

Report on the Symposium: Joint Reflections on Migration and Development Graduate Institute – Geneva, August 23-24 2011

Table of Contents

<u>Joint Reflections (1): Labor Mobility and Development.....</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Joint Reflections (2): Roundtable on Gender, Family, Migration and Development.....</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Joint Reflections (3): Irregular Migration and Development.....</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Joint Reflections (4) Policy and Institutional Coherence.....</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>Joint Reflections (5): How governments and civil society can move the GFMD forward and towards 2013.....</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>Annex (1): Agenda – Joint Reflections on Migration and Development, 23-24 August, 2011.....</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Annex (2): Recommendations on Migration and Development produced by a group Swiss Civil Society Organizations (23-24 August 2011).....</u>	<u>48</u>

Introduction:

Co-sponsored by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, this symposium offered a space for Swiss and international civil society as well as governments to brainstorm about the outcomes of the 2010 Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Mexico, their connections with the thematic program for the GFMD 2011 in Switzerland, the role of civil society within the Global Forum, and how to build on the efforts of 2010 to strengthen interaction between civil society and governments in the GFMD 2011. The discussions were informal and engaged a balanced selection of participants from governments of countries of origin and destination, civil society and academia. They were guided by the authors of a book on *Reflections on Migration and Development* to be published by Springer, IOM and the Mexican government in 2012. These presented key issues and outcomes from the chapters they had prepared. Governments and civil society participants were invited to be discussants and to debate the experts' observations and findings.

The objective was to encourage joint reflections towards a more collaborative and cohesive debate at the year end meeting in December 2011. In particular, the symposium engaged Swiss civil society in the GFMD 2011 process, by devoting two half days to their discussions and consolidation of inputs and questions. The objectives of the Swiss civil society representatives were to 1) use this opportunity to strengthen and develop the process of consultation and cooperation among Swiss organizations and with the Swiss government; 2) improve Swiss civil society knowledge, awareness and engagement with migration and development issues and the GFMD process; 3) exchange ideas with international civil society representatives to feed into the November 2011 Civil Society Days and the future GFMD process; 4) develop recommendations for the November 2011 Civil Society Days and ultimately the December 2011 Friends of the Forum meeting (with the special aim to connect the Swiss perspective with the international debate on Migration and Development).

The symposium covered a combination of the thematic scheme of GFMD 2011 and the themes of GFMD 2010, as reflected in the forthcoming Springer book: Labour Mobility and Development, Gender, Family, Migration and Development, Irregular Migration and Development and Policy and Institutional Coherence. It also reflected on How governments and civil society can move the GFMD Forward towards 2013. It was

Report prepared by Dr. Jérôme Elie (Programme for the Study of Global Migration, Graduate Institute – Geneva,) with the help of Ms. Marina Peterhans. Thanks to the International Organization for Migration for its assistance, especially in providing an audio recording of the Symposium.

Contact: globalmigration@graduateinstitute.ch - <http://graduateinstitute.ch/globalmigration>

23 August 2011:

Joint Reflections (1): Labor Mobility and Development

After words of welcome by **Prof. Jussi Hanhimäki**, Director of the Graduate Institute's Programme for the Study of Global Migration, **Ms. Beata Godenzi** (Head, Global Programme on Migration and Development at the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation – SDC) launched the joint discussions with an opening address in which she commended the efforts developed by the Swiss civil society organizations (CSOs) in working on recommendations ahead of this symposium and in the morning. This was the **first time Swiss CSOs were present in such numbers in a GFMD related event** and she hoped it would **contribute to increasing cooperation between Swiss CSOs and the federal administration, which should expand beyond the 2011 GFMD**.

Working in partnership with governments was the key objective of the Global Forum and the Swiss Chair's new GFMD format for 2011 followed this approach. Nevertheless, as in the past, it also involved other stakeholders, including the Global Migration Group (GMG) and other relevant international organizations as well as civil society. In this context, this symposium **offered space for international and Swiss civil society and governments to brainstorm** about the outcomes of the 2010 GFMD; the connections between these and the thematic program for the 2011 Global Forum; the role of civil society within this Forum and how to build on the efforts to engage and strengthen interactions between civil society and governments. 2010 was an important benchmark in this perspective and the Swiss Chair aimed at continuing with the same spirit in 2011. The key objective was to encourage joint reflection and ownership among governments, international and Swiss academics as well as international and Swiss civil society towards a more collaborative and cohesive concluding debate for the GFMD on 1-2 December, in Geneva. It was hoped those two days would be helpful in providing thinking to better define the 2011 GFMD Common Space.

From Ms. Godenzi's perspective, this approach did not mean having the same voice and position on different issues, but rather being able to discuss these different positioning in order to improve our actions for the mutual benefits of origin and destination countries as well as the migrants.

In this context, she recognized the **value of CSOs' engagement, which are "often the heroes of the shadow in the migration and development story"** and **"sometimes represent the conscience of societies and governments"**, especially when they act as unofficial implementers and welcomed critiques of policies. They are often the advocates of migrants' rights as well as their representatives at the negotiating table. In this respect, being closer to the people, CSOs can often make the connections before governments do and achieve more with and for migrants than governments and international organizations.

However, Ms. Godenzi also reminded the audience that **civil society encompasses a wide variety of actors which need to agree on the roles that they can and should play in the Global Forum. Civil society is not fully represented in all its diversity**, the private sector and migrant associations being especially underrepresented. Acknowledging the difficulty in gathering all actors, she welcomed and **called for strengthening the civil society coordinator's efforts to have most of them on board**.

Mr. John Bingham (Head of Policy, International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) and 2011 GFMD Civil Society Coordinator) then presented two brief words of introduction:

He highlighted that this symposium was **deliberately 'JOINT' in many ways**: first, it had been proposed as a meeting with experts from the GFMD 2010, mostly from the academic community but for continuity, for great value, and to build a sensible bridge between 2010 and 2011, practitioners of civil society were also associated. The aim became to bring together expert perspective from both academia and the field (practitioners). This was first proposed at an international level, but encouraged by the Swiss Chair, the invitation was extended also to the Swiss civil society. The idea was to somehow reproduce similar CSOs' preparatory meetings organized ahead of Global Forum meetings in prior years. So this event ended up **running two tracks, jointly: a global convening of expertise and specific break-out sessions of Swiss CSOs**. Moreover,

although the 'Jointness' of those reflections had first been proposed as an engagement of civil society participants, involving governments and international organizations rapidly proved essential: it allowed **bringing together all actors who engage with one another, day to day**, in partnership and cooperation in the field of migration and development.

The second word of importance in this symposium title was 'REFLECTIONS'. The themes discussed over those two days were central to the Global Forum, past, present and future and Mr. Bingham insisted that we **need reflections and not just rush to talk**. To aid reflections, the organizers had structured the program around an active dialectic, with presentations followed by discussants' comments and interaction with the audience. In addition, he remarked that reflection was also important in considering the future of the Global Forum, especially in the run up to the UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013. Lastly, 'reflection' was also to be understood in the other sense of the word: this symposium aimed to **reflect reality as well as better possibilities**. Those were aimed at joint thinking and commitments, reflecting practical and attainable options for more decent development, human dignity and common good.

Ambassador Juan José Gomez Camacho (Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations in Geneva) closed the introductory session with a keynote address in which he highlighted the critical challenges ahead for this symposium and more generally for the GFMD. He started by reminding the audience that migration is one of the most important phenomena of the 21st century. **Migration is a fact, it takes place worldwide and we all have to deal with it** whether we are from countries of origin, transit or destination. We can have different assessments of whether this is good, bad, relevant or not but no one can dispute that this is happening and that it will continue to happen because of different forces and factors such as economics, labor, demographics, etc.

Yet, the **debate on migration is one of the most controversial and polarizing**. It is highly emotional, highly psychological and extremely political. It is often trapped between complex emotions and the complexity of domestic politics, which act as constraints and limitations. Those are very difficult to overcome and make it **hard to find some common understanding and common ground**. As an example, Amb. Camacho explained that when he started working in the field of migration and development, he quite naively thought that 'development meant development', that it was one of those positive notions used in the UN and in his own country, quite a safe word therefore. But it was a real surprise for him to see that the simple expression 'Migration and Development' was one of the harshest terminology, calling for the most polarized and incomprehensible debates. The lesson was again that this debate is ideological and that, quite unfortunately, all terminology is politically and emotionally charged.

In this perspective, he considered that debating informally and understanding those challenges could be very fruitful and useful: With this symposium participants could produce a debate relatively free of obstacles. They could ignore emotions, politics, and their countries' position to produce real reflections on migration issues and how to address these in the future.

Reflecting on the pertinence of the Forum, Amb. Camacho declared that the **GFMD is relevant particularly "because it is the only thing we have"**. Originally, some (mainly from the developing countries) thought that the debate should be within the United Nations. Others (mainly from developed countries) absolutely rejected this notion. It was finally set outside of the UN and now, despite its own merits or lack thereof, the GFMD is and will be – for the foreseeable future – the only existing forum of this type. Hence, Amb. Camacho concluded, **"we should better take care of it"**.

He also considered that the **GFMD actually does have a lot of merits**. In particular, the **fact that it is outside of the UN system gives extra flexibility to the process**. It allows government representatives to say things they would not say and do things they would not otherwise do because of the UN culture and modalities. The GFMD also provides the possibility to build some common places, which are so difficult to find in this emotionally and politically charged debate. It allows bringing together developed and developing countries, southern and northern States, destination, origin and transit countries in an attempt to speak without all the ghosts around.

It also allows for partially integrating civil society into these discussions. Because of politics, psychology, emotions and some national traumas, many countries have seen civil society as a

terrible thing for the GFMD. Civil society can be finger pointing but as Ms. Godenzi said, it can also fulfill the role of being the consciousness of what is wrong and right. Moreover, **CSOs have the ability to provide enormous wealth of knowledge and experience in an apolitical way.** Therefore, **civil society participation can be a good thing, if it is done in a constructive way,** intelligently and substantially, bringing all the knowledge and expertise that they have. Finally, Amb. Camacho explained, for the Forum to produce real knowledge and understanding and for it to be of any help to policy-makers, it is **fundamental that the GMFD is transparent and democratic,** because **real debate can only take place within democratic spaces.**

Roundtable on Labor Mobility and Development:

Chairing this session, **Mr. Md. Shahidul Haque** (International Organization for Migration – IOM) reminded that Labor Mobility and Development has been a central theme of the Global Forum since the beginnings. Moreover, he added that it is **important not to consider the concept of migration and development as static:** since 2006 both the concept and dynamics have evolved.

Prof. Phil Martin (UC – Davis, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics) gave a presentation on reducing migration costs to increase the development impacts of migration, especially international labor migration. As a theme, recruitment costs are addressed every year at the GFMD but **progress in reducing recruitment costs has been somewhat lagging behind progress in reducing remittance costs.** This is problematic because **reducing recruitment costs has the potential of having a higher impact.**

He started by reminding the audience of the complexity and uniqueness of the labor market. It is difficult for employers to recruit and select the best workers and it is also difficult for workers to learn about jobs, especially if those are in another country. Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that the **labor market is not a one time transaction but rather a continuous transaction, based on an asymmetric information process:** employers know about the jobs, workers know about their abilities. Finally, international norms and national laws in most countries say that employers should pay recruitment costs. However, the reality is that there is an inverse relationship: **employers do pay most or all of recruitment costs for highly skilled workers but low-skilled workers often have to pay most or all of their recruitment costs.**

High recruitment costs can be bad because instead of win-win, these can lead to lose-lose situations: In order to pay high recruitment costs, a migrant might have to take a second job while abroad, and then risk violating the terms of his visa. Migrants can worry about the debts they have contracted in order to get a foreign contract. Governments of countries of origin may worry about protecting their nationals abroad, some of whom could become irregular because of second jobs and overstays. Governments of countries of destination may have to deal with irregular migration. Finally, if the recruitment/migration costs are high, there may be less money flowing back to the family and the country of origin.

