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“Today we established a new mechanism fostering international cooperation towards safe, orderly and regular migration: an inspiring example of what the UN can do together.”

António Vitorino
the Director General of the IOM,
Coordinator of the Network and Chair of the Fund’s Steering Committee

On 9 May 2019, within six months of the UN Member States coming together in Marrakech to adopt the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (the Global Compact, or GCM), ¹ the United Nations Network on Migration established the Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (Migration MPTF or the Fund), the first pooled funding instrument focusing on migration, as called for by the GCM.

The eight heads of the UN organizations in the Executive Committee of the UN Network on Migration (UNNM) attended the signing ceremony, demonstrating their commitment to jointly support the implementation of the Global Compact.²

The Migration MPTF was officially launched on 16 July 2019 at the UNICEF Headquarters in New York. UN Deputy Secretary-General Ms. Amina J. Mohammed, officiating the event, expounded that “the Migration Fund can provide the impetus for all of us to take the next step; to bring the Migration Compact to life, to move us closer to realizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and to effect positive change in the field of migration.”

In its second year of operations, the Fund is in full swing. The governance structure is operating effectively with the first Steering Committee membership rotation successfully completed. Twelve diverse joint programmes are being implemented across the globe in partnership with governments (both national and local), regional entities, stakeholders, communities, and migrants themselves; and there are 34 additional joint programmes in the pipeline, ready to start when resources become available.

**Governance:** Throughout 2021, the governance, operational and programmatic frameworks and mechanisms established in the Fund’s first year were tested, and proved effective. With its inclusive governance structure, comprehensive Operations Manual, the unwavering commitment to results orientation, and the GCM’s vision, objectives and guiding principles, the Fund operated efficiently and effectively, achieving most of the results set out in its Results Monitoring Framework. In addition, the Risk Management Strategy adopted the previous year was reviewed and updated.

In order to ensure that the governance structure is transparent and truly representative of the stakeholders identified by the Global Compact, the Steering Committee underwent its first rotation exercise in 2021. The rotation affected half of its members, making way for new members in all four constituents. The Steering Committee welcomed UNFPA, UNICEF (UN Network on Migration), Mexico (donor), Ghana, Iraq (countries of origin, transit and destination) and the International Detention Coalition (stakeholder) as new members.

---

¹ See: https://undocs.org/A/RES/73/195
² The eight UN organizations (ILO, UNICEF, IOM, UNODC, OHCHR, UNDP, UNDESA and UNHCR) signed the Memorandum of Understanding which included the Terms of Reference for the Fund. Since then, ten additional UN entities have joined the Fund.
Joint Programmes: In 2021, six joint programmes started working, bringing the total number of active joint programmes to twelve. The new joint programmes are again diverse, both programmatically and geographically. They range widely:

- supporting evidence-based, gender-responsive migration management at national and sub-national levels in Indonesia;
- tackling trafficking in persons and strengthening protection systems in Trinidad and Tobago;
- addressing irregular migration, organized crime and vulnerabilities faced by female migrants, along and among border communities of the Trans-Gambia transport corridor;
- managing border health risks and operationalizing International Health Regulations in Afghanistan;
- facilitating socio-economic integration of migrants and host communities in Ecuador; and
- addressing drivers and facilitating regular migration in the context of disasters and climate change in the IGAD Region.

The Demand and Supply: Interest in the Fund and demand for its support continues in all corners of the world. The Fund identified additional quality proposals to include in the pipeline, bringing the total to 34 joint programmes ready to be implemented when resources become available. To date, the Fund has received 113 concept notes from 83 different countries and regions. The proposals came from different regions, covering all thematic areas, and reflecting varying migration context and dynamics. With limited outreach and awareness raising, partly due to COVID-19 restrictions and partly to manage expectations, this continued interest in the Fund reflects the need for support and the strong interest of Member States and partners in implementing the Global Compact through a joint programming approach.

However, as was the case in 2020, the demand has not been reciprocated with sufficient financial resources. While the total capitalization level reached USD 28.1 million by the end of 2021, the USD 13.3 million committed by nine donors during the course of 2021 fell short of the USD 30 million target set by the Steering Committee – a target which may have been ambitious given the prevailing financial constraints, but is modest in view of needs expressed and the number of quality joint programme ideas.

Funding remains the main hindrance to fully achieving the Fund's potential. The Migration MPTF was not designed to absorb all migration projects and activities of the UN system, most of which must continue to be delivered on a bilateral or entity-specific basis. However, to be relevant, add value and truly foster a collective approach to GCM implementation, the Fund requires sufficient resources.

This Annual Report presents key achievements in 2021, including a section on the 12 joint programmes. The report covers:

- The foundations: governance, approach and guiding principles
- The programming cycle
- The joint programmes
- Overview of the financial situation
- Looking forward

The Afghanistan joint programme was put on hold shortly after its initiation in July due to the current crisis.
THE FOUNDATIONS: GOVERNANCE, APPROACH, AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Throughout 2021, the governance, operational and programmatic frameworks and mechanisms established in late 2019 to early 2020 were fully implemented. With its inclusive governance structure, comprehensive Operations Manual, and unwavering commitment to results orientation, along with the GCM’s vision, objectives and guiding principles, the Fund operated efficiently and effectively, achieving most of the results set out in its Results Monitoring Framework.

2.1 Governance Structure and the Operations Manual

2.1.1 Governance Structure

The Fund governance structure, established in late 2019, consists of:

- the Steering Committee (decision-making body),
- the Fund Management Unit (small unit supporting the Steering Committee and responsible for the Fund’s operational functioning) and
- the Administrative Agent (“trustee” of the Fund, responsible for administering the contributions).

An Annual Consultative Forum ensures broader stakeholder engagement.

Throughout 2021, this structure, along with the established processes, methodologies and tools of the Fund, facilitated effective and efficient operations.

**Migration MPTF Governance Structure**

**Steering Committee**

- Decision making body chaired by the Coordinator of the UNNM (IOM DG)
- 12 members representing 4 constituencies (UNNM, donors, countries of origin/transit/destination, stakeholders) on staggered rotational basis

**Fund Management Unit**

- Day to day operational management
- Supports Steering Committee in advisory capacity

**Administrative Agent: UNDP MPTFO**

- “Trustee” of the Fund
- Administers funds in line with UNSDG rules

**Consultative Forum**

- Provides status update to Member States, UN Network members and all stakeholders
- Solicits inputs/recommendations for the Fund’s current operations and future direction

The Steering Committee, chaired by the Director General of IOM as Coordinator of the Network, governs the Fund. It provides oversight and makes - collectively and on a consensus basis - all key decisions related to the Fund such as selecting concept notes, allocating funds, commissioning evaluations, revising the Terms of Reference or Operations Manual, approving the direct costs related to Fund operations, and mobilizing resources.
To ensure that the Steering Committee is truly representative of the stakeholders identified by the Global Compact, it consists of three members each from the following constituents: UN Network on Migration; donors; countries of origin, transit and destination; and stakeholders. Moreover, in order to ensure wide representation, membership is rotational on a staggered basis (half the members rotate every year). In 2021, the first rotation took place with six members rotating out and six new members joining in July.

Steering Committee membership in 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>From Dec 2019 to June 2021</th>
<th>From July 2021 (new membership highlighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Network on Migration</td>
<td>ILO, UN Women, WHO</td>
<td>WHO, UNFPA (new), UNICEF (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>Germany, UK, Thailand</td>
<td>Germany, UK, Mexico (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries of origin, transit and destination</td>
<td>Ecuador, Morocco, the Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines, Ghana (new), Iraq (new)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fund Management Unit (FMU) is responsible for operational functioning, providing management support to the Steering Committee, and liaising with the Administrative Agent. Embedded within the UNNM Secretariat at IOM Headquarters, the FMU is a lean structure (two professional and one administrative staff throughout 2020-2021), benefitting from the overall support of the Secretariat, as well as other components of the Network.

From the beginning, the FMU has been fully funded by IOM, as part of its overall support to the UN Network on Migration Secretariat. However, it was foreseen that, in line with good practices, these costs will be transferred to the Fund itself by the end of the start-up phase. Accordingly, at its December 2021 meeting, the Steering Committee agreed to have 25% of the FMU’s budget covered by the Fund in 2022, with the remaining 75% to be covered by IOM. Taking a gradual approach, the Fund’s share is expected to increase, and IOM’s share decrease in successive years.

During 2021, the FMU managed the joint programme technical review process, and provided various strategic recommendations for consideration by the Steering Committee to facilitate effective and efficient Fund operations. Moreover, the FMU ensured that all subsequent Steering Committee decisions were implemented within the agreed timelines and reports/documents were developed and finalized.

The Migration MPTF uses a pass-through funding modality, where donors and Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) channel funding through one UN organization, referred to as the Administrative Agent. The Administrative Agent is the appointed interface between the PUNOs and the donors for administrative matters. The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office has been appointed to carry out this task, functioning in strict accordance with the UN Sustainable Development Group Protocol on the AA for Multi-Donor Trust Funds.
Established in 2003, the UNDP MPTF Office is the UN centre of expertise on pooled financing mechanisms, supporting development effectiveness and UN coordination through the design and administration of innovative pooled financing mechanisms. With USD 16.1 billion in cumulative portfolio, over 100 active funds, and providing 120 countries with pooled financing services, the MPTF Office’s efficient and transparent services are recognized by all partners. The Administrative Agent’s costs are 1% of the contributions received.

To ensure broad-based consultation and stakeholder engagement at the highest level, an Annual Consultative Forum is held. Open to all Member States and stakeholders, the Forum discusses and solicits recommendations for the Fund’s current operations and future direction.

In 2021, two Steering Committee meetings (in June and December) and one Consultative Forum (December) were held. Steering Committee decisions are available at https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00. The recording of the Consultative Forum can be found under “Session III, 10 December 2021” on https://migrationnetwork.un.org/meeting/annual-meetings/third-annual-meeting-2021.

Migration MPTF Consultative Forum

As part of the UN Network on Migration Annual Meeting, the second Consultative Forum of the Migration MPTF took place on 10 December 2021. The Forum was open to Member States, UN Network members, and all stakeholders. The Forum aimed to provide an update on the status of the Fund (allocation decisions taken, key achievements and main challenges faced) and offer all the opportunity to discuss the Fund’s current operations and future direction. Concerns, recommendations or suggestions raised during the Forum were brought by the Chair to the attention of the Steering Committee at its meeting held the following week on 14 December 2021.

The Forum started with opening remarks by the Chair of the Fund and Coordinator of the UN Network on Migration, Mr António Vitorino. Then, plenary discussions took place under three themes with two key speakers each:

1) **Migration, environment and climate change**: The speakers were Dr Elke Löbel (Commissioner for Refugee Policy and Director of Displacement and Migration; Crisis Prevention and Management; German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development /BMZ); and Mr Atle Solberg (Head of Secretariat, Platform on Disaster Displacement /PDD).

2) **Engagement with local authorities**: The speakers were Minister Erika Martinez Lievano (Chargé d’Affaires, a.i., Permanent Mission of Mexico in Geneva); and Ms Vittoria Zanuso (Executive Director, Mayors Migration Council).

3) **Gender responsiveness**: The speakers were Ms Monica Ferro (Director, Geneva Office, United Nations Population Fund /UNFPA); and Ms Susan Ople (Blas F. Ople Policy Center and Training Institute).

The Forum then opened the floor for Network members, Member States and stakeholders to discuss the Fund’s current operations and future direction. Finally, concluding remarks were made by Ms Jennifer Topping, the Executive Coordinator of the UNDP MPTF Office.

Key concerns, recommendations and suggestions raised during the Forum were brought by the Chair to the attention of the full Steering Committee at its following meeting on 14 December 2021.
2.1.2 Operations Manual

At its inaugural meeting on 10 December 2019, the Steering Committee endorsed the Migration MPTF Operations Manual, which outlines the governance structure and mechanisms, the management rules and procedures, the programming cycle (including all necessary tools and templates for joint programmes), and the Fund’s results framework. All the components encapsulate the Fund’s commitment to transparency and the GCM’s 360-degree approach and guiding principles.

Commitment to Transparency

The Migration MPTF is committed to ensuring maximum transparency in its operations, through the MPTF Office Gateway. All relevant information is publicly available on the page dedicated to the Migration MPTF (http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00). This includes Steering Committee decisions, the joint programme pipeline and, once funded, all joint programme documents and reports.

The MPTF Office Gateway also provides real-time financial data generated directly from its accounting system, enabling the tracking of all information related to contributions, transfers to participating UN organizations, expenditures, and so on.

In addition, the UN Network on Migration website has a dedicated section for the Migration MPTF: https://migrationnetwork.un.org/mptf

2.2 Results Orientation

Getting things done is the priority. The Migration MPTF operational framework and programming approach is highly results oriented.

From the beginning, the Steering Committee incorporated a Results Framework in the Fund’s Operations Manual, placing strong emphasis on 1) alignment with the SDGs; 2) programmatic alignment to the GCM guiding principles and commitment to sustainability and partnerships; and 3) operational effectiveness and performance. By outlining specific results and indicators to monitor and assess performance under each of the three areas, the Migration MPTF holds itself accountable to both donors and joint programme beneficiaries. It also forces the Fund to be goal-oriented and prioritize its activities.

The table below is an excerpt of the RMF, summarizing the expected results, indicators, 2021 targets and results achieved. The full RMF is in Annex A of this report.

A detailed narrative of the results can be found in relevant sections of this report. These sections are referenced in the table’s last column. Please note that Result Area 2 related to joint programme sustainability, and the second indicator for result 3.3 related to joint programme evaluations were not reported for 2021. This is because the joint programmes have not been implemented long enough to attain these results (the earliest joint programmes launched in late October 2020).

In 2021, all targets were achieved except for result 3.1 (indicators 3.1.1 and 3.1.2) related to financial resource mobilization and utilization. Each result will be elaborated upon in the relevant sections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS AREA</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>TARGET (2021)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results Area 1: The Joint Programmes and Initiatives funded by the Migration MPTF is aligned to key Global Compact Guiding Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1) Joint Programmes (JPs) funded by the Migration MPTF (‘MMPTF’) are people-centred</td>
<td>1.1.1) % of JPs that consulted with, and explicitly reflect the needs and concerns of migrants and/or migration affected communities in its design</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2) JPs are founded on international human rights law and its principles, and take a rights-based approach to programming</td>
<td>1.2.1) % of JPs that self-report as: a) Human Rights (HR) Marker has largely been achieved; or b) HR Marker shows significant integration of human rights in the joint programme but some challenges remain; or c) HR Marker shows a very partial integration of human rights in the JPs.</td>
<td>100% for a, b, c 90% for a, b</td>
<td>100% for a, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3) JPs are gender-responsive</td>
<td>1.3.1) % of JPs that: a) Have gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls as the primary or principal objective; or b) Make a significant contribution to gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls; or c) Contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly.</td>
<td>100% for a, b, c 70% for a, b</td>
<td>100% for a, b</td>
<td>3 The Programming Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4) JPs are child-sensitive</td>
<td>1.4.1) % of JPs that: a) Have upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18 as the primary or principal objective; or b) Make a significant contribution towards upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18; or c) Contribute in some way to upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18</td>
<td>60% for a, b, c 20% for a, b</td>
<td>100% for a, b, c 50% for a, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5) JPs take a whole-of-government approach.</td>
<td>1.5.1) % of JPs that include as partners more than one government line entity</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6) JPs take a whole-of-society approach.</td>
<td>1.6.1) % of JPs that include non-UN and non-governmental stakeholders in its programme management and coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.2) % of joint programmes and initiatives that enter into implementation agreements with non-governmental stakeholders. Note: Implementation agreements were interpreted broadly to include coordination and collaboration partnerships, entailing financial support, or not.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result Area 2: The Joint Programmes and Initiatives funded by the Migration MPTF are sustainable and complementary to other development initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>TARGET (2021)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1) Expected results of the JPs have been achieved and are sustainable</td>
<td>2.1.1) % of JP outcomes and output results achieved by end of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2) % of JPs that are evaluated as achieving sustainable results</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2) JPs are complementary to other development projects and initiatives</td>
<td>2.2.1) % of JPs that are mutually reinforcing with other local, national, regional or global development initiatives.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Result Area 3: The Migration MPTF is managed efficiently, coherently, and consistently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>TARGET (2021)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1) Financial resource mobilisation and utilisation</td>
<td>3.1.1) Volume of resources mobilised annually (in million USD) - Annual targets</td>
<td>30m USD 10,795,762</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2) % of resources mobilised that are earmarked - Cumulative targets.</td>
<td>Less than 60% earmarked</td>
<td>71.35% earmarked</td>
<td>5. Funding Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earmarking to a specific TA over 25% of total contributions received</td>
<td>No earmarking to specific TA over 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3) % of resources allocated to each thematic priority - Cumulative targets.</td>
<td>Bracket 10-30% per TA</td>
<td>12.57% - 28.09%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2) Approval process of JPs are facilitated in an efficient and consistent manner</td>
<td>3.2.1) % of concept notes (CNs) and JP documents submitted to the MMPTF that are reviewed per transparent criteria and assessed in a timely manner (Annual targets).</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2) % of JPs that initiate implementation within 20 working days of approval of the final proposal by the Steering Committee (SC) and confirmation of availability of funds - Annual targets.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3) Implementation of JPs are monitored</td>
<td>3.3.1) % of Annual JP reports and mid-year progress updates submitted on time, or within 10 working days of the deadline - Annual targets.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2) % of JPs that complete joint final independent evaluations within 6 months of completion of project activities - Annual targets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Please note that indicators 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 were intended to be cumulative and will be clarified as such going forward.*
## 2.3 Risk Management

All pooled funds must include a solid risk management strategy. Through the adoption of the Funding Compact in July 2019, the Member States pledged to double their support to the UN pooled funds while the UN committed to improving the management of pooled funds, including through the design and implementation of risk management systems and strategies. 6

In this context, the Steering Committee endorsed a risk management strategy and corresponding risk register in mid-2020. Annex B of the Operations Manual provides the full strategy and risk register.

