

RESTRICTED

MC/2233

**Original: English
19 November 2007**

NINETY-FOURTH SESSION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMMES AND FINANCE

REPORT ON THE FIRST SESSION

Geneva

30-31 October 2007

Rapporteur: Ms. M. Sato (Japan)

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	1
II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	1
III. STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL	1
IV. STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMMES AND FINANCE	2
(a) Rules of Procedure	2
(b) Future programme of work	2
V. OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PART OF THE BUDGET	2
(a) Status report	2
(b) Republic of Liberia outstanding contributions	3
VI. SUMMARY UPDATE ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2007	4
VII. PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2008	5
VIII. STATEMENT BY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STAFF ASSOCIATION ...	8
IX. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON ITEMS PROPOSED BY THE MEMBERSHIP ...	10
(a) IOM and “One UN”	10
(b) IOM’s role in the Clusters	12
(c) Global Migration Group, including the International Partnership for Migration and Development	13
X. IOM ASSESSMENT SCALE	18
(a) Methodology used to establish the IOM assessment scale	18
(b) IOM assessment scale fully equated to the United Nations assessment scale ..	18
XI. REPORT ON HUMAN RESOURCES	19
XII. UPDATE ON DELOCALIZATION	20

XIII. SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION – 1035 FACILITY	21
XIV. OTHER BUSINESS	22
(a) Application for membership	22
(b) Migrant remittances observatory for Least Developed Countries	22
(c) Election rules and procedures	22
(d) Ninety-fourth Session of the Council	23
(e) Regional advisers	23
(f) Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance	23

ANNEX I - List of participants

ANNEX II - Agenda

ANNEX III - Statement by the Director General

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMMES AND FINANCE REPORT ON THE FIRST SESSION

INTRODUCTION

1. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF) met at the Palais des Nations in Geneva for its First Session on 30 October 2007. Three meetings were held. The first meeting and most of the second were chaired by Mr. March (Spain). The final portion of the second meeting, as well as the third, were chaired by Ms Sato (Japan), in the absence of both the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson.

2. The following Member States were represented: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).¹

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

3. The Standing Committee elected Mr. March (Spain) as Chairperson, Mr. Carvallo (Venezuela) as Vice-Chairperson and Ms. Sato (Japan) as Rapporteur.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The Standing Committee adopted the revised agenda appended as Annex II.

III. STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

5. The Director General welcomed the participants to the inaugural meeting of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance and encouraged them to make every effort to ensure that its endeavours met with success. He then delivered the statement appended as Annex III.

¹ See List of participants appended as Annex I.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMMES AND FINANCE

(a) Rules of Procedure

6. Introducing document MC/2232, Rules of Procedure for the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance, the Legal Adviser drew attention to operative paragraph 5 of Resolution No. 1151 (XCIII) on the “Establishment of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance” stating that “the Standing Committee [shall] establish its Rules of Procedure, which shall be subject to approval by the Council”. The draft rules of procedure subsequently prepared by the Administration had drawn on the Rules of Procedure of the Council, of the Executive Committee and of the former Subcommittee on Budget and Finance. They had been discussed with the Member States at informal consultations held on 21 September and 18 October 2007. After the Member States’ comments had been incorporated, a consensus had been reached on document MC/2232.

7. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the draft Rules of Procedure and recommended that the Council adopt them.

(b) Future programme of work

8. The representative of Portugal, on behalf of the IOM Members States from the European Union, welcomed the establishment of the Standing Committee. The European Union remained convinced that migration, when managed effectively, could have a positive impact on countries both of destination and origin. It was one of IOM’s largest donors, and its migration policy agenda largely coincided with IOM’s objectives and activities. It looked forward to continuing to work closely with IOM on migration issues, not least within the new Standing Committee. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the statement.

V. OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PART OF THE BUDGET

(a) Status report

9. Referring to document SCPF/6, Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget, the Administration reported that two Member States had made payments since the informal consultations of 18 October 2007. Kyrgyzstan, which had agreed to a repayment plan in 2007, had paid CHF 21,423, and the Administration was verifying whether that payment had been made under the repayment plan. Tunisia had paid CHF 12,779 and was now fully paid up. Five Member States (Armenia, Georgia, Nicaragua, Peru and Sudan) were complying with the provisions of their repayment plans, whereas two (Argentina and the Dominican Republic) had yet to make a payment under the plans they had negotiated. The issue remained a serious one and was being closely followed by the Administration in Geneva and in the capitals.

10. The representative of Ecuador, noting that his country was recorded in document SCPF/6 as owing CHF 563, explained that the outstanding amount was the result of an exchange-rate

problem, not of any failure on Ecuador's part to pay its assessed contributions. Ecuador's policy was to meet its financial obligations to all international organizations. The representative of Nigeria informed the Standing Committee that his country was working hard to pay off its entire debt to IOM, and it was therefore not necessary to negotiate a repayment plan. The representative of Cameroon confirmed that the funds to pay his country's assessed contribution had been allocated and that steps were being taken to facilitate their transfer to Geneva.

11. The African Group, for its part, attached great importance to the problem of outstanding assessed contributions and highlighted that a number of countries in difficult situations had not been able to settle their outstanding contributions. The Group indicated that the Administration should continue to do its utmost to ensure the payment of arrears.

12. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance urged Member States whose contributions had been outstanding for two or more consecutive years to pay their contributions in full or to agree to a repayment plan with the Administration and to pay a first instalment as soon as possible. It further took note that the item had been placed on the agenda of the Council and encouraged Member States with outstanding contributions to advise the Council about their efforts to address the situation.

(b) Republic of Liberia outstanding contributions

13. The Administration recalled that it had received a written request from the Republic of Liberia that CHF 208,946 of its total outstanding contributions of CHF 234,553 be waived. The Administration had told the Liberian Government that a decision on the matter would be made by the Member States and the Government informed accordingly.

14. The Legal Adviser clarified that neither the Constitution nor the Financial Regulations provided for the cancellation of debts. The question of cancellation had been raised in 1998, when the Constitution had been amended. Like the United Nations Charter, amended Article 4 of the Constitution – amendment not yet in force - only authorized the IOM Council, under specific conditions, not to suspend the right to vote of Member States in arrears. The Administration had asked other organizations how they handled such situations, in particular in respect of Liberia, and none simply wrote off debts. The most common approach was to work out a repayment plan. The Administration negotiated repayment schedules with Member States which had difficulty meeting their financial obligations to the Organization. The schedules could run for as long as ten years. In its letter to the Government of Liberia, the Administration would certainly propose that such a plan be discussed.

15. Several Member States welcomed the opportunity to debate the matter within the context of a governing body meeting. Liberia's request was without precedent and therefore required careful thought and scrutiny by the appropriate IOM bodies.

16. Several Member States, recalling that one of the premises for Liberia's request was that it would settle its obligations for 2006 and 2007, pointed out that this had not been done and felt that it was therefore premature to discuss writing off the rest of its arrears. Several others noted that payment of contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget was a constitutional obligation for all Member States; failure to meet it imperilled the Organization's financial health.

17. The Chairperson added that honouring financial obligations also reflected a country's domestic priorities. IOM should not be a weak point in the international commitments of States as their contributions would underline that migratory issues were a clear priority and that IOM was a serious and effective organization that needed financial resources to meet its objectives.

18. As several delegates pointed out, many other countries with financial difficulties had negotiated repayment plans with the Administration, and this was clearly the way forward in the case of Liberia. One added that IOM was not the only organization where Liberia had fallen behind in its payments and the experience of other organizations in concluding repayment plans should be considered. Two delegates felt that negotiation of such a plan should not be conditional on the prior payment of Liberia's 2006 and 2007 assessed contributions; any repayment plan should cover the entire amount.

19. Several Member States suggested that the Administration's response to the Government of Liberia should include these three points: it should express understanding for the request and welcome Liberia's intention to pay its assessed contributions for 2006 and 2007; it should propose that negotiations start on a repayment plan for the rest of the outstanding amount; lastly, given that Liberia was in a process of post-conflict reconstruction, and considering that the amount it owed was substantial from that point of view, it should hold out the possibility that the matter would be reconsidered at some point in the future. Such an approach had the advantage of giving due consideration to the unprecedented nature of Liberia's request. The point was not to discourage a country that needed IOM's services and that was trying to draw closer to the Organization, but rather to give it the time needed to work out a solution with the Administration. In addition, the fact that a new scale of assessed contributions would be considered for 2009 might facilitate repayment of its debt.

20. The Director General assured the delegates that the Administration would deal with the matter with sensitivity and flexibility. It had negotiated many repayment plans with governments, and in the case of Liberia would also consider what other organizations had done, with a view to concluding a plan that took account of the problems faced by Liberia and of the Organization's needs.

21. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance, underscoring that it was important for the Member States to show financial discipline when it came to paying their assessed contributions, invited the Administration to contact the Government of Liberia so as to examine, in the light of comments made, how best to resolve the problem and to report to the forthcoming Ninety-fourth Session of the Council on the progress made.