In this context, **governments can deal with the costs under their direct control** (such as the costs of passports and visas) and **deal with indirect effects of labor migration costs** (such as regulating private recruiters; educating workers about what they should pay; and establishing competition between recruiters to try to limit costs or set up government monopolies). In many cases **governments can help migrants most by doing things that have nothing – or that appear to have little – to do with labor migration,** such as encouraging low fair air carriers (especially in Asia) because the cost of flying, which workers often pay, is quite high. According to Prof. Martin, this is one of the simplest things governments can do. Furthermore, Prof. Martin suggested that we should revisit the assumption – often voiced in fora such as the GFMD – that in looking out for the best interests of their citizens, governments of countries of origin act to lower migration costs. Civil society representatives certainly know this is not always the case. Some sending governments look upon people leaving with contracts to work for higher wages as winners of a lottery and therefore try to extract money from them. Therefore another important message is that it is **not always easy to count on governments to lower the costs, even governments of countries of origin.**

Moreover, it is important to know that, within the recruitment process, **employers mostly take the lead in trying to find workers. Government employment services usually do not play much of a role.** In many industrial countries, multinationals like Adecco or Manpower are increasingly important in the national labor market but their role is limited when it comes to the international labor market. Most international labor recruiters being small, one may ask whether it would help to have larger recruiters playing a role. For example, are multinationals better able to withstand pressures to pay employers for job offers or to pay recruiters to get job offers? In this connection, ILO conventions have typically stated that employers should pay for recruitment costs and that private – for profit – recruiters are not institutions to be encouraged. In 1997 the ILO acknowledged that private recruiters do play a useful role in some labor markets but has generally encouraged labor migrants to move over national borders under the terms of bilateral agreements, with contracts and paying no or very low fees. One should also mention that in some migration corridors (between Mexico and the United States for example), social networks play a huge role in moving workers.

Prof. Martin then moved to analyze migrants' motivations. He explained that international labor migrants move because they want to earn higher wages. This reflects the fact that there is **a gap or a wedge between wages in countries of origin and destination.** During the 1960s (the Guest Workers Programs era) employers did pay most of the recruitment costs, which meant that migrants got most of that wage wedge. **Workers may nonetheless be willing to pay some of that wage difference for recruitment (although not all of it).** In many Asian countries where much of the labor migration is legal, workers often pay 20-30% of what they expect to earn abroad in order to get a foreign job. There are many factors coming into play for an individual to decide how much he/she would be willing to pay to go abroad, including the prospect for permanent settlement.

Recruitment regulations are government efforts to divide that wage wedge between employers, migrants, recruiters and governments. Over the past years, the **general rule has been for the workers' paid share of recruitment costs to go up, except for highly skilled workers** (Private fee charging recruiters dominate the hiring of low skilled migrants). In this context, what governments tend to do is to try to regulate recruiters, mainly in 3 ways: 1) they first get recruiters to identify themselves, through licensing; 2) they then put regulations on the fees (e.g. in the Philippines recruiters are supposed to charge a maximum of one month of foreign earnings); 3) they can make the recruiter jointly liable for violations of the contracts.

Thus, for Prof. Martin the **important question was: Which of these regulations is most effective?** For example, in many countries recruiters must be linked to a recruiter association. But is this a leveling up process whereby recruiters get together to develop best practices or is it a leveling down process by which recruiters can agree on high fees and avoid competition? Some people say that it is important to increase competition to lower migration costs. On the contrary, some countries such as South Korea have established government monopolies to try to deal with labor migration costs.

Prof. Martin indicated that, in trying to deal with migration costs, **sending governments could review existing regulations to balance protection and costs; they could do a lot more with education and information¹; they could look at both direct and indirect costs; and work in cooperation with receiving countries.** However, the important question is **how to find the optimal mix between educating migrants, regulating recruiters and cooperating between governments to actually reduce those costs.** From Prof. Martin's perspective, there is no easy answer to reduce migration costs: **Recruitment does have costs** and we have to **be realistic about who pays them.** However, we have to think about how to balance protection and costs: Which recruitment regulations are worthwhile in terms of adding substantively to protection? Which of those end up just creating more costs?

¹ Education of migrants can also go a long way to help people getting away from thinking about foreign wages vs. local living costs, which is a very difficult hurdle for many migrants to overcome.

Before concluding, Prof. Martin briefly discussed Mr. Holzmann's contribution to the Symposium's background paper² by addressing the question: what access should international labor migrants have to the so called welfare system? In his brief, Mr. Holzmann presented 3 extremes: 1) full access: a migrant should have exactly the same access as a local worker; 2) no access or access only on the sending country side (for example a Mexican worker in Canada would participate to the Mexican social security system); 3) something in between the first two options. Mr. Holzmann focused mainly on temporary and seasonal workers such as those employed in agriculture.

As with recruitment costs, the social security part of the background paper does not present a road map with ready made solutions. It rather lays out a series of options and dilemmas that may be useful in achieving better protection and more development as a result of labor migration. In this context, Prof. Martin asked the audience to keep in mind that there are **only a few universals: what may work in one migration corridor might not work in another.**

Discussants:

First discussant **Mr. Gibril Faal** (GK Partners and Afford) focused most of his observations on the social protection issue, which he considered a bigger, longer term challenge. In this connection, he actually referred to financial protection and how workers can continue to have access to financial resources either during times of infirmity or when they are unemployed or old. This is so big a challenge that almost all countries are struggling with it already.³ The challenge of providing social protection for temporary migrants is especially difficult on two layers: 1) for the sending countries which are usually developing countries, there is not even a comprehensive social security payment system or a generous pension scheme because the governments are not able to afford these; 2) by definition, the work of temporary workers, is not continuous and not very rewarding. Therefore, Mr. Faal concluded, there can be **no illusions as to whether a viable comprehensive social protection system can be provided for temporary migrants because it is not even available for fully employed migrants in developing countries and in some cases to local workers who are not migrants.**

Still he considered that there were options to provide some sort of protection and support: 1) we should **ensure that temporary workers have an envelope of income**; 2) **temporary migrants should have access to financial services in the origin country**; 3) **formal temporary migration schemes should be directly or indirectly endorsed by the governments of sending countries**; 4) **most sending countries should already have a parastatal social security system**, whereby local workers in the country pay a percentage of their income as a contribution to social security companies.

Given certain circumstances, he followed, it is **possible to think about a package of financial products and services that builds on what already exists in the country of origin.** Among the associated advantages, it would mean migrants have security numbers similar to any local worker in the country of origin. Apart from providing the opportunity for local investment via social security funds, it would also be strategic in getting those temporary migrants who become permanent migrants to have a financial interest in the social security system of their countries of origin. This would keep permanent settlers' financial connections alive. The second element would be to encourage a far more enterprising but safe investment of these funds locally.

Mr. Faal concluded by saying that **creating financial services in the country of destination is what creates the link between temporary migrants' social protection and remittances:** The ultimate question is what to do with migrants' money to make it work better? There is much to be said about the development of local financial packages that are attractive and viable for migrants to contribute.

² Mr. Holzmann was originally scheduled to give a presentation on this theme during the Symposium but could not attend. Readers may refer to his contribution to the background paper.

³ Mr. Faal mentioned that in OECD countries, one reason why temporary migrant workers are allowed in is to get young people to pay taxes and thus contribute to retirement pensions, which is part of the problem.

Second discussant, **Mr. Colin Rajah** (National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights – NNIRR), addressed the perspective of migrant communities. He started by saying that it is fundamental to remember that migrants are not different from the rest of the population: “They are human, they love, they worship, they like to play and working is certainly the last thing they like to do”. As a consequence, **looking at the policy formulation purely from the economics of labor would be a mistake**, he said.

From his perspective, migration today is happening within a larger global economy and elements of this economy are increasingly competitive and very volatile. Within this context, **employers have enormous pressures to reduce costs as much as possible, which means employing the cheapest, most disposable, most docile labor force**. From the workers viewpoint, people are basically part of a larger pool of supply of labor and **in many countries of origin the demand for that labor is shrinking, which puts pressure to migrate to look for work**.

Mr. Rajah also explained that we need to consider the shift that has happened over the last 20-30 years: there has been **increasing de-regulation of work and deterioration of working conditions and in this context, the situation of migrant workers has worsened**. They face very poor working conditions, extremely low-pay (lower than the standard), high job insecurity, threats from employers against demands and the organizing of employees, harassments, etc. This is becoming more and more the norm rather than the anomaly. For example, in a recent article, Patrick Taran identified data showing that foreign workers suffer occupational injury and death rates twice as high as native workers. So across the board, **migrant workers are facing very precarious conditions and the situation of temporary migrant workers is even worse**. Basing his argument on a concrete example of J-1 visa migrant workers in the US who went on strike because of terrible working conditions and extremely low wages, Mr. Rajah pointed to a critical condition: Even a program such as the J-1 Program which is widely recognized in the US has enormous flaws.

However, he recognized that **in some regions there is a demand by migrants to take up temporary labor positions to alleviate their living conditions**. However, **this is not a permanent solution**, he insisted, underlining that a permanent solution should involve real development in home countries to make it unnecessary to migrate to find work. Nevertheless, recognizing that this might not happen soon, he suggested three basic but critical elements which, if included in temporary labor programs, could alleviate this condition:

- 1) **Job portability: The ability to move freely from one job to the next**. This is almost unheard of in many temporary labor programs in which people are not only tied to the type of employment they are in but also tied to a particular employer and their legal status is also tied to the employer. This exposes the workers tremendously to exploitation by the employer and, Mr. Rajah explained, many migrants often refrain from protesting for fear of losing their status.
- 2) **Equal treatment**: Given the global economic context presented earlier and the pressures to find docile, cheap and malleable work force, he claimed that the **responsibility is onto States to set standards ensuring equal protection, wages and treatment of foreign and national workers**.
- 3) **Pathways to citizenship**: A controversial point which many might consider too radical and unacceptable. However, Mr. Rajah insisted that **“what we see as the norm now is actually what is crazy”**. The conditions that have been endured by migrant workers in any region are much worse than those of native workers. A pathway to citizenship would alleviate the second element by allowing equal treatment, family members to work and family reunification.

Third discussant, **Mr. Alex Zalami** (Government of the United Arab Emirates), made comments based on lessons learned by the UAE ministry of labor over the past two years in the course of the UAE administration activity on migration or within international fora such as the GFMD.

Mr. Zalami first revisited the premises of the discussion, especially the idea that lowering costs of migration is a desirable objective. He expressed his unease concerning the notion of win-win or “win-win-win-win-win” situations when there are many stakeholders involved, saying that **“very often doing things right means that someone is going to loose”**. Referring to Prof. Martin’s

comments on the 'wage wedge' and the unfair division of wages, Mr. Zalami expressed his **hesitation to join the chorus that says everybody can win from lowering the cost of migration**: If it were the case then "why is it that the cost of migration has been going up?", he asked. For him, the **most important question relates to stakeholders management and to the necessity of ensuring that there is equity in the added value of migration?** If the UAE has learned something over the past 2 years, it is that a government (whether of origin or destination countries) can not do it alone and that there has to be a way of dealing with the dilemma of high costs or rising costs by looking at root causes.

Most contract workers coming from Asia in the GCC countries (Gulf Cooperation Council) are low-skilled workers and they are very vulnerable. They tend to pay more for migration than anybody else (relative to their earnings). Mr. Zalami's government officials have tried to segment the problem by looking at the components of the costs of migration, including recruitment. But in the process they also realized that there are other drivers of high costs of migration, such as informed consent, linked to the education of workers. He found this crucial because **knowing what to expect in a foreign employment can lower the costs of migrating and being totally unaware makes migrants much more exposed and vulnerable**. Accordingly, the UAE government started looking into improving communication flows. It also discovered that there can be contract substitution issues, where terms of employment initially offered to migrants by employers or recruitment agencies are modified upon arrival in the destination country.

Mr. Zalami explained that his government had learnt that having good national legislation is sometimes not enough to deal with this kind of problems. According to him, as the relationship between countries of origin and destination became more rational (in previous years, it was mainly a game of finger pointing), it **became clear that identifying and implementing solutions required collaboration between countries of origin and destination**.

To conclude, Mr. Zalami explained that there are two important points to understand if we are to seriously look for solutions to the high costs of migration: 1) "We do not live in Alice in Wonderland", therefore **some policies may be hurting some stakeholders and we need to prepare for that**; 2) **we need to increase the tempo of collaboration between countries of origin and destination and we need civil society to join forces in order to find and implement solutions**.

Fourth discussant, **Ms. Elizabeth Warn** (International Organization for Migration) commented on Prof. Martin's presentation from a human capability angle. Restating that talking about migration and development means talking about human beings, she explained that it seems logical to go beyond economic aspects to talk about the development of human beings and their capacities, skills and resources.