After the first year of implementation, in June 2021 the risk drivers and treatment measures were reviewed, assessed for their relevance/effectiveness, and adjusted. See below for summaries of the review and adjustments made for each risk statement.

### Risk Statement 1)
**Fund governance and decision-making undermine effectiveness, and undermine the principles of the GCM.**

**Analysis:** Apart from the issue of earmarking of resource mobilized, the risk drivers related to this risk statement either did not materialize, or if they have, the treatment measures were effective in mitigating impact. With regards to earmarking, while it is a concern that 74% of contributions in 2020 were earmarked, this figure did decrease slightly for 2021 (68%). Moreover, some contributions were earmarked across different thematic areas, giving the Fund a degree of flexibility in allocation. As such, it was agreed that while this necessitates close monitoring, no additional measures were required at this stage.

### Risk Statement 2)
**Fund operations undermine effectiveness of the Fund, leading to disengagement from key actors.**

**Analysis:** Overall, the risk drivers did not materialize. There is potential for increased risk related to FMU capacities if/when more joint programmes are funded. However, the current treatment measures remain sufficient to address this risk in the near future.

---

Risk Statement 3)
Investments fail to show results/do harm (including through fraud), undermining GCM agenda and trust in the Fund.

Analysis: As the earliest joint programmes only started late 2020, it was not possible to evaluate the risks related to lack of programmatic results. For the risk drivers identified at the time, none materialized, nor were assessed as likely to increase. However, since government ownership and support are central to the joint programmes, the following risk driver and treatment measures were added:

- **Risk Driver**: Change in Government willingness/readiness to implement the funded joint programme.
- **Treatment Measures**: High-level government endorsement of the joint programme; alignment to national priorities; early detection by PUNOs and FMU (FMU conducts monitoring calls with PUNOs at least twice a year); timely alert to SC; clarification of criteria for joint programme termination and potential exit strategy.

Risk Statement 4)
A gap is created between expectations and ability to support GCM implementation, which undermines credibility of the Fund, support and willingness to engage with the Fund (from UNCT, host governments, donors).

Analysis: With the resource mobilization targets not being reached for 2020 nor 2021, the risk driver relating to insufficient donor support did materialize and is likely to increase. In the post-COVID context, donor support and resource mobilization remain a challenge. Fundraising was a priority item at the June 2021 Steering Committee meeting.

2.4 GCM Vision, Objectives and Guiding Principles

As a GCM capacity-building mechanism, a critical feature of the Migration MPTF is its close alignment to the vision, objectives and guiding principles of the Compact. This is evidenced by the Fund’s 360-degree approach to ensure a balanced support to all GCM objectives, and its operational and programmatic alignment to the GCM guiding principles. These principles are reflected in the Fund’s governance structure, Results Monitoring Framework, and Investment Plan, but most importantly, in its review and funding allocation decisions vis-à-vis the joint programmes.

2.4.1 The 360-Degree Approach

“This Global Compact offers a 360-degree vision of international migration and recognizes that a comprehensive approach is needed to optimize the overall benefits of migration, while addressing risks and challenges for individuals and communities in countries of origin, transit and destination.”

- GCM, paragraph 11
Thematic Balance

To ensure a comprehensive approach in line with the 360-degree vision, the Fund’s programmatic framework clusters the GCM’s 23 objectives under 5 thematic areas. This allows the Fund to ensure balanced support and provides an umbrella of broad operational areas towards which donors can earmark their funding, if necessary. This clustering also helps to effectively monitor and report on the Fund’s impact.

As articulated in the Investment Plan, thematic balance is a fundamental criterion when selecting joint programmes to be funded. It is second only to quality. This clustering is a powerful management tool to ensure that the Fund’s operations are thematically balanced.

Joint Programming alignment to the 360-degree approach is monitored in the Results Monitoring Framework under Result 3, indicator 3.1.3.
Geographic Balance and Diversity

Following on thematic balance, the Fund seeks to achieve geographic balance and diversity of partnerships and interventions among its joint programme portfolios. Noting that this is conditional on a sufficient level of resources and on the existence of variety among the pool of quality proposals submitted by countries and regions, it is recognized that geographic balance and diversity can only be achieved over time. This sub-component of the 360-degree approach is further elaborated upon in the Investment Plan 2021-2022, approved by the Steering Committee in its December 2020 meeting.

Geographic balance: The Fund aims to ensure appropriate geographic balance, in keeping with the spirit of a funding instrument called for by the UN General Assembly. GCM implementation is crucial in all regions, as all face migration-related challenges. To ensure that geographic balance can be monitored consistently over time, the Fund reviews its allocation decisions considering the following five regions, and sub-regions, to properly reflect the variety and scale of migration dynamics amongst and within regions: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sub-Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>East Africa; Southern Africa; West and Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Caribbean; Central and North America; South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>Central and North Asia; East and Southeast Asia; South Asia; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversity of partnerships and interventions: Over time, the Fund will have 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 will 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) is also a consideration.

7 The regions and sub-regions were agreed upon at the December 2020 Steering Committee meeting and are reflected in the Investment Plan 2021-2022. Both the Investment Plan and the Steering Committee meeting decisions document can be found at: http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00
2.4.2 GCM Guiding Principles

The Migration MPTF is fully aligned with the guiding principles of the Global Compact, which are reflected in all areas of work, from joint programming to the Fund’s Results Framework. To ensure all funded programmes and activities align with these principles, they constitute the key criteria for assessing, selecting, monitoring and evaluating joint programmes.

Four guiding principles - sustainable development, international cooperation, national sovereignty, and rule of law and due process - are inherent in the Fund’s objectives and funding criteria, and adherence is ensured through the joint programme proposal submission and selection process, as well as ongoing monitoring of funded programmes. Alignment of the remaining six guiding principles is ensured via rigorous quality assessment of the proposals, and subsequent monitoring and evaluation of joint programmes.

Human Rights, Gender-Responsive, and Child-Sensitive

In order to ensure all joint programmes incorporate and mainstream these three cross-cutting principles, the Fund requires all proposals (both at concept note and joint programme document stages) to self-report on marker questions.

The Migration MPTF Human Rights Marker is the first of its kind to be adopted by a UN pooled fund. It was prepared under the leadership of OHCHR with support from the UN Network on Migration and the Migration MPTF FMU, and endorsed by the Migration MPTF Steering Committee in December 2020. An innovative endeavour, the marker and corresponding guidance note support UN organizations and partners in developing joint programmes that are consistent with international human rights law and its principles, and take a human rights-based approach to programming. It provides guidance for integrating human rights throughout the project cycle - from conceptualization, joint programme development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation – as well as guidance for exercising a human rights due diligence approach. At the aggregate level, the marker also helps the Fund to track and report on allocations and expenditures to make sure human rights are upheld in all joint programmes; and it guides the development of an effective and coherent approach for tracking resources to support human rights-based results.

The Gender Marker is based on the UNDG guidance, and in December 2020, a Migration MPTF-specific Guidance Note was developed to strengthen understanding of and alignment to this principle for migration-related proposals.
People-Centred, Whole-of-Government and Whole-of-Society Approach

Leave nobody behind. The Fund strongly espouses the GCM’s commitment to people-centred, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches, to ensure relevance, ownership and sustainability. The composition of the Steering Committee with various constituency representatives, and the commitment to an annual Consultative Forum reflect this commitment.

Programmatically, the Fund ensures that joint programmes to be funded involve and meaningfully engage with: more than one government line entity, and/or local government(s) and/or related entities; and a broad range of stakeholders including civil society, migrants and/or migration affected communities.

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 their communities in countries of origin, transit and destination. Particular attention is 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.

Joint Programming alignment to these guiding principles are monitored in the Results Monitoring Framework as follows:

- **Human Rights**: Result 1.2, indicator 1.2.1
- **Gender-responsive**: Result 1.3, indicator 1.3.1
- **Child-sensitive**: Result 1.4, indicator 1.4.1
- **People-centred**: Result 1.1, indicator 1.1.1
- **Whole of government**: Result 1.5, indicator 1.5.1 and 1.5.2
- **Whole of society**: Results 1.6, indicator 1.6.1 and 1.6.2

While not a quality requirement for all proposals (since some joint programmes may not target children), a Child-Sensitive Marker is also included to upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18.
3 THE PROGRAMMING CYCLE
At its inaugural meeting in December 2019, the Steering Committee adopted an ambitious timetable that foresaw Migration MPTF funded joint programmes up and running before the end of 2020. The Fund achieved this, despite the COVID-19 pandemic, with six inaugural joint programmes commencing in October 2020. During 2021, the Fund continued the process of solicitation, review and selection of joint programmes. By the end of 2021, the number of funded joint programmes grew to twelve.

The Fund uses a three-step process to review and select joint programmes: 8

1. The Steering Committee identifies high-quality, relevant and eligible concept notes to include in the Pipeline of Joint Programmes. The pipeline is constantly updated with the possibility of adding or withdrawing concept notes at each Steering Committee meeting.

2. Then, the Steering Committee prioritizes concept notes (evenly distributed among the 5 thematic areas, in line with the GCM’s 360-degree approach) and requests full joint programme documents, in order to maintain a pool of ten Priority Joint Programmes.

3. When resources become available, the Steering Committee selects Joint Programmes to be funded from this pool of priority joint programmes. In this manner, the Fund can efficiently allocate resources to joint programmes, without having to wait for concept notes to develop full proposals.

This section provides an overview of the programming cycle from submission of concept notes, review and identification of pipeline joint programmes, to funding decisions of joint programmes, that the Fund undertook during 2021.

8 This process is further elaborated upon in the Investment Plan 2021-2022.
### 3.1 The Demand: Concept Notes

To date, the Fund has received 113 concept notes from 83 different countries and regions. While most of these concept notes were received during 2020, the first year of operations, 2021 saw continued interest in the Fund among Member States and Participating UN organizations with 23 concept note submissions.

The proposals came from different regions, covering all thematic areas, and reflecting varying migration context and dynamics. With limited outreach and awareness raising, partly due to COVID-19 restrictions and partly to manage expectations, this continued interest in the Fund reflects the need for support and the strong interest of Member States and partners in implementing the Global Compact through a joint programming approach.

The tables below show concept notes received per thematic area and geographic regions (regions/sub-regions), broken down by concept notes reviewed per Steering Committee meetings (June and December 2021).

#### Thematic Balance

While there was a slight leaning towards thematic areas 1, 2, and 4 (focus on evidence and data; protection of human rights, safety and well-being of migrants; and facilitating regular migration, respectively), every thematic area received at least two concept notes in 2021. With these new submissions, at least 13 concept notes were received in total under each thematic area. This allowed the Fund to comply with the 360-degree approach in its decisions without compromising on quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Geographic Diversity

Twenty-six countries submitted one or more concept note either separately or as part of a multi-country proposal. Africa submitted the greatest number (9), with Asia, particularly the central Asia sub-region, coming in as a close second (8). While the numbers are relatively small, there were submissions from every region, reflecting varying migration contexts. The table below provides a breakdown of all submissions by regions.

Regional concept notes are those that were submitted in coordination with Regional Economic Communities.

---

*Regional concept notes are those that were submitted in coordination with Regional Economic Communities.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 The Review: Pipeline of Joint Programmes

The relatively high number of joint programmes in the pipeline is encouraging. 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. It further reinforces the commitment of the UN system to support GCM implementation in coordinated, coherent, joined-up fashion.

In line with the criteria outlined in the Operations Manual, the assessment of the concept notes focused on:

- eligibility and adherence to key cross-cutting principles (people-centred, human rights dimension, gender-responsiveness, child-sensitivity),
- the quality of the consultative process leading to the joint programme design,
- complementarity with existing initiatives/programmes,
- the strength and breadth of the partnerships envisaged in implementation (whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches),
- the innovative value of the initiative, and
- the sustainability of results.

In general, most concept notes demonstrated a strong whole-of-government approach, with many engaging with numerous government counterparts both at national and local levels. While adherence to the whole-of-society and people-centred approaches was mixed, most concept notes still exhibited promising levels of involvement and engagement. While there were no new regional submissions strictly speaking (submitted in coordination with Regional Economic Communities), three submissions involved multiple countries.

Out of 23 concept notes submitted in 2021, the Steering Committee approved 9 and rejected 14.

Due to the comparatively low number of concept notes received in 2021, the following analysis is cumulative, reviewing the 2020-2021 figures in total.

Thematic Balance

Reviewing all concept notes received to date (during 2020 and 2021), at least 14 concept notes were received for each thematic area. This thematic diversity enabled the Migration MPTF to abide by the 360-degree principle. Any discrepancy between the thematic areas at the submission stage was significantly reduced through the pipeline selection process, as the pie charts below show.
Total CNs received per thematic area (2020-2021)

Approved CN’s per thematic area (2020-2021)
Geographic Diversity

The geographic distribution of the concept notes received to date was sufficiently diverse to allow for balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMPTF Concept Notes (CNs) Submissions 2020-2021</th>
<th>Total Concept Notes received in 2020-2021</th>
<th>Approved (funded + pipeline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total CNs received per Region (2020-2012)

Approved CNs per Region (2020-2021)

Overall, the pipeline of project concept notes clearly illustrates how the Fund can assist with GCM implementation across a broad range of issues. It shows that, with adequate resources, the Migration MPTF is ready to respond to needs identified by the Member States and that it is committed to the 360-degree approach. It is an eloquent demonstration of both the relevance of the Global Compact and the foresight of its drafters in calling for the Fund.
### 3.3 The Selection: Joint Programmes

In 2021, from the pipeline of joint programmes, ten were approved as priority following the submission of a full-fledged joint programme document, and six were selected for funding: one through an ad hoc decision in January, two at the June Steering Committee meeting and three at the December meeting. Detailed decisions are explained in the Steering Committee meeting decisions documents available here: [https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00](https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00).

