

MIGRATION MPTF INVESTMENT PLAN 2021-2022

The Investment Plan is organized around the following four sections:

1. Introduction: Role of the Investment Plan which explains how the Investment Plan complements the Migration MPTF Pipeline of Joint Programmes and summarizes its main objectives.
2. Fund Capitalization Target which lays down the fundraising target for the coming biennium as the projected income is a key element of any investment strategy.
3. Key criteria: Quality, Balance and Diversity which outlines the key criteria for allocating resources and explains how performance vis-à-vis said criteria is measured.
4. The approach to prioritization which describes step by step the practical approach to prioritization and highlights its objectives

1 Introduction: Role of the Investment Plan

The Investment Plan complements the pipeline of joint programmes

The Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund ('Migration MPTF' or 'the Fund') pipeline of joint programmes contains all joint programme concept notes or documents submitted by UN Resident Coordinators on behalf of the national government and the UN Country Team (or submitted directly by participating UN organizations for programmes of a regional nature) that have been positively assessed by the Migration MPTF Steering Committee. All joint programmes included in the pipeline are deemed highly relevant for the Fund and are eligible for funding. The pipeline is constantly updated with the possibility to include new concept notes or withdraw some at each Steering Committee meeting.

The pipeline selection operates as a crucial quality assurance process and does not intend to "filter" project ideas through any other lens: the decision of the Steering Committee to include or not a concept note in the pipeline is exclusively based on the Steering Committee's assessment of the quality of the submission. Given the very high number of submissions received (90 concept notes in 2020), the number of pipeline joint programmes will inevitably exceed the available (or projected) resources.

The relatively high number of joint programmes in the pipeline is not a shortcoming as it constitutes a valuable communication and resource mobilization tool for the Fund. It offers a comprehensive illustration of what the Migration MPTF is poised to support and, beyond the Fund, it provides a roadmap by which the GCM can be put into action.

Yet, from a fund management perspective, the pipeline of joint programmes needs to be complemented by a strategic framework, an Investment Plan, which outlines the principles and approach to be followed for the necessary prioritization amongst selected joint programmes and which may guide allocation decisions.

The Investment Plan is both an internal and an external tool

The Investment Plan is first and foremost designed as a management tool to support the decision-making process of the Migration MPTF Steering Committee. It is not and does not intend to be of a mechanical nature, offering simple formulas that will lead to the automatic selection of some joint programmes over others. However, the Investment Plan offers a framework for Steering Committee deliberations by outlining the medium-term resource mobilization targets, by identifying key criteria and ways to measure performance vis-à-vis said criteria, and by describing a practical approach to the funding allocation process.

The Investment Plan is also a public document that plays an important role vis-à-vis stakeholders. It is a vehicle for increased transparency. Although the actual decisions are systematically communicated through the short summaries of the Steering Committee meetings, the rationale for allocation decisions may remain opaque for some partners. While a large degree of flexibility remains for the Steering Committee and difficult choices will always be required, making public the Fund's medium-term approach to prioritization enables all to perceive the logic behind the decisions.

2 Fund Capitalization Targets

Medium term planning for the use of the Fund's resources requires first to determine what the expected level of funding will be, so that the strategy adopted is commensurate with resources available. With few multi-year commitments made by donors in this initial phase of the Migration MPTF and with the added uncertainty on donor priorities and budgetary constraints brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, projecting a level of income is not easy. Yet, the Steering Committee of the Migration MPTF has set clear fundraising targets for 2021 and 2022 at USD 30 million and USD 45 million respectively.

These targets, which will be reassessed on an annual basis, were determined after due consideration to the capitalization levels of comparable global pooled funding instruments, the initial ambition level of the Fund (USD 25 million in year one as indicated in the Fund's Terms of Reference) and its actual performance in year one (over USD 17 million mobilized). More importantly, the decision on the targets was informed by the strong interest expressed by Member States, UN Country Teams and stakeholders, reflected in the demand for the Fund (e.g. 90 concept notes were received in the span of 10 months) and a realistic assessment of the Fund's capacity to efficiently deliver.

While the funding targets require growth and represent a challenge, they remain modest for a funding mechanism called for by a UN resolution and in view of the Funding Compact adopted by the United Nations and Member States in 2019 which calls for the "doubling of resources channeled through development-related inter-agency pooled funds".