This approach brought into the debate the important dimension of the **empowerment of migrants so that they can take the right decision and address their own problems** rather than looking only at markets or the States. Ms. Warn explained that to take the best decisions possible about migration costs, migrants also need the relevant skills, knowledge and know-how to manage their own finances. Indeed, it is **through financial literacy that migrants will be able to make the most informed decisions** about what is reasonable or not and what the financial costs will be in the short and long term. Migrants often get into debt not only because they pay middle-men, but also because they make plans for the future that are based on unrealistic expectations; because they do not invest and put back savings. In this regard, she explained, financial literacy can represent an important tool since it can help diagnose the social factors within households, develop potential to build savings, spend wisely, build capital and invest. Ms. Warn said that experiences in Nicaragua, the Philippines and Moldova have proved such approaches could have positive impacts.

Turning to lessons learned, Ms. Warn mentioned that it is important to diagnose social factors within households but also to consider the inventory of the migrants' incomes, expenses, investments, saving portfolios, liabilities and assets. One also needs to discuss the development direction or the potential of remittances and the income migrants are likely to have in the country of destination. Finally, it is also important that they are directed towards the best product and services, which may involve banks or NGOs but also various funds that may exist as well as

microfinance and cooperative schemes. It is **fundamental that they can make the best decisions not just for immediate but also for longer term plans.**

As a conclusion, Ms. Warn came back on the important question raised by Prof. Martin: Who pays? She explained that in the longer term, the countries of origin and destination have to work out what the benefits are for their countries and whether a short term investment really makes sense in the long term. In that regard, only policy-makers, with their ghosts, their concerns, and their domestic policies can really decide what is best.

Questions, Comments and Answers:

Mr. Shabari Nair (Program Officer, GFMD at SDC) commented that the situation is often that employers tell recruiters they have a limited number of visas available which have to be paid for and the price is often paid by the migrants themselves. This can lead to huge debts for the migrants. He therefore asked Mr. Zalami: What are the destination countries doing to try to prevent employers from exploiting the visa situation to come to the UAE or other GCC countries?

Mr. Hendrik Garcia (Philippines Mission to the United Nations in Geneva) started by acknowledging that **interaction with civil society is important because it helps keep the GFMD responsive to what actually happens on the ground.** He also supported the idea that international cooperation between countries of destination and origin is important. Nevertheless, noting that many recommendations were addressed to countries of origin, he asked which recommendations could be directed to destination countries to lower economic and social costs of migration, especially with regards to enforcing labor standards and promoting human rights standards.

He then reminded the audience that despite differentiations between types of economic forms of migration (circular, permanent, temporary, seasonal, etc.) which may create a hierarchy, **human rights belong to all, regardless of status and that it is a State obligation to protect people.**

Finally, he **called on the audience to dispel the notion that there is a point where more development stops migration.** Indeed, equitable development should be an objective but in itself it should not stop migration. In fact, he insisted, **when societies get richer, the opportunities to migrate increase.**

Reminding that within the guest worker programs of the 1960s, governments were very much involved, **Ms. Katja Hujo** (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, UNRISD) asked Prof. Martin whether he could see any potential for government agencies to be more strongly involved in international labor migration for low-skilled workers.

Replying to Mr. Nair, **Mr. Zalami** explained that the model of economic development in the UAE and the GCC involved governments investing heavily in infrastructure development, which requires many unskilled construction workers. Because of the way admission policies were structured (based on the employers' needs) anomalies and distortions were created, especially when some employers thought they could determine the destiny of their workers. The UAE government is dealing with this situation through various policies, as for example, by improving mobility in the labor market: Since December 2010, a **worker who has fulfilled the terms of his contract with an employer is allowed to transition into employment with someone else without the prior consent of the first employer.** This helps in making sure the status of the worker is protected and also contributes to long term human development (skills development, etc.).

In his answers, **Prof. Phil Martin** started by saying that migration is potentially win-win-win for migrants, employers and some parts of government but there will always be losers. **Reducing migration costs will indeed bring losers and this may be problematic because many of the potential losers are politically powerful and would certainly not loose gratefully.** Secondly, he explained that migrants being people and people being much more complex than goods or anything else, **managing migration is always going to be a far harder job than managing trade** (which in itself is not easy). Therefore, he asked the audience to remember that **migration is a process one**

can manage but it is not a problem one solves. There is always going to be migration and we should not think the UN will someday adopt a convention or a resolution solving the issue. It is a process we have to get better at managing and this is what fora like this one aim at, he stated.

Replying to Ms. Hujo, Prof. Martin explained that during the 1960s public employment service agencies were moving workers in manufacture and construction centers but for reasons which have little to do with migration, the role of those agencies has gone down in all countries since then and it has never been very important in developing countries. Therefore, he could not see government employment service agencies playing a similar role to what they did in the 1960s. There are some examples of government agencies which have been established to move workers to particular countries (the Korean Employment Permit System and the Japanese Trainee System for example) but those are special cases, he explained.

Mr. Rajah shifted his remarks to the notion of burden, rather than rights, noting that it is important to think about how we can shift this burden. According to him, the **current trend is towards putting even more burden on the migrant**, although in a nice way, talking about pre-departure training, programs to help invest remittances, etc. This again puts the onus on the migrant as the primary actor who can alleviate his/her condition. Therefore, he **called for shifting the burden to the other two parties: The employers and more importantly States**, which could benefit in the longer run. In this respect, he stated that he could understand why employers have a problem with job portability but he could not understand why States have a problem with it. Indeed, in essence, we are talking about people who would continue to contribute to the economic development of countries.

Concluding this first roundtable on Labor Mobility and Development, **Mr. Md. Shahidul Haque** reminded the following important points made by the participants:

- Migration is often a second-best option and most of the people actually stay within their countries of origin. Therefore, we should **look more at the development of origin countries so that people are not compelled to undertake unsafe migration;**
- Migrants are human beings. They are **entitled to all human rights and protection**, whatever their status;
- Labor markets are different because the flow of information is asymmetric and presumably, power relations between various players are asymmetric as well. Therefore, **our approach to labor market needs to be more innovative;**
- Migrants should be offered to the option of becoming full citizens. There **should be a pathway to citizenship;**
- **Collaboration between countries should be increased and include the private sector;**
- The role of civil society has been emphasized many times, especially in the context of protecting and empowering migrants.

Joint Reflections (2): Roundtable on Gender, Family, Migration and Development

Family ties and family unity are central factors in migration processes and the significance of gender role in mobility is also important, involving many interfaces with the issues addressed at this Symposium. Yet, in her introduction to this session, **Ms. Denise Efionayi-Mäder** (Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies – SFM) explained that **much of the policies and research which is available are still family- and gender-blind**. However, while labor policies are sometimes ill-adapted to the realities of such developments at the margins (migrant women, child migrants), **civil society actors are often the first observers of these developments**, which **makes their participation to this debate all the more interesting**.

Prof. Juan Carlos Calleros (Centro de Estudios Migratorios, Mexico) started by reminding that although we often hear that the concept of sovereignty is declining, this is highly inaccurate in the migration field, where sovereign rights and territorial frontiers are still concrete elements. This remaining sovereignty creates costs and previous panelists had mainly dealt with economic costs. Prof. Calleros decided to address the social and personal impacts of migration for families and through the gender perspective. The conceptual proposition, which was already endorsed in Puerto Vallarta, is to see migration through the eyes of women and families/children. The transnational family is a relatively new reality that concerns many people who live in another country, with separated families. It also includes families with members having mixed status (some regular, some irregular) in the same country. **Transnational family is a reality that countries have to deal with** and the GFMD in Puerto Vallarta concluded that we are **behind in dealing with the associated problems**.

In his presentation, he first explained that special policy consideration of family unity; gender related needs; social welfare of migrants and families abroad as well as those left behind can amplify the developmental effects of migration. It means that **migrant workers with access to their usual family structures can be more productive**, because they are healthier, more adaptable and they bring more certainties to their employers. The end result, Prof. Calleros explained is that there are more positive effects on the economies of the receiving countries.

Second, he posited that the **lack of regular avenues for migration may push children to migrate on their own and then expose them to criminals and predators**. The problem of children travelling on their own, even at a very young age, seems to be growing – although there is a lack of reliable data on how many children are in this situation and on how many are vulnerable to trafficking, smuggling, prostitution etc.

Third, **gender-biased, gender-blind and even gender-neutral policies perpetuate gender discriminations which curtail women migrants' abilities to take advantage of the human development potential linked to migration**. In this perspective, focusing on the negative impacts of gender-biased or gender-blind policies on the human development of migrant women and their communities of origin is a good step although, he explained, we need to go further than that.

Four, Prof. Calleros explained that the **recognition of domestic and care work as a professional occupation with full social benefits and work permit visa schemes has the potential of increasing human development possibilities within an economic sector comprising mainly women**. It would also contribute to preventing abuses for millions of domestic workers worldwide.

To conclude, he presented three main recommendations for the audience to consider:

1. To **promote the ratification and implementation of the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child**;
2. To **develop gender-sensitive guidelines, policies, programs and budgets with appropriate indicators**;
3. To **create an ad-hoc working group on family, gender and migration within the GFMD** (which had initially been proposed as an ad-hoc working group on gender but the Mexican government suggested to broaden the perspective).

Ms. Jean D'Cunha (UN Women) focused her presentation on domestic workers, a category of care workers at the interface between migration and development. She looked at the link between domestic-work migration and development as an illustration of the link between gender, family, migration and development: According to ILO statistics, **83% of the estimated 100 Mio domestic workers worldwide are women, reinforcing the stereotype of domestic work being women's work**. Moreover, migrant domestic work is a development issue grounded into socio-economic and political (including gender) inequities within and between countries of origin, destination and transit. For women, becoming domestic workers largely represents a window of opportunity and a question of survival because development processes often marginalize them from education and job access. However, the lack of family support systems in countries of origin tends to generate social costs and to raise questions about the development potential of women's migration.

Ms. D'Cunha expressed the opinion that domestic workers make significant contributions to development because they deal with social reproduction, raising the future generation of workers and revitalizing the current one, which is the bed rock of social and economic development. Moreover, migrant domestic workers contribute to countries of origin and destination through their taxes, consumption, social security contributions, remittances etc. **Despite these contributions, there is a lack of regulation of the sector and a lack of protection of domestic workers** (although the ILO Convention generated new momentum). Many factors can explain this fact, including isolation, the invisibility of domestic work, especially linked to the privacy of the household which has not been defined as a workplace. In addition, she referred to the depiction of domestic work as innately consistent with women's attributes requiring no special skills. Therefore, she said, there is an important need for protection and regulation of the sector, which lead her to the second part of her presentation on the international human rights regime that deals with domestic workers and the challenges in implementing those instruments.

There have been major achievements in this realm, including for example the adoption of the ILO Convention and the general comment by the Migrant Committee on Migrant Domestic Workers. Ms. D'Cunha explained that although each of these instruments has a special focus, they should be considered as complementary and mutually reinforcing mechanisms. The value of these instruments is that: 1) they **bridge the dichotomy between the public and private space of domesticity, defining the home as a work place; domestic work as work; and domestic workers as needing protection**; 2) the ILO Convention in particular is an example of converting the informal sector into a formal one and this could be expanded to other sectors as well; 3) in varying degrees all these instruments deal with the issue of policy coherence and institutional coherence in addressing the concerns of domestic workers; 4) the ILO Convention in particular focuses on collective bargaining which deepens the engagement of unions with domestic workers. Moreover, **all these instruments focus on regional, bilateral and multilateral cooperation and provide for monitoring mechanisms** (labor inspections, grievance and redress mechanisms).

There are nevertheless challenges in the implementation of these instruments. One is the whole mindset challenge: according to her, we need to move from the current perspective of migration (a paradigm that refers to national sovereignty, security, law and order, morality and the market) to **adopt a rights based, sustainable human development paradigm focusing on collaboration between and within States and multiple stakeholders**. The mindset change should recognize domestic work as work, the value and contribution of domestic workers and treat them with respect and dignity. A second set of challenges is related to political will, accountability, good governance as well as policy and institutional coherence. There is a **need for political will to translate international standards into policies, legislations, programs with indicators and budgets and to change institutional norms, rules and procedures to ensure domestic workers are treated according to human rights standards**. A peculiarity of this sector is that it involves practical challenges: geographical spread, isolation, the difficulty of detecting violations, privacy laws, the resistance to labor inspectors breaching the privacy of the home, tight controls over domestic workers inhibiting them to filing complaints, lack of support systems for them to remain in the countries and press charges, etc. In this context, it is essential to **establish accountability mechanisms to sanction erring public officials, recruitment**

agencies and employers as well as to **set up institutionalized mechanisms ensuring access to all stages of the policy process for domestic workers**: implementation, formulation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs that are relevant to their needs.

