



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

IOM EVALUATION POLICY

Evaluation is a core function of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which is tasked to promote it, set the relevant policies and guidelines for the entire organization and conduct corporate evaluations. As a third line of defense, the central evaluation function ensures that IOM's oversight role in project, strategy and policy management is effective, allowing the organization to perform with highest standards, to be fully accountable and to build institutional knowledge with relevant learning tools. IOM's evaluation efforts are largely decentralized and the policy reflects it accordingly. Since 2015, Monitoring has been included in OIG mandate, a function which had no central repository in IOM. The two functions are separate but mutually beneficial, as illustrated by the concept of 'M&E'.

SEPTEMBER 2018

Office of the Inspector General

ACRONYMS

SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
MiGOF	Migration Governance Framework
MCOF	Migration Crisis Framework
RO	Regional Office
CO	Country Office
RBM	Results-Based Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
IOM	International Organization for Migration
OIG	Office of the Inspector General

CONTENTS

Background	2
The Objective of the Policy	2
The Definition and Purpose of Evaluation	3
Norms and Standards for Evaluation	6
Evaluation Criteria and Types	8
Budgeting for Evaluation	9
Roles and Responsibilities	9
Glossary of Other Terms	12

BACKGROUND

IOM's internal and external environment has undergone significant changes in recent years, with an increased focus on migration worldwide. As the UN Migration Agency, IOM is a reference on migration, supporting the attainment of migration-related commitments of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDGs),¹ which is framed and accelerated by the elaboration of the Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, as well as by the adoption of the IOM Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF).

IOM aims to continuously reinforce its accountability and coherent strategic management with a focus on results based management (RBM), to strengthen organisational effectiveness and move towards evidence-based programming. Incorporating a results-based approach also requires robust evaluation systems within the programmes and strategies IOM implements.

In terms of institutional set-up, the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) of the High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) endorses the 'Three Lines of Defense Model' as the reference model on Risk Management, Oversight and Accountability. The three lines model consist of: (1st line) functions that own and manage risks; (2nd line) functions that oversee risks; and (3rd line) functions that provide independent assurance. The third line of defense, 'Independent Assurance', includes the OIG functions of Internal Audit, Investigation and Central Evaluation.

OIG's Central Evaluation aims to contribute actively to the oversight, accountability, transparency, strategic guidance and organizational leadership and learning of the Organization. It sets the norms and standards of Evaluation in IOM, prepares relevant institutional policies and instructions, harmonizes procedures, provides technical guidance and support to IOM departments and offices, contributes to the set-up of decentralized evaluation systems and guarantees their quality, conducts central and corporate evaluations as well as specific evidence-based assessments and independent reviews, and contributes to policy and decision-making.

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE POLICY

This policy presents the definition and purposes of evaluation, demonstrates how evaluation is included in IOM's structure and outlines the key principles, norms, standards and procedures that are related to the function. The policy also describes the evaluation roles and responsibilities inside IOM.

The broad objectives that evaluation is pursuing are to:

¹ Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies.

- **Satisfy accountability obligations** by informing member states, donors, beneficiaries, affected populations, and other stakeholders on the performance and achievement of organisational results, including impact and sustainability, as well as on the effective functioning of processes;
- **Assess changes in the implementation context, risks and assumptions** to propose project, policy or strategy adjustments for effective product delivery, including early-warning signals (this is particularly valid for mid-term as well as real time evaluations);
- **Inform decision making** by providing feedback to management on progress made, on overall performance and on achievements to enable the identification of problems with the implementation of remedial measures, to ensure that resources are utilized appropriately, efficiently and effectively and to replicate best practices across the organisation;
- **Draw lessons learned** and to provide institutional perspective into the design, planning and implementation of future interventions, strategies and processes, within overall knowledge management approaches;
- **Contribute to the development of an evaluation culture** in IOM for underlining the importance of the function as a management and oversight tool, and for showing IOM's readiness to meet donors' expectations and openness to self-criticism.
- **Guarantee inclusion** into activities of **cross-cutting issues such as gender and accountability to affected populations.**

As custodian of the policy, OIG will develop a strategy on how it will promote and guarantee the implementation of the policy and indicate how it will support related efforts across the Organization.

THE DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The UNEG Norms and Standards (2016), which IOM adheres to, proposes the following comprehensive definition for evaluation: "An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders."