USD 30 million in 2021 would allow the Fund to finance the implementation of at least two projects under each thematic area, enabling the Fund to constitute a diversified and balanced portfolio of quality joint programmes and maintain a sustained interest in GCM joint implementation.

The investment strategy outlined here is based on these targets. While it would remain valid with a slightly lower capitalization level, substantially failing to reach the targets could affect the Fund's ability to achieve thematic and geographic balance, as well as other diversity considerations, and may require the Steering Committee to reconsider its prioritization approach.

3 Key Criteria: Quality, Balance and Diversity

3.1 Quality

The first and the most important criteria for joint programme selection is quality. It is assessed from two equally important perspectives: adherence to fundamental project cycle management (PCM) and results-based management (RBM) principles, and alignment to the GCM guiding principles.

Inclusion of the concept notes in the pipeline of joint programmes is fully conditional to meeting the eligibility and quality standards and it is important to underline that, once fully developed, the joint programme documents are thoroughly assessed again against the quality criteria. If the standards are not met, whether by the concept note or the full-fledged joint programme document, the joint programme is not eligible for allocation.

3.1.1 Project Cycle Management and Results Based Management Principles

First and foremost, quality of the joint programmes is assessed based on fundamental adherence to Project Cycle Management (PCM) and Results Based Management (RBM) principles.

PCM refers to the cyclical process of conceptualization, proposal development, project management/monitoring, reporting and evaluation. A quality proposal would undertake relevant needs assessment and other analyses (e.g. stakeholder, problem, results, factor), then propose an intervention based on sound rationale, aligned with national priorities and complementing existing interventions. The management and monitoring of proposed interventions would reflect the context and needs identified during conceptualization, and the proposal must ensure that innovation and sustainability of results are taken into consideration.

RBM is a strategy that focuses on performance and the achievement of results (outputs, outcomes and impact). The aim is for an intervention to be relevant, efficient, effective, and to achieve impact for the beneficiaries. The quality of the proposal is assessed by the extent to which the proposal is structured in a logical manner, identifying expected results and the inputs needed to accomplish them. RBM principles must be reflected not only in the proposal's results framework and theory of change, but also in its management and coordination arrangements, budget, workplan and risk analysis.

3.1.2 GCM Guiding Principles

The Global Compact lays out cross-cutting and interdependent guiding principles as follows: (a) People-centred; (b) International cooperation; (c) National sovereignty; (d) Rule of law and due process; (e) Sustainable development / 2030 Agenda; (f) Human rights; (g) Gender-responsive; (h) Child-sensitive; (i) Whole-of-government approach; and (j) Whole-of-society approach.

As outlined in the Migration MPTF Results Framework (see Annex A, Migration MPTF Operations Manual), the following four guiding principles (e) sustainable development, (b) international cooperation, (c) national sovereignty, and (d) rule of law and due process, are inherent in the nature of the Migration MPTF objectives and funding criteria, and as such adherence is ensured through the joint programme proposal submission and selection process, as well as ongoing programmatic monitoring of funded programmes.

Alignment of the remaining six guiding principles are ensured via rigorous quality assessment of the joint programme proposals. These principles are also included as a results area for the Migration MPTF Results Framework (see Annex A, Migration MPTF Operations Manual).

Human rights; Gender-responsive; and Child-sensitive: Markers have been established specifically to ascertain that all selected joint programmes reach the minimum quality requirement of upholding human rights and gender responsiveness throughout the project cycle (conceptualization, implementation/monitoring, and evaluation). While not a quality requirement for all proposals (since some joint programmes may not target children), a child-sensitive marker is also included to assess the level of proposals that may contribute to upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18.

People-centred; Whole-of-government approach; and Whole-of-society approach: While there is no quantitative guidance on adherence to these principles, they are integral to the quality assessment of all proposals, from the initial concept note to full joint programme document stage.

- **People-centred:** All proposals must place the individual at its core, promoting the well-being of migrants and the members of communities in countries of origin, transit and destination. Particular attention would be given to ensuring involvement/ engagement of affected populations (e.g. migrants, affected communities) throughout the project cycle (project development, implementation and evaluation).
- **Whole-of-government approach:** Since migration is a multidimensional reality that cannot be addressed by one government policy sector alone, effective interventions need to take a whole-of-government approach to ensure horizontal (e.g. various line ministries) and vertical coherence across all sectors and levels of government (e.g. national-provincial-local levels)
- **Whole-of-society approach:** Joint programmes must promote broad multi-stakeholder partnerships to address migration in all its dimensions by including migrants, diasporas, local communities, civil society, academia, the private sector, parliamentarians, trade unions, national human rights institutions, the media and other relevant stakeholders.