The last type of challenges presented by Ms. D'Cunha related to the **difficulty of building the technical capacities of policy-makers, service-providers, law enforcers and employers to truly apply these human rights standards in their routine work** and to the **need for standard operating procedures to provide incentives and sanctions**. There is also a need for building the technical capacity of domestic workers to be able to get organized and claim their rights and entitlements.

Finally, Ms. D'Cunha highlighted some good practices that promote and protect the rights of domestic workers as well as specific recommendations on enhancing government and civil society collaboration to further this protection agenda. First of all, she reminded that **international instruments are good practices and the key issue relates to their implementation**. There are also good practices in the area of labor and social protection. Four cases stand out in this respect: Uruguay, the Philippines, the New York State Bill of Rights and South Africa have developed legal provisions and contractual elements protecting domestic workers such as: minimum wages, rest days, overtime payment, no sexual harassment, no discrimination at the workplace, timely payment of wages, payment directly to the workers unless stipulated otherwise, no impermissible deductions from wages, etc. Some of the reasons which lead to the adoption of those provisions include: supportive governments and employer organizations, strong workers organizations, strategic advocacy activities of domestic workers (including shaming mechanisms) and broadening the constituency used to advocate with governments by engaging unions, faith based groups, youth groups, etc.

Her specific recommendations on enhancing government and civil society collaboration included **making sure that civil society participate in standard setting, in the treaty body review processes, and work with governments to implement concluding comments of treaty bodies**. She also **recommended the presence of civil society representatives on government panels to provide inputs into the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of legislation**. She added that we **need research on the impact assessment of policies and programs** and how these could be readjusted, as well as better information dissemination.

Discussants:

First discussant, **Dr. Helen Schwenken** (International Centre for Development and Decent Work, University of Kassel) focused her comments on Prof. Calleros work on transnational families and gender issues. She started by establishing a connection with temporary migration programs as she wondered how those two sets of issues fit together since **one may think that temporary migration programs produce mixed status and transnational families**.

Her second point was slightly critical of the background paper and the presentation as she remarked that the main focus was on family when the title specifically mentioned 'gender and family'. Therefore, she addressed the implications of focusing on the family unit in terms of gender relations: Although the move away from the individual to the household is important and relevant, economics and development theory and some experiences have shown that **taking the household as the primary unit obscures gender and gender relations within the household**. For example, who has the power to decide who moves away and what to do with remittances? Those aspects slip away from the agenda if we simply talk about the household. Dr. Schwenken therefore expressed her **doubts that gender and family need to be dealt with together**.

Then she made a point about policy coherence and gender noting that in 2011 the GFMD had the issue of coherence prominently in the title. She remarked that since it is very difficult to bring together migration and development in terms of policy coherence, it is even more complex to add gender aspects: Different countries not only have different gender regimes but also different welfare systems, labor and employment regimes, care regimes, migration regimes, etc. Her point was not that we should surrender to complexity but that we should be aware of it. The gender regimes differ so much from country to country, from very traditional male breadwinner models to

more egalitarian models that we have to differentiate between those models when we talk about good practices in migration policies: **Good practices may have very different effects in different contexts.** Moreover, these **gender regime models may change through migration: The role of women changes when they are 'left behind'. They are not just victims since there is also sometimes an empowerment mechanism** where they take up new roles in the local communities.

Another issue which makes the gender question challenging in terms of Migration and development is that gender relations do not change easily and not all gender issues can be quickly solved. It is especially challenging when dealing on an institutional level built over years and even more when we touch on the normative level of gender questions.

Finally, Dr. Schwenken closed her comments by suggesting that one way of testing whether more gender sensitive policies really lead to more development outcomes in migration would be to make sure that gender impact assessment becomes a routine policy tool.

Second discussant, **Mr. Ignacio Packer** (Head of Programs at Terre des Hommes, Lausanne) started his comments by reminding the audience that **one third of mobility is linked to the group age 12-24 years old.** Given the focus of his organization, Mr. Packer presented three main messages: 1) **children are not small adults and therefore specific measures are needed for them.** They need specific protection measure whether they are in the country of origin, on the move or in the country of destination; 2) **migration is not only about transnational migration.** Actually three quarters of migratory movements are happening within the country itself and we should not forget this aspect when discussing migration and development issues; 3) there is an **increase in migration due to climate change** and one of the most vulnerable associated groups is children.

Mr. Packer felt he should remind States of their duties in this field and since the Symposium was organized in Switzerland, he explained that its law on asylum and foreigners involves a number of breaches of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). For example, the law and its implementation can lead to children above 15 being detained for a period up to 12 months, pending deportation. In addition, access to basic services varies according to Cantons (which is a breach of the CRC provisions on non-discrimination).

He also presented methods developed by CSOs, in cooperation with governments, to improve protection mechanisms of children in countries of origin, on the move and in countries of destination. Mr. Packer first said that we have to **increase the specific attention to children and develop specific protection measures for them.** This has to be brought in debates, research and policies and this is being done by some governments. During the mobility phase, all existing mechanisms for protection should be strengthened. In the destination country detention and deportation should be banned, bringing in the notion of the children's best interest determination.

His main message was that there **can be no compromise on the Convention on the Rights of the Child**, which has been ratified by almost all States. Therefore, we have to **look at issues of migration and development through the unit of the child, within the family context.**

Moreover, he suggested that in the place of origin we could work on policies that aim at preventing children from leaving their countries of origin explaining that the cause for **child mobility is often linked to elements of development.** Finally, he suggested that more consideration should be given to the children left behind: in some regions and countries, the roles those children play in their communities are changing fast: some are asked quite a lot, particularly to behave like adults.

Third discussant, **Ms. Gloria Moreno-Fontes** (International Labor Organization) also referred to Prof. Calleros work and agreed with Dr. Schwenken in saying that the background paper could have benefited from being more gender mainstream and from adding some information on the promotion of gender equality. Moreover, it should not only look at women but should also compare the experiences of men and women migrants and look at the impact of different types of policies and programs aiming at helping them achieve gender equality.

She also highlighted missing elements in the paper. For instance, she insisted that **family reunification schemes should be addressed with reference to different income**

requirements, in different countries. In this context she mentioned the example of Italy, which provides regularized workers with opportunities to bring their families in. However, these schemes require migrants to have a certain income or a certain amount of money available that most of these women do not have. So although legally there may be a possibility, in reality it is economically impossible.

The paper should also have given more consideration to the **issue of brain-waste which affects women much more negatively. A larger proportion of migrant women relative to men have to accept lower-skilled work such as domestic work.** Most countries are affected by this issue and we should start doing something about it, she said.

Policies do make a difference and they do have effects on millions of workers. In this respect, she wanted to mention some positive examples such as the fact that Geneva has recently agreed to grant children of undocumented migrant workers the right to do apprenticeships. This is very important because it is providing them the first step towards accessing the labor market, if possible, documented. Linked to this, she mentioned that many EU countries allow children of undocumented migrant workers to go to primary and secondary school.

Finally, Ms. Moreno-Fontes came back on the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention explaining that it has been a long and hard process. The ILO has been working on this since the 1960s. Political support was lacking for a long time but it finally came and the Convention was adopted in June 2011. Of course, she reminded, there is much follow-up work to be done with ratification and implementation. But she also explained how **the process of drafting and adopting the Convention already by itself had a positive impact: Between 2010 and 2011, eleven countries changed their legislations on domestic workers,** even sometimes going over the dispositions included in the convention.

Questions, Comments and Answers:

Prof. Calleros explained that interestingly the transnational family concept had not been contested at all by governments when it was introduced in the discussions. Similarly, the proposition to include gender perspectives in laws had also been agreed on. The more difficult aspect was related to implementing the concepts. Thus, he explained, when the Mexican government passed a new migration law, it lacked a gender perspective. The government acknowledged that but said it had not been able to insert specific articles to this effect.

He also explained that he had focused on good practices rather than on bad practices because the paper had been prepared in connection to the GFMD, which is a process that deals with consensus. For this reason, it was important to focus on positive aspects. The aim was to focus on the spirit of the GFMD: alliances, partnerships and synergies.

Finally, Prof. Calleros agreed with Ms. D'Cunha and Ms. Schwenken in saying that there is a strong **need for a check list on gender impact assessments.**

Ms. D'Cunha repeated that the **gender perspective has to be at the heart of any analysis of policies, legislation and programs. It should not be about adding gender or having a separate extra exercise.** You need to be at the policy table to look at the policy being developed and at the impact it would have on men and women. This is how one can incorporate provisions from a gender perspective. Similarly, she said, you need to look at policy coherence with a gender perspective at the outset and not have gender as an add-on separate exercise. Finally, she pointed that there are already many studies (especially in agricultural studies) showing that gender equality, women empowerment and investing in women does lead to sustainable development, increase in productivity and economic growth.

A **member of the Swiss civil society** made a comment about the term 'gender-blind' which was used by some of the panelists, saying that we have to be very careful when using this term. Policies are not necessarily gender-blind and gender might be included without it being obvious. For example when a migrant woman marries a Swiss, she gets a permit to stay with her husband and she has to leave the country in case of a divorce. Therefore, it is important to **analyze how policies actually construct women and men and what the implications are.** Moreover, this person

mentioned that **although we have to be concerned by the protection of women, we should refrain from portraying them as victims**. It is important to emphasize their resources, otherwise they will be treated as children: protected by the States without the autonomy to participate on an equal basis. Finally, this person agreed that **gender is not just about women**. It is necessary to talk about gender relations, not just about women, and about the ideas that give different roles to men and women in society and their implications.

Ronald Skeldon (Centre for Migration Research, Sussex University) came back on Mr. Packer's reference to the UNDP estimate that three quarter of people who move do so within the boundary of their own countries. He considered this is certainly an underestimate and explained that we know there are huge human rights abuses associated to internal migration. Therefore he asked whether the **instruments outlined by Prof. Calleros and Ms. D'Cunha could be broadened to address internal migration**. Moreover, since it seemed curious to him that so much of our discussions on migration and development exclude the majority of those who move, he added: **Can the GFMD give a space for the discussion of internal migration?**

Prof. Calleros explained that when working on the background paper, he looked for good practices on gender perspectives that included men but received none. This indicates again that this issue is not enough considered in research and in policy.

On internal migration, he acknowledged that when people (particularly children and women) move within the borders of their country they face similar problems than those going abroad but they do not have the problems associated with the lack of rights because they are citizens in their own country. **International migrants have, apart from other vulnerabilities and problems, their rights curtailed, clearly in political terms but also in terms of their human and social rights**. This is why the focus of the GFMD is so much on the international aspects. Nevertheless, it is also true that **international instruments can help in shaping better policies for internally displaced persons**.

On this same issue, **Ms. D'Cunha** agreed with Prof. Skeldon when he said that internal migration is an important phenomenon and existing instruments can address it from a gender perspective.

24 August 2011

Joint Reflections (3): Irregular Migration and Development

Prof. Susan Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University) presented the objective of this roundtable as being to address development perspectives in connection to different forms of irregular migration (such as visa overstays, clandestine entry, human smuggling and trafficking). It focused on the causes and impacts of irregular migration for the migrants themselves but also for countries of origin, transit and destination. Important to the discussion should also be mixed migration flows (asylum seekers and other types of migrants) as well as all parts of the life cycle of irregular migration: prevention (particularly focusing on factors pushing people to take tremendous risks for their life and safety); protection of migrants during transit, at borders and within countries of destination; return issues (voluntary or mandatory) and potential integration into destination countries. All those themes were to be addressed from a development perspective, looking at the impact of irregular migration on development.

Prof. Stephen Castles (Department of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Sydney) based his presentation on research developed with three of his colleagues, looking at the development effects of irregular migration. In this endeavor, he followed the UN Development Program approach considering migration as a fundamental aspect of human development which has the potential of bringing benefits to origin and destination countries and to the migrants themselves. Unfortunately, this potential is often not achieved because of the conditions in which migration takes place. **Irregular migration in particular often results in high levels of risk and exploitation for migrants, which undermine the potential development benefits.** However, one should **not think that irregular migration is always negative for development nor that regular migration is always positive.** Given this observation, he explained that it is important to look at the dynamics of migration and its complex effects in specific situations. The starting point in this perspective is to realize that **irregular migration is essentially a product of global inequality.** The great increase in inequality brought about by neo-liberal globalization is the main reason for migration.

