficiently transparent. Regular audits of the approval process, reporting on implementation status and follow-up, and on lessons learned and best practices could be considered.

4. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

- 4.1.1 *The types of projects approved for the first five years of existence of the Facility are in line with the agreed selection criteria, apart from a very few approved cases, mainly at the beginning of the implementation of the Facility. The clarifications provided as a result of the first evaluation contributed to reducing such cases. The different categories and sub-categories presented under the 1035 Facility web page of IOM website also bring useful clarification on the areas covered by the selection criteria of the Facility and on the priority given to capacity building projects, as formally agreed in the selection criteria and as requested by Member States.*
- 4.1.2 *Based on a relevant sample of projects examined and on the detailed feedback received from IOM offices and some benefiting Member States, the majority of projects have achieved their expected outcome and/or impact. In terms of sustainability, action taken by IOM offices or governments may be considered satisfactory. Recommendations under the selection criteria and management guidelines analysis, however, propose measures that may lead to improvements in outcome, impact and sustainability. The Facility is perceived as having a positive overall impact in line with initial expectations and original intent.*
- 4.1.3 *The request for more information on the types of projects funded by the Facility has been met through the opening of the 1035 Facility web page and publication of the 1035 Facility brochure, in addition to formal reporting to the SCBF. Such initiatives must be continued, as they clarify the approval process and types of project funded. The evaluation does not consider it appropriate to use 1035 funding to establish strategies or action plans for training activities or capacity building projects, unless specifically requested by an eligible Member State. The Facility has been established to meet the needs of eligible Member States and they are best placed to define and frame their needs. The 1035 Facility Management can, however, discuss fields of activity that deserve to be addressed with eligible Member States, also in accordance with IOM priorities*
- 4.1.4 *There is no need for the time being to establish new ceilings or further priorities in allocating funds. Sound management for equitable distribution is the best option, especially as it has proved effective during the first five years of implementation of the Facility. Attention is paid to eligible Member States lacking IOM presence in the country, for assessing their needs in terms of national projects and not only regional projects.*
- 4.1.5 *Proposals made by some Member States and the informal group met some concerns also raised in the evaluation, but the mechanisms proposed by them (formal deadlines, focal points, project approval board) are heavy, there are potential problems for their formal functioning and their effectiveness is not guaranteed. Focus on stronger commitment and ownership from benefiting Member States during project implementation and for follow-up action and on better information flow between benefiting*

Member States seem valid alternatives. Existing controls and reporting are effective but could still be improved, if needed.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 The criterion of a minimum of two eligible Member States formally endorsing regional projects for submission to the Facility should not be changed. However, for broad regional projects and if deemed necessary, the 1035 Facility Management could ask for additional commitments and letters of support from eligible Member States participating in the projects, and demand that the project developer include more information on the expected outcome/impact, a plan for follow-up action by all participants and sustainability when applicable. The measure could also be applied to smaller regional projects at the discretion of the 1035 Facility Management, especially if effectiveness and expected impact as presented in the project proposal were uncertain.

Benefiting Member States endorsing the project could also act as leaders in the implementation of the regional projects for encouraging commitment, sense of ownership and participation from other participating Member States.

4.2.2 The 1035 Facility Management should clarify the 'Movement' and 'Emergency' exclusion criteria, for example specifying what could be excluded in post-emergency situations. It is not recommended to change the criterion 'Conferences and Similar Events', but the 1035 Facility Management may apply the recommendation made in this evaluation for endorsing broad regional projects. Exclusion of eligible Member States falling under the provision of Article 4 from access to 1035 funding is a decision for the membership as a whole, taking into consideration the overall debate on measures to address arrears.

4.2.3 Benefiting Member States should play a more pro-active role in attracting new funds and building on the results of 1035-funded projects, to support the Facility's limited resources and ceilings. A stronger commitment from donor Member States to fund follow-up activities and co-fund 1035 projects would also help maximize the use of the limited resources available.