3.2 Balance and Diversity

While the quality criteria are to be fully met for every allocation decision, the balance and diversity criteria described below cannot be achieved for every round of allocation decisions by the Steering Committee. Each round of allocation will unavoidably appear unbalanced if looked at strictly in isolation. It is only over time that balance can be achieved and evaluated.

Striving to achieve balance requires consideration of individual allocation decisions in the broader context of allocations previously made, and keeping in mind that more allocations will be made in the future. Balance and diversity are also conditional to securing a sufficient level of resources. A low number of funded projects makes it increasingly difficult to achieve this objective.

Finally, and evidently, the balance and diversity objectives can only be met in allocation decisions if variety exists in the pool of quality joint programme proposals submitted by countries and regions.

3.2.1 *Thematic balance*

The 360-degree approach of the GCM is a guiding principle for the Migration MPTF as outlined in both its Terms of Reference and its Operations Manual.¹ In line with this principle, thematic balance is a fundamental and uncompromisable criteria when selecting joint programmes to be funded. It is second only to quality and comes before any other considerations.

Measuring thematic balance

The clustering of GCM objectives under five broad thematic areas is a powerful management tool to ensure that the Funds operations are thematically balanced. While some complementary analysis needs to be carried out to ensure a degree of diversity amongst joint programmes funded under each thematic area, the breakdown of resource allocation per thematic area offers an easy to present and easy to understand snapshot of the thematic balance.

In line with the 360-degree approach, the Migration MPTF aspires to an equitable distribution amongst all thematic areas - both in terms of number of joint programmes funded per thematic area, and level of resources allocated to each thematic area. To monitor its performance in this area, dedicated indicators and targets were adopted as part of the Fund results monitoring framework making the transparent tracking of thematic balance a requirement for the management of the Fund.

By the end of the biennium, the Steering Committee aims at having allocated no less than 15% and no more than 30% of the total resources available to each of the five thematic area. To make this possible, the Steering Committee also adopted a target set at 25% of total contributions received for the maximum level of donor earmarking to a specific thematic area.

Performance on these indicators will be communicated transparently and regularly to all stakeholders.

3.2.2 *Geographic balance*

Quality and thematic balance are the overarching principles of the Fund, which cannot be compromised. Within that, the Steering Committee will aim to ensure appropriate geographic balance, in keeping with the spirit of a funding instrument called for by the UN General Assembly through the adoption of the Global Compact. GCM implementation is crucial in all regions, as all face migration-related challenges.

Measuring geographic balance

To ensure that geographic balance can be monitored consistently over time, the Fund will review its allocation decisions considering the following five regions: Africa, Americas, Asia-Pacific, Europe, and Middle East and North Africa (MENA). Moreover, to properly reflect the variety of demographic scale and migration dynamics amongst and within regions, geographic balance is also measured at the sub-regional level, defined as follows:

¹ Both documents are available at: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00>

Region	Sub-region
Africa	East Africa
	Southern Africa
	West and Central Africa
Americas	Caribbean
	Central and North America
	South America
Asia-Pacific	Central and North Asia
	East and South-East Asia
	South Asia
	Pacific
Europe	Europe
MENA	Middle East and Northern Africa

Measuring distribution of resources or approval of joint programmes at regional or sub-regional levels does not imply that balance is achieved by evenly distributing resources amongst all regions/sub-regions. Unique demographic and migration contexts (some regions are more – or differently – affected than others) must be taken into consideration, alongside raw numerical factors such as the number of states in each region which have adopted the GCM.

By the end of the biennium, the Fund endeavours to having ensured diversity by supporting at least one joint programme in each region and sub-region. For this goal to be achieved without compromising on quality standards and thematic balance, funding targets need to be met and a variety of quality submissions need to be received from all regions and sub-regions.

Once the initial diversity objective has been achieved, the Steering Committee will prioritize on the basis of needs expressed (number of quality submissions received from the regions/sub-regions) while proactively seeking greater engagement from under-represented regions/sub-regions.