VI. SUMMARY UPDATE ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2007

22. The Administration recalled that the Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2007 (MC/2226) had to be read in conjunction with the Programme and Budget for 2007 (MC/2203) and the Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2007 (MC/EX/681). There had been no change in the Administrative Part of the Budget since the publication of the Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2007 in the spring. Projects and programmes estimated at approximately USD 85 million had been added to the Operational Part of the Budget, which

presently amounted to USD 721.5 million. The largest increases had been in emergency and post-crisis activities, in migration and health activities, in regulating migration projects and in the reparations programme. The projection for Discretionary Income had increased by approximately USD 7 million due principally to higher than anticipated interest income. The Administration proposed to allocate that additional amount as outlined on page 13 of the Summary update: USD 800,000 to extend health insurance coverage to locally hired IOM staff in its Field Offices worldwide who are not fully covered; USD 2.4 million to fully cover the budget for the new financial system - Processes and Resources Integrated Systems Management (PRISM); USD 1.2 million for Line 2 of the 1035 Facility; USD 1.2 million for staff security purposes; and USD 1.5 for unbudgeted activities and structures. The last amount was set aside for projects that required bridging funds or for which all expenditure had not been met and that any unused funds would be carried forward to the Programme and Budget for 2008.

23. One delegate asked why there were no reparation programmes in Africa. The Administration replied that reparation programmes concerned essentially the final phase of the German forced labour compensation programme.

24. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2007 (MC/2226) and of the proposed allocation of additional Discretionary Income.

VII. PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2008

25. The Administration, introducing the Programme and Budget for 2008 (MC/2227), said that it had taken account of comments received from Member States and had endeavoured to simplify the document, make it more transparent and user friendly, and provide an overall understanding of IOM's structure, budget and financial management. The document contained a number of new sections on the Constitution, on programme area objectives, on IOM's strategic focus, including a version of the four-box chart indicating how the strategic objectives were linked to the programme areas, and on the general finance and budget principles the Organization used to handle resources in the best interests of beneficiaries and donors. Detailed information on funding of the Organization's core structure was also provided.

26. Reflecting the wishes of the Member States, the Administrative Part of the Budget, contained in Part I of document MC/2227, had been prepared on the basis of zero nominal growth. As a result, the budget for 2008 had been maintained at the same level as that of 2007, CHF 38,045,000. That had been achieved by absorbing cost and statutory increases of about CHF 1.0 million. In addition, the new assessment scale for 2008 would bring about reductions in the contributions of most Member States.

27. The Operational Part of the Budget, contained in Part II of document MC/2227, amounted to USD 529,068,700, an increase of about USD 90 million over the original 2007 budget. The only significant change to the Organization's structure had been the separation of the Manila Administrative Centre from the Manila Mission with Regional Functions. An official had been appointed at no additional cost to carry out the regional functions. Two additional technical cooperation experts had been recruited, one in Dakar and one in Canberra, in response to demands

for technical cooperation and capacity-building support. At the request of the African Group, additional funding amounting to USD 250,000 had been budgeted for structural support and capacity building in Africa. Discretionary Income had been estimated at USD 31 million. As requested by Member States, the sources and application of Discretionary Income had been described in detail. The Programme and Budget for 2008, in particular the Operational Part of the Budget, was subject to revisions that would be communicated to the membership on a regular basis in informal consultations and future Standing Committee sessions.

28. The membership, commenting on various issues relating to the Programme and Budget for 2008, expressed appreciation for the Director General's opening remarks and for the Administration's detailed presentation of document MC/2227. Several delegations welcomed the improved features of the document, which was user friendly and comprehensive. One delegation suggested that it would be helpful to list project originators in the project descriptions in the interest of enhanced cooperation and coordination.

29. The African Group stated that it reserved the right to resume discussion of the Programme and Budget for 2008 at the forthcoming Ninety-fourth Session of the Council, based on the outcome of its consultations with the Administration on various issues of concern to African countries.

30. In response to concerns raised by one delegation, the Administration confirmed that if approved by the governing bodies, the assessment scale fully equated to that of the United Nations would not become applicable until 2009. Two delegations queried budget allocations of USD 4,581,500 to support European Union election observation missions (paragraph 331), in one case not convinced that the activity fell within IOM's mandate and in the other because Ecuador was not planning to hold any elections in 2008. It was not clear how funds earmarked for post-crisis migration programmes and projects for Latin America and the Caribbean, namely budget item I.3.21 on page 187 of MC/2227, Support for EU election observation missions, were distributed. The Administration clarified that such missions were fully funded by the European Commission, with IOM providing technical assistance in various countries. The Administration would seek clarification from the IOM Office in Brussels regarding the budget for the election in Ecuador.

31. The Director General added that IOM helped governments lacking an extensive consular or embassy network to provide out-of-country voting services for their nationals, in particular migrants. With 350 Field Offices worldwide and broad expertise in election services, such as public information campaigns, secure handling of voting materials and capacity building for election authorities, IOM was in a position to provide such assistance. The European Commission called on IOM to provide logistics and operational support for their election observer missions for similar reasons. In addition, the Organization enjoyed good relations with governments, knew their election officials and performed its services discreetly, showing respect for the sensitive nature of elections.

32. Three members of the Administration gave presentations on programme areas under their responsibility. In response to the presentations, one delegation wished to know the nature of IOM's collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO) because some of the two organizations' field activities appeared to overlap. The Administration replied that IOM did

indeed work closely with WHO and that there were no overlaps but rather complementarity. The two organizations had concluded a memorandum of understanding on migration health issues of mutual concern and IOM was providing WHO with information on migrant health for *The World Health Report 2008*, which would focus on primary care.

33. One Member State suggested that as part of further efforts to improve the presentation of information in budget documents, which he appreciated, the Administration should consider comparing Discretionary Income trend lines in the Programme and Budget for 2008 to updated 2007 data in order to enhance clarity. The delegate also reiterated his comments during previous informal consultations that the sound growth of Discretionary Income had not been accurately reflected in paragraph 193 of document MC/2227. It was not entirely correct to state that Discretionary Income was not “an adequate, reliable or predictable source of income” or that its increase was “very small” compared to the volume of activities implemented by the Organization. In reality, Discretionary Income had risen by 60 per cent, compared to 20 per cent in operations. It would be useful to know why interest income had been growing so swiftly and whether that trend could be expected to continue.

34. The Administration thanked the Member States for their suggestions and said that they would be taken into account. The increase in Discretionary Income was due primarily to the increase in the level of project activities and the rise in interest income.

35. The application of Discretionary Income elicited a number of queries from one delegate. It was difficult to understand why the amount of Discretionary Income earmarked for staff and services in Country Missions – USD 2.8 million for 2008 – had grown steadily over the years when those missions were supposed to be financed by projects implemented in those locations. Discretionary Income was reportedly allocated to Country Missions with temporary financial difficulties, but trends suggested that those difficulties had become permanent in some cases. An external audit of the field structure, the outcome of which should be delivered to Member States, would shed light on the financial situation of those Country Missions with temporary difficulties. The Administration explained that, in principle, IOM Country Missions should be fully projectized, but that it was not always possible to do so. Some required core funding, hence the allocation of Discretionary Income, mainly for project development; it was used primarily to fill gaps, for example, when donor funding required to maintain IOM Field Offices was not readily available. The Administration would ask the external auditors to review the field structure and report their findings to the membership.

36. The allocation of USD 168,000 for cooperation with multilateral institutions and global forums also required clarification: why did IOM pay experts seconded to global forums, especially when such forums were a State-owned process? In reply, the Administration said that those funds were to be used flexibly for secondments. Past examples included secondments to the World Bank and to the Global Forum on Migration and Development hosted by Belgium. Such partnerships with multilateral institutions only strengthened and contributed to IOM’s outreach and expertise in various areas.

37. Another question related to the allocation of Discretionary Income intended for private-sector liaison. What did that amount (USD 50,000) cover? The Administration explained that those funds served to support the activities of the Business Advisory Board set up by the Director

General in 2005 and to launch and institutionalize fund-raising activities from the private sector, necessary for the Organization's growth. A recent appeal for funds launched by IOM on the Internet was testimony to the potential to be tapped from private- and public-sector organizations and foundations as well as from the general public.

38. Lastly, one delegate stated that it would be helpful to know whether the combined funding for the Migration for Development in Africa programme included donor funding or whether it was strictly financed by IOM. The Administration replied that those funds were a combination of Discretionary Income and donor contributions.

39. Despite the Administration's efforts to ensure the equitable representation of IOM's membership in its Field Offices, several delegations noted that Africa remained underrepresented, with only four Missions with Regional Functions to cover its five regions. Furthermore, they felt that the Administration should give priority to the central African region in discussions regarding increased structural support and capacity building. African countries should also be able to benefit from courses on international migration, in the same spirit as the Latin American countries attending the annual Inter-American Course on International Migration.

40. The Director General reassured the Standing Committee that the Administration was working to fill that gap and would soon put forward some suggestions to the African Group. The Administration reiterated its intention to pursue the matter and would report to the Council at its autumn session.

41. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance, taking note of the comments made by Member States and the responses provided by the Administration, recommended that the Council approve the Administrative Part of the Budget in the amount of CHF 38,045,000 and the Operational Part of the Budget in the amount of USD 529,068,700, subject to the reservation of the African Group.