4.2.4 The 1035 Facility Management should take note of the concerns expressed by Member States in their requests for stronger control and transparency of the approval process, even if the evaluation clearly shows, in line with the views of several Member States, that current systems are effective and sufficiently transparent. Regular audits of the approval process, reporting on implementation status and follow-up and on lessons learned and best practices could be considered.



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

**INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS ON
BUDGETARY AND FINANCIAL ISSUES
29 April 2005**

IC/2005/2
RESTRICTED

English only
18 April 2005

**SECOND EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

**SECOND EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND

Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX) 5th paragraph, adopted at IOM's 432nd meeting on 29 November 2000, requested *'the Director General to allocate one million United States dollars from the Discretionary Income for the development of migration projects in favour of developing Member States and Member States in transition, on the basis of an equitable regional distribution, without prejudice to funds already allocated for these purposes'*. A total of USD 1,430,000 was allocated for the Facility in 2001. In 2002 the final allocation was lower at USD 1,380,000, but was again increased to USD 1,430,000 in 2003. In 2004, USD 1,427,400 was allocated and in 2005 the level was increased to USD 1,435,000.

The criteria and guidelines established by IOM's Administration to facilitate and streamline allocation of these funds were outlined in document MC/EX/631, on which Member States were invited to comment. In June 2001, the criteria were completed to take into account additional suggestions made by Member States. In 2003, IOM's Administration, in agreement with its Member States, requested the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to conduct an evaluation of the Facility.

The evaluation exercise was completed in September 2003, endorsed by the Director General, and the report formally presented at the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance (SCBF) in October 2003. The new criteria and guidelines for utilizing the funds, derived from the evaluation, were implemented in 2004. The new guidelines were presented to the Member States at the 91st Session of the SCBF in document SCBF/265 of March 2004. The evaluation also recommended the implementation of a follow-up evaluation in 2005, focusing on impact analysis.

In 2003, a group of Member States led by Canada also started informal discussions on the Facility, in parallel with the evaluation process. The resulting document 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' was made available in June 2004 and was discussed at the informal consultation of 15 September 2004. The Administration was invited to share its comments further in writing with all Member States and document IC/2004/9 'Administration's Comments: Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' was distributed on 29 September 2004. In this document the Administration suggested that the second OIG evaluation of the Facility, already scheduled for 2005, be used as an opportunity to review any relevant issues raised in the 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility' document.

Following discussions, the SCBF decided at its 92nd session of November 2004 that all relevant issues should be examined within the framework of the second evaluation of the 1035 Facility, in 2005.

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Based on the SCBF's decision of November 2004, the evaluation will be conducted by the Evaluation Unit of the Office of the Inspector General. In addition to the impact analysis already planned, the evaluation will again examine the criteria and guidelines that continue to raise questions and cause disagreements. The overall objective of the evaluation is:

To evaluate the performance and achievements of projects implemented within the framework of the Facility, with a major focus on their impact and sustainability. Conclusions will also be drawn on the Facility's overall impact. In addition, the evaluation will address issues related to criteria and guidelines, taking into account the Facility's terms of reference and its original intent.

More specifically, the evaluation will investigate, analyse and present recommendations in the following areas:

- *The performance and achievements of funded projects in particular their impact and sustainability, in line with the Facility's objectives;*
- *The criteria and management guidelines and procedures;*
- *The effectiveness of the Facility in achieving its overall goals and meeting IOM Member States' expectations;*

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The impact analysis will require surveys from which both the impact of specific projects and the overall impact of the Facility can be assessed. One survey will be sent to IOM Missions having implemented projects and another to governments having benefited from the Facility. Cross-checking analysis will be made through a document review, in particular activity reports, and through specific interviews.