Accountability and learning are two important dimensions of evaluation. Knowledge development, organizational learning, innovation, improvement, and capacity building are also integral parts of evaluation in IOM.

Evaluation work in IOM is guided by the overall mandate of the Organisation as defined in its Constitution, being committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society, and acting with IOM partners in the international community: to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management, including in response to migration crises; to advance understanding of migration issues; to encourage social and economic development through migration; and to uphold human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Evaluation also intends to contribute to the reinforcement of IOM as the UN Migration Agency, and works towards retaining its attributes of responsiveness, efficiency, cost-effectiveness and independence, to which Member States attach importance.² Through the use of evaluation, IOM also supports Member States' request to receive IOM's pragmatic advice and assistance to manage migration challenges and seize migration opportunities, and to identify factors that contributed to success/failure of an intervention.

THE DECENTRALIZED EVALUATION APPROACH

Guidance on the implementation of decentralized evaluation approaches is the responsibility of IOM Central Evaluation as a core oversight function of the Organisation, which falls under the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) responsibility and has the following mandate:³

- Set the norms and standards of evaluation,
- Prepare relevant institutional policies, guidelines and instructions,
- Harmonize procedures and set up relevant networks to channel them,
- Provide technical guidance and support to IOM departments and offices,
- Guarantee quality of decentralized systems related to the function,
- Conduct central and corporate evaluations as well as specific evidence-based assessments and independent reviews,
- Contribute to policy-making and decision-making and promote effective as well as innovative approaches in the management of migration.

The UN Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) defines decentralized evaluations as follows:⁴ "The decentralized evaluation is planned, managed and conducted outside the central evaluation unit". Other definitions of decentralized evaluation exist in line with the JIU definition, for instance specifying that programmatic offices, regional or subsidiary offices manage decentralized evaluation. IOM's proposed definition is: "decentralized evaluations are evaluations commissioned and managed outside the IOM central evaluation office (OIG/Evaluation) – by Headquarters Departments, Regional Offices and Country Offices – focussing on activities, themes, operational areas, policies, strategies, and projects falling under their respective areas of work".

Evaluations managed by the OIG Central Evaluation function (OIG/Evaluation) are mainly conducted by OIG evaluation staff, and in few cases by external consultants working under OIG's overall guidance. Decentralized evaluations are conducted by independent internal or external evaluators, and managed by country offices, regional offices and headquarters departments. Self-evaluations are internal but not

² Resolution 1309 from IOM Council 106th Session, 4 December 2015.

³ IN/74 Rev.1 Charter of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

⁴ JIU, 2014: Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system

independent, conducted by the programme manager or someone involved in implementation of the project or strategy.⁵

Decentralized evaluations are often related to projects and programmes, or operational areas at the global, regional and country levels, but they can also focus on thematic areas and strategies of national or regional importance. It should also be reminded that, as per the IOM's Project Handbook, all project proposals must include an evaluation component or provide an explanation as to why an evaluation is not being included.⁶ OIG must also be kept informed of all evaluations undertaken across the Organization for maintaining a central registry under its IOM Evaluation Webpage, to maximize the use of evaluations for learning and continuous improvement in IOM's projects, activities and strategies. Evaluation also allows to promote IOM's activities externally, by providing a comprehensive analysis of their relevance and performance, and sometimes of their innovative and creative approaches.

NEXUS BETWEEN MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

OIG formally integrated Monitoring in its mandate in 2015,⁷ a function which had no specific institutional repository in IOM and required a centralized structure to ensure comprehensive approaches within the Organisation. The OIG Monitoring function is managed by OIG/Evaluation, which provides upon request, technical support to offices worldwide for monitoring requirements, and develops and/or assists in the development of monitoring policies and guidance materials for the Organization in coordination with relevant Departments.

In the IOM RBM context, monitoring is one of the key instruments to guarantee a proper implementation of RBM, while evaluation looks at monitoring and RBM with a critical eye inquiring whether, why and how results were achieved. Evaluation also provides information not readily available from monitoring systems, such as the impact, relevance, efficiency, outcome and sustainability of the action, as well as recommendations for management action or institutional lessons learning.