VIII. STATEMENT BY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STAFF ASSOCIATION

42. The Chairman of the Staff Association Committee (SAC) reported on the main developments in staff matters since his last report to the Member States. First, in the most significant improvement in working conditions for field staff in the past 15 years, the Administration had agreed to set aside an amount of Discretionary Income to extend health insurance to IOM staff worldwide, with first priority in countries where access to appropriate health care was limited or non-existent. In addition, joint SAC-Administration negotiations with the health insurance company had resulted in reduced premiums for staff and dependents and an increase in overall insurance coverage.

43. The Committee had studied the Administration's draft revision of the Staff Regulations and Rules, which contained interesting proposals to simplify the format and layout but also some worrying changes. In particular, a number of "regulations", which could only be changed by the Council, had become "rules" which could be changed at the Administration's discretion. The Committee would study the final draft revision to ensure that its understanding was complete and to provide further input.

44. A joint SAC-Administration working group that also included the Ombudsperson had been established on disciplinary measures. It had met three times, and the Committee hoped it would result in fairer, more consistent and transparent treatment of all staff.

45. On the issue of taxation, the Committee had suggested that taxes on all IOM salaries be reimbursed by the Administration until all Member States had agreed to treat IOM staff in the same manner as other international civil servants covered by the 1947 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Indeed, the fact that IOM did not automatically benefit from the standard of the 1947 Convention obliged it to negotiate separate conditions of service with the government of each country in which it operated. The issue of *laissez-passer* was also important in order to enhance staff security and reduce deployment time and costs, but approaches to the UN had not been successful.

46. The Staff Association Committee welcomed the Administration's decision to increase funding of the SAC secretary from a half-time to a full-time position in 2008. It hoped funding would also be found for a full-time position of SAC chairperson, as was the case in many other organizations.

47. The Administration had taken positive action on some of the issues advocated by the Committee in recent years. The Administration knew it could count on the commitment of staff to implement programmes in support of migrants and Member States but expected the Administration to be responsive to their concerns. By the same token, the Member States, working through the governing bodies, should play a more active role in determining the rules and procedures needed to ensure institutional health and staff well-being.

48. The Administration read out the response of the Director General, who was encouraged by the positive tone of the statement by the Staff Association Committee. The Committee's concerns regarding the Staff Regulations and Rules were understandable. The most sensible course of action would be for a member of the Administration to work through the proposed changes systematically with the Committee. It was a source of satisfaction that the availability of Discretionary Income in 2007 would enable the Administration to extend the Medical Service Plan to more staff, and the Member States were to be thanked for having approved that allocation. There were still many issues on which the Administration and the Committee needed to work, and it was to be hoped that increased funding for the SAC secretary position would allow them to move forward and that as much progress would be reported at the next opportunity.

49. One delegate agreed on the importance of *laissez-passer* in speeding up the delivery of visas. The Legal Adviser explained that *laissez-passer* were available only to the staff of United Nations agencies. The Administration had asked the United Nations Secretariat whether IOM staff could be issued with *laissez-passer* on the basis of the cooperation agreement signed over 10 years earlier, but its request had been turned down.

50. Two Member States applauded the newly cooperative working relationship between the Administration and the Staff Association Committee, in particular as concerned health insurance coverage.

51. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the statement of the Staff Association Committee.

IX. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON ITEMS PROPOSED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

52. The Chairperson invited the participants to exchange views on three items: IOM and “One UN”; IOM’s role in the Clusters; and the Global Migration Group, including the International Partnership for Migration and Development. Other matters, such as the *Migration Initiatives* document and IOM’s participation in institutional bodies, would be placed on the agenda of future Standing Committee sessions, following consultation with the Member States.

53. The African Group listed the documents it expected to receive at future Standing Committee meetings. At the spring session, it expected to receive a consolidated assessment of the previous year’s *Migration Initiatives*, with the Organization’s conclusions and its objectives measured against the results achieved, and the new *Migration Initiatives* document for the year. In respect of the latter, it strongly supported the Administration’s initiative to organize an initial launch of *Migration Initiatives* in the framework of informal consultations attended by observers and donors, as had been the case in 2007, and suggested that there be similar launches worldwide, wherever IOM had a Field Office, preferably on the same day.

54. At the autumn session, the Group expected to receive the revision of *Migration Initiatives* for the year, plus an initial assessment of its implementation, with preliminary conclusions.

55. The Administration took note of those requests.

(a) IOM and “One UN”

56. The Administration recalled that, while Member States had generally not been in favour of IOM’s incorporation into the United Nations, they did wish to see the Organization pursue closer practical links and cooperation with it. One avenue was enhanced participation in United Nations country teams. In countries where humanitarian needs were overriding, IOM’s participation had been facilitated by its membership in the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and by its long-standing links with partner humanitarian agencies such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Growing recognition of the migration-development nexus had also prompted IOM to participate in country teams where development was the main concern. A recently conducted poll of Field Missions had revealed that IOM had been welcome in over 95 per cent of the United Nations country teams in which it had sought to participate. As part of the country teams, IOM had been invited to take part in the “One UN” process and to discuss the broader issue of United Nations reform.

57. The “One UN” concept was part of UN reform, intended to strengthen the coherence of the United Nations response to national development plans. Its main feature was the four “ones”: one programme, one leader, one budget framework and one office. In 2007 the United Nations had launched a “One UN” pilot phase in eight countries; IOM had offices in six of those and was an active member of the United Nations country team in five: Albania, Pakistan, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam. IOM’s analysis of whether or not to seek participation in “One UN”

pilots had been based on five considerations: (1) whether IOM's activities in the pilot country were likely to be linked to development plans and processes in the future; (2) existing and potential programme partnerships; (3) whether or not the host country welcomed IOM participation; (4) the position of other intergovernmental partners with respect to the process; and (5) the position of the resident coordinator on IOM participation.

58. IOM had used Viet Nam as a test case. Its analysis revealed that while the "One UN" process varied considerably from one country to another, the aim in all cases was to provide coherent support for national development plans - an objective shared by IOM. The analysis also revealed that IOM's participation would enable it to avoid duplication, be more cost-effective and make optimal use of donor funds. It would not affect IOM's flexibility or responsiveness, a key factor repeatedly highlighted by the Member States, nor would it impinge on IOM's independence as an institution or the role of the Council as its supreme policymaking body. Participating in the process would allow the Organization to preserve and possibly strengthen its partnerships with the United Nations agencies, and give it potential access to "One Fund". The Administration had therefore decided to continue working in the development of the "One UN" framework locally, with any formal decision on applying to participate being taken on a country-by-country basis in the light of the situation in the country and the considerations outlined earlier.

59. At present, IOM's association with the process varied in each country, depending on the Organization's activities and how the country team and host country wished to take the process forward. Two general considerations merited highlighting at this stage, however. One concerned the alignment of IOM's short-term projects with the long-term five-year plans consistent with national development priorities, and how "One UN" would relate to humanitarian activities. The other concerned the extent to which the Organization would be eligible for funding from "One Fund". On the latter point, it would seem that IOM would have access to "One Fund" only as an implementing partner of a United Nations agency, not in its own right.

60. The Member States that took the floor in the ensuing discussion agreed that the subject was well worth debating and should be kept on the agenda of future Standing Committee sessions. One suggested that the Administration include the information it had provided in the updated report on the IOM/UN relationship it was preparing for the Ninety-fourth Session of the Council. Several others agreed that such information should be provided in advance, and in writing, so that the Member States would be in a position to contribute to the discussion.

61. One delegate asked how long the pilot phase would run and what the results were in the six pilot countries in which IOM had participated.

62. The Administration confirmed that information on the "One UN" process would be included in the document on the IOM/UN relationship being prepared for the Ninety-fourth Session of the Council, which would be issued shortly. It would also circulate the notes prepared for the current session of the Standing Committee, and would prepare up-to-date documents for future sessions if the item remained on the agenda.

63. The "pilot phase" was intended to lay the groundwork for a long-term process. The "pilot" countries were in fact testing a new method of cooperation whose continued implementation would be discussed at the United Nations General Assembly. The pilot phase had started only

about one year earlier, and some of the countries selected had yet to produce the document on which the process would be based.

(b) IOM's role in the Clusters

64. The Administration said that the cluster system was being developed against the backdrop of United Nations reform as outlined under (a) above in order to enhance coordination, provide more predictable input and reduce overlap and waste. IOM was involved as an active participant in the emergency shelter, protection, logistics, early recovery and health clusters. It was the lead agency in the unified camp coordination and management cluster as concerned natural disasters, UNHCR keeping the lead for conflict-related internally displaced persons.

65. IOM participated in the cluster approach through the Operational Support Department's Emergency and Post-Crisis Division. The Division hosted the virtual secretariat of the camp coordination and management cluster, developed implementing tools, incorporated all IOM input into standards and provided relevant training. At the global level, the cluster focused on strengthening capacity, tools and standards, and at the country level it focused on implementation.