It will be essential to receive feedback from Governments to measure the impact properly. Sufficient time will be given to complete the questionnaire and forward it to the Office of the Inspector General. Confidentiality will be guaranteed. More detailed information on the surveys and interviews will be shared at a later stage. The impact review will focus primarily on the more recent projects, completed in the last two years, where impact will be easier to relate to the specific outcomes from the Facility project.

Relevant documentation to be reviewed will include the list of projects, activity and project performance reports, financial data, correspondence with Member States and IOM field offices, specific agreements and/or sub-agreements signed

within the framework of selected projects, follow-up projects and any other documentation relevant to the exercise. These documents will be provided primarily through the 1035 Facility management at Headquarters, relevant IOM field offices and the Project Tracking Unit.

Concerning the second aspect of the evaluation on the re-examination of the criteria and guidelines, another questionnaire will be sent to all Member States. **In order to draw conclusions based on a consensus, it is essential to have the broad participation of Member States in the exercise.** Sufficient time will also be given to Member States to complete the questionnaire and return it to the Office of the Inspector General. Confidentiality will be guaranteed. Interviews will also be conducted to complement the data and opportunities provided for specific Member States or regional groupings of Member States to meet the Evaluator.

4. RESOURCES AND TIMING

The Evaluation Officer of the Office of the Inspector General will conduct the evaluation. Costs for the evaluation will be borne by OIG.

Reports on the status of the evaluation exercise and on the preliminary and final results will be presented under special agenda items of either or both informal consultations and SCBF meetings in 2005 (and 2006 if necessary).

The Terms of Reference will be presented to Member States in early 2005, at the first informal consultation on budgetary and financial issues. It is anticipated that the questionnaires for the various surveys will be sent to Member States in April/May 2005, with a timeframe of three months to complete them. Interviews with Member States, or groupings of Member States, will take place immediately after the Evaluator's initial review of the questionnaire input, in May and June.

A final report should be available by the end of September 2005, to be discussed at the Autumn Session of the SCBF.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO IOM OFFICES

The following offices answered the questionnaire:

1) Missions with Regional Functions:

(The eligible countries in which 1035 projects were implemented but that were covered by the MRF's questionnaire are mentioned in parenthesis)

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| - Argentina | - Bangladesh |
| (Chile) | - Philippines |
| (Paraguay) | - Thailand |
| - Costa Rica | |
| - Peru | - Hungary* |
| - Egypt | |
| (Yemen) | |
| - Kenya | |
| - Senegal | |
| (Benin) | |
| (Burkina Faso) | |
| (Cape Verde) | |
| (Côte d'Ivoire) | |
| (Gambia) | |
| (Liberia) | |
| (Mali) | |
| (Niger) | |
| (Nigeria) | |

2) IOM Field Offices:

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| - Bolivia | - Albania |
| - Ecuador | - Azerbaijan |
| - Guatemala | - Bulgaria |
| - Honduras | - Croatia |
| - Uruguay | - Czech Republic* |
| | - Lithuania* |
| - Algeria | - Poland* |
| - Guinea | - Republic of Moldova |
| - Guinea-Bissau | - Ukraine |
| - Morocco | |
| - Tunisia | |
| - Uganda | |
| - Zambia | |
| - Zimbabwe | |
| | * (ineligible as of 2004) |
| - Cambodia | |
| - Kazakhstan | |

SECOND EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO IOM FIELD MISSIONS

In 2004, various debates took place with IOM Member States on the 1035 Facility that led to the decision to conduct a second evaluation of the Facility in 2005. The Member States agreed with the IOM Administration's proposal to focus on the impact and sustainability of the 1035 funded projects, as well as on an analysis of the overall impact and outcome of the Facility, but they again requested the inclusion of an analysis of the criteria and guidelines.

The questionnaire to IOM Missions will however not cover the criteria and guidelines, as the input from IOM Missions was already requested in the first evaluation conducted in 2003. It is now for IOM Member States to reach a final consensus on the criteria and guidelines and a questionnaire was sent to them along these lines. As in 2003, OIG is tasked to conduct the evaluation exercise.