Monitoring and evaluation are complementary management tools, both ensuring that ongoing learning and accountability processes take place throughout the implementation of policies, strategies and projects. They are often merged under the single concept of M&E. However, even if presenting them

⁵ *'Independent internal'* means conducted by an IOM staff not having participated to the development and/or implementation of the project/activity. *'Independent external'* means, in IOM, conducted by an independent external consultant, not having for instance already collaborated to the set-up of an M&E framework inside the project. Even if funded by the project, IOM accepts to consider an external consultant/company as *'independent'*, which is not the case in some organizations who consider that *'independent external'* requires also external funding sources not related to the project/activity. Within the same logic, they consider that all evaluations commissioned and managed internally, even if using external consultants, are self-evaluations.

⁶ The only exception to this requirement is for Expedited Procedure for Project Endorsement (EPPE) projects, as per page 212 of the Handbook.

⁷ IN/74 Rev.1 Charter of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

together is relevant, both functions require specific resources and planning for sound implementation and effective utilization.⁸

NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

IOM operates under the evaluation norms and standards established by the UNEG, in line with the commitment taken to adopt them as a member of UNEG.⁹ OIG is responsible for promoting them and implementing them to the extent possible.¹⁰ OIG particularly puts focus on the following norms and standards, adapted to the IOM context for the elaboration of the Evaluation policy, to operational realities and to existing guidelines such as the Project Handbook:

- a) **Intentionality and utility:** In the context of limited resources, evaluations must be selected and undertaken with a clear intention of use and in a timely manner to provide decision-making with relevant and useful information.
- b) **Impartiality:** which is mitigating the presence of bias at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation with the necessary methodological rigor, and presentation of key findings, recommendations and challenges. It provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest.
- c) **Independence:** the evaluation function should be independent from other management functions so that it is free from undue influence. It needs to have full discretion in submitting directly its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent and must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation. They must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner, without potential negative effects on their professional status or career development. Independence of the evaluation function should not impinge the access of evaluators to information about the evaluation.
- d) **Transparency and consultation:** are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process, particularly with the major stakeholders, as it establishes trust, builds confidence, enhances ownerships and increases accountability. They also guarantee **credibility** (another UNEG norm) and

⁸ Monitoring is defined as the **continuous function** that uses the **systematic collection of data** on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of a project or a strategy with an indication of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the **systematic and objective assessment** of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policy, its **design, implementation and results**.

⁹ For further references and the full listing of norms and standards, see the IOM Evaluation Webpage www.iom.int/evaluation.

¹⁰ Some norms may require financial resources for implementation that are not necessarily made available by the organization, or only partially, as well as full commitment from Senior Management to fully adhere to them, which may not be considered as a priority.

quality of the evaluation and facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

- e) **Disclosure policy:** All evaluations reports are expected to be publicly available and listed on the IOM evaluation Webpage and under other specific webpages as deemed necessary, with due regard to IOM' Data Protection Principles (IN/138). All additional evaluation products (annual reports, evaluation plans, terms of reference, evaluation management responses etc.) should also be shared when requested.
- f) **Competencies:** Evaluation competencies refer to the qualifications, skills, experience, educational background and attributes required to carry out roles and responsibilities within an evaluation process, also to ensure the credibility and quality of the evaluation process. All those engaged in promoting, designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should aspire to promote and conduct high-quality work guided by professional standards and ethical evaluation principles.¹¹ Some of these elements are also included in the **professionalism** norm, which calls for a support through an enabling environment, institutional structures and adequate resources. Internal and external evaluators should also abide by these principles and show sufficient professional competencies to conduct evaluations.
- g) **Ethics:** Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and evaluations should not reflect personal or sectoral interests. They must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, take care that those involved in evaluations have a chance to examine the statements made and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work and must address issues of discrimination and gender inequality. Evaluators may sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing, which must be reported to the appropriate investigative body with the required confidentiality. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate the personal performance of individuals but must rather balance an evaluation of management functions with due consideration for this principle.
- h) **Evaluability:** before undertaking complex evaluations requiring a significant investment, it may be useful to conduct an evaluability assessment to examine the scope and financial implications, fine-tune methodological approaches such as for data collection and availability analysis, decide on the evaluation criteria and conduct any preliminary surveys or focus groups to ensure that the evaluation will provide timely and credible information for decision-making and guarantee an impartial evaluation process.
- i) **Conduct of evaluations:** each evaluation should use design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data-collection, analysis and interpretation. All evaluations must first be framed and prepared through terms of reference providing the evaluation objective(s), scope, methodology, resources required and implementation workplan. Evaluators should be required to develop an evaluation matrix or inception report clearly showing how they understand the scope and approach to the evaluation. Evaluation reports must