66. The camp coordination and management cluster did not advocate the establishment of camps. Rather, it had noted that displaced people tended to reside in collective centres, spontaneous settlements or organized camps. Its aim was to find lasting solutions as quickly as possible. In the past 18 months it had been formally activated and IOM had taken the lead in Pakistan, the Philippines and Ethiopia. It had not been formally activated in Timor-Leste or Mozambique, but IOM had nevertheless applied the principles developed for camp management in those countries. One of the cluster's main activities was to raise standards in terms of camp safety. Since 2006 it had trained over 300 staff from a variety of national and international non-governmental organization partners. Internally, IOM would have trained about 200 staff members by the end of the year.

67. The protection cluster was headed by UNHCR, but IOM had made substantial contributions to the Inter-Agency Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons. It had worked with UNHCR and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the emergency shelter cluster, and with the World Food Programme in the logistics cluster. It had also played an important part in the early recovery cluster, falling back on its consistent and strong role in return and reintegration and ensuring that post-crisis returns were sustainable.

68. IOM's operational budget was projectized. The Organization therefore could not dedicate resources to the cluster system as such, although some of the resources currently allocated to the Emergency and Post-Crisis Division would be used to carry out the tasks inherent in implementing the cluster system. Although no final decision had been made on mainstreaming the approach within IOM, it was not anticipated that it would generate substantial staffing requirements. In the *Appeal for Building Global Humanitarian Response Capacity 2007*, IOM had requested USD 3.6 million for its cluster activities but had received no response to date. Its appeal had brought in USD 1.37 million the previous year.

69. One Member State was struck by the relative absence of debate on the cluster approach within IOM compared to other organizations. IOM had taken on substantial global

responsibilities implying the disbursement of millions of dollars without circulating concept papers to its Member States, engaging in detailed debate with them or determining whether or not they were in favour of it doing so. IOM had requested substantial amounts for capacity building in connection with its cluster responsibilities in 2007 and 2008. There had been no discussion of the impact this would have on its funding structures or whether or not Member States had sufficient information to decide on the extent of their support.

70. The same Member State suggested that a document presented on 30 October at the donor support group meeting of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs on the camp coordination and management cluster be distributed to all Member States.

71. Another Member State asked whether IOM's cluster activities required additional budget allocations, and a third, whether the capacity-building activities concerned essentially IOM activities or work within the cluster.

72. The Administration replied that neither the Operational Support Department nor the Emergency and Post-Crisis Division had received cluster-dedicated budget allocations. They had endeavoured to reorganize the work internally so as to cover all possible ground. The funds received had been invested in training and in the development of management tools under a plan devised with the other members of the camp coordination and management cluster, notably UNHCR. The cluster approach applied to capacity-building activities almost exclusively at field level. The Administration would provide the Member States with information that explained its activities under the cluster approach in greater detail.

(c) Global Migration Group, including the International Partnership for Migration and Development

73. The Administration explained that the Global Migration Group had stemmed from the Geneva Migration Group, and currently consisted of the heads of ten agencies. In addition, nine other agencies had recently expressed an interest in joining the Group.

74. Under the leadership of UNHCR in 2006, the Global Migration Group had contributed to preparations for the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, conducted a survey of migration research and data collection activities and discussed follow-up work.

75. With IOM in the Chair in early 2007, the Global Migration Group had shifted its focus to information exchange, coordination, transparency, discussions of cooperative projects and preparations for the Global Forum on Migration and Development. Such preparations had led to a number of statements on behalf of the Group and various documents, including a survey of capacity-building activities. Three meetings had been held at the principals' level, and three at the working level, alongside intense networking with contacts of the Group. The Report for the Period under IOM Chairmanship January to June 2007 had been distributed to the participants.

76. The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, which had assumed chairmanship of the Group in July 2007, had concentrated on agency follow-up to the Global Forum on Migration and Development, created a common work space for working-level contacts and proposed a survey of relationships with government bodies dealing with migration to identify

commonalities and gaps. The Group had held a working-level meeting on 1 October 2007, and would hold a meeting of principals on 9 November 2007.

77. Turning to the International Partnership on Migration and Development, the idea had arisen from the need for an implementation mechanism, *inter alia* to facilitate follow-up to Global Forum recommendations at the operational level, and provide necessary funding and support. It would be up to governments to decide whether to move forward with the project.

78. The International Partnership, conceived in the spirit of the former International Migration and Development Initiative, would consist of international agencies and government and non-government stakeholders. Its aim would be to ensure follow-up to the recommendations and action outcomes of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, promote policy coherence by working to mainstream migration issues into country-level development agendas, craft development-friendly migration policies, and build capacity to enhance the benefits of development for migration and to engage in safe and effective labour migration management that matched labour supply with demand while safeguarding migrants' rights and well-being. Financing and coordination would be accomplished through a multi-donor trust fund. The International Partnership would operate under a light administrative structure that could be linked to the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the Global Migration Group, with agencies as implementing partners according to areas of expertise and in coordination with and under the guidance of governments. A Draft Concept paper outlining the goals, modalities, areas of work and funding of the International Partnership had been distributed to the assembly.

79. The presentation prompted a number of questions from the membership. One Member State wished to know IOM's views on the functioning and potential of the Global Migration Group. In response, the Administration said that the Group, characterized by a true spirit of cooperation among member agencies, was an evolving and useful mechanism that enabled members to share information and to exchange advice.

80. Another delegation stressed that the Global Migration Group was not an entity of its own and should not become unduly formalized or take directions from States. The latter should interact directly with the relevant agencies within the Group.

81. One delegation asked whether the Global Forum on Migration and Development was destined to become an annual event, raising the concern that such a timeframe might not be sufficient to implement recommendations from one year to the next. The Administration pointed out that it was up to the States attending the Global Forum – not IOM – to decide upon the frequency of meetings.

82. Another Member State praised the Administration for organizing the inaugural meeting of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance and for putting pertinent issues such as governance, management and policy on the agenda, a welcome change from previous sessions of the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance. The Standing Committee's future programmes of work should include additional informal consultations on substantive issues relating to item 9 of the agenda.

83. The Draft Concept of the International Partnership on Migration and Development had been presented at the Standing Committee's inaugural session, giving delegations virtually no time for reflection. A number of questions were raised concerning the authorship and circulation of the Draft Concept paper. Various Member States also expressed the need to consult with their governments before taking a stand on the initiative, although several had had favourable first impressions. Rather than trying to "reinvent the wheel" the initiative was headed in the right direction and it might well fill the gap between ideas discussed at the Global Forum on Migration and Development and their implementation. Because the International Partnership would be donor-driven, it would require consultation with potential donors from both the public and private sectors. The idea of a multi-donor trust fund facility was especially attractive.

84. Although it was incumbent upon the Global Forum on Migration and Development to decide how to move forward with the initiative, Member States could also consider whether the Organization intended to play a substantive role in that initiative. With regard to how the International Partnership would be set up, one Member State was struck by the reference to "key" Global Migration Group partners in the Draft Concept (paragraph 1, section 2) and by the absence of some organizations, making in its view an inappropriate distinction between major and minor agencies. Responding to that comment, members of the Administration said that all GMG agencies had been encouraged to participate, any could join at any time, but that no member agency of the Global Migration Group could compel another to become involved in a specific task of any initiative; it was up to the agencies themselves to decide for themselves. However, that Member State's views would be communicated to the forthcoming meeting of the Global Migration Group to be held on 9 November 2007.

85. Regarding the link between the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the Global Migration Group, the Administration explained that the former was a State-run process; the Government of the Philippines had asked for support from members of the Group. By distributing the Draft Concept paper at the present meeting, the Administration sought to obtain initial feedback from the membership but the document is still a draft and no decision is requested of the membership. The Administration would consult further with all parties, in particular the Philippines, which as Chair of the upcoming Global Forum on Migration and Development would decide whether the proposal would be put to its Steering Committee or the Friends of the Forum for discussion in preparation for the next Global Forum. Delegations would have time to consult with their capitals and to further examine the issue. The World Bank had offered to host the International Partnership fund, but no decision had yet been made.

86. Several Member States commended the Administration for presenting the initiative at the First Session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance. Although it was regrettable that the proposal had not been discussed previously in informal consultations, it was clear that the issue would require further deliberation to determine the way forward. Whatever the case, such talks should reflect the ongoing discussions of the Global Forum on Migration and Development Steering Committee, and Member States should be allowed enough time to examine the proposal carefully. One Member State suggested that an *ad hoc* working group should be set up to discuss the Draft Concept, while another believed that the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance would be the appropriate forum for discussion and was not in favour of forming a working group. In addition, it would be advisable to hold an informal consultation with other members of the Global Migration Group to ascertain the Group's overall vision of the

International Partnership and its link to the Global Forum on Migration and Development. Some delegations expressed the view that discussions relating to the Global Forum should be kept apart from discussions in the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance because the former was dealt with in other mechanisms and channels. Further consultations should focus on how the International Partnership should be administered and the governing bodies of the Global Migration Group agencies should be involved in the process since the Global Forum on Migration and Development's recommendations were not part of IOM's mandate *per se*. By the same token, it was necessary to hold bilateral consultations between IOM Member States and the Administration, as well as among the Member States themselves, before approval could be given by the membership.

87. The Administration took note of the comments and said it would make arrangements for a suitable date for further consultations to be held on the issue.