The 1035 Facility is a financial tool of great importance to IOM and the second evaluation could give a new impetus to the Facility, in particular for increasing the overall amount allocated through voluntary contributions. **Participation from IOM Missions having benefited or benefiting from 1035 funded projects will therefore be essential in the evaluation of the Facility's impact and sustainability.**

If your mission is benefiting or has benefited from a project or projects funded by the 1035 Facility, please complete the following information on the projects and answer the questionnaire, which should be completed and returned **before 6 July 2005** to the following address: cfranzetti@iom.int

. As usual, confidentiality will be guaranteed.

The 1035 Facility Manager sent recently a list of approved projects for each country by mail. If not yet received, the list can be requested to the 1035 Facility Manager at the following address: 1035Facility@iom.int

I thank you in advance for your contribution.

Christophe Franzetti
IOM Evaluation Officer
Office of the Inspector General
Geneva

Projects funded by the 1035 Facility in your country, including regional projects:

1) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

2) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

3) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

4) *Title:*
Date of implementation:
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

5) *Title:*
Date of implementation:
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

6), etc.

1. Did the project(s) complement another activity/project or was it (were they) a stand-alone intervention (please provide details very briefly in the box)?

	<u>Complement</u>	<u>Stand alone</u>
Project 1		
Project 2		
Project 3		
Project 4		
Project 5		
Etc.		

Other comments if any:

2. Did you properly and regularly inform the Government(s) of the implementation status of the project(s) and final outcome?

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Project 1			
Project 2			
Project 3			
Project 4			
Project 5			
Etc.			

Other comments if any:

3. Did the Government contact your Office for discussing an extension or follow-up project to consolidate impact?

YES

NO

If yes, briefly explain the outcome (please specify the projects if more than one):

4. Did you propose an extension or follow-up project to the Government(s)?

YES **NO**

If yes, briefly explain the outcome (please specify the projects if more than one):

5. Reference to the ‘seed money concept’, did the Government or a donor fund follow-up activities or a new project at the end of the 1035 Facility funded project(s)? (For on-going projects, is the Government or a donor already committed to fund follow-up activities or a new project?)

YES **NO**

If yes, for which project(s) and which activities:

6. According to your own evaluation of the project(s), has it (have they) had its (their) expected impact and are you satisfied with the overall outcome of the project(s)?

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Project 1			
Project 2			
Project 3			
Project 4			
Project 5			
Etc.			

Other comments if any:

7. Did you discuss/are you discussing with the Government(s) (or/and other agencies/donors) a follow-up project or other mechanisms in order to guarantee the sustainability of the project(s) funded by the 1035?

YES **NO**

If yes, please specify which projects (if more than one):

If no, why (please specify for all projects if more than one):

Were/are the discussions successful? Yes No

If not successful, briefly explain why:

8. Do you think that follow-up activities or new projects should have been/should be funded by the Facility?

YES NO

Please explain (specify the projects if more than one):

9. Based on your own experience, do you consider that the 1035 Facility meets its objective and has a positive global outcome?

YES NO

Please comment:

QUESTIONNAIRE TO IOM MEMBER STATES**1) Eligible (including formerly eligible) Member States having completed the questionnaire:**

- Algeria
- Burkina Faso
- Colombia
- Hungary
- Kenya
- Morocco
- Peru
- Slovenia
- Uganda
- Bulgaria
- Cambodia
- El Salvador
- Kazakhstan
- Mexico
- Panama
- Republic of Moldova
- Thailand

NB: Jamaica called the Office of the Inspector General to state that it did not complete the questionnaire as the country had only applied for IOM Membership in June 2005.