¹¹ See IOM Evaluation Webpage for technical references including "Evaluation Competency Framework" UNEG, June 2016, as well as UNEG ethical guidelines.

present in a complete and balanced way, the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations. They must be brief and to the point and easy to understand.¹²

- j) **Quality assurance:** Quality control mechanisms should be put in place at each stage of the evaluation process. OIG can provide such services, in line with UNEG guidelines, and for decentralized evaluations the regional Monitoring and Evaluation officers can be consulted.
- k) **Management response and follow-up:** in addition to the comments on the draft report that are requested from stakeholders, including managers (programme managers, chiefs of mission, directors of department), evaluations may also require an explicit response by the management to endorse or challenge the report and its recommendations. This may take the form of a management response, an action plan on the follow-up of recommendations and/or an agreement on the assignment of responsibilities and accountabilities. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations may be asked to the office/manager too, particularly with sensitive reports requiring close follow-up.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND TYPES

Evaluation criteria are standards, yardsticks, measures or benchmarks against which evaluation judgements are made and correspond to key evaluation questions. IOM's evaluation criteria are aligned with those of OECD/DAC¹³, which are widely adopted and used in development-oriented projects: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Additional criteria used for evaluating humanitarian interventions and emergencies include: appropriateness, connectedness, coverage, coordination and coherence.¹⁴ The development and number of evaluation questions related to the criteria and to be answered during the evaluation are dependent on the specifics of each evaluation and will be informed by the characteristics and context of the intervention in question, as well as the need to focus on particular areas of inquiry.¹⁵

IOM uses a variety of evaluation types¹⁶ suited for different contexts and areas of inquiry, such as thematic, strategic, process, real-time or project evaluations. Evaluations can also be timed at different stages of project implementation, referring to ex-ante, mid-term, final or ex-post evaluations or to formative and summative evaluations. Types can also be determined by methodological considerations, such as outcome evaluations, rigorous impact evaluations, quasi-experimental evaluations, or participatory evaluations. IOM evaluation guidelines provide further information on and brief definitions

¹² For more information on IOM report format and writing of a report, see *IOM Evaluation Guidelines* and for quality control of Terms of Reference and evaluation reports, see UNEG guidance documents under IOM evaluation Webpage: <https://www.iom.int/technical-references>.

¹³ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee.

¹⁴ For more information, refer to the IOM Evaluation Guidelines (2006) and IOM Project Handbook, module 6: <https://intranetportal/Pages/ControlNo.aspx?controlNo=IN/00250/Module6>, as well as the ALNAP Evaluation Guidelines of Humanitarian Action 2016 <http://www.alnap.org/resource/23592.aspx>

¹⁵ See samples of questions in the IOM Project Handbook module 6 or the IOM Evaluation Guidelines.

¹⁶ See IOM Project Handbook (2017) and IOM M&E Guidelines (2018) for more information about typology and methodology.

of the types. It is important however that the type be clearly defined in the evaluation terms of reference. Reviews, which are less rigorous in terms of methodology or focusing on specific areas, can also be conducted using evaluation approaches and criteria.¹⁷

BUDGETING FOR EVALUATION

At the central level, OIG prepares a biennial evaluation plan and OIG/Evaluation staff conduct them.¹⁸ A financial provision is allocated to the OIG budget to cover travel costs for field visits, but no funds are allocated to the OIG's annual budget to implement additional evaluations through the recruitment of external consultants or firms working under the responsibility of OIG or to complement OIG conducted evaluations with specific external expertise.

For decentralized evaluations, the costs are usually covered by a specific budget within the projects. In some cases, departments, regional and country offices can allocate specific resources or raise funds to conduct evaluations. Donors may also propose to fund and conduct evaluations of IOM's work, in coordination with IOM.

The evaluation community usually suggests a provision ranging from 5 to 10 per cent of a project's budget for monitoring and evaluation, with 2 to 4 per cent allocated to evaluation.¹⁹ However, this is purely indicative and whatever the size of the project, the amount allocated to evaluation in IOM will differ based on whether it is conducted by IOM staff or external consultants and on the type of evaluation required (rigorous impact evaluations are for instance more expensive than standard programme evaluation).