88. The Administration said that the Draft Concept, which had received wide support from the agencies at a recent working-level meeting, was under consideration by the agencies of the Global Migration Group. The Administration agreed that the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance was not the appropriate body to decide on the Draft Concept, which in any case was not yet ripe for decision. In contrast, two Member States felt that the Draft Concept should be discussed by the IOM governing bodies for various reasons: IOM had played a leading role in its preparation, recommendations were needed to improve and fill gaps in the document, and IOM or the Administration was not acting on its own behalf but with the approval of Member States, which could also provide guidance as to how to proceed.

89. Two delegations expressed disappointment at not having received background documentation before the meeting, one of which requested that electronic copies of the Global Migration Group Report and the Draft Concept be sent to the membership as soon as possible.

90. Three Member States expressed their concerns with the International Partnership because the human rights component was not sufficiently present in the Draft Concept paper. One of them also objected to the fact that migrant remittances would be discussed by the International Partnership or in the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance. One delegation, however, failed to see how the proposal ran counter to human rights, and the Administration added that human rights underpinned all of IOM's endeavours, and that it was addressed explicitly in the proposal.

91. In the view of one delegation, the International Partnership appeared essentially to be an initiative spearheaded by IOM, parts of which were supported by other Global Migration Group agencies which would seek guidance from their own governing bodies. There were two ways of envisaging the International Partnership. The first was as a project to be submitted by the Philippine Government, in which case it would be discussed in the framework of routine meetings of the governing bodies where Member States could express their views on the project. The second was as an IOM initiative within the Global Migration Group, approved by members of the Group involved in the initiative as well as by IOM Member States. Once such approval had been secured, the initiative could be submitted to the Global Forum on Migration and Development, either through the Friends of the Forum, the Global Forum Steering Committee or the Philippine Government. Whatever the case, clarity was of the essence. In addition, it was not for IOM

Member States to discuss whether the World Bank could set up a fund to finance the follow-up activities of the Global Forum on Migration and Development. The Government of the Philippines should not be treated differently from other Member States that submitted a project, as that would set a dangerous precedent.

92. The Administration confirmed that the initiative could indeed be deemed a project. Once that had become clear, one Member State suggested that consultations should be led by the Government of the Philippines as project originator, with input from other Global Migration Group members. Logically, members of the Global Forum on Migration and Development should decide, in consultation with the Philippine Government as current Chair of the Forum, how the International Partnership might work and whether it should go forward. IOM should keep Member States informed about its role in such a mechanism and the possible impact on the Organization's budgetary structure, through informal consultations, in particular with other members of the Global Migration Group. One Member State sought clarification as to how the informal consultations on the Draft Concept paper would be held. That Member stressed the need to discuss the Concept Draft in detail, either in the context of meetings of IOM Member States, with the other members of the Global Migration Group within the framework of the Global Forum process, or both. In reply, the Administration said that it would ask the Philippine Government whether it wished to hold such a consultation; if so, based on the outcome of that consultation, it could decide whether there was a need for a separate consultation within IOM.

93. If the purpose of the International Partnership was to follow up the Global Forum, the latter should assign tasks and responsibilities to the respective parties. However, if the International Partnership was designed to be an inter-agency mechanism to discuss migration issues, the agencies would then be free to do so.

94. The Administration pointed out that before any issues were to be placed on the agenda of informal consultations or of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance, they would be discussed with Member States and the Standing Committee Bureau.

95. The representative of the Philippines said that it was urgent to find a mechanism to facilitate collaborative undertakings among governments and other stakeholders to pursue the outcomes of the First Global Forum on Migration and Development. Efforts should be made to reach a swift and smooth consensus to avoid further delays in the process. The Global Forum Steering Committee had not yet discussed the concept of the International Partnership, but it would possibly be put forward for consideration at its next meeting.

96. He thanked IOM for its continuing support to the Global Forum on Migration and Development, in particular for its secondment of a technical expert to help with preparatory meetings for the Second Global Forum on Migration and Development to be held in Manila in October 2008.

97. In summing up the debate, the Acting Chairperson said that it had been a rich exchange of ideas. She thanked the Administration for its efforts to facilitate a substantive discussion of issues that were important to all delegations. A good start had been made in meeting the membership's expectations by establishing the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance, and that could be built upon and improved. Suggestions had been made as to how to place items on the future

Standing Committee agendas and to prepare those discussions. All requests made by the assembly would be followed up by the Administration.

X. IOM ASSESSMENT SCALE

(a) Methodology used to establish the IOM assessment scale

(b) IOM assessment scale fully equated to the United Nations assessment scale

98. The Administration introduced documents SCPF/3 (Methodology used to establish the IOM assessment scale) and SCPF/4 (IOM assessment scale fully equated to the United Nations assessment scale).

99. Document SCPF/3 explained the methodology used by the Administration to establish IOM's assessment scale. The current assessment scale methodology prorated the assessments of all IOM Member States with the equation factor used to match IOM's smaller membership with the assessment scale of the United Nations, but continued to assess a few Member States at a rate equal to that of the United Nations. The minimum and maximum rates had to be established by the Member States.

100. Document SCPF/4 contained the proposal initiated by Morocco and supported by Chile, Italy, Mexico and South Africa, for a fully equated assessment scale. That proposal had gained growing support from other Member States at various informal consultations. The Administration viewed it as a simple and straightforward mechanism for fully equating the two scales. It would be applied as of 2009 once approved by the Executive Committee in 2008.

101. Several delegates thanked the representatives from Chile, Italy, Mexico, South Africa and in particular Morocco for putting together the proposal. They were joined by many others in noting that the fundamental guiding principle established by the Council in the early 1990s was to gradually eliminate distortions between the United Nations and the IOM assessment scales and this proposal seemed to meet that objective. It was thought by a number of delegations that the proposal might also serve to resolve a number of other outstanding issues relating to contributions from low-income countries.

102. One representative was still awaiting official instructions from his capital.

103. Two Member States, Japan and the Republic of Korea, would see their assessed contributions go up under the proposed scale, but agreed to join the emerging consensus in a spirit of cooperation with the entire membership. The representative of Japan urged the Administration to maintain its efforts to streamline the Administrative Part of the Budget and thereby hold it to zero nominal growth. The representative of the Republic of Korea emphasized that the proposal, if adopted, would apply only as of 2009.

104. The representative of Morocco thanked Japan and the Republic of Korea for having agreed to compromise and join the consensus. He added that the way the proposal had been drawn up – by a group of Member States that were not necessarily all from the same region or all from the

North or South – could serve as a model when the Organization dealt with other outstanding issues.

105. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of documents SCPF/3, Methodology used to establish the IOM assessment scale, and SCPF/4, IOM assessment scale fully equated to the United Nations assessment scale, and recommended that the scale for 2009 be reviewed and decided by the Executive Committee at its next session.

XI. REPORT ON HUMAN RESOURCES

106. The Administration, introducing the Report on Human Resources Management at IOM (MC/INF/286), briefed the Member States on developments in human resources management since the Ninety-sixth Session of the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance.

107. The recruitment functions had been transferred from Geneva to the Manila Administrative Centre, which would also administer IOM's participation in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. The Field Staff Support Unit had been transferred from Manila to the newly opened Panama Administrative Centre.

108. The Rotation Appointments and Postings Board had been established to review organizational staffing needs and the mobility of international officials, and to make recommendations to the Director General for staff rotation and renewal. Funds had been set aside to extend gradually non-occupational accident and sickness insurance benefits to local staff worldwide. The Staff Regulations and Rules were being reviewed with a view to dividing them into two separate but linked documents and to covering all staff members throughout the Organization. The aim was to make the Staff Regulations and Rules more inclusive and to eliminate any unnecessary distinction between officials and employees.

109. The Staff Association Committee had been closely associated in all those endeavours. In addition, a Committee representative had taken part in the insurance and risk review and in the *ad hoc* task groups on the introduction of internal customer satisfaction surveys and on disciplinary measures.

110. In order to ensure that IOM had staff who were prepared to deal with migration challenges globally, the Administration proposed to set up an accelerated development pool for effective succession planning in its major areas of activity. The objective of the initiative, which would require a one-time investment of CHF 200,000, was to form a pool of 15 professionals who, by mid-2008, would be ready to step into positions as specialists in migration policy and practice, leadership and targeted management. The candidates would be selected on the basis of their performance records, the skills required and fair regional distribution. Consideration was being given to a strategy for involving nationals of countries not represented on the Organization's staff.

111. Further to a meeting with the African Group, the Administration had taken steps to increase the number of nationals from non-represented Member States working for the Organization. Those measures included opening vacancies to internal and external applicants from non-represented Member States, contacting donors about the possibility of increasing the number of

Associate Experts and secondments from non-represented Member States, having the national authorities of such States second staff to new projects, developing an internship programme for non-represented Member States and, in the context of the Resource Management Officer Voluntary Mobility Scheme, giving several employees from Uganda, Ghana, Senegal, Kenya and Zimbabwe the possibility to become officials.