2) Member States having completed Part I only:

- Australia
- Denmark
- Germany
- Japan
- Netherlands
- Switzerland

**SECOND EVALUATION OF THE 1035 FACILITY:
SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION**

QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEMBER STATES

The questionnaire is divided in two parts:

Part I covers the second review of the 1035 Facility's criteria and guidelines, including the management of the 1035 Facility. The review draws upon various informal consultations in 2004 and reports.¹⁶ Document **SCBF/277 of 18 April 2005** (which includes the up to date 1035 Facility's criteria and guidelines) will be used as reference, using the same headings.

The first Evaluation report analyzing also the criteria and guidelines can be consulted in the three official languages from the IOM Evaluation web page:¹⁷
http://www.iom.int/en/who/main_structures_evaluation.shtml#internal

As mentioned in the evaluation's terms of reference (Document IC/2005/02), **it is essential to have the broadest participation of Member States in the exercise, in order to draw conclusions on the criteria and management guidelines, based on a consensus.**

Part II will mainly cover the analysis of the impact and sustainability of the projects funded by the 1035 Facility and the overall impact and outcome of the Facility based on its original objective. Part II should be completed by Member States having benefited from 1035 Facility's project(s), including regional projects. Similarly to Part I, **the participation of Member States by answering the questionnaire is a key element for measuring the impact and outcome.** Other methodological tools will be used to complement the answers received.

Queries regarding the questionnaire can be sent to the IOM Evaluation Officer, Christophe Franzetti, at the following e-mail address cfranzetti@iom.int or to Evaluation/Office of the Inspector General: eva@iom.int. The questionnaire should be completed and returned before **31 July 2005** at the same address, or by fax at the following number: (41) 22 798 61 50.

Confidentiality will be guaranteed. Thank you in advance for your contribution.

Office of the Inspector General
IOM Headquarters, Geneva

¹⁶ See in particular 'Informal Consultations - 15th September 2004': Reports 'Proposals to Restructure the 1035 Facility' submitted by an informal group of Member States and 'Administration's Comments: Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility'. Both documents are available under the IOM web site – Informal Consultations – 15 September 2004:
http://www.iom.int/en/who/main_informal_consultations.shtml.

¹⁷ The report on the follow-up of the recommendations is published as document SCBF/265, 91st Session of the SCBF – 4-5 May 2004.

PART I: SELECTION CRITERIA AND MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES**Eligibility and Regional Balance:**

1. Do you agree with the existing procedures for submission of regional projects, which require project endorsement by a minimum of two eligible and benefiting Member States?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

2. Do you agree with the management guideline requiring the funds to be allocated according to an 'equitable regional balance' based on the number of eligible Member States in each of the four main regions (Africa and Middle East, Asia and Oceania, Americas, Europe)?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

Types of Projects:

3. Do you consider that the description of selection criteria for capacity building projects is precise enough?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

4. Do you think that the exclusion criteria are relevant and well defined?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

5. **Do you think that other fields of activity should be added as excluded from consideration for support from the Facility?**

YES

NO

If yes, which?

Funding Levels:

6. **Do you agree with the maximum funding levels for projects submitted, including the possibility for exceptional approval of higher funding levels for a national project?**

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

7. **Do you consider it necessary to establish a limit to funding received by an eligible Member States over a given period of time?**

YES

NO

If yes, please provide details:

Application Procedures:

8. **Do you agree with the present guidelines for the submission of proposals by eligible Member States?**

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

9. **Do you find the procedures in place for approval of projects by IOM and related formal reporting requirements as per IOM procedures appropriate?**

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

SCBF Reporting and Evaluation:

10. Are you satisfied with the reports submitted by the IOM Administration to the SCBF, taking into account the recent publication of the 1035 Facility brochure and the establishment of a 1035 Facility web page for regular and updated information flow?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

11. Are you satisfied with the initiatives taken by the IOM Administration to evaluate the 1035 Facility?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

Miscellaneous:

12. Do you agree with the general policy of reallocation of unspent funds from completed projects to the Facility?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

13. Are you ready to allocate a voluntary contribution to the 1035 Facility in addition to the amount allocated from the IOM Discretionary Income?