IOM remains committed to support any efforts for increasing IOM overall evaluation capacity, considering its budget constraints. Monitoring and evaluation are also regularly included in discussions related to budget initiatives aiming to increase IOM's oversight and operational capacity, sometimes with specific funding received from Member States to be allocated to M&E.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Collaboration and exchange of evaluation knowledge are key for an effective promotion of an evaluation culture in the Organisation and of IOM's work. The utilisation and benefits of evaluations are the responsibility of every entity inside IOM that can consider its use with a view to improve activities, policies, strategies, operations and project design and delivery, to learn from experiences as well as for showing accountability to member states, stakeholders and beneficiaries. Key roles and responsibilities are summarized in the table below:

¹⁷ IOM project performance reviews (PPR) for instance – see Glossary of other Terms for further information.

¹⁸ OIG also develops an annual plan for the conduct of PPR by OIG/Evaluation staff, in addition to the evaluations.

¹⁹ See IOM Project Handbook (2017) Module 6.

Director General (DG)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guarantees that proper attention is paid to Evaluation in IOM and allocates relevant resources; - Endorses OIG/Evaluation work plan and supports the conduct of broad thematic, process and strategic evaluations by OIG.
The Inspector General (IG)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approves policies, guidelines and strategies related to evaluation; - Promotes evaluation as a mechanism for corporate learning and accountability; - Approve OIG’s evaluation work plan and OIG evaluation reports for submission to DG.
IOM Audit and Oversight Advisory Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviews the functioning, operational independence and effectiveness of OIG as the main internal oversight body, including the evaluation function; - Provides advice on the status of evaluation in IOM.
OIG/Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is responsible for establishing a framework that provides overall guidance, quality assurance and technical assistance, and supports professionalization; - Prepares the work plan for the central evaluations in consultation with the IG, the Office of the Director General, senior management and other relevant stakeholders; - Undertakes and promotes thematic, strategic, project and process evaluations of IOM policies, strategies and/or projects; - Promotes an evaluation culture and the use of evaluation inside the Organization and oversees the evaluation function in IOM; - Develops and adjusts evaluation guidelines and methods for the conduct of evaluations throughout the organization, including for decentralized evaluations, and provides training on evaluation; - Maintains a roster of internal and external evaluators; - Contributes to the inclusion of evaluation in the development of RBM; - Reinforces partnership and participation in evaluation networks with regional and International organizations, the UN, Member States and donors; - Conducts quality checks of evaluation reports before publication on the IOM Evaluation Webpage or other specific Webpages as deemed necessary; - Manages a Community of Practice on M&E.
Directors of Regional Offices and of Departments
<p><u>For all evaluations</u> (central and decentralized) within their responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute to the development of the work plan for central evaluations conducted by OIG; - Promote the use of evaluation as a strategic tool, and facilitate the conduct of evaluations throughout the evaluation processes; - Ensure that relevant staff/offices are involved and provide support to conduct evaluations; - When relevant, ensure that a management response is provided and follow-up actions on recommendations implemented. <p><u>Decentralized evaluations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and plan evaluations, including making resources available in line with the evaluation scope, principles, norms and quality provisions;

- Ensure conformity with the evaluation mandatory policy as per the project handbook requiring that evaluation is included in all IOM projects.

Regional M&E Officers

- Prepare evaluation work plans for the respective regions;
- Prepare and/or undertake thematic, strategic and project evaluations of IOM strategies and/or projects within the region;
- Promote the use of evaluations within the region;
- Provide technical support and capacity building within the region for the planning and conduct of quality evaluations and to increase the pool of staff with skills in internal evaluation;
- Contribute to the development of evaluation guidelines and methods for evaluations under OIG's overall guidance;
- Promote and ensure the application of the evaluation policy, guidelines and methods;
- Reinforce partnership with and participation in regional evaluation networks;
- Inform and consult with OIG/Evaluation on technical support, advice, and quality assurance matters.