112. The PRISM human and financial resources software application continued to be rolled out. It had been used since early 2007 in the Manila Administrative Centre and the Field Offices in Indonesia and Zimbabwe to process the payroll of field staff. That function would be extended to at least ten more large Field Offices in 2008. There had also been a sharp increase in the use of PRISM's employee self-service module: 5,586 leave requests had been processed online since January 2006, and 7,136 applications received online for vacancies posted between January 2006 and June 2007.

113. Thanks to the Administration's efforts, progress had been made towards achieving the Organization's gender-balance targets and more than 40 per cent of its officials were now women. There was still room for improvement, however, in particular as concerned the number of women at the P5 grade and higher.

114. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the Report on Human Resources Management at IOM (MC/INF/286).

XII. UPDATE ON DELOCALIZATION

115. The Administration, introducing document SCPF/2, entitled Update on delocalization – Manila and Panama Administrative Centres, said that the number of staff at the Manila Administrative Centre had grown by 27 to 137 since 2006. That increase had been brought about by the transfer from Geneva of the administrative and functional management of units such as Accounting and Human Resources Operations, and the establishment in Manila of the corresponding supervisory positions, and of functions relating to publications, occupational health and information technology. IOM's projects and programmes in the Philippines and the region had also grown, leading to an increase in the number of staff at the Manila Mission with Regional Functions from 26 to 63 units.

116. The Panama Administrative Centre had 14 staff members. Established in 2007, it had spent much of the year recruiting and training personnel, renovating its premises and purchasing and installing equipment. It had been inaugurated on 7 September and was now providing financial control, information technology and human resources management support to IOM's Field Offices in the region. It would start providing support for internal audits as soon as the requisite staff had been hired and trained.

117. The respective roles and responsibilities of the Manila and Panama Administrative Centres had been clearly defined, and the Administration would continue to ensure that they complemented rather than duplicated each others' efforts to provide global support.

118. One representative pointed out that the purpose of delocalization was to save money, yet the costs of the administrative centres had risen sharply. Their total staff now numbered 150 – more than Geneva Headquarters had ever had – and their total costs amounted to 15 per cent more than Headquarters costs before delocalization. He wondered when the steep annual growth in total cost would level off, and whether the Administration was satisfied that the objective of providing administrative services at significantly lower costs was being met.

119. The Administration replied that, while it was true that costs and number of staff continued to rise, it also had to be borne in mind that the administrative centres enabled the Organization to do more at the same or at a lower cost, and to provide services to more Field Offices and Member States without the costs of those services exploding.

120. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of the Update on delocalization – Manila and Panama Administrative Centres (SCPF/2).

XIII. SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING MEMBER STATES AND MEMBER STATES WITH ECONOMY IN TRANSITION – 1035 FACILITY

121. The Administration introduced document SCPF/5 (Support for developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition – Status report 1 January to 30 September 2007). The 1035 Facility had started the year with an allocation of USD 1.4 million from Discretionary Income, USD 727,551 carried forward from 2006, and EUR 100,000 contributed by the Government of Italy. It had recovered USD 54,783 from projects completed in 2007, bringing the total amount of funds available at 30 September to USD 2,182,334. On that date, 83 Member States had been eligible for funding from the Facility and 21 projects were being funded for a total of USD 1,609,731, or 74 per cent of the total funds available.

122. In June 2007, the Ninety-third (Special) Session of the Council had decided to expand the 1035 Facility by creating a second line of funding (Line 2) and to request the Director General to allocate 25 per cent of Discretionary Income, excluding security, in excess of the 2007 Programme and Budget Discretionary Income of USD 20.5 million to the Facility starting in 2008. The Facility would therefore have two funding sources as of 2008: Line 1 (USD 1.4 million) and Line 2 (USD 2.5 million). The same criteria and guidelines would apply to both, except that Member States subject to Article 4 of the Constitution would not be eligible for funding under Line 2. In addition, Line 2 had a higher ceiling for national and regional projects: USD 200,000 and USD 300,000 respectively. The Facility's management would monitor implementation of the projects under the two lines separately and would keep separate accounts for them.

123. One Member State encouraged the Member States to support the Facility financially and applauded the Administration's efforts to ensure that expenditure was in proportion to the geographic distribution of eligible Member States.

124. The Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance took note of document SCPF/5 (Support for developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition – Status report 1 January to 30 September 2007).

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Application for membership

125. The Standing Committee for Programmes and Finance took note of the application for membership of the Republic of Burundi and of its proposed assessment of 0.026 per cent.

(b) Migrant remittances observatory for Least Developed Countries

126. The coordinator for the Least Developed Countries recalled that the Ministerial Conference of the Least Developed Countries on Migrants' Remittances, which had been held in Cotonou in February 2006, had recommended that a migrant remittances observatory be established for Least Developed Countries. The host country, Benin, had agreed to house the observatory but was encountering difficulties in implementing the recommendation. The coordinator requested that IOM become more involved in raising the funds that Benin and the Least Developed Countries needed to set up the observatory.

127. Many Member States underscored the importance of the observatory. One suggested that a meeting of all Least Developed Member States be organized to discuss the problem of its funding and explore potential solutions.

128. The Deputy Director General pointed out that IOM had upheld its commitment and had hired a consultant who, after six weeks in Benin, had issued a report on the facilities and constraints inherent in establishing the observatory. The Ministerial Conference's recommendation nevertheless had to be implemented by the Least Developed Countries themselves, in particular by their Bureau. Benin had made available a building and IOM had drawn up the observatory's terms of reference in coordination with all the partners, but the functioning of the observatory nevertheless depended entirely on the Bureau. Some form of meeting could certainly be organized, but she recalled that very few of the countries concerned had attended the conference preparatory meetings organized by the Ambassador of Benin and herself. She suggested that IOM's Regional Adviser for sub-Saharan Africa contact the coordinator of the Least Developed Countries to set a date.

(c) Election rules and procedures

129. Several Member States, recalling that the Organization would elect a Director General at the Ninety-fifth (Special) Session of the Council, said that it was essential that clear and transparent election rules and procedures be developed to guide the process and ensure it was fair. Those rules and procedures could be derived from those applied in the election of the Deputy Director General in 1999. The process by which they were drawn up had to be governed by the Member States and should be open and inclusive, so that all Member States had the same opportunity to participate. The Member States concerned had on several occasions requested that a working group be established under the Council Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson to better define the election rules and procedures, and one asked the Administration to provide an update on the status of that request. The working group should start meeting in November, but the starting date could be flexible so long as there was a commitment to move forward and set a date for a first meeting. The election rules and procedures should be approved at the Ninety-fourth Session of the Council.

130. The Legal Adviser reported that a written request received from a Member State on that matter had been forwarded immediately to the Chairperson of the Council, who had asked the First Vice-Chairperson to take care of the matter. He had further been informed by the First Vice-Chairperson that for scheduling reasons it appeared unlikely that consultations on the matter, preferably at ambassadorial level, could be organized before the forthcoming session of the Council.

131. Various delegates insisted that consultations should be open to all IOM Member States and be established at the earliest opportunity.

132. The Acting Chairperson said that she would inform the Chairperson of the concerns raised by the Member States and was certain that they would be given careful consideration.

(d) Ninety-fourth Session of the Council

133. Two delegations raised concerns about the timely arrival of documents relating to the forthcoming session of the Council. One pointed out that it had not yet received an invitation, the other recalled that the Member States were still awaiting two documents: the updated version of document MC/INF/263, IOM-UN relationship, and a report on the Administration's plan to implement the activities listed in the IOM strategy. The Member States needed both documents enough in advance to allow their capitals to react and to decide how the Council should proceed with them.

134. The Administration assured the Member States that the invitations for the forthcoming session of the Council had been sent out earlier in the week.

(e) Regional advisers

135. One Member State suggested that the regional advisers be more closely associated in the deliberations of IOM's governing bodies. They had first-hand knowledge of the problems and issues of concern to their regions and could provide valuable guidance on governing body decisions and implementation of the IOM strategy.

(f) Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

136. The Deputy Director General trusted that the Standing Committee would conduct its future deliberations in close coordination with the Council, since the two shared the same bureau. She congratulated the Member States on their growing involvement in the functioning of the Organization. The Standing Committee had been established in response to a pressing demand for greater coherency between IOM's programmes and the budgets used to finance them. The items raised under item 9 of the agenda had been well worth debating, but numerous other policy issues had yet to be placed on an agenda for dialogue with the Administration. The Standing Committee's role was to examine the budget and programme, but also to deliberate policy themes. In that respect, she invited the Member States to provide the Administration with feedback and ideas.

137. After thanking the interpreters and the Meetings Secretariat, the Chairperson declared the First Session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance closed on Wednesday, 31 October 2007, at 1 p.m.



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

1st Session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

(30 - 31 October 2007)

Conference Room XVI
5th Floor, Assembly Building (Door 13), Palais des Nations, Geneva

Final List of Participants

Total number of participants: 123

Total number of pages: 13 (including this page)

MEMBERS**ALBANIE****QERIMAJ Sejdi, S.E. M.**

Mission permanente de la République d'Albanie
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire
Représentant permanent

PISTOLI Miranda, Mme

Mission permanente de la République d'Albanie
Deuxième secrétaire

NINA Ervin, M.