The first table below lists the joint programme documents approved, and the second lists the joint programmes selected for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Priority Joint Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Allocation of Resources to Joint Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Country, Countries, or Region</th>
<th>Region /Sub-Region</th>
<th>Joint Programme Title</th>
<th>Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs)</th>
<th>Budget (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Asia/ East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td>Migration Governance for Sustainable Development in Indonesia</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UN Women</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Americas/ Caribbean</td>
<td>Access, Support, Cooperation (ASC) Programme: A Collaborative Approach to Support Survivors of Human Trafficking</td>
<td>IOM, UNFPA, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Africa/ West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Addressing the drivers and causes of migration-related vulnerabilities among border communities along the Trans-Gambia transport corridor</td>
<td>ITC, IOM, UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Asia/ South Asia</td>
<td>Managing Health Risks linked to Migration in Afghanistan: Operationalization of International Health Regulations</td>
<td>IOM, WHO</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Americas/ South America</td>
<td>Socio-economic integration of migrants and host communities focused on national and local governments and innovation projects</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UN Women</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regional IGAD</td>
<td>Africa/ East Africa</td>
<td>Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region</td>
<td>ILO, IOM, UNHCR, UNOPS</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 13,200,000

These funding allocation decisions are aligned to the vision, objectives and guiding principles of the Compact.
3.4 Programmatic Alignment to GCM Principles

Thematic Balance

Thematic areas 1 and 3 had one joint programme approved for funding, and thematic areas 2 and 4 had two joint programmes funded in 2021. While no joint programme from thematic area 5 was funded in 2021, this decision balanced out the resource allocation in 2020, when two joint programmes were funded under thematic area 5, and only one for all other thematic areas.

As per RMF result 3.1, indicator 3.1.3, the percentage of resources allocated to each thematic area was monitored. In reviewing this cumulative indicator (2020-2021), the overall thematic balance has been achieved, with allocation of resources per thematic area ranging between 12.57% to 28.09% (within the range of 10-30%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Allocation</th>
<th>Cumulative (2020-2021)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total allocation (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 1</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 2</td>
<td>7,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 3</td>
<td>5,686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 4</td>
<td>5,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 5</td>
<td>4,267,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25,454,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geographic Balance

As mentioned, while geographic balance is a longer-term goal, the Fund made every effort to have a balanced approach in its allocation of resources, and all regions except MENA are currently represented in the joint programmes.

This reflects both the insufficient level of resources and the limited variety among the pool of quality proposals submitted by the region: To date, only 5 out of 113 concept notes were from MENA, and only one was positively assessed and included in the priority joint programmes.

The following table summarises funded and pipeline joint programmes per region for the cumulative 2020-2021 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Allocation</th>
<th>Funded joint programmes</th>
<th>Pipeline joint programmes</th>
<th>Total funded and pipeline joint programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 GCM Guiding Principles

Human Rights

Joint programmes largely achieved the Fund-specific Human Rights Marker approved by the Steering Committee in December 2020.

With 8 joint programmes reporting A, and 4 reporting B (i.e. all 12 joint programmes reporting human rights marker of either A or B), the Fund has achieved its 2021 target under Result 1.2, indicator 1.2.1 (100% joint programmes report A, B, or C, with minimum 90% reporting for A or B).

Leaving No One Behind: Reaching the Furthest Behind First

The promise of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development is to leave no one behind, and to reach the furthest behind first. This includes working towards an end to discrimination, as well as addressing inequalities and vulnerabilities, with a focus on those who are at greatest risk of exclusion or marginalization. This can include migrants, particularly those with irregular migration status, and can also be influenced by gender, age and other factors. Two examples elucidate some of the ways that the joint programmes contribute to the principle of leaving no one behind.

**Chile-Mexico:** In Santiago and Mexico City the joint programme is working with municipal governments to ensure that services are delivered in a non-discriminatory manner. For example, the joint programme has developed training modules on age, gender and diversity that are available on the local government's interactive platform. The mayor of Santiago has championed this initiative and made it mandatory for all current and future officials to undertake the course. Given the interest in the course, the joint programme is exploring opportunities for it to also be launched on IOM’s E-Campus, which is a publicly available platform for e-learning courses on migration-related topics. This will support its wider availability, beyond the initial intended audience.

**South Africa:** The joint programme has identified focal points in the targeted communities to support efforts to mitigate the occurrence of conflict and strengthen early warning systems relating to violence and unrest in the community. Deliberate efforts have been made to include single men, single women, LGBTIQ persons, the elderly and youth among these local points. Working with a diversity of focal points supports inclusion of those who are often hard to reach, ensuring that they are not left behind. In 2021, the joint programme held virtual and in-person information sharing sessions for a total of 706 individuals as part of this initiative.
Gender-Responsive

One joint programme (Tajikistan) has gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls as the primary or principal objective (gender marker A) and all others will make a significant contribution to gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls (gender marker B).

The Fund fully achieved its 2021 target under Result 1.3, indicator 1.3.1 (100% joint programmes report A, B or C, with minimum 70% reporting for A or B).

Addressing the Gender Dimensions of Migration

Recognizing the gender dimensions of migration, the GCM commits to a gender-responsive approach that ensures the human rights of men, women, girls and boys are respected at all stages of migration, their specific needs are properly understood and addressed, and they are empowered as agents of change. Gender considerations should therefore be reflected across the joint programmes. Below are some examples of how on the ground:

Responding to migration-related gender dynamics in Tajikistan: Approximately 10% of Tajikistan’s working age population has migrated to Russia; 85% of this group are men. Conservative societal values and understandings of gender roles contribute to a strong dependence on men, leaving abandoned women more vulnerable, facing unequal access to property, land, and credit. Women can also lack access to legal remedies and often face discrimination in the application of law.

The joint programme responds to these challenges. For example, it addresses gender-related barriers to the inclusion of women in economic activities, particularly in the agricultural sector. In 2021, the joint programme established partnerships with Farmer Field Schools in the selected districts and began looking for suitable channels for the provision of agricultural productivity grants. These grants will support resilience and self-sufficiency in farming, and contribute to improved food security and incomes for women and their families affected by migration. Following the scoping exercise, the joint programme concluded that these grants will be disbursed through community-based women’s groups. The grants will be coupled with support to strengthen beneficiaries’ financial management capacities.

South Africa and female community leaders, including LGBTIQ: This joint programme has established Peace Rooms, community hubs where women in the community receive and share information on security-related concerns. They can also alert the authorities when needed. By the end of 2021, Peace Rooms were created in the joint programme’s three focus provinces. So far in each province, 25 women, youth and LGBTIQ persons have been trained in early detection and reporting of violent incidents.

Promoting digital skills among women in the Philippines: The BRIDGE programme supports the empowerment of women, including returnees. One of its pilot projects equips women with digital skills for business management, which builds women’s capacities in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). Aside from improving their economic situation, this approach also challenges gender biases and stereotypes in the design of reintegration programmes, through providing women with access to labour initiatives that would traditionally have targeted men.
**Child-Sensitive**

Tajikistan also aims to uphold the rights and address the needs of boys and girls under 18 (child sensitivity marker A) as its primary objective. This is due to its focus on families left behind, which includes both women and children left behind and impacted by migration. In addition, five joint programmes (North Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, The Gambia, Regional IGAD, and South Africa) will make a significant contribution towards upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18; and the remaining six joint programmes (Indonesia, Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Ecuador, Philippines, and Chile-Mexico) were assessed as contributing in some way to upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18.

The Fund fully achieved its 2021 target under Result 1.4, indicator 1.4.1 (60% joint programmes report A, B or C, with minimum 20% reporting for A or B).

**People-centred**

All twelve joint programmes consulted with, and explicitly reflected the needs and concerns of migrants and/or migration-affected communities in their design. The Fund has thus fully achieved the 2021 target under Result 1.1, indicator 1.1.1 (80% of joint programmes reporting as such).

Below is a summary of alignment to the people-centred approach of the joint programmes that were selected for implementation in 2021:

- **Indonesia**’s joint programme was developed via extensive consultations at national and provincial levels, including stakeholders in the target districts of West Nusa Tenggara, Central Java, and South Sulawesi Provinces;

- The **Trinidad and Tobago** joint programme, which addresses trafficking in persons, has strong representation of non-governmental (civil society) partners, among them TTVSOLNET, a registered NGO managed by a group of Venezuelan nationals;

- The **Gambia**’s joint programme was developed via broad consultations, including with those directly affected by the Trans-Gambia bridge and transport corridor, such as communities and community leaders, youth- and women-focused civil society organizations, migrants and regular users of the borders, and victims of trafficking.

- **Afghanistan**’s joint programme was based on consultations with community leaders, members and civil society around selected border points of entries.

- **Ecuador**’s joint programme responds to challenges identified via nation-wide consultative processes, involving immigrants, Ecuadorian returnees, civil society members, international cooperation organizations, members of the diplomatic corps, local government representatives, academia, non-governmental organizations and state institutions.

- During project planning, the **Regional IGAD** joint programme engaged migrants in a participatory manner, to take into account different needs and rights of women, men, girls and boys.
Whole-of-government

All twelve joint programmes include, as partners, more than one government line entity, allowing the Fund to fully achieve its 2021 target under Result 1.5, indicator 1.5.1 (90% of joint programmes include as partners more than one government line entity).

In addition, six out of the twelve (50%) of joint programmes entered into implementation agreements (both financial and non-financial) with local government and related entities. This allowed the Fund to fully achieve its 2021 target under Result 1.5, indicator 1.5.2 (20% of joint programmes enter into implementation agreements – financial or other - with local government and related entities).

Please note that since three joint programmes only started in December 2021 and Afghanistan suspended implementation, these programmes were not considered in this indicator.

Working with Local Authorities

A whole-of-government approach to programming helps ensure both vertical and horizontal policy coherence, across sectors and at all levels of governance. This important element of GCM implementation supports migration governance that is considered in local planning, rather than solely at the national level. Below are some examples of how the joint programmes have demonstrated the value of this in their programming in 2021.

Working with municipal governance structures - Chile-Mexico: The joint programme in Chile and Mexico responds to the call for strengthened partnership with local governments in the context of GCM implementation. The joint programme forges partnerships horizontally among local institutions and stakeholders in both countries and vertically between local and national government. In particular, the joint programme works with municipal authorities in Mexico City and Santiago to strengthen city services and ensure that they are delivered in a non-discriminatory manner. This includes the development of livelihood approaches inclusive of migrant workers, refugees and asylum-seekers, with focus on women, youth and persons with disabilities, as well as consolidated referral pathways offering migrants easy access to information and a range of services.

The value of horizontal governance - South Africa: During the reporting period the joint programme engaged with local governance structures and stakeholders to formulate conflict prevention plans and to establish a multi-stakeholder forum, with a focus on prevention. This included the eThekwini Municipality, the Department of Community Safety and Liaison, South African Human Rights Commission, eThekwini Business Unit, SAPS, Metro Police, religious leaders, as well as community leaders. Building on existing partnerships, the joint programme was able to apply a whole-of-government approach. The programme worked directly with local government entities in the target provinces while also leveraging vertical governance structures, linking both in the process. This is applied through community-based early warning systems that can feed into national platforms, such as the National Disaster Management Centre, to help strengthen responses.
Whole-of-society

All six joint programmes include non-UN and non-governmental stakeholders in their programme management and coordination mechanisms, allowing the Fund to fully achieve its 2021 target under Result 1.6, indicator 1.6.1 (85% of joint programmes include non-UN and non-governmental stakeholders in its programme management and coordination mechanisms). Disaggregation per type of stakeholders (GCM definition): migrants (8), diasporas (3), local communities (7), civil society (12), academia (5), private sector (6), trade unions (2), National Human Rights Institutions (1).

In addition, all twelve joint programmes have entered into implementation or collaboration agreements (financial or non-financial) with non-governmental stakeholders. This was monitored under indicator 1.6.2 (% of joint programmes that enter into implementation agreements with non-governmental stakeholders), with the Fund surpassing its 2021 target (70%).

Please note that since three joint programmes only started in December 2021 and Afghanistan suspended implementation, these programmes were not considered in this indicator.
Partnering with Stakeholders

Below are some examples of how the whole-of-society approach has been integrated into the joint programmes in 2021.

**Leveraging community structures to respond to violence and unrest - South Africa:** This approach is particularly effective for interventions such as conflict early warning systems. Beyond local governance structures, the joint programme also works through community leaders, including women leaders, as well as media institutions, ensuring that responses are localised and context-specific. This leads to adjustments to the interventions to meet the needs of communities, and groups such as women and youth within communities.

**Engagement with private sector - Mexico-Chile:** In both Mexico and Chile, the joint programme has been working with private sector entities to identify possibilities for training and enhancement of skills, as well as employment opportunities and advocacy to improve hiring practices among refugees and migrants. In Mexico City, the joint programme partnered with the local council to address discrimination and xenophobia, through an entity known as the “Council to Prevent and Eliminate Discrimination in Mexico City” (COPRED, for its acronym in Spanish).

Through the support of COPRED, the joint programme was able to connect with private companies that are members of its platform: The Great Agreement for Equal Treatment in the State of Mexico City within the business sector. This platform links with decision makers in companies to foster equality and non-discrimination, focusing on the rights of people that live in, and travel through, Mexico City. It covers approximately 100,000 private sector workers in Mexico City. Through this partnership, the joint programme supported the sensitization of businesses on the opportunities that labour migration brings. Additionally, dialogue with companies led to a better understanding of companies’ recruitment needs, which the joint programme incorporated into its interventions.

**Local media - Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone:** In pursuit of strengthened security, community cohesion and improved health outcomes in the Parrots Beak area, the joint programme established a partnership with a local radio station. This station broadcasts in French, English and local languages, to maximize its reach. The joint programme provided the radio station with equipment to increase its transmission capability and reach. During the reporting period, the radio station broadcasted shows and jingles in local languages on human rights, health and security, with the aim of contributing to awareness of the issues as well as how to report of security and health concerns.

**Academia – North Macedonia:** In 2021 the joint programme fostered partnerships among academia, think tanks and government entities, drawing on global experiences and good practices. This includes cooperation with Southampton University for the design and implementation of a statistical framework for producing estimates of migration to/from North Macedonia. The joint programme is also partnering with the Faculty of Computer Science and Engineering (FINKI) in Skopje, as well as the Ministry of Information Society and Administration (MIOA), the State Statistical Office, for the compilation and exploration of alternative sources of data and potential use of big data analytics.

Annex C contains a summary table of the joint programmes with marker grades. The full joint programme documents are available on the relevant projects’ pages at [https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00](https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00).
Strengthening UN Coherence

As stated in its Terms of Reference, a key objective of the Migration MPTF is to foster UN system coherence in the field of migration by supporting the work of the UN Network on Migration at regional and country levels. It is therefore important to assess to what extent the Fund has contributed to rallying the UN system in support of GCM implementation, by taking stock of the level of engagement of the broad membership of the UN Network on Migration and measuring how resources are distributed.

The table below provides a breakdown per UN Organization of how many concept notes were submitted, how many were included in the pipeline, and how many were funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Pipeline</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Habitat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows a great engagement of the Network: 21 UN entities participated in the submission of at least one joint programme concept note, and among them, 13 agencies participated in ten or more.

With 17 agencies included in the pipeline and 12 involved in the implementation of the funded joint programmes, the selection reflects the diversity of UN system involvement. It demonstrates the Fund’s readiness to provide support to the broad group of UN partners, and, through them, a wide range of governmental and non-governmental partners associated with the design, implementation and management of the joint programmes.

The surface chart below illustrates how the first USD 25.5 million of the Fund have been allocated.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the majority of countries that have successfully submitted a concept note (i.e. that have a joint programme either already funded or in the pipeline) have established a country-level Migration Network. Looking at it from another angle, approximately 45% (29 out of 67) of the countries that have established a local Migration Network have successfully submitted a concept note to the Fund, demonstrating the very close link between the engagement with the Migration MPTF and effective coordination of United Nation entities and their partners at country level.
UN system Coherence in Action: Building on Areas of Comparative Advantage

The United Nations Development System calls for greater collaborative work between UN entities, which can help accelerate the achievement of the SDGs, as well as progress towards the GCM’s objectives. The Migration MPTF contributes to this through valuing initiatives that are coordinated, inclusive and coherent. Many of the programmes under the Fund were founded under national UN Networks on Migration, which bring together UN entities at the country level as part of the One UN approach.

The Philippines BRIDGE programme, which builds on past UN actions on migration and complements those that are ongoing with the support of the full UN Network on Migration, is an excellent illustration of the value of “delivering as one”.

“In a context where financing for development is exposed to a wide range of challenges and constraints, the BRIDGE Programme emerges as a catalytic multi-partner investment to advance knowledge, strengthen UN coherence, and foster meaningful partnerships. The Programme has made available key resources to allow us build alliances, develop durable solutions and reinforce institutional capacities in support of the implementation of the Global Compact on Migration. With such investment, the Programme also contributes to bring the SDGs back on track, at a time when all countries are grappling with the impact of COVID-19 pandemic.”