YES

NO

If no, please explain:

PART II: IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

If your country is benefiting or has benefited from a project or projects funded by the 1035 Facility, please provide the following information and answer the questionnaire.

If necessary, lists of approved projects for a given country can be requested to the Evaluation Office at the following e-mail address cfranzetti@iom.int, or directly to the Manager of the 1035 Facility at the following address: 1035Facility@iom.int.

1) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

2) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

3) *Title:*
Date of implementation :
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

4) *Title:*
Date of implementation:
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

5) *Title:*
Date of implementation:
Budget:
If regional, please list the other countries:

6), etc.

10. Were you properly and regularly informed of the implementation status of the project(s) by the IOM Office/Administration?

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Project 1			
Project 2			
Project 3			
Project 4			
Project 5			

Other comments if any:

11. Based on the information received and according to your own evaluation of the project(s), has it (have they) had its (their) expected impact and are you satisfied with the overall outcome of the project(s)?

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Project 1			
Project 2			
Project 3			
Project 4			
Project 5			

Other comments if any:

12. Do you think that the project(s) still necessitates (would have necessitated) an extension or follow-up project to meet the objectives and consolidate its impact?

YES

NO

If yes, why (please specify the projects if more than one):

13. Reference to the ‘seed money concept’, did your country or a donor fund follow-up activities at the end of the 1035 Facility project(s)? (For on-going projects, is your country or a donor already committed to fund follow-up activities?)

YES **NO**

If yes, for which project(s) and which activities:

14. Do you think that follow-up activities or new project should have been/should be funded by the Facility?

YES **NO**

If yes, please explain (please specify the projects if more than one):

15. Did you discuss/are you discussing with IOM (or/and other agencies/donors) a follow-up project or other mechanisms in order to guarantee the sustainability of the project(s) funded by the 1035?

YES **NO**

If yes, please specify which projects (if more than one):

If no, why (please specify for all projects if more than one):

Were/are the discussions successful? Yes No

If not successful, briefly explain why:

16. Based on the information provided through the 1035 Facility’s status reports and based on your own experience, do you consider that the 1035 Facility meets its objective and has a positive global outcome?

YES **NO**

If no, please explain:



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND FINANCE

NINETY-FIRST SESSION

4-5 May 2004

SCBF/265
RESTRICTED

29 March 2004

**SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND
MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION**

(Status report: 1 January to 31 March 2004)

SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION

4.

Background and New Considerations in 2004

1. The background and guidelines for the management of the budget allocation for Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition, informally referred to as the 1035 Facility, have been presented at various sessions of the SCBF and at Informal Consultations since the Facility's inception in Council Resolution No. 1035 (LXXX), adopted on 29 November 2000 at the Eightieth Session of the Council.

2. Based on the internal Evaluation Report of September 2003, whose recommendations were approved by the Director General, certain features of the selection criteria and management guidelines have been reinforced and other features have been revised. Starting in 2004, the management of the Facility has reflected these considerations.

3. In 2004 the 1035 Facility will remain a flexible tool to respond to important migration demands and challenges rapidly and efficiently, and the following criteria and guidelines are being followed.

Updated Criteria and Guidelines

Eligibility and Regional Balance

4. The main beneficiaries of the 1035 Facility are IOM developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition. IOM will continue to follow the most recent version of the OECD Development Assistance Committee list of Aid Recipients, with the continued exclusion of those in the "More Advanced Countries and Territories" category. Additionally, countries that would otherwise be eligible due to their placement in the OECD list will be excluded upon joining the European Union. Voluntary withdrawal from eligibility in deference to Member States in greater need remains open to any eligible country.

5. In the context of regional projects, non-IOM Member States continue to be included among the beneficiaries, only, however, as was previously the case where a majority of IOM Member States is benefiting from the project. At least two eligible and benefiting Member States must endorse a regional project.

6. Decisions for an allocation of funds on the basis of equitable regional distribution are based on objective factors such as the number of beneficiaries in the region.