Chiefs of Mission and Heads of Office

For all evaluations (central and decentralized) within their Country Office:

- Facilitate the conduct of evaluations throughout the process;
- Ensure that relevant staff/offices are involved in the conduct of evaluations and provide comments in a timely fashion;
- Ensure that a management response is provided, whenever relevant;
- Take steps to implement and support follow-up actions on the agreed recommendations.

Decentralized evaluations within their Country Office:

- Identify and plan evaluations, including making resources (including human resources) available in line with the evaluation scope, principles, norms and quality assurance provisions;
- Conform with the evaluation policy and guarantee that evaluation is included in all IOM projects as per IOM project handbook, and if not, provide relevant reasons;
- Ensure that all projects in the Country Office have sound evaluation plans and that the relevant Regional M&E Officer is kept informed;
- Inform and consult with Regional M&E Officers and OIG/Evaluation for technical support, advice, and quality assurance that may be required.

Programme Managers and M&E staff in country offices

For all evaluations (central and decentralized) of their project(s) or programme(s):

- Facilitate the conduct of evaluations throughout the process;
- Ensure that relevant staff/offices are involved and provide comments in a timely fashion;
- Ensure that a management response is provided when relevant and follow-up actions implemented.

Decentralized evaluations of their project(s) or programme(s):

- Identify and plan evaluations, including making resources available in line with the project budget, evaluation scope, principles, norms and quality provisions;
- Conform with the mandatory evaluation policy requiring that evaluation is conducted for all IOM projects; take note of any explanation given if not included in the project document and assess if still valid, with the possibility of conducting an evaluation;
- Inform and consult with the Regional M&E Officers or OIG/Evaluation for technical support, advice, and quality assurance that may be required.

GLOSSARY OF OTHER TERMS

Below are a series of terms which are linked to evaluation, or to other oversight functions and systems.

- **Internal Audit:**²⁰ is an independent, objective assurance activity designed to add value and improve an organization's operations. It helps an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to assess and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.
- **Inspection:** is an independent review of an organizational unit, system, process or practice perceived to be at risk of meeting its objectives in an efficient and effective manner or to improve measures and systems of control that would pre-empt wrongful acts.
- **Investigation** is a formal fact-finding inquiry to examine allegations of misconduct and other wrongdoing, to determine whether they have occurred and if so, the person or persons responsible.
- **Monitoring:** is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds (OIG Charter). A broader definition may be considered to encompass monitoring of policies and strategies: Monitoring is an established practice of internal oversight that provides management with an early indication of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results in operational, strategic and financial activities.
- **Project Performance Reviews (PPR):** are assessments focusing on results, whose objective is to assess the performance of projects using a constructive, participatory and coordinated approach, and to improve implementation to reach expected results. OIG has issued standard templates and short guidance notes for the conduct of PPR.
- **Review:**²¹ is an assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis. Frequently "evaluation" is used for a more comprehensive and/or more in-depth assessment than "review". Reviews tend to emphasize operational aspects. Sometimes the terms "review" and "evaluation" are used as synonyms.
- **Internal controls:** are the policies, procedures, practices and organizational structures designed to provide reasonable assurance that the organization's operational and financial objectives will be achieved and undesired events will be prevented or detected. Internal controls include activities like approvals, authorizations, verifications, reconciliations, review of operating performance, safeguarding of assets and segregation of duties.
- **Performance measurement:** is a system for assessing performance of an activity or intervention against stated goals within a strategy or project.
- **Indicators:** are the quantitative or qualitative factors or variables to measure achievement or to reflect expected changes.
- **Objective:** is the most significant, realistic goal to which the strategy or project can contribute. It seeks to align to a broader, longer-term strategy, whether internal or external.
- **Outcome:** is the intended change in institutional performance, individual or group behaviour or attitudes, or the political, economic or social position of the beneficiaries.

²⁰ The first four definitions are the definitions contained in the OIG charter IN/74 Rev.1. There are also other audit types with different definitions such as external audit, compliance audit, financial audit, performance audit.

²¹ OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-based Management. Accessed on 21 August 2017: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>

- **Output:** is the intended change in the skills or abilities of the beneficiaries, or the availability of new products or services as a result of the project or strategy activities.
- **Inputs:** are the financial, human, and material resources used for the intervention.
- **Results:** are changes in a state or condition which derive from a cause-and-effect relationship. There are different types of change (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative), which can be set in motion by a programmatic or strategic intervention – its output, outcome and objective.