Irregular migration, he added, is almost inevitable when States fail to create legal migration routes despite strong market demands and this “States vs. Market contradiction” is especially strong for low-skilled workers: **Most governments believe they need high-skilled but not low-skilled workers. Employers tend to think and act differently. Many employers also prefer irregular workers because they lack rights and cannot demand wages and conditions equal to those of local workers.** Some States collude in this by accepting that large segments of their labor markets rely on irregular work.

Referring to the current dominant views on the benefits migration can bring in terms of development, Prof. Castles explained that **irregular migrants do send back remittances and they even tend to send a higher proportion of their pay than regular migrants. However, their pay tends to be lower so the overall amount of remittances may be less.** They also often have to pay higher rates for money transfer because they cannot access the best formal transfer opportunities and have to rely on informal ones, often involving high costs. Moreover, **irregular migrants are unlikely to bring back positive benefits in terms of social remittances** because their experience of high risk migration and living underground in an unwelcoming society may lead to very negative reactions. **Irregular migrants are also unlikely to play a big part in technology transfer** because informal sector employment in destination countries does not generally provide access to advanced technology, training or education. Similarly, ‘brain circulation’ implies acquiring new knowledge and techniques which again applies mainly to regular skilled migrants and very rarely to irregulars.

In summary, Prof. Castles explained that irregular migration is very unlikely to have positive development benefits but regular migration also frequently fails to bring about benefits: **When there is no willingness in the origin country to bring about development friendly changes,**

the benefits of migration simply disappear into poverty reduction for specific families and increase consumer spending. This, in turn, may even lead to inflation and reduce living standards of others. Moreover, there are also governments which actually encourage migration to avoid reform policies. Therefore, he stated that we ought to keep in mind that migration is only beneficial to development if it is linked to land reforms; investment friendly policies designed to boost production and productivity and to reduce poverty; infrastructure measures to make production a viable investment; and measures to improve governance and combat corruption.

From this standpoint, Prof. Castles then briefly reflected on what governments can do to ensure that irregular migration does bring about development benefits. First of all, **one obvious option is 'regularization', i.e. changing irregular migrants into people with regular legal status. States can also build development partnerships** based on the relationships between specific origin and destination countries, recognizing the interests of migrants, their communities and the governments of origin countries. This means abandoning policies based only on the short term interests of the destination countries, which has often been the rule. In this context, he referred specifically to **reducing expenditures on border controls and enforcement** as well as **increasing expenditure on training, start-up assistance and credits.** For example, he explained that looking at the budget of FRONTEX (the EU agency for external border security) he had noticed that expenditures increased from less than 10 Mio Euros in 2005 to reach 87 Mio Euros currently. He suggested that it would be interesting to compare those figures to expenditures related to migration-related development friendly measures. Prof. Castles also added that **States should recognize the human rights of all migrants**, whatever their legal status and that voluntary return programs should be based on providing support for migrants in reintegration and improving livelihoods.

Finally, he explained that **since the key issue driving irregular migration is global inequality, policies to address inequality would be the only long term solution.**

Prof. Phil Martin (UC-Davis, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics) focused his presentation on three points Prof. Castles had already addressed: First, **irregular migration is a dynamic concept:** Someone can be legal and later get into an illegal status by overstaying and working. Moreover, many illegal people become legal (e.g. through regularization or marriage). Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that **peoples' status change.** The **links between migration and development are also dynamic: Sometimes irregular migration can have positive effects on development but in general legal/regular is better than illegal/irregular.** Therefore one should not look at irregular migration as a static concept but as a dynamic one.

The second important point discussed the fact that there is **no automatic link between migration and development** since some sending countries and regions benefit in terms of poverty reductions and faster development while some others do not: Policy and economic circumstances can make a difference. Prof. Martin therefore suggested that one might refer to two extremes: a virtuous and a vicious circle:

- **A virtuous circle** is one in which a **country sends out some people and their remittances and new ideas create an industry at home ensuring that children and grandchildren will not have to migrate.** He referred to the Indian IT industry as an example: A relative handful of high-skilled Indian computer programmers has led to major back office and increasingly front office functions in parts of India. Those employ people who have never worked abroad but whose jobs exist because some other people did go abroad. **A virtuous circle then is one in which migration sets in motion economic forces that lead to less migration in the future.**
- **A vicious circle** is one in which **some migration sets in motion more migration.** From his point view, irregular migration can have this impact if what people are earning abroad is just enough to sustain them in areas that are not viable economically in the long term.

His third point addressed governments' role and the demand for labor and for open legal channels. Based on his experience Prof. Martin mentioned that within the US Department of Labor there are disagreements about whether or not the US needs foreign workers in agriculture. His message was that **economics is always about options. There is always flexibility** and different ways to get

things done and these can involve more or less labor. There are disagreements on whether or not we should have an employer demand driven approach for some kinds of workers, he said. Finally Prof. Martin touched on the question of what industrial countries should do about the relatively large groups of irregular migrants they host. He explained that many people recommend regularizing their status but **regularization is usually coupled with tougher enforcement of some kind**. Therefore he cautioned that **one has to think about how to couple 'regularization now' with 'enforcement in the future' and who should qualify**. Indeed, no regularization is ever 100% complete so it is necessary to reflect on what happens to those who do not get regularized? What tougher penalties does one put in place? And what happens back in the areas of origins? Does a regularization process in a destination country speed up development back home or set in motion forces that might lead to more irregular migration in the hope that there will be yet another possibility to legalize? Those questions should be looked at, he explained. The idea of **simply converting illegal into legal by opening more legal channels is not an easy thing to do**. It is important to **reflect on exactly how to determine how wide and deep regular channels should be**; how to manage irregular migration and development; and how does one go about regularization, enforcement and development in the future.

Discussants:

In her comments, **Ms. Michele LeVoy** (Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants – PICUM) looked at the impact of irregular migration through European examples. She first reminded the audience that since the 1999 Tampere Council, **most of the common EU immigration policy provisions relating to irregular migration have been concerned with prevention and fight of irregular migration**. This led to the adoption of various EU directives and instruments such as the Return Directive and FRONTEX, with a clear emphasis on border control policies. Parallel to this development, Ms. LeVoy explained, unofficial statistics show that more than 15000 people died over the past 12 years while trying to enter Europe.

Moreover, she referred to the September 2010 Global Migration Group Statement on the Human Rights of Migrants in Irregular Situation. In the text, GMG members recognized that “States have legitimate interests in securing their borders and exercising immigration controls”, but also stressed that “such concerns cannot, and indeed, as a matter of international law do not, trump the obligations of the State to respect the internationally guaranteed rights of all persons, to protect those rights against abuses, and to fulfill the rights necessary for them to enjoy a life of dignity and security”.

She then looked at four examples indicative of what those fundamental rights are in theory and in practice: First, she mentioned the fair working conditions reminding that **“workers are workers are workers”** (a widespread slogan among Unions), whatever their status as migrants. There are **no illegal workers and undocumented workers have inherent labor rights that are recognized by the international human rights system**. However, research in Europe, through the EU Clandestino project for example, found a high correlation between levels of irregular migration, demand on the part of employers for migrants and poorly designed and operated immigration management systems across the continent. In Europe there is no official estimate but the most reliable data talks about 4 Mio undocumented migrants and the large majority is likely to be undocumented workers. In practice, she said, there are **many ways to uphold the rights of a worker who is undocumented, exploited or abused: The role of unions is important as they can provide information to and empower these migrants**. There are growing examples of working with governmental agencies, labor, safety and security inspectors, who work together with a wide variety of actors to uphold those rights. There is also **growing jurisprudence in this context**. For example, over the last few years, there has been a number of court rulings in the lower and the supreme courts in Europe and in the United States providing back wages or compensations. Second, she addressed the issue of access to social protection and services: Undocumented migrants sometimes need to have access to health care services. However, this area is not of EU competence, but that of member States, which means there are **27 different situations concerning access to health care in Europe**. Of course, this has an impact on access to health care

for undocumented migrants: **In some countries access is almost on the same level as nationals. In others, it is on a payment only basis, which makes it almost impossible for someone who is already exploited in terms of wages to access health care.**

As regards access to services, she reminded that local actors are often shouldering the burden of the situation of undocumented migrants. She therefore argued that, **when discussing the cost of migration, the audience should recognize the role played by volunteers working with migrants**, who often shoulder some of the costs. This is particularly the case for undocumented migrants in countries where access is only through emergency care. Sweden, she explained, is one of the countries where access is by payment only. As a consequence, there is a church in Göteborg which is converted once a week into a clinic and operated by more than 80 professional volunteers (General Practitioners, Gynecologists, Dentists, etc.) to provide assistance to approximately a hundred migrants. In this connection, she also thought important to mention that in March 2011, a European Declaration of Health Professionals Towards Non-Discriminatory Access to Health Care⁴ was handed to the European Parliament. Signed by 141 health organizations representing over 3 million health professionals, it urged EU institutions and member States to take action to allow health professionals to respect their medical ethical obligations. She also denounced that in some cases, health professionals are 'asked' to act as a migration police.

The Third area she addressed was the situation of families, especially the situation of undocumented children or children who are with undocumented parents. There is **much attention to policies, protection measures and research concerning unaccompanied children in Europe but those who are with their families are often hidden**. Associated issues are largely ignored, she said.

Fourth, she discussed the case of undocumented women, particularly highlighting protection from violence. At the local level there is evidence showing that **many undocumented women who have experienced violence are afraid of reporting it to the police because they fear deportation**. Therefore, they **cannot access services such as health care or temporary shelter, because of their status**. Ms. Levoy wondered whether such situations do not foster a culture of impunity. She also thought it important to mention a good practice example: The Spanish Gender Based Violence Act of 2004 is the only legislation she knew about in the EU which has a specific clause referring to migrant women and which offers specific protection to undocumented women.

Finally, she presented the following brief recommendations:

- We need to **reinforce international human rights standards in policies concerning migration**;
- We need to **find ways of remedying the situation linked to the status of undocumented migrants**. For instance, the European Commission is looking into the **issue of the 'non-returnables'**, undocumented peoples who have not received a status and cannot be sent back for a variety of reasons. Their access to fundamental rights in this limbo situation is in jeopardy;
- Because undocumented migrants are obviously in much more precarious situations, we **should remove the barriers that prevent them from accessing basic fundamental services** in the legal, structural, financial and administrative areas;
- We should strengthen the capacities of civil society and local actors who are working directly and often shouldering the burden.

Ambassador Eugenio Arene (Deputy Permanent Representative of El Salvador to the UN in Geneva) decided to devote his comments to reflecting on the concept of regular and irregular migration. In particular, he asked whether we should define 'regular' only by the fact that migrants are documented or not. Coming back on his personal experience he explained that even as a documented regular immigrant in the United States, it had not been his choice to migrate. He had been pushed because of political and economic conditions. Therefore, he stated that the audience should keep in mind that **being regular does not necessarily mean your migration is voluntary**. Moreover, he asserted that terms and labels can be very important: For example, talking again

⁴ Also called the HUMA (Health for Undocumented Migrants & Asylum Seekers) Declaration.

about his personal experience, he explained that he had been very confused when he first heard that the term 'aliens' is used in the United States to talk about migrants. Moreover, he expressed the idea that there is **no such thing as an illegal migrant: You cannot be illegal when you are forced to leave your country because of the conditions prevalent in it**, he said, adding that terrorists are illegals but migrants are not.

He then briefly reflected on the case of his country, El Salvador, indicating that its institutions and the government really care about the situation of Salvadorians abroad. One third of the Salvadorian population migrates and **remittances are the first source of income for the country**. He explained that originally the political and economic situations were the features that constituted the push and pull factors of migration: In the United States, the market was in need of labor and the political and economic conditions in the countries of origin, such as El Salvador, pushed people to move.

Concluding his comments, he also explained that the impact of Salvadorian immigration has been tremendous: The type of work that Salvadorian immigrants have done is what is called the **'3D': the Difficult, Dirty and Dangerous work**. This is the type of labor that the pulling country needed a workforce for.