Types of Projects

7. Priority is given to capacity-building projects in the various IOM Services, including research and feasibility studies related to such activities. The types of assistance that cannot be provided by the Facility include the following fields of IOM activity:

- A. Movement
 - B. Emergency
 - C. Major conferences and similar events that are continuations of on-going dialogue and similar activities already well established. However, other conferences and similar events that may be useful in launching new regional processes, opening new geographic coverage or in increasing programme planning and implantation between IOM and Member States are not excluded.
 - D. Projects mainly supporting IOM Staff and Office costs, including projects proposed for the specific purpose of opening an IOM office. IOM Staff and Office costs can, however, be included in the budget for project implementation following the usual IOM projectization approach.
8. Regional approaches will be given special consideration.
9. Bridging funds for projects with good prospects for future funding, and projects that provide co-funding to major donor commitments will continue to be considered.

Funding Levels

10. Funding levels of a maximum USD 50,000 for national projects and USD 200,000 for regional projects can be considered. Exceptional increases at the national project level can be considered up to USD 100,000.

Application Procedure

11. A project for consideration can be presented by the central Government of an eligible Member State, by its Permanent Mission in Geneva with the confirmation of the endorsement by the capital, by IOM Field Missions and Offices, or by IOM Headquarters Departments.
12. Projects must be presented, for final review, in the IOM Project Document or Summary Project Outline format, with complete budgets, and must be reviewed and endorsed by the relevant Service before final consideration from the 1035 Facility.
13. In all cases the benefiting Member State(s) must endorse the project specifically for 1035 consideration.
14. In the case of regional projects, a minimum of two eligible and benefiting Member States must endorse the proposal.
15. All projects are referred to the participating IOM Mission(s) for coordination and approval.
16. All 1035 project funding is managed through the lead IOM Mission or Office, or in exceptional cases the lead IOM Headquarters unit.

Status Report, 1 January to 31 March 2004

17. This document includes the following annexes:

Annex A: List of IOM Member States Eligible for Allocations from the 1035 Facility,
by Region, 31 March 2004

Annex A

List of IOM Member States Eligible for Allocations from the 1035 Facility, by Region,
31 March 2004
(Total: 75)

<u>Africa and the Middle East</u> (32)	<u>Americas and the Caribbean</u> (19)	<u>Asia</u> (9)
Algeria	Argentina	Bangladesh
Angola	Belize	Cambodia
Benin	Bolivia	Kazakhstan
Burkina Faso	Chile	Kyrgyzstan
Cape Verde	Colombia	Pakistan
Congo	Costa Rica	Philippines
Côte d'Ivoire	Dominican Republic	Sri Lanka
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Ecuador	Tajikistan
Egypt	El Salvador	Thailand
Gambia	Guatemala	
Guinea	Haiti	
Guinea-Bissau	Honduras	<u>Europe</u>
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mexico	(15)
Jordan	Nicaragua	
Kenya	Panama	Albania
Liberia	Paraguay	Armenia
Madagascar	Peru	Azerbaijan
Mali	Uruguay	Bulgaria
Mauritania	Venezuela	Croatia
Morocco		* Czech Republic
Nigeria		Georgia
Rwanda		* Hungary
Senegal		* Lithuania
Sierra Leone		* Poland
South Africa		Republic of Moldova
Sudan		Romania
Tunisia		Serbia and Montenegro
Uganda		* Slovakia
United Republic of Tanzania		Ukraine
Yemen		
Zambia		
Zimbabwe		