- Gustavo Gonzalez, UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator in the Philippines

The North Macedonia joint programme on Migration Policy and Discourse aims to support policy makers in North Macedonia to effectively manage demographic and migration dynamics through development of evidence-based migration policies based on improved systemic data collection and analysis and enhanced inter-institutional data exchange; and improve the perception of the general public and policy makers about immigrants and refugees.

“The achievement of the Joint Programme in 2021 was made possible because of our joint UN team efforts and the full engagement of our national, international and civil-society partners. The development of the country’s new Migration Policy 2021-2025 and Action Plan that were adopted through the Parliament’s Resolution in December 2021 is the result of truly joint efforts, providing a strong foundation that will shape the migration management discourse in North Macedonia.”

- Rossana Dudziak, UN Resident Coordinator in North Macedonia
Joint Programme contribution to the SDGs

The Global Compact is rooted in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and aims to leverage the potential of migration for the achievement of all SDGs, as well as the impact this achievement will have on migration in the future.

By requiring all joint programmes to identify which SDG targets and indicators they mainly contribute to, the Migration MPTF contributes to realizing the intrinsic link between the GCM and the achievement of the SDGs, beyond target 10.7 which calls on States to “facilitate orderly, safe and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies”.

This focus on the SDGs is also critical to further strengthening the alignment of the GCM-inspired programmes with the country-level UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks.

In order to participate in the global efforts to track financial flows towards the 17 SDGs and with the support of the teams in charge of the implementation of the various joint programmes, the Migration MPTF has endeavoured to monitor what proportion of its programme budget contributes to which goal. Below is an overview of self-reported joint programme budgetary contribution towards relevant SDGs \(^\text{10}\).

In all, the joint programmes contribute towards 8 SDGs. The first of the list is SDG 10 (reduced inequalities) towards which 26% of the resources are directed. This was to be expected considering that SDG 10 includes target 10.7 which calls on States to “facilitate orderly, safe and responsible migration and mobility of people”. Gender equality (SDG 5) comes second with over 20% of the resources, confirming the strong gender focus of the Migration MPTF and consistent with the joint programmes’ gender marker. Both SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth) and SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) are also prominently featured.

---

10 The Afghanistan joint programme was not included in the calculations as it remains on hold.
THE JOINT PROGRAMMES
By the end of 2021, 12 Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) joint programmes were funded, with implementation underway: six were approved in Oct 2020; one in Jan 2021; two in June 2021; and three in Dec 2021. The joint programmes have made progress towards results. Some are now in the middle phase. Implementation has so far resulted in good practices, challenges and lessons learnt. All the joint programmes follow whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches and integrate human rights, people-centred and gender-sensitive considerations. Specific examples are provided in the content below.

This chapter provides a brief overview of each joint programme, as well as summaries of the main achievements and challenges, if any, for those that initiated implementation between late 2020 to mid-2021. For the three joint programmes that started in December 2021, only programme summaries are provided. These overviews are presented according to the five Migration MPTF thematic areas. For more information, the full 2021 Annual Reports for each joint programme are available on their respective MPTFO project fact sheet pages: https://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MIG00.
Responding to COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic affected many joint programmes in 2021. The impact was also directly (and indirectly) noted in relation to changing migration dynamics, including through travel restrictions and lockdowns, as well as in response to the socio-economic dimensions of the pandemic, such as job losses and widening inequalities. This had both direct and indirect implications for programme beneficiaries, including migrants, their families and communities. The examples below show how the joint programmes adjusted their approaches to remain effective and relevant in spite of, and in response to, COVID-19.

**South Africa – Addressing socio-economic inequalities**: Aside from the direct health implications of COVID-19, communities across South Africa have been widely and adversely affected by the pandemic in a number of ways. COVID-19 widened inequalities and disparities, and heightened poverty. In some instances this has contributed to community tensions, leading to a reversal of some of the social cohesion gains from joint programme implementation.

While the joint programme experienced significant challenges in programming that was initially intended to take place in person, virtual information-sharing platforms and focal points such as community-based ‘peace ambassadors’ and ‘monitors’ trained through the joint programme were instrumental during hard lockdown periods to keep information channels open among communities, community organizations, local authorities, and UN partners. As part of the broader COVID-19 recovery process, the joint programme supported ongoing national efforts to reduce vulnerabilities and strengthen resilience of affected communities by promoting social enterprises and employment creation opportunities.

**The Philippines BRIDGE Programme – Addressing needs of returning workers**: Large scale job losses due to the pandemic have led to mass returns, and the need for associated effective reintegration frameworks and tailored services. In response to this, BRIDGE identified a need for a COVID-19 impact assessment of returned overseas foreign workers’ situations upon return to the Philippines during the pandemic. This assessment is a follow-up study to the COVID-19 Impact Assessment on Returned Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) that was launched in May 2021 with the support of the national UN Network on Migration, in partnership with the Scalabrini Migration Center. Maximizing its access to reliable data, the study focuses on the plans and prospects of returned OFWs, guided by the remigration intentions and reintegration business plans from the original assessment. The follow-up study design was presented to the national UN Network on Migration in the last quarter of 2021, as well as to the BRIDGE TWG representatives for Outcome 2 and to SMC partners, Agricultural Credit Policy Council (ACPC) and Small Business Corporation (SBC), that offer microbusiness reintegration programmes for returned OFWs affected by the pandemic.

**Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone - Responding to the pandemic in border areas**: In 2021, the joint programme worked to reinforce community support systems along the Parrot’s Beak border, with special focus on improving health outcomes. This region has a history of health challenges such as COVID-19, Ebola virus disease, and Lassa fever. Building on lessons learnt from the Ebola outbreaks, and drawing on existing UN expertise and experience in the region, the joint programme responds to
public health considerations across each of its pillars, including through trainings in rapid detection and response to epidemic threats for PoE officers and provision of protective equipment and hygiene kits to authorities. It does this through strengthening collaboration for efficient and coordinated response, such as supporting cross-border meetings between authorities and community members, as well as establishing community structures to support the dissemination of information and to ensure authorities are rapidly alerted of any health concerns. For example, through the cross-border exchange platform between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, the joint programme supported information sharing and the strengthening the health surveillance measures along the borders in accordance with the provisions of the International Health Regulations (RSI 2005), in order to prevent the spread of disease.
Promoting fact-based and data-driven migration discourse, policy and planning

4.1.1 Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Migration governance for sustainable development Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
<td>December 2021 – December 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Programme Background and Summary

Migration governance is emerging as a focus across all areas of government in Indonesia. However, the response remains significantly diffused across national and sub-national government structures. Policymaking and budgeting are both decentralized, including for migrant services, vocational training, and protection of vulnerable migrants and victims of trafficking.

This scenario highlights the importance of strengthening the integration of migration in national and local development planning processes in order to accelerate the realization of the SDGs, and in line with the GCM, in an integrated manner. The joint programme, which began in December 2021, will help strengthen the Government of Indonesia’s capacity for evidence-based migration management at the national and sub-national levels. This includes support for the establishment of an inter-institutional coordination mechanism and a GCM National Action Plan.

The joint programme also strengthens government stakeholders’ capacities at sub-national levels to understand and maximize the development potential of migration. It will establish platforms for sub-national governments to exchange best practices on migration policies and programmes, including for the protection and empowerment of Indonesian migrant workers.

The joint programme envisages strong ownership and empowerment at the sub-national level, responding to localized migration governance priorities in its design, implementation, and monitoring. Therefore, aside from central government entities, local leaders, such as mayors and city administrators, and civil society partners, are important for all aspects of programme design and implementation, in line with whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches.

Achievements and Challenges

Implementation of this joint programme officially started in December 2021. It is therefore too early to report on achievements and challenges.
Achievements and Challenges

Following the launch in late 2020, implementation is now well underway. The joint programme has made substantial progress towards its overall objective of contributing to good migration governance through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development.

Evidence-based and coordinated migration policies: In 2021, the joint programme supported the development of the new Resolution on Migration Policy and associated Action Plan for 2021-2025 ("Migration Policy and Action Plan"). The Migration Policy and Action Plan were adopted by Parliament on 23 December 2021. They set out the strategic direction for the period 2021-2025 and are important contributions to migration governance in the country.

The Migration Policy and Action Plan were developed through an intragovernmental body 11 convened though the joint programme specifically for this purpose, including representatives from a cross-section of government ministries and departments and other partners. During the reporting period, the joint programme supported capacity development of the members of this body so they could contribute to the institutionalization of participatory, innovative, and forward-looking planning and policy development in migration management. It ensured policy coherence, and that cross-cutting issues such as gender, were well reflected in the final document. In addition to enhancing their role during policy development, the joint programme will ensure that the body will effectively support the Migration Policy and Action Plan’s implementation.

Through the support of the joint programme, the Migration Policy and Action Plan is evidence-based, with mechanisms for data to be updated over time so it remains relevant and responsive to changing migration trends, challenges and priorities. Specifically, the development of the Migration Policy and Action Plan benefitted from the following products, produced with support from the joint programme:

---

11 The intragovernmental body includes representatives from the following: The Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of North Macedonia • The Ministry of the Interior (MoI) • The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) • The Secretariat for European Affairs (SEA) • The Ministry of Labor and Social Policy (MLSP) • The Ministry of Education and Science (MES) • The Ministry of Justice - Civil Registry Office (MoJ-CRO) • The Ministry of Economy (ME) • The State Statistical Office (SSO) • The Ministry of Health (MoH) • The International Organization for Migration (IOM) • The International Center for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) • The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) • The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and • The Regional Initiative on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (MARRI)
1) The country’s first National Migration Profile, which reflects migration trends, migration and development linkages, as well as migration management considerations;

(ii) Migration Governance Indicators report, which focuses on migrants’ rights and well-being, whole of government approaches to migration, partnerships, the mobility dimensions of crises and safe, orderly and dignified migration; and,

(iii) Migration module, which has been integrated into the Labour Force Survey, with questions on nationals living and working abroad, as well as foreigners residing in the country.

These three products are all fully in line with international and EU data management standards, as well as the GCM.

In intra- and inter-institutional data exchange: In mid-2021, the joint programme finalized an assessment of pre-existing collection and exchange mechanisms of migration data. The assessment report highlights international standards and requirements on data, as well as migration data sources, and recommendations for enhancing intra- and inter-institutional data exchange.

Based on this assessment, the joint programme supported the procurement of hardware and software for core government ministries doing this work, with particular focus on mechanisms for data collection, management, sharing and analysis. Beneficiaries included the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Information Society and Administration, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia. This support is intended to contribute to enhanced data governance, including data exchange.

Perception of migrants and refugees among policymakers and the public: During the reporting period, the joint programme worked to create positive narratives and perceptions of migrants and refugees, focusing on their contributions to national development. This was undertaken through a range of media initiatives, guided by a Communication Strategy for Social Change. The Communication Strategy outlines a variety of tools for effecting change in attitudes amongst national stakeholders.

The Communication Strategy identified youth engagement as one of the key channels for improving public perceptions of refugees and migrants. In that vein, in October 2021, UNHCR established a partnership with the civil society organisation (CSO) ‘Youth Educational Forum (YEF)’ to analyse the attitudes of young people towards refugees and migrants. The data gathered through this partnership is being used to implement public awareness and outreach activities and to develop related non-formal educational programmes, targeting young people.

In 2021, the joint programme supported two information and outreach campaigns: (i) “This is home”12 which reached approximately 450,000 people among the general public; and (ii) “Not hate – build an attitude!”13 which reached approximately 555,000 youths. These campaigns used a range of modalities and media channels to reach their target audiences, including feature videos, animation and op-eds on social media, public screenings, and posters and fliers on public transport.

The joint programme also provided training on the Communications Strategy for journalists and members of the Advisory Body, including Office of the President of North Macedonia, Office of the Ombudsman, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Ministry of Justice, Commission for Prevention and Protection Against Discrimination, journalists, and partners (MYLA, YEF and CRC).
Strengthening the Evidence Base: Leveraging Migration Data

Through Objective 1 of the GCM, States commit to strengthen the global evidence base on international migration by improving and investing in the collection, analysis and dissemination of accurate, reliable and comparable data. In 2021, many of the joint programmes included initiatives to increase knowledge about migration. This has the potential to directly contribute to policy making, dialogue and other areas of programming across the joint programmes.

North Macedonia - Big data: In 2021 the joint programme established innovative approaches to participatory and evidence-based policy development, including through the use of ‘big data’, which have the potential to provide real-time estimates of migration stocks and flows. Big data complements traditional sources of migration data and contributes to an evidence-based approach to migration governance.

Tajikistan – understanding community dynamics: In Tajikistan, the joint programme has begun research on attitudes and behaviour patterns of Tajik migrant workers to better understand family dynamics, to ensure suitable support to families left behind. The joint programme also carried out consultations with communities in the two targeted districts of Khatlon, to directly reach migrants and communities, and understand their evolving needs.

Through these exercises, the joint programme learnt of the need to broaden their focus from ‘families left behind’ to also include women and families who are affected by migration in other ways, including:

- Women whose husbands’ work experience during migration resulted in death, terminal illness or disability, and thus cannot provide financial support to the family;

- Divorced women who migrated and left their children in the home country with their relatives; and

- Women whose husbands migrated but cannot provide financial support to their family in Tajikistan due to not finding a job in the destination country through sickness and/or poor wages.

Given that these women’s (and families’) needs are similar to those initially envisioned for support
Protecting the human rights, safety and well-being of migrants, including through addressing drivers and mitigating situations of vulnerability in migration

4.2.1 The Gambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Addressing the drivers and causes of migration-related vulnerabilities among border communities along the Trans-Gambia transport corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
<td>December 2021 – December 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Programme Background and Summary

The Trans-Gambia transport corridor has seen a significant increase in migration in recent years, particularly with the 2019 opening of the Senegambia Bridge, which crosses the Gambia River. While migration dynamics in this area could lead to socio-economic development, they can also exacerbate vulnerabilities for communities and people on the move, if not well managed.

The joint programme aims to respond to this need through increasing safety and prosperity among women and youth in districts along the Trans-Gambia transport corridor. Doing so allows those in border communities to reap the benefits of the transport corridor without being at risk of harm, particularly related to irregular migration and organized crime, including specific challenges faced by women.

The joint programme is a pilot initiative with strong potential for replicability. It targets two districts (Jarra West and Upper Baddibou) and focuses on women and youth. The main components include: 1) support for border authorities to effectively facilitate safe, orderly and regular migration for women and youth; 2) increasing awareness among women and youth of their rights and access to protection services and mechanisms; and 3) strengthening skills and access to livelihood opportunities for women and youth.

The joint programme was conceptualized based on consultations with government and civil society stakeholders, reflecting the needs of affected populations and communities. The close engagement of community members will ensure interventions are community-driven, which will facilitate ownership and contribute to the initiative’s sustainability.

Achievements and Challenges

This joint programme officially started in December 2021. It is therefore too early to report on achievements and challenges.
Approximately 10% of Tajikistan’s working age population has migrated to Russia; 85% of this group are men. Conservative societal values and understandings of gender roles contribute to a strong dependence on men, leaving abandoned women more vulnerable, facing unequal access to property, land, and credit. Women can also lack access to legal remedies and often face discrimination in the application of law.

The joint programme responds to these challenges by applying a comprehensive approach of top-down protection and policy initiatives, with bottom-up empowerment interventions. This is combined with a long-term sustainability focus through capacity building of duty-bearers, such as respective government entities. The joint programme is a pilot initiative, focusing on two districts in the Khatlon region.

The joint programme addresses the migration-related vulnerabilities of Tajik ‘families left behind’, through the following areas of focus: 1) well-being; 2) economic resilience and inclusion; 3) protection of rights (including through strengthening capacities of government and NGOs); 4) evidence-based responses, to guide policy, planning and awareness raising.

**Joint Programme Background and Summary**

Approximately 10% of Tajikistan’s working age population has migrated to Russia; 85% of this group are men. Conservative societal values and understandings of gender roles contribute to a strong dependence on men, leaving abandoned women more vulnerable, facing unequal access to property, land, and credit. Women can also lack access to legal remedies and often face discrimination in the application of law.

The joint programme responds to these challenges by applying a comprehensive approach of top-down protection and policy initiatives, with bottom-up empowerment interventions. This is combined with a long-term sustainability focus through capacity building of duty-bearers, such as respective government entities. The joint programme is a pilot initiative, focusing on two districts in the Khatlon region.