Prof. Vincent Chetail (Programme for the Study of Global Migration, Graduate Institute – Geneva) made general remarks on the international law framework. He started by saying that generally speaking, **Human Rights Law (HRL) provides the critical normative framework of protection regarding irregular migrants**. This is a quite obvious re-statement but such repetitions are useful, he insisted.

Human Rights apply, by definition, to everyone, including migrants, without regard to their legal status. This derives from a major principle of International HRL: the **principle of non-discrimination** endorsed in all HR treaties and has also been considered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights as a norm of *Jus Cogens*, a peremptory norm from which there can be no derogation, whatever the circumstances. Therefore, the principle of non-discrimination clearly remains relevant for asserting the basic rights of irregular migrants.

He continued his demonstration by referring to the two major HR instruments, the international Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. He explained that, for obvious reasons, the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights contains only one right only attributed to citizens: the right to vote. Within the long list of basic rights, one can find only 2 rights limited to regular migrants, provisions that cannot therefore be invoked by irregular migrants: The right to choose a residence in a host country (art. 12) and due process guarantees governing expulsion (art. 13). All other rights are plainly applicable to irregular migrants, such as the prohibition of arbitrary detention, the principle of non-*refoulement*, etc. This needed to be reminded although it is also important to understand that the **key issue is not about the existence of norms but about enforcement**, he said.

He also explained that irregular migration is a product of domestic legislation. Again, he acknowledged this could be considered an obvious statement but one he thought important in order to circumscribe the phenomenon: **International law is rather indifferent to the legal status of migrants**, at least from the perspective of HRL. **Irregular migration is a result of domestic regulations and the solutions must be found in domestic laws**, on the basis of international law.

Finally, he closed his comments by explaining that in the last decades, **repressive measures adopted by Western States have failed to combat and eliminate irregular migration**. This failure is **probably the most immediate reason for the sudden interest in the migration and development nexus**. Therefore, because of the failure of repressive migration-control measures, the international community needs to rethink migration in more positive and rational terms. The migration and development nexus is a unique opportunity to address migration this way, but it is also an ambiguous concept. It is based on two contradictory driving forces: On the one hand most observers acknowledge that legalizing labor migration is the most promising avenue for development. On the other hand, the **migration and development nexus may appear to include**

a **hidden agenda for exporting migration control in the global South**. Therefore, he explained, the **key challenge resides in the ability to adopt a comprehensive and balanced approach on migration and development, based on the principle of inclusiveness**, involving all stakeholders, not only host countries but also the other two key actors: the migrants and the countries of origin.

Questions, Comments and Answers:

Prof. Juan Carlos Calleros explained that some classical texts about migration policy argue that **migration is always favorable to economic growth** because it creates aggregate demand and because it produces predictability about the availability of the workforce. He completely agreed with this view, adding that from an economic stand point it does not necessarily matter whether migration is regular or irregular, although it does matter for Human Rights and security issues. For example, he said, in Mexico after hurricane Katrina, most of the reconstruction of Cancun was done by workers from Guatemala, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Honduras who were in irregular status because there was no schemes for providing visas. This is an example of how irregular migration can contribute to development. The status makes a difference for the human development of the individual though and this is the reason why, as a government, Mexico prefers regular statuses.

Prof. Susan Martin remarked that one interesting point Prof. Calleros made was that a **great deal of irregular migration takes place in countries of the South. We often ignore that but the GFMD is an opportunity to look more comprehensively at these issues.**

Ms. Sofia Guaraguara (Association Encuentro-Rencontre) wanted to repeat that the **concept of development should be enlarged, particularly by considering that migration is not just about economics but also about human beings**. Her association works with people living in extreme precariousness in Geneva. In particular, some women have to deal with psychological problems because they arrived in Switzerland with diplomas and education but they have to work in under-skilled and underpaid jobs. How could we think about the suffering of those people? Mentioning a good practice, she referred to the French *Centres de Consultation psychanalytique* (**Psychoanalytic Consultation Centres**) for persons in distress. Psychological suffering is important and this practice should be reproduced in other countries, she said. And since migration starts in the countries of origin, it would be good to provide these kind of psychological services there as well.

Mr. William Gois (Migrant Forum in Asia – MFA) noted that the **speakers had referred to six different terms and concepts to talk about one category of people**: regular, irregular, legal, illegal, documented, undocumented, and alien. He found it interesting to see **how we can struggle with indentifying and categorizing a certain section of people**. He also found it interesting how Prof. Castles and Prof. Phil Martin had tried to make the whole concept palatable to the neoliberal global market and then how Prof. Chetail and Ms. LeVoy had tried to address the legal angle to show how rights exists for those people. And then, on his part, Amb. Arene, had challenged everything by saying in essence: ‘let’s go back to the basics’. Based on those remarks, Mr. Gois asked whether there is, within the GFMD, some space to actually look at those concepts. Can the GFMD be such a space? He finally said that we **seem to have accepted the issue of rights and the question now is how to make it palatable, how to give rights to these people?**

Ms. D’Cunha also remarked that the panel has made the human rights case very strongly to address irregular migration and that to some extent, the business case for countries of origin had been made as well. **To ‘market it to neoliberals’, she asked the panelists, what case they would make to business and governments in countries of destination to address the issues of irregular migration from a practical point of view.**

A **member of the Swiss civil society** mentioned that a few years ago the Australian government decided to exclude a number of islands from its national territory in order to curtail the number of

potential candidates for asylum applications. He then asked what the position of the Australian civil society was, where the public opinion stood on this issue and whether Prof. Castles could explain how things have developed since the adoption of these measures.

Prof. Castles started by answering the question on the so-called Excision of Territories from Australia's migration zone. For him, it is a most peculiar situation and he never understood how this could legally be possible. Public opinion has unfortunately been lead to be very hostile to asylum and irregular immigration. Yet, the position of civil society organizations is totally different and supportive of asylum seekers and other migrants. Moreover, he thought that the excision of these territories from the migration zone has not had much impact on the people living on those islands, because it is only about migration and does not relate to other issues of services such as welfare.

He agreed with Amb. Arene that **nobody wants to be irregular or illegal**. These are **status created by governments**. He then questioned Prof. Phil Martin's comments on the notion that a virtuous circle is one that reduces migration and a vicious circle leads to more migration. Between highly developed countries there is an enormous amount of migration which takes place under very good conditions because people have skills and market power. He also contested the idea that development will reduce migration. According to him, if anything **migration will lead to more migration although one would hope it will take place under much better conditions**.

Commenting on another of Prof. Phil Martin's points, the idea that it would be possible to eliminate irregular migration by raising wages, Prof. Castles argued that in the United States for example, it would mean that Americans would have to confront the issue of whether they want to continue to have an agriculture in their country because it can only be viable by relying on cheap labor.

Then he explained that a fundamental point had been made by Mr. Gois: The remedies that had been suggested are really about making irregular migration palatable to neo-liberalism and he thought this was slightly misleading. The real point, he explained, was: given that global inequality between and within countries is a source of migration and particularly of irregular migration, **the demand for reducing inequality really questions the neoliberal mode of organizing the world economy**. He considered this to be the most fundamental aspect and discussion topic because **there will always be irregular migration as long as there are high levels of inequality**.

Reacting to Prof. Castles' last comment, **Prof. Phil Martin** worried that **"if we say we cannot really deal with this question until we reduce global inequality, then as Keynes said, we might all be dead by the time we start dealing with things"**. On Prof. Castles point about agriculture in the United States, Prof. Martin replied that roughly 1/6th of the total agriculture relies on migrant labor, mainly concerned with the production of fresh fruits and vegetables. Today only 2% of the American population live and work on farms, when the figure was 90% a century ago. According to him, the history of agriculture shows that when wages rise, people figure out how to get the food cheaper and nothing indicates this historical pattern will change.

He then said that the discussion had focused much on issues linked to irregular migrants in destination countries and he believed it would also be valuable to take a look at countries of origin as well. First, he considered that it could be debated whether Prof. Calleros was right in saying that the status of people does not matter much for the economic impact on receiving countries. One important question in this context was also **whether the status of people abroad matters for the development impact on the country of origin**. This kind of issue has been discussed at least in some of the GFMD meetings.

Prof. Martin also came back on the discussion relating to the labor force. According to him, the **demand for labor is not fixed**. In any industrial country, only half of the population is on the labor force. Many more people could work but **minimum standards (like minimum wages) have an impact on the number of jobs available** (at least on the lower end of the market). He therefore indentified a dilemma: From his point of view, there is a fundamental contradiction when people argue that there should be decent wages and decent working conditions and, at the same time, express the willingness to keep high numbers of jobs in their country. **You can either have more jobs or better jobs. At the lower hand of the market it is very difficult to have both**. Prof.

Martin explained that one effect of migration is to add to the supply of labor into the population; what temporary workers do is add to the labor force but presumably they do not settle and therefore, they do not add to the population over time. The contradiction that we face is that we want to bring in people but still have minimum standards. **We want two good things. We want cheap food but also decent wages for the people who produce the food but it is not possible to have both**, he considered. Hence, it is important to decide what minimum standards are and whether we are willing to pay a little more. It is often said that this is an easy thing to do. Some say: 'Let's just let people in; let's just determine the demand for labor and then we will figure out the conditions under which we bring temporary workers in'. This is however not that easy. If it were easy, it would have been done long ago. Nevertheless, **if we do not deal with this issue, the inequality between countries (which is what motivates migration) could create or aggravate inequality within countries.**

Amb. Arene explained that **issues linked to irregular migration are not likely to change in the short term.** Nevertheless, what could and should be modified is the consciousness. In this context, he expressed the idea that **embassies and consulates have an important role to play. Going beyond producing passports these can help 'raise the consciousness'** concerning the status of immigrants in the country of destination. One way of doing this is by establishing a constructive dialogue with the police, with civil society and authorities. This is also related to media perception and portrayal of migrants. Furthermore, he explained that it is fundamental to strengthen the relationship between civil society and governments because it is key for development in the comprehensive sense of the concept. It is also **key for the ambassadors and consuls to play a different role, not only representing the country in bilateral and multilateral meetings but to also as ambassadors of their people**, making sure that the rights of Salvadorians, for example, are protected. This is impossible to achieve without a direct and strong connection with civil society.

Finally, he explained that remittances are important and that his government is working actively on the issue of how to go back to the productive investment in countries and places of origin? How do we go about redirecting those financial flows?

Ms. LeVoy started her reply by addressing Ms. D'Cunha's question: How to make the case to business and States? She said that many States are already addressing the impacts at different levels and there is often incoherence between those different levels. Sometimes this incoherence can actually be beneficial: States may be allowed to do more when the public is not aware of the extent of resources and services being already provided to migrants. **Since the issue of irregular migration often hampers an informed discussion, sometimes States think it is better not to be too upfront about what they already do. However, this approach can also be detrimental to further protection.**

She also noted important contradictions: for example she explained that workers coming to her organization offices had indicated that undocumented workers have participated in the construction of the Labor Inspection Office building in Brussels or a detention centre in France. This is of course linked to the use of subcontractors, but it indicates that there is **sometimes a gap between the local level in terms of what States are already doing to provide services and the national level where the discourse can sometimes be very different.**

Mr. Michael Flynn (Global Detention Project, Graduate Institute – Geneva) addressed the issue of detention and deportation, saying that it is an important issue especially when discussing irregular migration although it is difficult to discuss it in the context of migration and development. He posited that one of the unintended developments of governments' responses to migration is the creation, in transit countries and often in origin countries, of entire bureaucracies devoted to the detention and deportation of migrants, which involve a number of institutions, both States and international organizations. He therefore asked whether the panelists could comment on how they saw this issue within the context of migration management and migration and development.