Information on the geographic spread of the Fund's allocation is publicly available and the Migration MPTF annual reports will provide an analysis of its performance vis-à-vis this criterion.

3.2.3 Diversity of partnerships and interventions

Over time, the Migration MPTF will aim to fund a varied portfolio of joint programmes to showcase how the GCM can be implemented at the local, national, regional and global levels. Beyond the individual quality of each joint programme funded, the quality of the portfolio of funded joint programmes needs to be considered as a whole. To this end, diversity in terms of partnerships (range of participating UN organizations, government line ministries, local authorities, civil society organizations and other stakeholders), types of intervention (e.g. policy level technical assistance, pilot interventions at the local level, etc.) and joint programme targets (e.g.

population/ beneficiaries, stage of the migration cycle – origin, transit, destination and return) will also be criteria for prioritization.

No quantitative indicator can meaningfully measure all aspects. However, the Fund results monitoring framework performance indicators related to the alignment to the GCM guiding principles will provide useful information that will be complemented by a qualitative analysis in each Migration MPTF annual report.

4 Approach to Prioritization

Taking into account the criteria listed above, the Steering Committee agreed on a prioritization process for the 2021-2022 biennium which consists of maintaining a pool of ten priority joint programmes (two for each of the five thematic areas) from among the pipeline. Whenever resources become available, joint programmes to be funded will be selected from this pool of priority joint programmes.

4.1 Objectives of the prioritization approach

This approach intends to fulfill the following objectives:

- **Focus on medium-term objectives.** Rather than making allocation decisions driven by immediate reactions to opportunities arising with every new contribution, having a pool of priority joint programmes allows the Fund to focus on medium-term goals.
- **Increase readiness of the Funds operations.** By inviting submitters whose concept notes have been identified as priorities to develop a full-fledged joint programme document ahead of a potential allocation decision, the Migration MPTF greatly reduces the time-lag between availability of resources and start of implementation.
- **Ensure quality.** Concept notes of equal quality are not automatically translated into full-fledged proposal of equivalent quality. Having two joint programme documents developed under each thematic area increases the Steering Committee's ability to safeguard the highest quality standards.
- **Fulfill expectations.** While the fact that not all priority joint programmes will be funded needs to be properly communicated to all concerned partners, likelihood that a majority of priority programmes will receive support is high.
- **Adjust to expected levels of resource.** Two priority joint programmes is commensurate with expected level of resources at the beginning of the biennium. However, the approach can be easily adapted to a higher volume by increasing the number of priority projects under each thematic area from two to three.
- **Enhance transparency.** By making public the list of priority joint programmes, the Migration MPTF allows all partners to have an understanding of the Migration MPTF selection process throughout the approval cycle: from the pipeline through the priorities to the allocation decision.

4.2 The prioritization process

The prioritization process will observe the following steps:

- 1) Upon assessing each submission based on the criteria listed in section 3 above and eligibility criteria, the Steering Committee identifies two priority joint programmes from the pipeline and invites the submitters of the concept notes to develop a full-fledged joint programme document. The two priority programmes are not ranked and will be subsequently considered on an equal footing.
- 2) Within three months of the decision to include a programme in the priority list, the concerned country or regional teams submit the complete joint programme document, which will then be assessed by the Steering Committee (with the support of the Fund Management Unit). If a joint programme is deemed to not meet the quality standards, it is rejected by the Steering Committee. In this case, the Steering Committee will immediately proceed with identifying another priority joint programme among the pipeline to maintain a list of two priorities under each thematic area.
- 3) Whenever funds become available under the thematic area, the Steering Committee reviews the two priority joint programmes and, taking into consideration the context and overall balance, decides which joint programme will be funded.
- 4) As soon as a priority joint programme is selected for funding/implementation, a new priority joint programme is identified among the pipeline so that, at all time, there are two priority joint programmes under each thematic area.
- 5) Upon each allocation decision, the Steering Committee would consider whether a priority joint programme that was not selected remains a priority, or should be removed from the list in order for the pool of priority joint programmes to remain relevant.

Should resources mobilized during the course of the biennium allow for funding over ten projects per year, the Steering Committee will review the approach and may decide to increase the number of priority joint programmes to fifteen (three per thematic area).