The joint programme addresses the migration-related vulnerabilities of Tajik ‘families left behind’, through the following areas of focus: 1) well-being; 2) economic resilience and inclusion; 3) protection of rights (including through strengthening capacities of government and NGOs); 4) evidence-based responses, to guide policy, planning and awareness raising.

**Achievements and Challenges**

The joint programme began operations in October 2020. However, the formal government authorization to initiate the programme took longer than anticipated. Implementation was delayed by seven months and a no-cost extension was granted.

Despite the delays, the joint programme made progress across all four outcome areas in 2021, with a focus on establishing coordination structures and partnerships, including with local authorities and civil society organizations in the target districts.

**Improved well-being of families left behind:** In mid-2021, the joint programme began work on a situational analysis of the psychosocial and economic situation of women and children left behind in Tajikistan. The study focuses on attitudes and behaviours of migrants and their families, as well as service availability (i.e. psychosocial, emotional, healthcare, livelihoods, education and social support). The study also includes a mapping of potential beneficiaries for inclusion in the joint programme and has established a database to record beneficiary details. This will support targeted future engagement and will allow the joint programme to monitor progress towards improving the well-being, protection, resilience and empowerment of beneficiaries.

---

14 Scoping work for the mapping, including through engagement with communities and local leadership highlighted the breadth of women whose husbands’ migration-related work results in challenges for them and their families. This includes husbands who have died, terminal conditions, disabilities or severe injuries resulting from their migration-related work, as well as those who divorced their wives following migration for work, or those who either receive very low wages or are now unemployed as they have not been able to secure recurrent work in the migration-context.
In 2021 the joint programme carried out preliminary sensitization activities on child protection and protective family environments to reach more than 100 personnel in family, child and maternity-support services in the target districts. While these sensitization activities will be scaled up in the year to come, for example with the inclusion of modules on child rights, these preliminary activities have been valuable in strengthening service providers’ capacities.

**Increased economic resilience and inclusion:** Gender-related barriers to economic activities, particularly in the agricultural sector, has been a core area of focus. In 2021, the joint programme established partnerships with Farmer Field Schools in the selected districts and began looking for suitable channels for agricultural productivity grants. These grants will support resilience and self-sufficiency in farming, and improve food security and incomes for women and their families affected by migration. Following the scoping exercise, the joint programme decided that these grants will be disbursed through community-based women’s groups. The grants will be coupled with support to strengthen beneficiaries’ financial management capacities.

**Enhanced rights protection of women and children left behind:** The joint programme strengthens the capacities of government and NGO service providers to enhance access to information and legal services on issues such as family violence, access to land, civil status, migration and family tracing. The joint programme also contributes to improved knowledge among individuals and communities of their rights, focusing on women and girls, as well as adolescents.

In 2021 the joint programme supported the establishment of Juvenile Support Services in the regions of Kulob and Vose. These will help divert children from the formal justice system. So far, 47 children have been reached with this service.

**Evidence-based responses:** Progress towards the fourth outcome area of the joint programme was largely focused on prepositioning for research on attitudes and behaviour patterns of Tajik migrant workers, to better understand family dynamics. This research will help make sure the support provided to families left behind under the joint programme focuses on their needs and vulnerabilities. In 2021, the joint programme forged partnerships with the Ministry of Labour, Migration and Employment of Population, in order to identify policy synergies and priority interventions.
Human trafficking has surged after the large flows of Venezuelan migrants and refugees into Trinidad and Tobago in recent years. This puts pressure on existing protection systems and leads to increased risk of abuse, violence and exploitation, especially for young women and unaccompanied and separated children.

This joint programme, “Access, Support and Coordination,” focuses on strengthening the capacities of national and community-based partners (access), caring for and empowering survivors (support) and coordinating efforts (coordination) in response to the needs of trafficking survivors in Trinidad and Tobago. The goal is to enhance the well-being, resilience and protection of migrants, including those who are vulnerable to violence, exploitation and abuse (particularly women, children and victims of trafficking), through strengthened, modernized and integrated national and community-based systems. It addresses each stage in the continuum of care, from case identification, screening, direct support to reintegration.

The joint programme builds on strong partnerships with both government and civil society, incorporating the GCM’s whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches. The initiative focuses on strengthening various actors’ capacity. It has a strong potential for replicability and/or scalability, including in other Caribbean countries, which often face similar challenges resulting from the migration dynamics linked to the Venezuela crisis.

**Achievements and Challenges**

The Access, Support and Coordination joint programme began implementation in July 2021. It includes three outcome areas: 1) strengthened protection systems; 2) improved collaboration among partners, and 3) direct support for survivors of trafficking and those at risk.

**Strengthened protection systems and improved collaboration among partners**: By the end of 2021, implementation under the first two outcome areas were still in the early stages. Some start-up activities have taken place, including a training needs assessment with government agencies and other service providers, and a situational analysis of assistance efforts to survivors of trafficking in persons. The findings of both will contribute to a better understanding of national and community-based protection systems and partnerships that will be strengthened under this initiative.

In 2021, the joint programme also produced a draft communication strategy to address xenophobia, discrimination and exploitation. This will be finalized in early 2022 and implemented after that.

**Direct support for survivors**: The joint programme carried out four individualized needs assessment for survivors of human trafficking, following referrals...
from government and civil society partners. During this time, the joint programme also assisted 27 female trafficking survivors (identified prior to its start) with short-term accommodation and other basic needs.

In order to strengthen the availability of services for survivors, proposals were solicited from non-governmental organizations to be considered as implementing partners. These proposals are now being appraised, with special focus on services to support survivors’ mental health and empowerment.

THEMATIC AREA 3

Addressing irregular migration, including through managing borders and combatting transnational crime

4.3.1 Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Managing health risks linked to migration in Afghanistan: operationalization of International Health Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
<td>July 2021 – June 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Programme Background and Summary

This joint programme aims to reduce the transmission of communicable diseases across the borders of Afghanistan through the improved implementation of International Health Regulations (IHR), with focus on key Points of Entry (PoE). This is to be undertaken through: i) building a comprehensive knowledge base and support legal and policy frameworks on IHR; ii) conducting capacity building and infrastructure upgrading at PoEs; iii) strengthening community-level surveillance systems and awareness; and iv) ensuring cross-border cooperation and interlinkages with Pakistan and Iran.

This joint programme is to be implemented within, and informed by, the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, but will provide critical support to prevent, detect and respond to the numerous infectious diseases detected in Afghanistan, with particular frequency in migrant populations. These include tuberculosis, malaria, cholera, Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever, arboviral diseases (dengue, chikungunya), leishmaniasis and hepatitis B, among others.

Work started in July 2020 but, due to the current crisis, implementation stopped shortly after that, and the joint programme remained on hold until the end of 2021.
Parrot’s Beak is in the southwestern part of Guinea, where the respective territories of Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia meet in a curved point of land between the Meli and Mokona Rivers. The movement of people and goods has increased in this region considerably in the last two decades. Recently, it appears that criminal networks are taking advantage of the lack of coordination between states and the vulnerability of border communities, to organize human trafficking and smuggling.

The joint programme addresses irregular migration and supports vulnerable groups by strengthening border management, social cohesion, and cross-border security in the Parrot’s Beak area. The intervention includes integrated border management approaches to address security, development and humanitarian concerns. It also promotes intra- and inter-country exchanges to better control illegal activities, as well as other risks to which border communities are particularly vulnerable, such as human trafficking, sexual and gender-based violence, COVID-19 and other health concerns.

The joint programme focuses on strengthening the management capacity among authorities at the borders, reinforcing trust and collaboration among state institutions and target border communities, and improving social cohesion among cross-border communities.

Integrated border management and strengthening migrant trust in state institutions: In 2021, the joint programme worked towards reinforcing community support systems along the Parrot’s Beak border, focusing on issues such as trafficking in persons, sustainable livelihoods and health outcomes. This support is part of the response to health challenges along the border, such as COVID-19, Ebola virus disease, and Lassa fever.

In pursuit of strengthening the capacities of immigration and health authorities for integrated border management, including border control, health, and mobility realities, the project carried out a series of trainings in 2021. These focused on identifying gender-based violence and trafficking cases, and the protection of the survivors of these crimes. Beyond this, the project facilitated cross-border meetings that allowed health workers from the three participating countries to share their experiences in cross-border epidemiological surveillance. This was coupled with training on the prevention and control of infections.

To support the monitoring of population mobility and border management, and to better respond to the health needs of mobile populations, the joint programme carried out mobility and public health risk mappings. This included working with local authorities to identify sites vulnerable to health threats, with focus on points of entry (PoE). Progress was made in all three participating countries to enhance the capacities of border health authorities for health surveillance, in order to reduce the spread of communicable and other infectious diseases.
In Guinea the joint programme supported epidemiological surveillance, as well as logistical and technical support to health authorities to continue such surveillance at six PoE and in cross-border communities;

- In Liberia, local health authorities received six-month capacity building support, on topics including passenger health checks, screening and consolidation of the associated data; and

- In Sierra Leone, 30 health surveillance volunteers were trained and deployed to support community members in the area of Kissi Tongi, including to help identify support referral of individuals requiring healthcare.

In order to support sustainable livelihoods, the joint programme focused on challenges and needs of small-scale cross-border traders, particularly female traders. To ensure that small-scale cross-border traders have information on their rights, as well as on border procedures, the joint programme is working towards establishing Trade Information Desks on the border between Guinea and Sierra Leone. The Trade Information Desks are linked to the West Africa Association for Cross-Border Trade, in agro-forestry-pastoral, fisheries products and Food (WACTAF), which brings together organizations whose members carry out marketing activities related to agro-forestry-pastoral and/or fisheries value chains in or between West African countries.

The joint programme also helped inform communities about health and human rights considerations, as well as services and referral pathways. Activities included:

- In Guinea, the joint programme trained members of the National Committee for the Fight Against Trafficking in Persons on the identification and referral of victims of trafficking. This was complemented by a mapping of vulnerabilities, needs and resources for psycho-social support, which identified significant gaps.

- In Liberia, the joint programme carried out community outreach on psychosocial and public health awareness, reaching more than 440 influential community actors, including religious, traditional, women’s and youth leaders. Those reached were supported with information on psychosocial and mental health awareness and approaches to the detection and activation of community-based response mechanisms.

Cross-border social cohesion: During the reporting period, the joint programme contributed to the enhancement of cross-border security and promoted information sharing among institutions and communities, including through the launch of cross-border exchange platforms. In Guinea, a training workshop was held on border security, peace and social cohesion with security units. This also addressed human rights considerations and gender-based violence, and reached approximately 50 people. Border security units also received technology to enhance communications.

In addition to this, in mid-2021, a cross-border meeting was held between all three countries, initiated by the Guinean National Health Security Agency and attended by representatives from Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, as well as local authorities and community members from the Parrot’s Beak area. The meeting focused on social cohesion and included discussion around possible community cohesion activities that could be supported by the joint programme. This contributed to the establishment of an action plan of the joint security units, based on the priorities established during the meeting.

The joint programme also supported the establishment of village surveillance committees in 15 districts that were identified as in greatest need for support. The committees include 75 members, 15 of which are women. They play an important role in the circulation of information though improved information flows between communities and authorities, disseminating information on rights and regulations, and providing advice on security-related matters to those in border areas.

In the Parrot’s Beak area, the joint programme established a partnership with a local radio station on themes related to peace and social cohesion. The radio station broadcasts in French, English and local languages, to maximise its reach. The joint programme gave the radio station equipment to increase its transmission capability. During the reporting period, the radio station broadcasted shows and jingles in local languages on human rights, health and security, with the aim of contributing to awareness among communities on reporting of security and human rights issues, such as trafficking in persons.

In Guinea, the joint programme initiated cross-border community credit unions to enhance economic inclusion and empowerment, focusing on women and youth, starting with an assessment of women’s groups to establish which met the criteria for support through the joint programme. In 2021, three cooperative groups for youth and women were identified for support. These will receive assistance in 2022 to become economically autonomous.
Facilitating regular migration, decent work and enhancing the positive development effects of human mobility

4.4.1 IGAD (Regional)

**Project Title**
Addressing drivers and facilitating safe, orderly and regular migration in the contexts of disasters and climate change in the IGAD region

**Budget (USD)**
2,150,000

**Implementation Period**
February 2021 – February 2023

**PUNOs**

The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) is one of eight Regional Economic Communities (RECs) of the African Union, comprising of Member States of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda. It is home to more than 230 million people whose livelihoods and income are predominantly linked to agriculture. The IGAD region includes areas of economic growth, as well as those prone to conflict, instability and crises linked to climate change and environmental degradation, all factors that inform migration dynamics in the region.

This joint programme contributes to facilitating pathways for regular migration in the IGAD region and minimizing displacement risk in the context of climate change, environmental degradation and disasters.

This will be achieved through addressing needs and gaps in: (i) data and knowledge; (ii) national and regional policy frameworks; (iii) disaster displacement preparedness; and, (iv) regular migration pathways.

The joint programme builds on ongoing work, programmes and action plans of IGAD, IOM, UNEP, ILO, the PDD and IFRC, and supports existing global policies and frameworks that address displacement related to climate change, notably the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. It makes use of existing information exchange platforms available in the IGAD region, such as National Coordination Mechanisms.

“Understanding risks and broadening the evidence on the interconnection between climate change, disasters and human mobility provides an opportunity for a well-informed preparedness and response policy formulation and decision-making process (...). We very much look forward to the outcomes of this partnership in terms of building ICPAC and regional capacity and the results of the modelling work in order to give more explanation on the climate change, disasters and human mobility nexus.”

- G. A. Artan, Director, ICPAC
Achievements and Challenges

Overall, the joint programme, "Migration, Disasters and Climate Change (MDCC)," aims to facilitate pathways for regular migration in the region and minimize displacement risk in the context of climate change, environmental degradation and disasters. It is comprised of four outcome areas: data and knowledge; national and regional policy frameworks; disaster displacement preparedness; and regular migration pathways.

Data and knowledge: MDCC supports national governments in the region for enhanced access to quality data and evidence on disaster displacement risk and on other forms of human mobility. Since its inception in early 2021, the joint programme has worked closely with IGAD’s Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC) to set up data collection methodologies, which feed into two innovative models to inform future programming: (i) a disaster displacement risk model; and (ii) a decision-making model. This work is being undertaken in partnership with the Centro Internazionale in Monitorragio Ambientale (CIMA) Research Foundation.

During 2021, IOM and CIMA facilitated coaching programmes to strengthen IGAD human mobility and ICPAC divisions’ institutional capacities on the links between the various areas of focus of the joint programme. This capacity development will be extended to IGAD Member States in 2022.

National and regional policy frameworks: During the reporting period, MDCC carried out an analysis of displacement and migration references in relevant regional frameworks and policies. The results of this exercise were reviewed and validated at the Regional Dialogue on Human Mobility, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (regional dialogue forum) with IGAD Member States in Addis Ababa in September 2021.

During the same regional dialogue forum, following their expression of interest, MDCC identified Somalia and Kenya, and their respective line ministries of Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in Kenya for country-level activities. After the forum, the IGAD Secretariat and MDCC liaised with the identified line ministries to support the development of detailed implementation strategies. These will help to inform the support that MDCC will provide to these Member States from 2022 onwards. Country-level follow up has also benefitted from engagement with national UN Networks on Migration in Somalia and Kenya. In Kenya, for example, the UNNM and partners created key messages demonstrating how the GCM provides an opportunity to anchor environmental and climatic dimensions in the international migration governance agenda. Partners are encouraged to utilize these key messages when engaging with different stakeholders on these issues, to support consistency and coherence.

Disaster displacement preparedness: During the reporting period, implementation under this outcome area focused on setting up the implementation modalities and mechanisms with IGAD, including the signing of an agreement between UNOPS and the IGAD Secretariat that will form the basis for implementation in the remaining joint programme period.

In addition, the MDCC started developing awareness-raising products for migrant workers and communities on their rights and obligations under national laws, as well as available forms of protection in the IGAD region. MDCC identified potential regional and local level media to carry out these campaigns.