Mission permanente de la République d'Albanie
Deuxième secrétaire

ALGÉRIE**EL BEY El-Hacène, M.**

Mission permanente de la République algérienne démocratique
et populaire
Conseiller

ARGENTINA**CAVALERI Paulo Alejandro, Sr.**

Misión Permanente de la República Argentina
Consejero

ARMENIA**HOVHANNISYAN Gagik, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Armenia
First Secretary

AUSTRALIA**DUKE Jane, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of Australia
Counsellor (Immigration)

AUSTRIA**BERNDORFER Thomas, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Austria
Advisor

WEIDINGER Markus, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Austria
Second Secretary

AZERBAIJAN**AMIRBAYOV Elchin, H.E. Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative

MARDALIYEV Seymur, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Second Secretary

MEMBERS

AZERBAIJAN

HASANOV Emil, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Intern

BANGLADESH

MOWLA Muhammed Enayet, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
Counsellor

BELARUS

LAZAREV Evgeny, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Belarus
First Secretary

BELGIQUE

VERHEYDEN Frédéric, M.

Mission permanente de la Belgique
Deuxième secrétaire

BÉNIN

ADJANONHOUN Rosemonde D., Mme

Mission permanente de la République du Bénin
Premier secrétaire

BOLIVIA

RODRIGUEZ Denisse, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República de Bolivia
Primera Secretaria

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

KUNDUROVIC Anesa, Ms.

Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina
First Secretary

BULGARIA

GOSPODINOV Ivan, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria
Second Secretary

BURKINA FASO

NÉBIÉ KANSOLE Aline, Mme

Mission permanente du Burkina Faso
Attaché

MEMBERS**CAMEROUN****NGANTCHA Francis, M.**

Mission permanente de la République du Cameroun
Ministre conseiller
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

CANADA**MANICOM David, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Canada
Minister Counsellor

CHILE**VERDUGO FUENTES Ximena Adriana, Sra.**

Misión Permanente de Chile
Primer Secretario

COLOMBIA**MENDOZA AGUDELO Adriana, Sra.**

Misión Permanente de Colombia
Ministro Consejero

JARAMILLO Mariana, Sra.

Misión Permanente de Colombia
Attachée

CONGO**MENGA Roger Julien, S.E. M.**

Mission permanente de la République du Congo
Ambassadeur
Représentant permanent

BIKOUTA Delphine, Mme

Mission permanente de la République du Congo
Premier conseiller

OGNIMBA Kellie-Shandra, Mme

Mission permanente de la République du Congo
Experte, Droits de l'Homme

COSTA RICA**THOMPSON CHACÓN Laura, Excma. Sra.**

Misión Permanente de la República de Costa Rica
Embajadora Extraordinaria y Plenipotenciaria
Representante Permanente

SEGURA HERNÁNDEZ Alexandra, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República de Costa Rica
Ministro Consejero

CROATIA**ADAMIĆ Maja, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Croatia
First Secretary

MEMBERS

CZECH REPUBLIC

HRNČÍŘ Pavel, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic
Deputy Permanent Representative

DENMARK

MOUYAL David, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Denmark
First Secretary

ECUADOR

MONTALVO Mauricio, Excmo. Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República del Ecuador
Embajador Extraordinario y Plenipotenciario
Representante Permanente

HOLGUÍN Juan, Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República del Ecuador
Ministro
Representante Permanente Alterno

EGYPT

FAKHRY Mohamed, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt
Counsellor

EL SALVADOR

ALFARO RIVAS Beatriz, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República de El Salvador
Consejero
Cónsul General

ESPAÑA

MARCH PUJOL Juan Antonio, Excmo. Sr.

Misión Permanente de España
Embajador
Representante Permanente

ARÍSTEGUI LABORDE Joaquín María De, Excmo. Sr.

Misión Permanente de España
Embajador
Representante Permanente Adjunto

GARCÍA FERNÁNDEZ-LLAMAZARES Isabel, Sra.

Misión Permanente de España
Consejera

SEVILLA Elena, Sra.

Misión Permanente de España
Pasante

FINLAND

KAIVOLA Veli-Pekka, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Finland
First Secretary

KARLSSON Max, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Finland
Intern

MEMBERS**FRANCE****GRANDJEAN Caroline, Mme**

Mission permanente de la France
Conseiller

MEHAULE Florent, M.

Mission permanente de la France
Attaché

GABON**LOUZET Adèle Patricia, Mme**

Mission permanente de la République gabonaise
Premier secrétaire

GERMANY**STILGENBAUER Gunther, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Germany
Counsellor

GHANA**ARYENE Paul King, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Ghana
Minister
Deputy Permanent Representative

GREECE**PAPADOPOULOU Marianna, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of Greece
Minister Counsellor

PETMEZAKIS Georgios, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Greece
First Secretary

GUATEMALA**URRUELA ARENALES Mariá Soledad, Sra.**

Misión Permanente de Guatemala
Segundo Secretario

GUINÉE**MONLMOU Pierre, M.**

Mission permanente de la République de Guinée
Conseiller

HUNGARY**BLAZSEK Dóra, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Hungary
Second Secretary
Deputy Permanent Representative

MEMBERS

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

SADRKHAH Asgar, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran
Second Counsellor

IRELAND

GALLAGHER Martin, Mr.

Permanent Mission of Ireland
Second Secretary

ISRAEL

LEVANON Itzhak, H.E. Mr.

Permanent Mission of Israel
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative

STAUFFER Hilary, Ms.

Permanent Mission of Israel
Adviser

ITALIE

FORNARA Domenico, M.

Mission permanente de l'Italie
Premier secrétaire

JAPAN

SATO Masako, Ms.

Permanent Mission of Japan
Second Secretary

JORDAN

QUDAH Hussam, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
Third Secretary

LATVIA

DUMPE Evija, Ms.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Latvia
Counsellor

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

BENOMRAN Abdurhman, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya
Minister Plenipotentiary
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

SAAITE Ibtissam, Ms.

Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya
Third Secretary

MEMBERS**LITHUANIA****ŠAKALYS Valdas, Mr.**Permanent Mission of Lithuania
Third Secretary**MALI****MAÏGA Alhacoum, M.**Mission permanente de la République du Mali
Deuxième conseiller**MALTA****LUNGARO MIFSUD Nicole, Ms.**Permanent Mission of Malta
First Secretary**MAROC****BENJABER Mohammed, M.**Mission permanente du Royaume du Maroc
Conseiller**MAURITANIE****OULD ABDI SALEM Taleb Khyar, M.**Mission permanente de la République islamique de Mauritanie
Conseiller**MÉXICO****MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ Erasmo R., Sr.**Misión Permanente de México
Ministro**MOLDOVA****CALUGARU Corina, Ms.**Permanent Mission of the Republic of Moldova
First Secretary**NEPAL****PAUDYAL Bharat Raj, Mr.**Permanent Mission of Nepal
Minister Counsellor, Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Deputy Permanent Representative

MEMBERS

NETHERLANDS

VAN SCHIJNDEL René, Mr.

Ministry of Justice, The Hague
Immigration Policy Department
Senior Policy Adviser

KNOBEN Irene, Ms.

Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
First Secretary

NEW ZEALAND

LOCKHART Andrew, Mr.

New Zealand High Commission, London
Counsellor (Immigration)

CROMPTON Mary-Anne, Ms.

Permanent Mission of New Zealand
Counsellor

HICKS Natalie, Ms.

Permanent Mission of New Zealand
Attaché

NICARAGUA

CRUZ TORUÑO Néstor, Sr.

Misión Permanente de Nicaragua
Primer Secretario

NIGERIA

MONEKE Sydney I., Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria
Minister Counsellor

PAKISTAN

ISMAIL Ahmar, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan
First Secretary

PANAMÁ

ALFÚ DE REYES Una, Excma. Sra.

Misión Permanente de Panamá
Embajadora
Representante Permanente Adjunta

MENDOZA GANTES Alejandro Ivan, Sr.

Misión Permanente de Panamá
Consejero

PERÚ

GOMEZ VASQUEZ Ivys, Sra.

Misión Permanente del Perú
Attachée

MEMBERS**PHILIPPINES****IMSON Manuel G., Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Philippines
Labour Attaché

BAUTISTA Miguel R., Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Philippines
First Secretary

POLAND**MISZTAL Andrzej, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland
Minister Counsellor
Deputy Permanent Representative, Chargé d'affaires a.i.

KASSANGANA-JAKUBOWSKA Margareta, Ms.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland
First Secretary

SIDOROWICZ Sergiusz, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland
Second Secretary

PORTUGAL**XAVIER ESTEVES Francisco, S.E. M.**

Mission permanente du Portugal
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire
Représentant permanent

PEREIRA MARQUES Carlos, M.

Mission permanente du Portugal
Ministre conseiller
Représentant permanent adjoint

ALVARENGA Teresa, Mme

Mission permanente du Portugal
Conseiller

CANAS Joana, Mme

Mission permanente du Portugal
Conseiller

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**BEK Bum-Hym, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea
First Secretary

REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA**HERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ Homero Luis, Excmo. Sr.**

Misión Permanente de la República Dominicana
Embajador
Representante Permanente

SEGURA Carlos, Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República Dominicana
Ministro Consejero

BELLO DE KEMPER Magaly, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República Dominicana
Consejero

MEMBERS

RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO

MUTOMB MUJING Sébastien, M.

