

Management models

Migrant centres should be established upon request of hosting Governments, pursuant to national migration management strategy, part of existing government systems and processes. State authorities shall therefore have the lead in the implementation of migrant centres programmes, while IOM shall ensure its support in the provision of protection and assistance. In cases where direct government management is not possible, an handover strategy shall be envisioned in the longer term.

Depending on the context and on the level of engagement of central governments and local authorities, **four models for the management of migrant centres** may be foreseen:

a) IOM-managed centres

In this model, centres are **set up by IOM and eventually transferred to state authorities** after these have progressively engaged in the management of the premises through the deployment of caseworkers and/or through trainings and capacity building initiatives. The advantage of this model is that this structure can be set up relatively fast and in full compliance with international standards of assistance and minimum requirements. However, since this model does not ensure high levels of ownership by state authorities, the handover to state authorities may be difficult to implement.

b) Centres managed through implementing partners (IPs)

In this model, centres are not managed directly by IOM but **fully or partially run through IPs**, i.e. a non-profit organisation with inherent capabilities that allow IOM to be more effective and efficient in fulfilling its mandate. This model may be chosen because of programmatic or security reasons. Implementing partners shall be selected through IOM standard procurement procedures and detailed terms of reference shall define the scope of the facilities, the minimum standards they shall respect as well as confidentiality/data protection clauses. For further information, please consult [these entries](#). Depending on their level of engagement, national authorities may take part in the selection of the IPs through a steering committee. This model may relieve IOM of daily facilities management task and it can be fully budgeted under operational costs. Challenges related to this model include time consuming internal administrative and financial procedures for the selection and monitoring of the IPs, as well risks related to government engagement which may impact the sustainability of IPs'

interventions beyond IOM's support.

Best practices from the field

The Migration Response Center (MRC) in Poi Pet, Cambodia, was established by IOM in 2015 to provide assistance to vulnerable Cambodian returnees. In 2019, the MRC was handed over to the Cambodian Government, which is now fully in charge of its funding and operationalization. IOM continues to ensure technical support to the Government, also through the deployment of one IOM staff to the MRC.

c) Government-managed centres

Government-managed centres are **embedded within government structures** since the beginning of the interventions ([see also this entry](#)). Depending on the context, IOM's role can be twofold. If national authorities are technically and financially able to run the facilities, IOM may provide complementary services to improve the quality of assistance and to ensure compliance with international standards. Another option is that a facility is run by a governmental agency with IOM financial and technical support. In order to be sustainable, this model implies a strong ownership and engagement by state authorities, which shall include the facility in its national/regional budgeting and planning. In this model, quality control, budgetary allocations, transparency and cost-efficiency may be difficult to monitor for IOM. In this model, governments shall ensure the financial sustainability of the centre, including its human resources. Nevertheless, if the coverage of government staff salary is foreseen in deviation of Internal Instruction (IN) 92 on the Policy on Non-payment of Bonuses to Government Officials when IOM and governments are jointly implementing capacity building or other projects, clearance shall be granted by both IOM Legal Department (LEG) and the donor entity supporting the activities ([see also this entry](#)).

Best practices from the field

In Morocco, IOM has established partnerships with civil society organisations (CSOs) to provide safe shelter to vulnerable migrants in private urban accommodation (apartments) in different cities. Apart from accommodation, CSOs offer a wide range of services, including trainings, medical support and non-food items and food distribution, among others.

d) Co-managed centres

In this model, migrant centres are **jointly managed by IOM and government authorities**. Division of roles and responsibilities, as well as boundaries and accountability of each actor shall be clearly defined through the establishment of a cooperation agreement ([see also this entry](#)) and management committees shall be established to operationalise the joint leadership and meet regularly to coordinate the interventions. If well implemented, this mixed model may ensure longer-term sustainability and government ownership compared to an IOM-managed centre, while ensuring the respect of international standards of assistance, transparency and cost-efficiency. As in the previous model, IOM welcomes measures aimed at increasing government ownership, with the long-term view that centers are nationally managed. Governments should be encouraged to contribute financial and human resources to centers. Any deviation to IN92 must be approved by LEG. In some cases, however, governmental technical staff working in the centre may be supported through the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding between each individual and IOM or through the

disbursement of daily allowances for the days they served in the centre. Examples of such arrangements may be found among the resources available in [this entry](#).

Best practices from the field

In Guinea Conakry, MRRCs are run jointly by IOM and government authorities. Management committees have been established to operationalise this joint leadership and meet on a monthly basis. Budgetary allocations for the MRRCs have been included in the 2020 National Budget by the Ministry of Social Affairs.

References and Tools

- [Methodology on the Conditions and Organization of the Social Support Provided in the Safety Zones for Unaccompanied...](#)
- [POS Centre de réception Jean Paul II \(Guinée Conakry\)](#)
- [TDRs Assistants et Travailleurs sociaux du MASPFE \(Guinea Conakry\)](#)

Category

Management of migrant centres