Mr. Zalami expressed some worries about the way the discussion had been framed. He considered this symposium as an opportunity to jointly reflect on the topic and that in this perspective all participants had a joint responsibility in making sure that “we are speaking to each other and not across each other”. He said that everyone agrees that human rights are supreme; **everyone agrees that in the context of dealing with migrants who are undocumented/irregular, their fundamental human rights have to be upheld.** However, he also thought that we should not lose sight of certain fundamental facts, particularly that **immigration policy is a matter of national sovereignty and part of that is immigration control.** From this perspective, he agreed that migrants have rights within the national territory of the country of destination and that their rights should be upheld. However, he **felt uncomfortable with the idea of extending those rights to say that a person who was in distress in his country of origin has a right to migrate without due process.** There are policies which need to be defined and considered, with due respect to rights, to prevent irregular migration and to deal with those irregular migrants which are in the country. But this does not eliminate the sovereign rights of States to decide on their migration policies. He explained that, for example, in the United States migrants acquire certain rights, irrespective of their status, by the mere fact of being in that country. However, this does not mean that these cannot be deported, following due process. He insisted that there **cannot be a substantive dialogue if we start saying that people can move from country to country without due process.**

Prof. Susan Martin reacted to Mr. Zalami’s comment by saying that **one of the fundamental contradictions in this field is that people have the right to leave their own country but there is no automatic right to enter another country** and this creates the kind of issues he mentioned.

Ms. Eva Åkerman Börje (Swedish Ministry of Justice, Migration and Asylum Department) made a point of explaining that Sweden is a liberal democracy, with an elected government and a parliament which take decisions about immigration policies. She felt it important to remind this as she also expressed **discomfort about comments on the way States run their migration policies and address irregular migration.** According to her, it sometimes sounds as if evil people make the decisions without any consideration for individual rights. It is essential to remember that in **countries like Sweden, migration policy is developed by democratically elected governments,** which points towards a dilemma she wanted the participants to consider: How do one think about the willingness of regulating migration that causes some people to be in irregular situations? How does one think about the responsibility of the migrants themselves? When talking about irregular migrants, she said, we **refer to them as victims, not as persons who have entrepreneurial skills, taking decisions on what they want to do for themselves.**

In addition, replying to some earlier comments, she said that Sweden does afford basic human rights and provide irregular migrants with access to basic and emergency health care. Furthermore, even in Sweden, which has an open immigration system, irregular migration exists. How public opinion reacts to migration is a fundamental question and to **sell open policies to public opinion, she argued, it is necessary to have repressive measures for those who move outside the system.** It is **needed to keep acceptance in our society,** especially about the very high costs of the asylum system.

Mr. Bingham explained that huge numbers of so called irregular migrants seem to match lower-skills migrant numbers even though they are structurally needed for the work they do. In this connection, he wondered whether some of the panelists could comment on whether a lot of these dynamics and tensions are not really about levels of skills.

Ms. Godenzi explained that when speaking about how much irregular migration contributes to the development of countries of origin, we should focus on how return policies are designed. This was not really mentioned in the presentations and comments. Therefore she asked how we could better define return policies to ensure more benefits for all.

Second, she noted that the **reality of civil society in relation to migration is that it is divided**. Diaspora organizations, for example, are not always working together, even those from a same country. Therefore, she asked how they could better work together. She expressed her **interest at hearing about organizations which could represent the full spectrum of what a migrant is**. **Without this capacity at this level, she said, it is difficult for governments to establish a true dialogue** although governments and civil society have a common duty to build capacity to strengthen this dialogue. Therefore she asked the audience how far this is possible and how governments can help.

Finally, referring to Prof. Phil Martin's comments on how wide the regular channels for migration should be, she noted that it is difficult to discuss this seriously at government level, without emotions. Hence, she asked whether there are examples of good practices where governments were able to tackle work demand issues.

Prof. Chetail explained that detention of irregular migrants is not part of the migration and development nexus, which is about an international dialogue between States to develop a positive interaction between migration and development. **Detaining irregular migrants does not contribute to development or to improving the interface between migration and development**.

On the idea that domestic laws are democratic constructions, he explained that the **democratic legitimacy of domestic laws does not mean that domestic laws are above international law and other basic principles**. The HRL framework concerning detention and due process are part of the picture of migration management. The difficulty is to insert those aspects into the general discussion about migration and development. By definition it is a repressive means but it can be improved provided that it is implemented with due respect for international norms.

As regards return policies and its links with the migration and development nexus, he explained that it is important that **voluntary return should be the rule rather than the exception**. Moreover, **voluntary returns should be linked to individual development projects** and some countries such as Switzerland and France have developed this approach. It should now be generalized.

Ms. LeVoy commended the organizers of the symposium for organizing what she thought was an exceptionally open and frank discussion on those particular issues. Then, she came back on Ms. Åkerman Börje's comments concerning Sweden being a rich liberal democracy. Ms. LeVoy said she had seen that in the way in which many migrants rights organizations work with the Swedish government. There is a continuous and rather frank and open dialogue which is certainly helped by the fact that this is a relatively small country. For example, following a four year campaign on the right to health, the government started rethinking its own position concerning access to health care for vulnerable migrants, including undocumented ones. Currently, those migrants have the right to emergency access by payment only, but this is being revised through this dialogue and a major civil society campaign. Moreover, she asserted that many of the organizations, particularly those working with undocumented migrants, do recognize the sensitivity of the issue and that continued dialogue is crucial, not only with the government but also with a wide range of actors.

According to her, to **talk frankly and seriously about detention and deportation it is necessary to recognize this as a reality of the migration control regime, otherwise we would be talking about open borders which is highly idealistic**. Some organizations still advocate for open borders but in her network, at least, most organizations recognize this reality: States have migration control policies in place; this is the reality they are working with. The issue is rather **how to do it in a more humane way, respecting fundamental rights** enshrined in international human rights conventions. Nevertheless, she considered that, contrary to what was said by Mr. Zalmi for example, there is **no agreement about the fundamental rights of undocumented migrants yet**. Progress is being made, especially with this dialogue but there is still a huge amount of work to do, she said.

On returns, she explained that the Return Directive is now in the process of being implemented in the European Union and observers have seen how it has been transposed into EU Law. She found it especially interesting that there is an article providing access to fundamental rights for persons who are in a limbo. This is an additional aspect that should be looked at.

Finally, on criminalization she explained that part of the trend concerns terminology. She actually expressed her satisfaction at the fact that in the course of this symposium's discussion, no one had specifically used the term 'illegal'. Her organization does not use this term, nor does the United Nations or any major regional institution. Those who do use this term do it to foster this notion of criminality of undocumented migrants and this is something her organization is advocating against.

Prof. Phil Martin explained that **there is indeed a migration business: a business in detaining foreigners before they are removed but also a business in helping people move**. Therefore, we have to remember this **works both ways** and that the **business in helping people moving is certainly larger than the detention business**. However, in both cases we need to realize that the **businesses have their own specific interests at heart, which are not necessarily the interests of the people they are moving or detaining**.

With reference to Mr. Flynn's question, **Prof. Castles** said that his country has the dubious distinction of having mandatory detention for all illegal entrants. Most detained persons are asylum seekers and some are detained for years even though they have committed no crime. This is a huge contradiction for a democratic State that claims to uphold the rule of law and human rights, he said. Then Prof. Castles expressed the opinion that Mr. Bingham really put the finger on a key issue: **Nearly every developed country believes in importing skilled-migrants (and has set up privileged systems for doing it) and believes it does not need lower-skilled workers despite all the evidence to the contrary**. Politicians are aware of the extent of irregular work going on in their country. They do know the economy needs irregular workers in many sectors, but do not want to explain this to the public. Until States face up to the reality of the demand for lower-skilled workers, there will be no solution to the problem, he thought.

Joint Reflections (4) Policy and Institutional Coherence

Chairing this session, **Dr. Irena Omlaniuk** (GFMD Task Force) explained that the issue of policy and institutional coherence has been one of the abiding themes of the GFMD over the years. The literature explains this is an important subject underpinning all other thematic debates within the GFMD and indeed it has been the one vast theme that is repeatedly revisited, every year.

Prof. Susan Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University) started her presentation by mentioning that the **GFMD established an ad-hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research** in July 2009. Policy and institutional coherence is necessary but extremely difficult to achieve, partly because of the contradictions exposed over this symposium. There are no simple straightforward answers to creating policies and coherence in the migration or in the development field. Therefore, it is even more challenging when one speaks about the nexus. In this context, three recurrent themes have been addressed over the years:

1. The need for improved data, research and for integrating migration into development policy and planning processes;
2. The relationship between regional and global processes (which Ms. Achieng will address);
3. The discussion of emerging issues or shocks to the migration and development system (such as the impact of financial crises and climate change).

She described the first set of issues (dealing with data, research, policy and institutional coherence) as really being an effort to develop a more evidence based set of policies that have internal coherence, based on the best information and analyses possible. Migration is an area that has been **traditionally understudied largely because of the absence of data, especially disaggregated data** (by age, by sex or by occupation, etc.). For example, we know a lot about how many people come into countries but we **know far less about how many people leave**. Very often there are contradictions and disagreements even in the estimates on emigration and immigration.

The Working Group has looked at ways of improving basic data, especially in terms of census, labor force surveys and how to better use administrative data. Indeed, she explained, there is a lot of governmental data about immigrants but it is usually not very useful for the purpose of analyzing the phenomenon. A result of that process has been the **drive to develop migration profiles** and methods of collecting and presenting data in a format which can particularly **help countries of origin to have a better understanding of who is migrating, to where, why and with what impacts**. The concept did not only aim at producing single snapshots of migration at a given point in time but also at **developing government capacity to continuously update that information and keep it relevant for policy formulation**. This is where the real challenge is, she said.

A second aspect of the Working Group's efforts was to try to develop better mechanisms to assess the actual impact of migration on development, especially looking at two areas:

First, the larger question of understanding the impacts: There is much talk around the issues because we **do not necessarily have good enough data and analyses to pinpoint whether there are positive or negative impacts of migration on development; or of development on migration trends and patterns**.

Second, there has also **been an emphasis on trying to identify and assess the impact of specific programs being implemented**: impact of returning policies and programs; programs to build and strengthen diasporas and help them become more effective vehicles in assisting their own communities or use their professional skills. Indeed, there has been a lot of public support for linking migration and development but **still very little systematic evaluations and assessments of whether those programs are effective and whether those are good use of resources**.

Prof. Martin added that a June 2011 workshop in Marseille looked at methodologies necessary for engaging in this type of systematic evaluation. Among other things, the discussions indicated that evaluating a transnational issue of this type is particularly challenging not only because one has to look at the viewpoints of the source, the destination and the government but because one also has to make sure that the views of the migrants themselves and the communities from which they migrate are taken into account in the assessments.

The third aspect of trying to reach a more evidenced based and coherent set of policies, mentioned by Prof. Susan Martin, involved the effort to determine how to better integrate the migration issues into development planning. This has focused largely on poverty reduction strategies, national development plans for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and more recently on adaptation frameworks coming out of climate change negotiations and discussions. In this area the **GFMD lead to concrete progress in helping governments to have the capacity to integrate migration into their development planning.**

Moreover, Prof. Martin argued in favor of integrating civil society perspectives and knowledge into development planning. Indeed, although the strength of the poverty reduction strategy process is to integrate civil society, **too few governments have developed good mechanisms particularly to get feedback from their diasporas and migrants associations.** She considered it a **next step that the common space should really be trying to engage in.**

Concerning climate change, Prof. Martin based her comments on the Puerto Vallarta 2010 Civil Society Days paper on Climate Change, Migration and Development⁵ she had prepared with Dr. Koko Warner. This topic was addressed in other fora and came rather late into the GFMD agenda. The **added-value of discussing climate change within the context of the Global Forum has been to look at it from a development perspective and not just as a problem or a failure,** she said. In the UNFCCC process (UN Framework Convention on Climate Change), the starting point had been to consider that without mitigation and adaptation strategies, people would have to move which is a bad thing. In the GFMD context migration has been looked at from both points of view:

1. There is a **need for action to help people to remain where they are,** when they can find alternative livelihoods and safe places to live;
2. **Migration has also been considered as an adaptation strategy,** which can help communities and people adapt to the effects of Climate Change. Diasporas and migrant associations can play a positive role in helping other people stay where they are; in providing resources, skills and technology (for example to help deal with deforestation, desertification and drought or to help deal with rising sea levels or the effects of flooding). She insisted that **migration is not necessarily an awful thing to be stopped. It can also be a positive way of helping communities to survive, and perhaps even flourish** despite the ravages of climate change.

To conclude, Prof. Martin said she hoped the Global Forum would continue to be the place where emerging issues can get onto the agenda.

Ms. Maureen Achieng (International Organization for Migration) explained that the GFMD model is very similar to RCPs (Regional Consultative Processes) and IRFs (Inter-Regional Fora). This in part may explain why these have received so much attention within Global Forum meetings. Indeed, the GFMD has consistently looked at how RCPs and IRFs are contributing to advancing an understanding of migration and development issues. Given the number of recurrent themes, a **challenge was for each new Global Forum to come up with something new** instead of reiterating subjects discussed in previous forum. Therefore, she started by providing a summary of the issues addressed at the first three Global Forum meetings with regards to RCPs and IRFs.