Regular migration pathways: This pillar focuses on enhancing pathways for regular migration and access to protection services, in accordance with international, regional and domestic law. In 2021, MDCC began assessing the needs and opportunities for stronger integration of human mobility in regional and national green economy and related policies and plans. It also started work on a study of existing protection frameworks and coordination mechanisms to respond to human mobility related to climate change and disasters. This study aims to improve insights into how climate change and disasters relate to cross-border movement and to identify legal, policy and operational challenges and opportunities for providing protection and humanitarian assistance, as well as support to promote resilience and adaptation.
4.4.2 The Philippines

This joint programme, BRIDGE, supports the Government of the Philippines in achieving the country’s priority GCM objectives: Objective 6 (Facilitate fair and ethical recruitment and safeguard conditions that ensure decent work) and Objective 21 (Cooperate in facilitating safe and dignified return and readmission, as well as sustainable reintegration), with a focus on the needs and protection of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) throughout the migration cycle - from recruitment and employment, to return and reintegration.

BRIDGE focuses on ensuring that government initiatives promote fair and ethical recruitment and sustainable reintegration services that are evidence-based, gender-responsive and coordinated through people-centred, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches. It also establishes mechanisms to translate evidence into policy and best practices through considerations at each stage of the migration cycle.

Achievements and Challenges

This joint programme started implementation in October 2020. In 2021 BRIDGE supported multiple stakeholder consultations, demonstrating the focus on ownership and sustainability. This includes collaboration through the Sub-Committee on International Migration and Development (SC-IMD), an interagency structure that ensures policy coherence on international migration and development by coordinating relevant strategies and programmes of government and partners.

During the reporting period, the Government of the Philippines signed a law to establish the Department of Migrant Workers (DMW), reflecting its commitment to the progressive realization of the GCM objectives, and paving the way for BRIDGE initiatives. The Department of Migrant Workers is mandated to protect the rights and promote the welfare of OFWs, regardless of status and means of entry into the country of destination.
With the creation of this department, significant changes will be made in the governance and operational structures of Philippine labour migration landscape. As relevant migration-related government offices will be subsumed under one department, it may ease service delivery for migrant workers. BRIDGE will support the initiatives of the DMW and put measures in place to ensure strong working partnerships during the transition period.

BRIDGE follows an integrated and multifaceted approach, focusing on three outcome areas: 1) promotion of fair and ethical recruitment and sustainable reintegration of migrant workers through whole-of-government and evidence-based approaches; 2) improved policies and practices pertaining to fair and ethical recruitment, and sustainable reintegration, informed by evidence based data and international standards; and 3) improved alignment of policy and practices to GCM objectives on reintegration and fair and ethical recruitment.

Promotion of fair and ethical recruitment and sustainable reintegration: In 2021, BRIDGE worked towards supporting the Government of the Philippines to be responsive to the needs and protection of OFWs, from recruitment to reintegration. In particular, programming focused on supporting government to promote fair and ethical recruitment and sustainable reintegration services that are evidence-based, gender responsive and coordinated though a people-centred, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach. So far, this has included mapping of data collection practices and research activities on the impact of migration, in coordination with key partners.

In addition to this, during the reporting period BRIDGE partnered with Yale University to study the impact of migration on educational outcomes for children left behind. The research is being carried out in partnership with the Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA), the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), the Department of Education and Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA), migrant associations, among others. Data collection is now underway.

Improved policy and practices: In 2021, BRIDGE worked towards improving policies and practices pertaining to fair and ethical recruitment and sustainable reintegration that are informed by evidence-based data and international standards. Among key achievements during the reporting period was the establishment of regional collaboration supported by a Regional Development Council (RDC) Resolution to localize migration interventions from recruitment to reintegration.

In addition to this, engagement with the SC-IMD in 2021 included collaboration for strengthening and operationalization of the Migrant Resource Centre and in developing the Reintegration Advisor, an online portal containing key information to help migrants navigate their return and reintegration.

Alignment of policies and practices to GCM objectives: The Philippines is a GCM champion country and places emphasis on establishing best practices that align with and support its implementation. To ensure alignment with GCM objectives, the joint programme completed a gap analysis, which contains a review of existing recruitment and reintegration practices and policies. This was undertaken through a desk review and key informant interviews with DFA, POEA, and OWWA. Among the key findings were weaknesses in the preventive and protective policies and practices in the pre-departure and onsite employment phases of labour migration, limited awareness among the general public (including potential migrants) on fair and ethical recruitment principles and practices, lack of harmonized data systems for OFWs, as well as incoherent and limited types of reintegration programmes and services.

Informed by these findings, BRIDGE, in cooperation with complementary United Nations initiatives, supported the Government of the Philippines with the development of a National Action Plan on Sustainable, Gender-responsive Return and Reintegration. The NAP was developed in partnership with civil society organizations, migrant groups and associations, the private sector, and academia, which helped to ensure it was grounded in priority areas and is realistic in scope. The National Action Plan was launched in December 2021.

15 Complementary UN initiatives include the IOM Aligning Lenses Towards Ethical Recruitment (ALTER) project, which supports wider adoption of ethical recruitment principles in the Philippines. Other related initiatives that BRIDGE partners with include: the Safe and Fair Programme (SAF), a joint programme of ILO and UN Women promoting safe and fair labour migration and elimination of violence against women; the Philippine component of the Ship to Shore Rights SEA Programme, an ILO project promoting regular and safe labour migration and decent work for all migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.
Innovation and Technology

Technology and innovation are essential elements of successful programming, making sure that interventions respond to the dynamic needs of individuals (including migrants and displaced persons) and communities. It is also valuable to integrate technological solutions into capacity development support for governments and other partners. Effectively utilizing technological advancements can strengthen migration governance, support adaptability and efficiency, and maximise the reach of programming. Below are examples of innovation and technology incorporated into the work of joint programmes in 2021.

Innovation - online training for officials in Chile: In Chile, the joint programme supported the municipal authorities in Santiago with the development of online training hosted on the local government’s interactive platform, to raise awareness on gender, age and diversity considerations. The mayor of Santiago championed this initiative and made it mandatory for all current and future officials. Given the interest in the course, the joint programme is exploring opportunities for it to also be launched on IOM’s E-Campus, which is a publicly available platform for e-learning courses on migration-related topics. This will support its wider availability, beyond the initial intended audience.

The Return and Reintegration Advisor, Philippines: The BRIDGE programme is supporting the development of a digital portal that helps overseas foreign workers navigate the return and reintegration process. This tool is known as the Return and Reintegration Advisor (RRA) and includes the following elements: (i) a registry of overseas foreign workers; (ii) pre-pathway interventions, including harm reduction and welfare assistance for survivors of gender-based violence; (iii) information on social protection and asset building; and (iv) other reintegration support, including support for those planning to re-migrate. Online tools such as this are an effective way of reaching target populations, including those who are situated across borders.

Responding to health and security threats in border areas, Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone: The joint programme contributed to the enhancement of cross-border security and promoted information sharing among institutions and communities, including through the launch of cross-border exchange platforms. To further strengthen intra- and inter-governmental coordination, the joint programme trained 50 security personnel in Guinea in border security, peace and social cohesion, and equipped them with technological solutions for communication and monitoring. The joint programme also worked with local radio providers to broaden their reach through enhanced technology. This means that communities in hard-to-reach areas could benefit from the joint programme’s outreach on service availability, as well as health and security matters.
Improving the social inclusion and integration of migrants

4.5.1 Ecuador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Socio-economic integration of migrants and host communities focused on national and local governments and innovation projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
<td>December 2021 – December 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Programme Background and Summary

This joint programme addresses issues related to the socio-economic integration of migrants, returnees and local communities in Ecuador, in the context of the Venezuela crisis and other regional mixed migration flows. It aims to enhance the positive effects of human mobility, in particular for women and youth (migrants and host community members), through focus on socioeconomic integration, well-being, and local development in Imbabura and Sucumbios regions.

The joint programme is firmly rooted in the GCM guiding principles and is based on needs identified via the Human Mobility National Boards (HMNB) process designed by Ecuador’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility (MREMH) involving consultations with immigrants, Ecuadorian returnees, civil society, international cooperation organizations and State institutions.

The joint programme follows a two-pronged approach directed at securing stronger participation and equitable access to livelihood opportunities among migrants and host communities; and strengthening local governments and other public stakeholders’ capacities in promoting the integration of migrants and host communities in their respective territories. It envisages close engagement with the private sector in the generation of new skills for the future of work, information tools, digital livelihoods and alternative financing mechanisms and instruments, with potential for future replication in other parts of the nation and beyond.

The joint programme is well-aligned with national priorities outlined in the current UNDAF, which calls for "...diversification of the productive structure, the generation of decent work and sustainable livelihoods and the economic inclusion of people, with equal opportunities for women and men", as well as in the National Plan on Human Mobility, with its overall objective of socioeconomic inclusion.

Achievements and Challenges

This joint programme officially began operations in December 2021. Accordingly, it is too early to report on programmatic achievements and challenges.
The joint programme focuses on improving migrant workers and refugees’ access to decent work and sustainable livelihoods by ensuring their employability, and access to employment opportunities and social protection programs implemented in Mexico City and Santiago de Chile.

To this end, the joint programme is supporting interventions that strengthen and articulate city services in both cities to provide an adequate response to populations on the move who are facing increased vulnerability. It seeks to create public-private synergies by engaging social actors and strengthening social dialogue. Finally, by developing city-to-city networks on migrant and refugee integration practices, the joint programme is contributing to the development of a new cooperation and exchange platform on migration-related issues.

This initiative is fully aligned with and responsive to the Member States’ call for strengthened partnership with local governments in the context of GCM implementation. The joint programme forges partnerships horizontally among local institutions and vertically between local and national government. Beyond core implementation, the joint programme also intends to contribute to the exchange of good practices between the two migrant-receiving cities.

## Joint Programme Background and Summary

The joint programme started in November 2020. Interventions focus on three areas: 1) strengthening public policies/programmes and services offered by governmental and non-governmental actors, in the areas of access to employment, entrepreneurship and social protection; 2) promoting social dialogue among governmental (including local authorities) and social partners in order to facilitate migrants’ integration in the labour market; and 3) facilitating South-South and City-to-City exchange of good practices.

Over the course of 2021, the joint programme consolidated its alliances with various partners in each of the participating countries and worked towards generating an evidence base on the situation of migrants and refugees in Santiago and Mexico City, including identification of barriers to socio-economic integration. These alliances strengthened joint programme implementation throughout 2021 and will further solidify its achievements going forward.

Enhanced employment and social protection programmes and services: The first component of the joint programme aims to enhance employment and social protection programmes and services in Santiago and Mexico City, as well as to develop

### Achievements and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Capacity building of local governments in Santiago (Chile) and Mexico City (Mexico) to strengthen the socioeconomic integration of migrants and refugees through access to decent work, sustainable livelihoods, and social dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>1,702,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
<td>November 2020 – November 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUNOs**

- 4.5.2 Chile, Mexico
livelihood approaches inclusive of migrant workers, refugees and asylum-seekers, with emphasis on women, youth and persons with disabilities.

Building on completed institutional assessments in both cities, the joint programme made progress towards the establishment of two core initiatives: the Migrant Resource Centre (MRC - Mexico City) and the Migrant and Refugee Route (MMR - Santiago). These initiatives support referral of migrants to a range of services, ensuring that all relevant information is available in one place, and that public officials (the duty bearers) are aware of their respective roles. Aside from the central role of municipal authorities in the two cities, the MRC in Mexico City and the MMR in Santiago are being designed through engagement with migrants and refugees, as well as civil society organizations and workers’ and employers’ associations.

Other key actions under this component of the joint programme in 2021 include:

- To support the capacities of government officials to deliver services in a non-discriminatory manner, the joint programme also developed training on age, gender and diversity;

- In 2021, in cooperation with the project “Mujeres Emplea” funded by the COVID-19 Response and Recovery MPTF, the joint programme organized an online job fair, targeting migrant women, focusing on typically male-dominated sectors. The fair was attended by 13,085 visitors online, of which 99.5% were women. The job fair included panel discussions, mentoring sessions, and information on job opportunities, courses in social entrepreneurship, digital marketing, and business management.

- To improve livelihoods and entrepreneurship opportunities for migrants and refugees, the joint programme established social mobility programmes in Santiago, and conducted trainings and orientations on cooperatives and enterprise management for public officials in Mexico City. These focus on women, youth and people with disabilities.

Promoting social dialogue: The joint programme promotes enhanced social dialogue and adequate service delivery.

During the reporting period, the joint programme contributed to tripartite dialogue in Mexico City through the Mexico City Decent Work Programme, to advocate for the inclusion of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in labour policies and programming. This event concluded with the signing of a Pact for Labor Equality and Non-Discrimination, which sets out a commitment to “implement effective actions and practices to prevent and eradicate discrimination in Mexico City workspaces”.

During the same period, in Santiago the joint programme carried out two assessments: 1) migrants needs and experiences relating to access to the labour market, and profile of companies with employment potential for migrants in the metropolitan region; and 2) availability of public services for migrants and refugees.

Facilitating South-South and City-to-City exchange: Concrete results under this area of the joint programme are anticipated for 2022, as they build on the results of other components.
As the main country of destination for migrants in the region, South Africa faces challenges of integration and social cohesion, with a recent history of xenophobic violence. The joint programme brings together UN partners with the aim of helping respond to these challenges. It seeks to shape the public narrative on migration and promote tolerance and evidence-based discussions, and focuses on targeted engagement and participation of government counterparts, migrants and host communities, through community-level peace and socio-economic related activities.

Fully aligned with South Africa’s National Action Plan to combat Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (2019), the joint programme contributes towards strengthening migrant, refugee and asylum-seeker integration, social cohesion and positive relations with host communities. It focuses on three xenophobia-affected provinces: Gauteng, KwaZulu Natal and Western Cape. These provinces contain some of the largest cities, where tensions between migrants and host communities have been evident, and violence attributed to xenophobia frequently occurs.

The joint programme employs a “Prevention, Protection and Empowerment” framework based on three interrelated outcome areas: 1) strengthening national and local systems and capacities to prevent and respond to violence and victims of violence; 2) reinforcing social inclusion and peaceful coexistence among migrants, other groups and host communities; and 3) strengthening institutional systems to understand the causes and dynamics of crisis and violence, and for articulating responses. The joint programme’s approach is intended to serve as a catalyst for follow-up interventions, as well as for possible replication in other parts of South Africa or the broader Southern African region.

Joint Programme Background and Summary

Achievements and Challenges

This joint programme began operations in October 2020. Progress to date can be seen across its three outcome areas.

**Strengthening national and local systems:** This component contributes to the prevention of and response to xenophobia. In 2021, the joint programme began assessing the drivers and manifestation of racism, xenophobia, related intolerance and violence in target communities, as well as existing social networks and capacities for violence reduction.

The joint programme also carried out a mapping to identify focal points in the targeted communities, including single men, single women, LGBTIQ, elderly persons and youth, to support efforts to mitigate the occurrence of conflict and strengthen early warning systems relating to violence and unrest in the community. During the reporting period 706 individuals attended virtual and in-person information sharing sessions. A draft Standard Operating Procedure to guide community conflict prevention and social cohesion mechanisms, to be finalised in 2022, was also shared with partners.
In 2021, the joint programme worked to increase community members’ awareness about reporting concerns and on accessing support services. The Help South Africa communication platform (part of the Help.org site), launched in 2021, includes information on documentation (primarily for asylum seekers and refugees), COVID-19, and service availability. More than 14,000 people have used the site.

**Reinforcing social inclusion:** This outcome area contributes to raising awareness and promoting positive narratives, using community dialogue and outreach approaches, as well as social media, to address anti-migrant narratives. While COVID-19 affected all plans, the joint programme leveraged existing partnerships and ongoing initiatives, such as sporting events, exhibitions, community dialogues and commemorative days. In partnership with Izwi LoMzansi FM in KwaZulu-Natal, the joint programme supported an online campaign using an electronic banner on social media to promote social inclusion and the integration of migrants during South Africa’s Month of Reconciliation, in December 2021. This month is significant for South Africa as it connects to historic events that took place in the country during December, including the advent of democracy.