* *Ineligible as of 1 May 2004, due to entry into the European Union*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- 1) Bibliographical references specific to the Second Evaluation of the 1035 Facility:
- IOM, 'Evaluation of the 1035 Facility', Office of the Inspector General, September 2003
 - IOM Member States, 'Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility', Informal Group led by Canada, August 2004
 - IC/2004/9, IOM, 'Administration's Comments: Proposals to Re-structure the 1035 Facility', September 2004
 - IC/2005/2, IOM, 'Second Evaluation of the 1035 Facility: Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Terms of Reference', April 2005
 - SCBF/265, 'Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Status Report: 1 January to 31 March 2004', March 2004
 - SCBF/272, 'Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Status Report: 1 January to 15 October 2004', October 2004
 - SCBF/276, 'Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Final Report 1 January to 31 December 2004', April 2005
 - SCBF/277, 'Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Status Report: 1 January to 31 March 2005', April 2005
 - SCBF/281, 'Support for Developing Member States and Member States with Economy in Transition – Status Report: 1 January to 30 September 2005', October 2005
 - MC/2119, 'Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Ninetieth Session', Council, November 2003
 - MC/EX/659, 'Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Ninety-First Session', Executive Committee, May 2004
 - MC/2146, 'Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Ninety-second Session', Council, November 2004
 - MC/EX/668, 'Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Ninety-Third Session', Executive Committee, June 2005
 - MC/2174, 'Report on the Hundred and Second Session of the Executive Committee', Council, July 2005
 - MC/2144, 'Programme and Budget for 2005', Council, October 2004

2) Bibliographical references used in the framework of the First Evaluation of the 1035 Facility:

- MC/2115, Report on the Hundredth Session of the Executive Committee, July 2003
- MC/2113, Financial Report for the Year ended 31 December 2002, April 2003
- MC/2097, Draft Report on the Eighty-Fourth Session of the Council, February 2003
- MC/2095, Resolutions adopted by the Council at its Eighty-Fourth Session, December 2002
- MC/2088, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Eighth Session, November 2002
- MC/2083, Programme and Budget for 2003, October 2002
- MC/2081, Report on the Ninety-Ninth Session of the Executive Committee, June 2002
- MC/2080, Report of the Director General on the Work of the Organization for the Year 2001, May 2002
- MC/2043, Report on the Ninety-Eighth Session of the Executive Committee, June 2001
- MC/2049, Programme and Budget for 2002, October 2001
- MC/2019, Resolutions adopted by the Council at its Eightieth Session, December 2000
- MC/2016, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Fourth Session, November 2000
- MC/2014, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Third (Additional) Session, October 2000
- MC/2010, Programme and Budget for 2001, October 2000

- MC/EX/651, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance – Report on the Eighty-Ninth Session, May 2003
- MC/EX/650, Zero Nominal Growth in the Administrative Part of the Budget and IOM's Growth, May 2003
- MC/EX/642, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Seventh Session, May 2002
- MC/EX/633, Subcommittee on Budget and Finance - Report on the Eighty-Fifth Session Part I, May 2001
- MC/EX/631, Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2001, April 2001

- MC/C/SR/446, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-Sixth Meeting, January 2003
- MC/C/SR/445, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-Fifth Meeting, January 2003
- MC/C/SR/441, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Forty-First Meeting, January 2003
- MC/EX/SR/438, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Eighth Meeting, July 2003
- MC/EX/SR/437, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Seventh Meeting, July 2003
- MC/EX/SR/436, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Sixth Meeting, June 2002
- MC/EX/SR/433, Summary Record of the Four Hundred and Thirty-Third Meeting, June 2001

- SCBF/257, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 30 April 2003), April 2003
- SCBF/256, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Final Report 1 January to 31 December 2002), April 2003
- *Informal Consultations on the 1035 Facility and Migration Initiatives*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 31 December 2002), April 2003
- *Conference Room Paper/1, 88th Session of the SCBF*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, (Status Report 1 January to 31 October 2002), November 2002
- *Conference Room Paper, 99th Session of the Executive Committee*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, June 2002
- *Conference Room Paper, 87th Session of the SCBF*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, May 2002
- *Informal Consultations on Financial and Budgetary Issues*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, February 2002
- *Conference Room Paper, 86th Session of the SCBF*, Support for Developing Member States and Member States in Transition, October 2001