Mission permanente de la République démocratique du Congo
Ministre Conseiller

ROUMANIE

BIRLADIANU Nicoleta, Mme

Mission permanente de la Roumanie
Deuxième secrétaire

RWANDA

KAYITAYIRE Alphonse, M.

Mission permanente de la République du Rwanda
Premier conseiller

SÉNÉGAL

BOYE El Hadji Ibou, M.

Mission permanente de la République du Sénégal
Deuxième conseiller

SERBIA

VUKČEVIĆ Slobodan, H.E. Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative

STAJIĆ Marija, Ms.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia
Third Secretary

SLOVAKIA

ŠELEPEC Peter, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Slovak Republic
Second Secretary

SLOVENIA

JERMAN Boštjan, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Slovenia
Minister Counsellor

HAM Marko, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Slovenia
Third Secretary

SRI LANKA

OMER LEBBE Ameer Ajwad, Mr.

Permanent Mission of the Democratic Socialist Republic
of Sri Lanka
Counsellor

MEMBERS**SUISSE****KAESER Philippe, M.**

Mission permanente de la Suisse
Premier secrétaire

SOFIA Silvano, M.

Mission permanente de la Suisse
Stagiaire

SWEDEN**BLOMBERG Ann, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of Sweden
First Secretary

VOGHOUI Ghazal, Ms.

Permanent Mission of Sweden
Intern

THAILAND**CHARNBHUMIDOL Pitchayaphant, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Thailand
Minister Counsellor

TUNISIE**BEL KEFI Mohamed, M.**

Mission permanente de la Tunisie
Conseiller

TURKEY**ULUSOY Fatih, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Turkey
First Secretary

UKRAINE**KASIANOV Andrii, Mr.**

Permanent Mission of Ukraine
Second Secretary

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**KITSELL Corinne, Ms.**

Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
First Secretary

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA**LUVANDA Baraka H., Mr.**

Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanzania
First Secretary

KAGANDA Deusdedit B., Mr.

Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanzania
First Secretary

MEMBERS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

REIMER David D., Mr.

Permanent Mission of the United States of America
Refugee and Migration Affairs
Acting Counselor

NICHOLSON Maura, Ms.

Department of State, Washington, D.C.
Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration
Program Officer, Office of Multilateral Coordination
and External Relations

URUGUAY

TRUCILLO Lucia, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República Oriental del Uruguay
Ministro
Representante Permanente Adjunto

VENEZUELA (REPÚBLICA BOLIVARIANA DE)

CARVALLO VALENCIA Oscar, Excmo. Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela
Embajador
Representante Permanente Adjunto, Encargado de Negocios a.i.

ARIAS PALACIO Juan, Excmo. Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela
Embajador
Representante Permanente Alterno

FLORES TORRES Carlos Enrique, Sr.

Misión Permanente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela
Consejero Laboral

SIERRAALTA Vivian, Sra.

Misión Permanente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela
Asistente Técnico

Annex II

**FIRST SESSION OF THE
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMMES AND FINANCE**

30-31 October 2007

AGENDA

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Statement by the Director General
4. Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance
 - (a) Rules of Procedure
 - (b) Future programme of work
5. Outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget
 - (a) Status report
 - (b) Republic of Liberia outstanding contributions
6. Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2007
7. Programme and Budget for 2008
8. Statement by a representative of the Staff Association
9. Exchange of views on items proposed by the membership:^{*}
 - (a) IOM and “One UN”
 - (b) IOM’s role in the Clusters
 - (c) Global Migration Group, including the International Partnership for Migration and Development

^{*} Items drawn from the topics suggested by Member States at the informal consultations held on 18 October 2007. Additional topics suggested (e.g. *Migration Initiatives*, IOM’s involvement in inter-agency bodies) will be incorporated in the agendas of future SCPF sessions following consultation with the membership.

10. IOM assessment scale:
 - (a) Methodology used to establish the IOM assessment scale
 - (b) IOM assessment scale fully equated to the United Nations assessment scale
11. Report on human resources
12. Update on delocalization
13. Support for developing Member States and Member States with economy in transition – 1035 Facility
14. Any other business

Annex III

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

1. It is my pleasure to address the First Session of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance. The adoption of the strategy earlier in the year opened a new chapter on how we address budget issues and their linkages to the programmes and policies of the Organization. The SCPF will provide a platform to engage broader issues and enhance the governance of the Organization by its Member States.
2. The strategy marked a forward step in IOM's emergence as an organization with global impact. Your support is the key to IOM's growth and development. We have much yet to accomplish together. The SCPF should become an important vehicle for our continuing effort.
3. In the preparation of the Programme and Budget for 2008, we have tried to link the strategic priorities identified by the Member States to our broad areas of activities. We look forward to mainstreaming the strategy in all areas of our work.
4. The Administration looks forward to working closely with the Bureau of the SCPF.
5. I shall now provide some brief comments on the various agenda items before us. The Administration stands ready to respond to specific questions later on each item of the agenda.
6. On the Rules of Procedure for the SCPF, I appreciate the contributions you have all made to get them finalized and trust they will serve as an excellent guide for the work of the SCPF. Beyond this, I look forward to your continued engagement with the Administration on critical areas of concern to you in order to map out a coherent programme of work for the Organization.
7. The question of outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget is an important, ongoing issue, one that has been constantly brought to your attention at various levels. The total of outstanding contributions as of 11 October 2007 (for 2006 and prior years) amounts to some CHF 6.0 million. The number of Member States potentially subject to Article 4 of the Constitution is 18. This is not a good situation. More positively, I note that there is a generally expressed willingness on the part of Member States to settle outstanding amounts. I take this opportunity to urge all who require help to enter into and honour repayment plans. The Administration is committed to working actively on the issue in close collaboration with the Member States.
8. Regarding the Summary Update on the Programme and Budget for 2007, I call your attention to an increase in projected Discretionary Income of USD 7.1 million compared with the 2007 Blue Book. The increase is primarily due to higher-than-anticipated interest and overhead

income. Conscious that interest income is often unpredictable, we have proposed to use the increase to finance one-time initiatives instead of structures that would require a long-term financial commitment.

9. I now turn to the Programme and Budget for 2008. No changes are proposed in the Administrative Part of the Budget, which is maintained at the 2007 level of CHF 38,045,000. On the other hand, we see once again an increase in the projection for the Operational Part of the Budget, from USD 639.6 million to USD 721.5 million. The increase of USD 84.9 million is primarily due to new programmes in the areas of movement, emergencies, migration management and reparations. The Operational Part of the Budget in any given year will normally exceed the projection we make in advance, as new programmes come in constantly.

10. In the 2008 Blue Book, we have not proposed structural changes. Rather our focus is to strengthen the Organization's capacity to deal with migration issues through reallocation of resources. Africa, Asia and the Americas all benefit.

11. As you will have noticed, the drafters of the 2008 Blue Book made a great effort to enhance its readability and usefulness as a guide book to the Organization and its work and I want to congratulate them on their successful effort.

12. The next item on the agenda is a Statement by a representative of the Staff Association Committee. As you will hear in the SAC statement, the Administration has worked with the SAC on a number of initiatives designed to offer better conditions of service to staff. One is the proposal to use some of the 2007 additional overhead to extend the Medical Service Plan to cover non-occupational accident and illness insurance for local staff in all IOM Offices. The SAC has also been invited to provide inputs on the amendments to the Staff Regulations and Rules in order to ensure that the best interest of staff members are maintained. The Administration's relationship with the SAC is one of cooperation, not confrontation. Although there are some areas where we might have differing perspectives, I believe we have always worked out solutions that benefit staff.

13. The next item on the agenda is an exchange of views on subjects you proposed in preparation for this meeting. We shall present an oral update on the three topics and expect that there will follow an interesting discussion of IOM and "One UN", the Clusters and the GMG.

14. Regarding the methodology applied in preparing the IOM assessment scale, the Administration will provide you with the technical support required through this process.

15. The report on human resources management at IOM provides information on human resources issues and statistics on staffing. As already mentioned, we are working on a number of initiatives for the benefit of staff, particularly through the update of Staff Regulations and Rules and the proposal to extend the full benefits of our health insurance plan system to all locally hired field staff. In addition, we have made serious efforts to attract candidates from non-represented Member States and I count on your continued involvement in identifying suitable candidates for openings within the Organization.

16. In spite of the challenges encountered in delocalization, I am gratified by the achievements to date. I was at the opening of our second Administrative Centre in Panama and I am convinced that the Manila experience will prove invaluable in building this new Centre to meet the growing administrative challenges of the Organization. Recognizing IOM as the pace-setter in delocalization, a number of Organizations have contacted us for advice. I hope they will be able to draw on the lessons of this undertaking.

17. The 1035 Facility has proven its value over the years. All Member States support it. The recent establishment of Line 2 of the Facility, with additional funding, will in my opinion greatly enhance efforts to address the migration concerns of the beneficiary Member States.

Chairperson and distinguished delegates, I thank you all for your kind attention.