This campaign reached more than 10,000 people. Linked to International Migrants Day (18 December), the joint programme also used the "I am a migrant too" video as part of the campaign, which attracted 4,981 views. The joint programme also forged partnership with community media in KwaZulu-Natal to increase awareness in targeted communities and enhance dialogue through panel discussions on social cohesion, entitled: "The relationship between Reconciliation Day and Social Cohesion in our Communities". The discussion included panellists from the Ubuntu forum in Phoenix, Phoenix Youth organization and the KwaMashu Cultural Organization. 92,000 people listened.

As part of the broader COVID-19 recovery process, the joint programme also supported small businesses in KwaZulu-Natal that were adversely affected, by both the pandemic and the riots in July and August 2021.16

### Strengthening understanding of the causes and dynamics of crisis and violence
In 2021 the joint programme initiated an assessment to analyse the structural causes, dynamics and triggers of crisis and violence in South Africa. The research looked at xenophobic violence, gender-based violence, impact on social cohesion, and the relationship between xenophobia, racism and intolerance. The findings will help strengthen policy responses to xenophobia and hate crimes.

During the reporting period the joint programme also engaged with the local governance structures and stakeholders (including the eThekwini Municipality, the Department of Community Safety and Liaison, South African Human Rights Commission, eThekwini Business Unit, SAPS, Metro Police, religious and community leaders) to formulate conflict prevention plans and establish a multi-stakeholder forum on prevention.

In 2021, the joint programme partnered with Zoe-Life, a civil society organization that champions the voice and participation of migrant and refugee communities in South Africa. In December, Zoe-Life participated in a social cohesion stakeholders forum: "The Revival and Revitalisation of the Diakonia Council of Churches to Address Social Cohesion and Moral Regeneration in eThekwini Municipality and KwaZulu-Natal”. This forum was designed to stimulate social cohesion in KwaZulu-Natal Province and is intended to feed into a social cohesion summit in 2022.

The joint programme is also establishing Peace Rooms, community hubs where women receive and share information on security-related concerns. They can also alert the authorities when needed. By the end of 2021, Peace Rooms were created in the joint programme’s three focus provinces: Gauteng (Parktown), KwaZulu-Natal (ACCORD offices) and Western Cape (Institute for Justice and Reconciliation). To date, 25 women, youth and LGBTIQ persons per province have been trained to detect early and report incidents of violence.

---

16 The civil unrest that erupted in Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) provinces in July and August 2021 resulted in destruction of property and loss of livelihood. Following the unrest, many businesses for both local and non-nationals were impacted. Consequently, the Provincial administration through the Premier’s Office in KZN reached out to the UN Country Team for support, which led to the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the KwaZulu-Natal Premier’s Office and the UN Country Team.
Objective 23 of the GCM focuses on strengthening international cooperation and global partnership for safe, orderly and regular migration. In 2021, some of the joint programmes included actions towards the realization of this objective, which is intended to support commitments across the GCM through mutually reinforcing joint actions. Some examples:

**Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone cross-border exchange platform:** The joint programme works through the long-established Mano River Union (MRU), specifically its Joint Border Peace Building Units. The MRU, a cross-border platform for coordination between local authorities and communities in Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Cote d’Ivoire, is headquartered in Sierra Leone and operates at both central and decentralized levels (such as in the border areas). It aims to achieve unity and solidarity and to enhance cooperation between Member States and peaceful coexistence among its peoples. Carrying out coordination-related activities through this existing structure helps to maximize the reach of the joint programme, and also contributes towards buy-in from government authorities and community members, thereby strengthening ownership and sustainability.

**Leveraging regional coordination mechanisms, IGAD:** The MDCC and the IGAD Secretariat have worked cooperatively to engage a wide range of stakeholders at local, national, regional and global levels under this joint programme. In particular, coordination has been achieved through the IGAD Climate Prediction and Application Centre (ICPAC), as well as the IGAD mobility division.

MDCC works through regional frameworks and policies, such as the IGAD Protocol on Free Movement of Persons (adopted in June 2021), the Regional Migration Policy Framework, Migration Action Plan and other relevant policies related to migration, climate change, disaster risk reduction and resilience. In addition to this, MDCC is informed by relevant international agreements, frameworks and existing forums that support integrated approaches linked to displacement and climate change, such as the Paris Agreement, and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

MDCC also works to complement and build on existing initiatives and partnership, including through the CIIMA research foundation; the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) in Kampala; and individual IGAD Member States.
5 OVERVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION
This section provides an overview of the financial situation. It first reflects on the overall capitalization level, considering the fundraising target set by the Steering Committee and the difficult context. It then focuses on the Fund’s performance with respect to the key indicators and targets on earmarking. Finally, it highlights the Migration MPTF’s efficient approach to fund allocation.

Additional financial information will be provided in the annual financial report prepared by the Administrative Agent, the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, for the period 1 January to 31 December 2021, which will be publicly available by 31 May 2022.

### 5.1 Insufficient Capitalization Level

The Migration MPTF was not designed to absorb all migration projects and activities of the UN system, most of which must continue to be delivered on a bilateral or entity-specific basis. Yet to be relevant, add value and truly foster a collective approach to GCM implementation, it requires sufficient resources. In December 2020, before adopting the Migration MPTF 2021-2022 Investment Plan and after carefully considering the funding situation at the time, the need expressed by the Members States and the Migration MPTF capacity to deliver, the Steering Committee set the funding target for 2021 at USD 30 million. This target was both ambitious given the prevailing financial constraints, and modest in view of the need expressed and the number of joint programme ideas already positively assessed.

While the total capitalization level reached USD 28.1 million by the end of 2021, the USD 10.79 million firmly committed17 by nine donors during the course of 2021 fell short of the target.

17 Standard Administrative Arrangement signed by the donor and the UNDP MPTF Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Commitments made between 1 January and 31 December 2021</th>
<th>Total contributions as of 31 December 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local currency</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>Local currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>EUR 5,025,000</td>
<td>5,677,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td>GBP 702,649</td>
<td>920,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong></td>
<td>NOK 18,000,000</td>
<td>2,168,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweden</strong></td>
<td>SEK 5,000,000</td>
<td>550,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>EUR 500,000</td>
<td>594,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain</strong></td>
<td>EUR 510,000</td>
<td>597,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyprus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,790,751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The diversity of the donor base should be noted, as it reflects the breadth of the partnership and is fully aligned with the spirit of the GCM. Contributions from “non-traditional donors” such as Cyprus, Mexico, the Philippines, Thailand, and Turkey have an importance greater than their financial value as they demonstrate the commitment of their governments and illustrate the shared responsibility of Member States.

However, with only two new contributors in 2021, efforts need to be made to continue broadening a donor base that still relies heavily on a very limited number of partners. At the end of 2021, 50% of the resources were contributed by one single country (Germany) and, while their overall share slightly decreased in 2021, the four largest donors still accounted for 88% of the total resources mobilized.

At its June 2021 meeting, the Steering Committee identified the May 2022 International Migration Review Forum (IMRF) as the key platform around which to articulate its advocacy and fundraising strategy. As the establishment of the Fund was called for by the GCM itself, it appeared logical and legitimate to highlight its role at the IMRF itself and throughout the preparation process. Consistent with the targets previously set out in the 2021-2022 Investment Plan, a total capitalization target of USD 70 million by the IMRF was adopted. As part of the overall IMRF advocacy strategy, resource mobilization materials (such as a short animated video) were designed, and the Fund was prominently featured in the Pledging Initiative launched by the United Nations Network on Migration.

5.2 Adhering to the 360-degree Approach

Consistent with the principles outlined in the Funding Compact, contributors to the Migration MPTF are encouraged to provide unearmarked contributions. Contributions that can be freely programmed under any of the five thematic areas are required for the Steering Committee to balance the allocations in line with 360-degree vision of the GCM. However, mindful of the constraints donors may face (such as parliamentary restrictions in the use of funds) and the need to facilitate alignment with their strategic priorities, the Terms of Reference of the Fund allow for earmarking at the thematic level.

This ability to earmark to a specific thematic area is crucial for mobilizing resources but, if excessively used, it may hamper the Steering Committee’s ability to deliver on its commitment to abide by the 360-degree approach. To ensure full transparency on the donor earmarking and mitigate the associated risks, two indicators and targets were included in the Migration MPTF Result Monitoring Framework.

The first target sets the maximum proportion of earmarked resources at 60% (no less than 40% should remain unearmarked). As in 2020, and in a very similar proportion, this target was missed by the Fund in 2021 as 72.68% of the funds mobilized during the course of the year were earmarked by donors.

However, while missing this target is a source of concern, this indicator alone is not sufficient to assess whether the risk of failing to abide by the 360-degree approach materialized. To assess this, the earmarking data needs to be disaggregated by thematic area. A target of maximum 25% of the resources earmarked to a specific thematic area, cumulatively, was set by the Results Monitoring Framework. As shown in the table below, this target was met as no thematic area reached the ceiling for 2020-2021 cumulatively, since the inception of the Fund:
For the purpose of this table, the 2020 and 2021 contributions from Norway have been divided equally between thematic areas 2 and 3. However, while strictly earmarking its contributions towards these two thematic areas, the government of Norway did not specify the breakdown, thus allowing the Steering Committee to allocate these resources towards the two thematic areas as it deems most appropriate.

This was possible because all the major donors that have earmarked resources have adopted a constructive approach to their earmarking. Some, like the United Kingdom, left a significant part of their contribution unearmarked. Others, like Germany and Norway, earmarked towards multiple themes.

Thanks to these constructive approaches to earmarking and to the unearmarked contributions received in 2021 from Ireland, Mexico, France, the Philippines, Spain and Sweden, the Steering Committee retained a large degree of flexibility and a balanced use of resources was achieved.

### 5.3 Efficient Programming

In view of the high number of quality joint programme ideas submitted to the Fund and to avoid unnecessary delays in GCM implementation, the Steering Committee continued implementing its policy to use all resources as they became available rather than conservatively keeping a reserve. Accordingly, by 31 December 2021, of the USD 28.1 million then committed by donors, 92% (USD 25.7 million) had already been used or budgeted for the implementation of the twelve joint programmes.

With 34 Steering Committee-approved concept notes constituting a USD 73 million pipeline, the Migration MPTF is ready to deliver on a larger scale and with 11 priority programmes (with a cumulative budget of close to USD 24 million) identified and ready for implementation, the Fund is all set to sustain its efficient programming approach.

It should also be noted that, while the Steering Committee endeavours to allocate resources rapidly when they become available, this does not mean that all Funds are immediately transferred out. Only 70% of the approved budget is transferred at the onset of a joint programme as the Migration MPTF incorporated a performance-based element to fund allocation, and follows a tranche approach.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New donor commitments in 2021 (USD)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total commitments (USD)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked TA1</td>
<td>1,408,703</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>2,794,203</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked TA2</td>
<td>2,492,962</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>5,207,647</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked TA3</td>
<td>1,084,259</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>5,167,615</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked TA4</td>
<td>2,860,476</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>5,903,637</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked TA5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,014,298</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearmarked</td>
<td>2,949,362</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>8,066,600</td>
<td>28.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the purpose of this table, the 2020 and 2021 contributions from Norway have been divided equally between thematic areas 2 and 3. However, while strictly earmarking its contributions towards these two thematic areas, the government of Norway did not specify the breakdown, thus allowing the Steering Committee to allocate these resources towards the two thematic areas as it deems most appropriate.*
LOOKING FORWARD
Throughout 2021, the Fund performed strongly. Twelve joint programmes are underway. Resources are deployed efficiently and transparently and across a range of issues covered in the GCM, touching on many regions in the world. The Fund has, further, operationalized its risk management strategy; and it is, notably, the first United Nations pooled fund to have its own dedicated human rights marker.

Most importantly, the joint programmes are starting to show results:

- In **North Macedonia**, with support from the joint programme, the new Resolution on Migration Policy and associated Action Plan for 2021-2025 was adopted by Parliament in December 2021.

- Cross-border social cohesion was enhanced in the Parrots’ Beak border area of **Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone** through strengthening of cross-border security and information sharing.

- Thanks to the BRIDGE joint programme in the **Philippines**, the Migrant Resource Centre was operationalized, and the Reintegration Advisor - an innovative online portal containing key information to help migrants navigate their return and reintegration - established.

This is just the beginning. With further achievements to come from the on-going programmes and many more joint programmes to be funded, the potential for this Fund to effect real change, at scale, is cause for excitement.

The demand for the Fund remains high and concept notes keep coming in. Looking forward to 2022, the Fund will continue encouraging submissions, in particular in areas such as climate change that the Steering Committee identified as in need of strengthening.

Yet, despite strong governance and promising early results, that excitement remains tempered by the challenge of further capitalizing the Fund. Among the many indicators of the Fund results framework, the only targets that have not been reached relate to funding.

The first **International Migration Review Forum (IMRF)** will take place in May 2022 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. Member States and stakeholders will review the progress made on the GCM in general, including on the Migration MPTF as a key component of the Capacity Building Mechanism called for by the Compact.

The IMRF presents an important opportunity to cement the GCM in international migration architecture and generate further momentum behind it. It is also a moment in time in which to showcase the Fund’s role (thus far and potential), and its contribution towards achieving safe, orderly and regular migration grounded in international cooperation. With the objective of strengthening and broadening the donor base, advocacy and resource mobilization efforts will be intensified in the run-up to the IMRF.

Taking stock of the status of the Fund and the recommendations made by Member States at the IMRF, the time will come in the second half of 2022 to thoroughly assess the performance of the Fund with a view to refining its strategic direction providing a basis for the elaboration of a new biennial investment plan.

We look forward to continued growth and collaboration with our partners “to bring the Migration Compact to life, to move us closer to realizing the Sustainable Development Goals, and to effect positive change in the field of migration” as the Deputy Secretary-General Amina J. Mohamed urged us when presiding over the Fund’s launch ceremony.
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Annex A: Results Monitoring Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>TARGET 19 (cumulative unless otherwise mentioned)</th>
<th>MOVs</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Annual Report 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1 (2020)</td>
<td>Year 2 (2021)</td>
<td>Year 3 (2022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 (2021)</td>
<td>Year 3 (2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 (2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results Area 1: The Joint Programmes and Initiatives funded by the Migration MPTF is aligned to key Global Compact Guiding Principles**

1.1) Joint Programmes (JPs’s) funded by the Migration MPTF (MMPTF) are people-centred

1.1.1) % of JPs that consulted with, and explicitly reflect the needs and concerns of migrants and/or migration affected communities in its design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP docs</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JPs (denominator) equals the JP funded during the target year; ii) The information will be qualitatively assessed by the FMU from JP documents

1.2) JPs are founded on international human rights law and its principles, and take a rights-based approach to programming

1.2.1) % of JPs that self-report as: a) Human Rights (HR) Marker has largely been achieved; or b) HR Marker shows significant integration of human rights in the joint programme but some challenges remain; or c) HR Marker shows a very partial integration of human rights in the JP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP docs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MMPTF Human Rights Marker Guidance Note was finalised in Dec 2020

1.3) JPs are gender-responsive

1.3.1) % of JPs that: a) Have gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls as the primary or principal objective; or b) Make a significant contribution to gender equality and/or the empowerment of women and girls; or c) Contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP docs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MMPTF Gender Marker Guidance Note was finalised in Dec 2020

Please note that the baseline for all indicators are not applicable (N/A).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4) JPs are child-sensitive</th>
<th>1.4.1) % of JPs that: a) Have upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18 as the primary or principal objective; or b) Make a significant contribution towards upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18; or c) Contribute in some way to upholding the rights and addressing the needs of boys and girls under 18</th>
<th>60% for a, b, c Min 20% for a, b</th>
<th>60% for a, b, c Min 20% for a, b</th>
<th>60% for a, b, c Min 20% for a, b</th>
<th>JP docs</th>
<th>In assessing the JPs, the 4 core principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child will be taken into account.</th>
<th>100% for a, b, c 50% for a, b</th>
<th>A: 1 JP B: 5 JPs C: 6 JPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5) JPs take a whole-of-government approach.</td>
<td>1.5.1) % of JPs that include as partners more than one government line entity</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>JP docs</td>
<td>Disaggregate government line ministries/departments/sectors as necessary</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>All JPs include more than one government line entity as partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2) % of JPs that enter into implementation agreements (financial or other) with local government and related entities (e.g. provincial, municipal, district agencies).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>JP reports</td>
<td>Disaggregate by type of agreement; Entry into implementation agreements only expected in Y2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 out of 8 (50%) joint programmes entered into implementation agreements (non-financial) with local gov and related entities. (^{20})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6) JPs take a whole-of-society approach.</td>
<td>1.6.1) % of JPs that include non-UN and non-governmental stakeholders in its programme management and coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>JP docs and reports</td>
<td>Disaggregate by type of stakeholders per the GCM definition</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Disaggregation (counted as instances mentioned per JP) include: migrants (8), diasporas (3), local communities (7), civil society (12), academia (5), private sector (6), trade unions (2), NHRI (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{20}\) Only 8 joint programmes were considered for this indicator. Three only started December 2021 and Afghanistan suspended implementation during second half of 2021 (month after funding disbursed). As such, no data is available for these four and they were not included in this indicator.
### 1.6) JPs take a whole-of-society approach

1.6.2) % of JPs that enter into implementation agreements with non-governmental stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
<th>MOVs</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>JP reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- i) Disaggregate by type of partners per the GCM definition;
- ii) Entry into implementation agreements only expected in Y2

100% of JPs entered into implementation agreements (financial and non-financial) with non-governmental stakeholders.

Disaggregation (counted as instances mentioned per JP) include: migrants (4), diasporas (0), local communities (4), civil society (8), academia (5), private sector (6), trade unions (1), NHRI (1).

### Result Area 2: The Joint Programmes and Initiatives funded by the Migration MPTF are sustainable and complementary to other development initiatives

#### 2.1) Expected results of the JPs have been achieved and are sustainable

2.1.1) % of JP outcomes and output results achieved by end of project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
<th>MOVs</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>JP docs and reports; FMU qualitative assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All JPs funded in 2020 have min 24 months duration and project completion would be late 2022; The denominator of the target % would be JPs that have reached end of project by the target year

N/A

Since JPs only started implementation in Oct/Nov 2020, it was not possible to measure this indicator for 2021.

#### 2.1.2) % of JPs that are evaluated as achieving sustainable results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 (2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 (2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 (2022)</th>
<th>MOVs</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>JP eval reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- i) Common definition and criteria of for sustainability will be included in all Evaluation Terms of References;
- ii) There are no JPs expected to conduct evaluations during Y1 or Y2;
- iii) The denominator of the target % would be JPs that have reached end of project by the target year

N/A

Since JPs only started implementation in Oct/Nov 2020, it was not possible to measure this indicator for 2021.

---

21 Only 8 joint programmes were considered for this indicator. Three only started December 2021 and Afghanistan suspended implementation during second half of 2021 (month after funding disbursed). As such, no data is available for these four and they were not included in this indicator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Area 3: The Migration MPTF is managed efficiently, coherently and consistently.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1) Financial resource mobilisation and utilisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1) Volume of resources mobilised annually (in million USD) - Annual targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2) % of resources mobilised that are earmarked – Cumulative targets:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3) % of resources allocated to each thematic priority – Cumulative targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2) Approval process of JPs are facilitated in an efficient and consistent manner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1) % of concept notes (CNs) and JP documents submitted to the MMPTF that are reviewed per transparent criteria and assessed in a timely manner (Annual targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2) % of JPs that initiate implementation within 20 working days of approval of the final proposal by the SC and confirmation of availability of funds - Annual targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESULTS

#### INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET 19</th>
<th>MOVs</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3) Implementation of JPs are monitored</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1) % of Annual JP reports and mid-year progress updates submitted on time, or within 10 working days of the deadline - Annual targets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>FMU records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2) % of JPs that complete joint final independent evaluations within 6 months of completion of project activities - Annual targets</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FMU records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4) Decisions made by the SC are implemented in a timely and comprehensive manner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1) Number of SC Meetings organized as planned in the MMPTF Operational Manual, with participation of the quorum of members - Annual targets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FMU records; SC meeting notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2) Annual Consultative Forum organized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FMU records; Consultative Forum notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3) % of SC decisions implemented within the agreed timelines - Annual targets</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>FMU records; SC mtg notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.4) MMPTF annual consolidated narrative and financial reports submitted to the SC and donors by agreed deadlines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FMU records; SC mtg notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5) Risks related to the management of the MMPTF are monitored and managed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1) MMPTF Risk Management Strategy in place and reviewed annually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FMU records; SC mtg notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex B: Pipeline of Joint Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Region</th>
<th>Region, Sub-Region</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>PUNOs</th>
<th>Budget Total (USD)</th>
<th>Duration (months)</th>
<th>SDGs</th>
<th>GCM objectives</th>
<th>HR Marker</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Child Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Africa, Southern Africa</td>
<td>Strengthening of migration data collection, analysis and management systems in Botswana</td>
<td>IOM, ILQ, UNDP</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8, 10, 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Asia, Central Asia</td>
<td>Supporting the Governments of Central Asian States in the implementation of the GCM</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UNESCO</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10, 16, 17</td>
<td>1, 3, 17, 23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Asia, Central Asia</td>
<td>Strengthening national capacity to collect, process, analyse and use migration data and statistics for evidence-based policy development in the Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>UNFPA, ILQ, IOM, UN Women, WFP</td>
<td>2,675,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8, 10, 16, 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Strengthening Fact-Based and Data-Driven Migration Governance and Management in Nigeria</td>
<td>IOM, UNODC</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10, 16, 17</td>
<td>1, 3, 9, 17, 21, 23</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Promoting evidence-based migration governance for maximizing development potential of migration</td>
<td>IOM, UNICEF, UNDP, UNHCR</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10, 16, 17</td>
<td>1, 23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Region</td>
<td>Region, Sub-Region</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td>Budget Total (USD)</td>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>GCM objectives</td>
<td>HR Marker</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Child Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Asia, East and South-East Asia</td>
<td>Promoting data-driven migration discourse, policy and planning in Viet Nam</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UN Women</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8, 10, 17</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Americas, Central and North America</td>
<td>Strengthen the government capacities in protection and reintegration of migrant persons and their families for a holistic approach with a human rights focus</td>
<td>IOM, WFP, UNFPA</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 16</td>
<td>3, 7, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Africa, East Africa</td>
<td>Joint Programme to Protect and Assist Children on the Move</td>
<td>IOM, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5, 10, 16</td>
<td>2, 10, 15, 21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Reinforcing protection of vulnerable migrants in Ghana</td>
<td>IOM, UNICEF, ILO, UNFPA</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5, 8, 10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Americas, Central and North America</td>
<td>Strengthening the National Capacities for the Regularization and Protection of Persons in the Context of International Migration in Mexico</td>
<td>IOM, UNHCR, UNICEF</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8, 10, 16</td>
<td>5, 10, 16, 23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Addressing Drivers of Irregular Migration among Youth in Sierra Leone</td>
<td>IOM, UNESCO</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 5, 16</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Africa, Southern Africa</td>
<td>Making Migration Safe for Women</td>
<td>UN Women, IOM, OHCHR, UNFPA</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5, 10, 16</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Thematic Area 3</td>
<td>Agency/Partnering Organizations</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Co-funding</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Africa, Southern Africa</td>
<td>Strengthening Protection, Safety and Well-being of Unaccompanied Minors and Separated Children in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>IOM, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,483,375</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 10, 16</td>
<td>2, 7, 8, 12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Americas, South America</td>
<td>Strengthening of border management and capacities of local communities to prevent human trafficking and migrant smuggling with a rights-based approach and gender and childhood perspective</td>
<td>IOM, UN Women, UNHCR, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,627,500</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5, 8, 10, 16</td>
<td>9, 10, 11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Americas, Central and North America</td>
<td>Costa Rica: Strengthening Coordination and Exchange of Information between Law Enforcement in Prosecution of Smuggling of Migrants and Human Trafficking Transnational Crimes</td>
<td>IOM, UNODC, UN Women, UPU</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5, 8, 9, 10, 16</td>
<td>9, 10, 20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire, Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Enhance Border Management and Combat Transnational Crime at the Northern Border of Côte d’Ivoire and Cascades region of Burkina Faso</td>
<td>IOM, FAO, UN Women, UNODC</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5, 8, 10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Africa, East Africa</td>
<td>Provision of essential services, protection and economic empowerment to support the inclusion and integration of migrant street children, youths, and adolescents in Addis Ababa</td>
<td>UN Habitat, WHO, ILO</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3, 8, 11</td>
<td>7, 15, 16, 18, 21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Region</td>
<td>Region, Sub-Region</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td>Budget Total (USD)</td>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>GCM objectives</td>
<td>HR Marker</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Child Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon, Togo</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Addressing irregular migration and combatting transnational crime in human trafficking along maritime and land routes from Togo to Gabon</td>
<td>UNODC, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5, 10, 16</td>
<td>9, 10, 11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Asia, South Asia</td>
<td>Strengthening Response to Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Migrants in Pakistan</td>
<td>IOM, UNODC</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5, 8, 16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Africa, Southern Africa</td>
<td>Facilitating regular migration and decent work through implementation of labour migration policy targeting Basotho seasonal labour in Ceres farms (place of destination) and youth in Quthing (place of origin)</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, ILO</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8, 10, 17</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Initiative for Diaspora Engagement and Investment in Mali’s Regions (INEDIT Mali - Initiative pour l’Engagement des Diasporas et des Investissements dans les Territoires au Mali)</td>
<td>IOM, UNCDF, UNIDO</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4, 8, 17</td>
<td>6, 19, 20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Asia, South Asia</td>
<td>Strengthening Government Capacity to ensure safe, orderly and regular Migration (GCM)</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UNODC, UN Women</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5, 8, 10, 17</td>
<td>5, 6, 18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Initiative Description</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Leveraging the positive impact of migration on Moldova's development through improved policy evidence and better engaged diaspora.</td>
<td>IOM, ILO</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8, 10, 17</td>
<td>1, 3, 18, 19, 20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, Pacific</td>
<td>Asia, Pacific</td>
<td>Labour Mobility for Sustainable Development and Climate Resilience in the Pacific</td>
<td>IOM, ILO</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 8, 10</td>
<td>2, 5, 6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>Asia, Central and North Asia</td>
<td>Safe and Skilled Migration for Young Tajiks Abroad</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4, 8, 10</td>
<td>5, 6, 18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Balkans</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Western Balkans: Labour Migration for the Benefit of All</td>
<td>IOM, ILO</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8, 10</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing the medium to long-term reintegration needs and strengthening social protection support mechanisms for the social inclusion of Bangladeshi migrants</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UN Women, UNFPA, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,568,521</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 8, 10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Asia, South Asia</td>
<td>Enhancement of social cohesion and inclusive development processes in Kyrgyzstan by promoting safe reintegration of returned migrant workers, with special attention to women and youth</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UN Women, UNESCO, UNFPA, IOM</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3, 4, 8, 10, 16</td>
<td>15, 16, 22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Region</td>
<td>Region, Sub-Region</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td>Budget Total (USD)</td>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>GCM objectives</td>
<td>HR Marker</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Child Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Making Migration Work for All: Improved Social Cohesion and fair access to services for migrants in Morocco</td>
<td>IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1, 10, 16</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Americas, South America</td>
<td>Strengthening socioeconomic inclusion and access to comprehensive quality healthcare and protection of refugees and migrants and receiving communities in the COVID-19 context in the district of San Juan de Lurigancho-SJL, Lima, Peru</td>
<td>IOM, WHO, UNFPA, ILO</td>
<td>2,053,567</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3, 8, 10</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Addressing the medium-long term mobility-driven COVID-19 development impact in the Republic of Moldova and contributing to an early recovery of impacted groups</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, ILO</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1, 3, 10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Asia, South Asia</td>
<td>Sri Lanka: Support for socio economic recovery and strengthening resilience of migrant communities</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UNDP</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8, 10</td>
<td>6, 15, 18, 21, 22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Asia, East and South-East Asia</td>
<td>Access to Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education for Migrant Children in Thailand</td>
<td>IOM, UNESCO, UNICEF</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Americas, South America</td>
<td>Labour Inclusion of Migrants in Latin America and Covid-19 Socio Economic recovery</td>
<td>IOM, UN Women, ILO</td>
<td>1,753,180</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3, 8, 10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Region</td>
<td>Region, Sub-Region</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td>Budget Total (USD)</td>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>GCM objectives</td>
<td>HR Marker</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Child Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td>Asia, East and South-East Asia</td>
<td>Migration Governance for Sustainable Development in Indonesia</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UN Women</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5, 10, 17</td>
<td>1, 17, 23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinidad and Tobago</strong></td>
<td>Americas, Caribbean</td>
<td>Access, Support, Cooperation (ASC) Programme: A Collaborative Approach to Support Survivors of Human Trafficking</td>
<td>IOM, UNICEF, UNFPA</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3, 5, 8, 16</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambia</strong></td>
<td>Africa, West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Addressing the drivers and causes of migration-related vulnerabilities among border communities along the Trans-Gambia transport corridor</td>
<td>ITC, IOM, UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5, 10, 16</td>
<td>2, 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afghanistan</strong></td>
<td>Asia, South Asia</td>
<td>Managing Health Risks linked to Migration in Afghanistan: Operationalization of International Health Regulations</td>
<td>IOM, WHO</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3, 10</td>
<td>7, 12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country / Region</td>
<td>Region, Sub-Region</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>PUNOs</td>
<td>Budget Total (USD)</td>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>GCM objectives</td>
<td>HR Marker</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Child Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Americas, South America</td>
<td>Socio-economic integration of migrants and host communities focused on national and local governments and innovation projects</td>
<td>IOM, UNDP, UN Women</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1, 5, 8</td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGAD</td>
<td>Africa, East Africa</td>
<td>Addressing Drivers and Facilitating Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in the Contexts of Disasters and Climate Change in the IGAD Region</td>
<td>IOM, ILO, UNOPS, UNHCR</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8, 10, 13</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acronyms

ACPC  Agricultural Credit Policy Council (Philippines)
ASC  Access, Support and, Coordination Programme (Trinidad and Tobago)
AA  Administrative Agent
AMWCY  The African Movement of Working Children and Youth
CIMA  Centro Internazionale in Monitorragio Ambientale Research Foundation
CN  Concept Note
COPRED  Council to Prevent and Eliminate Discrimination in Mexico City
CRC  City Red Cross (North Macedonia)
CSO  Civil Society Organization
ECOSOC  United Nations Economic and Social Council
EU  European Union
FAO  Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FINKI  Faculty of Computer Science and Engineering (Skopje)
FMU  Fund Management Unit
GCM  Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
GFMD  Global Forum on Migration and Development
GIZ  Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GSA  Grant Support Agreement
HMNB  Human Mobility National Boards (Ecuador)
ICPAC  IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre
IDMC  Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IGAD)
IGAD  Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IHR  International Health Regulations
ILO  International Labour Organization
IOM  International Organization for Migration
IPA  Innovations for Poverty Action (Philippines)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>International Trade Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Joint Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTIQ</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and gender diverse, Intersex, Queer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNOB</td>
<td>Leave No One Behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDCC</td>
<td>Migration, Development, Climate Change Programme (IGAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCOSUR</td>
<td>Mercado Común del Sur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and Northern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIOA</td>
<td>Ministry of Information Society and Administration (North Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLSP</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (North Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTF</td>
<td>Multi-Partner Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTFO</td>
<td>Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>Migrant Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MREMH</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility (Ecuador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRU</td>
<td>Mano River Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYLA</td>
<td>Macedonian Young Lawyers Association (North Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBRNM</td>
<td>National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFW</td>
<td>Overseas Filipino Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWWA</td>
<td>Overseas Workers Welfare Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Project Cycle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Platform on Disaster Displacement (IGAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoE</td>
<td>Point of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POEA</td>
<td>Philippines Overseas Employment Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNO</td>
<td>Participating United Nations Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>Regional Collaboration Centre (Kampala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Regional Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMF</td>
<td>Results Monitoring Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRA</td>
<td>Return and Reintegration Advisor (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>Small Business Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-IMD</td>
<td>Sub-Committee on International Migration and Development (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>Scalabrini Migration Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TID</td>
<td>Trade Information Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Trafficking in Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>United Nations Capital Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Habitat</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNNM</td>
<td>United Nations Network on Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPU</td>
<td>Universal Postal Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN WOMEN</td>
<td>United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACTAF</td>
<td>West Africa Association for Cross-Border Trade, in Agro-forestry-pastoral, fisheries products and Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG</td>
<td>Whole of Government (approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOS</td>
<td>Whole of Society (approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>Youth Education Forum (North Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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