One was related to how RCPs and IRFs are funded and to what extent this factor influences the issues that come up on the agenda. An important aspect was to ensure that those issues were relevant to the RCPs and IRFs in the regions they operate.

Moreover, previous GFMD meetings repeatedly discussed the **trend towards broader ministerial representation at RCPs, which is considered to have a positive impact in terms of enlarging the discussion to include issues beyond migration:**

- A growing number of ministries brought issues fostering new aspects of development concerns on the agenda;
- It was also felt that RCPs that have a predominance of developing countries tended to focus on issues going beyond migration to touch upon development and other policy fields.

⁵ Susan Martin and Koko Warner, Discussion Paper for Roundtable 3: "Migration and Development, Tools and Evidence for Policy and Institutional Coherence"; Session 3.2. "Impact of Climate Change on Migration and Development", Civil Society Days Global Forum on Migration and Development, Mexico 2010.

The need for cross-fertilization between RCPs (not just within a region but also between regions) also often came up, she said. This was important in the convening of the 2009 Global Meeting of RCPs in Bangkok. There were two other of those Global Meetings since then. This is again **evidence that GFMD discussions can influence action on the ground**. In this context, there has been a **call for assessing the impact, if any, that RCPs and IRFs have on migration governance**, not only at the national level but also in terms of the complementary role they can play.

There was also a frequent call for greater policy coherence at all levels, not only between countries but also within countries. This involved the issue of **making sure ahead of an RCP meeting that each country (e.g. different ministries) is able to develop a common vision and therefore present a coherent position at the meeting**. According to her, there has been perceived improvements as countries participation in such processes increased.

Within the GFMD, it was felt that something different was needed. The paper which considered this issue in Puerto Vallarta advanced three proposals:

1. RCPs and IRFs' impact should not only be analyzed with reference to their contributions to the traditional development related outcomes (remittances, etc.) but also in terms of the **contributions they make to improving migration governance** within the countries and within the regions they operate.
2. The issue of weak capacity on the part of RCPs and at the national level was also considered, leading to the argument that it is **not reasonable to expect countries with weak migration management capacities to translate into any stronger capacity at the regional level**. Therefore, reinforcing the capacity at the national level was felt to be important.
3. It was also suggested that the focus should be less on how RCPs and IRFs should take account of the migration and development nexus and more on how they should be strengthened to perform the functions they seek to perform in the regions where they operate in.

Looking at the point of view of civil society organizations, Ms. Achieng explained that while RCPs are State-owned and State-led fora, it was **considered important that CSOs could be given a more prominent role**. The **informal nature of RCPs was felt by many CSOs to be a negative aspect resulting in some CSOs pushing strongly for more formal RCP structures, which might ensure more binding outcomes for States**. Nevertheless, she said that civil society generally acknowledges that contributions from RCPs, although sometimes not very tangible, can represent trust building elements between States, improving understanding of migration issues, etc.

The RCPs' flexibility in including issues on the agenda was also considered a valuable answer to the question of how to better integrate migration and development concerns. On the negative side, **CSOs reiterated the problems linked to weak capacities of RCPs as well as the lack of a secretariat and of regular meetings** (which means a loss of momentum and therefore lesser impact than with more permanent structures), the underrepresentation of development actors, etc. On the whole, Ms. Achieng explained that the civil society segments of the discussion felt that the RCP framework may not be the best place to tackle migration and development issues, but that RCP deliberations could eventually positively influence migration and the situation of migrants by resulting in migration friendly policies.

Finally, Ms. Achieng addressed a couple more issues: First, she explained in her analysis **RCPs and IRFs are not substitutes for the lack of a global regime of migration governance and never will**. These have **appeared because of a void that exists** and, she added, with time we **might find that these are building blocks for greater interstate and interregional cooperation**. Second, she looked at how RCPs and IRFs should interact with the GFMD, a theme that was extensively discussed in Puerto Vallarta, leading to the idea that a two-way information flow exists: **RCPs and IRFs play a complementary role by providing a testing and dissemination ground for the GFMD and the latter produces new ideas which can influence discussions at RCPs and IRFs**. Therefore, the **GFMD has the potential to draw the migration and development nexus into the deliberations of RCPs**, whether or not this is a declared thematic priority.

Discussants:

Ms. Elizabeth Adjei (Government of Ghana; Migration Policy and Advocacy Network) has worked for 18 years with the government of Ghana before joining the Migration Policy and Advocacy Centre

in Ghana. According to her, migration has a growing profile in Ghana, thanks to the GFMD and other processes. Awareness is rising and the government acknowledges its responsibility to take a leadership role in ensuring that migration is placed in the right context of development and in defining coherent approaches. Therefore, Ms. Adjei focused her remarks on some of the challenges and experiences Ghana has faced in terms of developing policy and building a coherent agenda around migration and development. Coherence and governance do not come about easily for a variety of reasons. First, migration itself is a very multisectoral, multidimensional, multidisciplinary transnational phenomenon. Its governance poses some challenges which governments can tackle by **delegating a coordinating role to a functional ministry or by setting up a separate entity to manage the various fields of migration and development and establish some structured coordination between ministries**. She mentioned that in Ghana for example, almost all ministries had their own focal-points although the challenge related to bringing all of them together within a coherent whole, to have a whole-of-government approach. Furthermore, although migration was mentioned in the preamble of Ghana's development plan it was not yet clear how this would be implemented and how the structures would be put in place. Thus, there **was coordination but it had not yet translated into a coherent whole, thus undermining the impact or the measurement of the impact of migration on development and weakening governance**.

To achieve coherence, Ms. Adjei explained, it is also necessary to reflect on the development objectives and priorities that the government wants to set. In this perspective, she thought the best approach is to **frame the policies around the elements which make it easy to build consensus, i.e. those which give maximum or optimum benefits to the government**. For example, she considered that the challenge to provide space for internal migration in the Global Forum was a very important one. Rural-urban migration is one of the key policy challenges for governments and if there could be scope for connecting international migration and internal migration, we could really have overwhelming support from government for policy development, she said.

Brain Drain was an obvious trigger for governmental action 10-15 years ago, with the aim of keeping, for example, health personnel in their countries of origin. This element helped raise awareness among governments about migration issues. This is again an indication that it is important to find a relevant entry point for policy-makers and according to her diaspora policy could now be an important and tangible option: **Governments need diasporas and their remittances, which makes it a good entry point for policy to be discussed and build consensus**.

Another critical issue Ms. Adjei addressed related to capacity development in migration and development. She considered it important to discuss the state of knowledge within governments and civil society, explaining that there is **generally a shortage of technical capacity in Africa**. Ministries and NGOs are often unable to articulate their priorities or unable to design, implement and evaluate projects and programs because of this lack of capacity. In this connection, she noted that **migration studies and education are recent phenomena and there are very few dedicated centers in Africa**. Moreover, even when such a center exists (as the recently created Centre of Migration Studies (University of Ghana), affiliated to the University of Sussex), the focus is usually on themes such as demographics and mobility. There is **very little focus on development**. **Therefore, she called for encouraging and supporting research institutions, think tanks, etc. to build capacity within African governments and also within CSOs**.

Second discussant, **Prof. Ronald Skeldon** (Centre for Migration Research, Sussex University) proposed to discuss the two presentations and the background paper before looking forward, beyond 2013, at the important issues that will have to be faced and which will constitute the context for the formulation of policy coherence.

First, he referred to Dr. Khalid Koser's (Geneva Centre for Security Policy – GCSP) contribution to the symposium background paper, which explained that **few governments evaluate the impact of their policies** and this **may partly result from a fear that evaluation could reveal some approaches are not working and strategies should be modified**. Prof. Skeldon agreed with this idea. Although he expressed some disappointment about the fact that Dr. Koser only focused on the

development impact of migration policies, thus leaving aside the impact of development policies on migration. **Development policies have some impact on human mobility and this aspect should be analyzed** as well. Sometimes the impact is obvious (e.g., when building a dam, a road, etc.) but Prof. Skeldon asked how, for example, the impact of trade policies could be evaluated. **Trade policies do have mobility implications but those are rarely analyzed.** Therefore, he called for the creation of some sort of migration impact statement.

In addition, while explaining that the GFMD has always emphasized the need for more evidence-based research Prof. Skeldon questioned the quality of the evidence on which policies are based. Indeed, he considered that the **evidence available in the context of migration and development is usually not too robust.** Thus, it is difficult to actually demonstrate that remittances alleviate poverty particularly because we usually only look at migrants and not at non-migrants.

He also considered that regional processes are the way forward because what we know about migration patterns relates mainly to the regions: There are regional systems of migration; therefore, **to manage migration we should develop governance at the regional level rather than at the global level.** However, he considered that we should not be too ambitious at this early stage. He also said that the background paper and Ms. Achieng's presentation should have developed some analysis of good practices about how to bring civil society in the RCPs and IRFs. For instance, one could have looked at the Puebla Process' innovative approaches in this respect.

Going into the second part of his comments on future challenges, he explained that 'complexity' is certainly an important term in this context and that four main issues need to be addressed:

1. Demographic factors will be critical: There are very few generalizations we can make about migration but one is that the **vast majority of peoples moving are young adults.** Therefore, it makes sense to say that the number of migrants in and from any society is a function of the number of young adults available to move. There is no simple and easy correlation because beyond the numbers there is a question of youth education; of increasing female participation (especially in education); the unemployment issue; the failure of development etc.
2. **Dealing with 'environmental' change (of which climate change is a subset) is one of the major issues that need to be addressed.** Some estimates this factor will push about 200 Mio persons to migrate in next 30 years. It is important to note that in this context **movements will certainly be short-term and short-distance:** It will mainly be local or regional migration.
3. The third issue relates to the potential future structure of States. He explained that because of the huge costs involved, the **decades-long drive towards a market State with a predominance of neoliberal policies might have begun to change** since 2008 and the financial crisis.
4. Finally, Prof. Skeldon mentioned a regional issue, the **rise of Asia to challenge the West,** as an important issue to be considered. He essentially referred to China which has a very different model of development than those of Western States, especially when considering issues like human rights. Moreover, he mentioned that because of some factors such as the declining fertility, China is beginning to draw in labor. There are already large numbers of irregular migrants in China and those will continue to grow. There will therefore be **growing competition with the West on skilled and unskilled labor.** In addition, we **should consider China's new patterns of migration illustrated by the rising numbers of Chinese in Africa.**

In conclusion, Prof. Skeldon explained that we will have to plan to confront those issues if we want to get our migration management policy right.

Questions, Comments and Answers:

Before opening the Q&A session, the Chair, **Dr. Omlaniuk** said that she was expecting the discussion to cover four issues:

1. The need for evidence based policy, the type of evidence needed and indications on the most viable tools for collecting, sharing and using evidence.
2. Assessment of the impact of migration policies on development and of development policies on migration.

3. Integration of migration issues into development planning: What can we say about the link with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) or other planning tools? How has migration been incorporated in practice and what are the good practices examples?
4. Regional approaches: There is much talk about RCPs as being successful in fostering cooperation, but what is the evidence and could we discuss some good practices?

Referring to the lack of development officials involved in the GFMD and more generally within the processes discussing migration and development, **Ms. Eva Åkerman Börje** asked the panelists whether they had explanations to share and what should be done about it.

Ms. Mariette Grange (Global Detention Project, Graduate Institute – Geneva) reminded the audience of how the GFMD had been created and set outside of the United Nations system. She could see the value of the GFMD in the discussions of this symposium but also some problems linked to the lack of coherence. For example, **by having a State-led process outside of the UN, a number of elements – particularly the Human Rights element – seem to be left aside** although there is a move towards more coherence.

She then suggested that there is an important **evidence gap on North to South migration**. We do not hear about this aspect **because there is no figure and because it is not called ‘migration’**: migrants involved are called **‘expatriate experts’, ‘humanitarian staff’** of international organizations or **‘staff of multinationals’**. Ms. Grange explained that she had once asked the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) and the Washington Migration Policy Institute for data on North-South migration and she discovered that nobody collects this information. This **far from being anecdotal since there are for example about 4 Mio Australians outside of Australia and more than 2 Mio French living outside of France**. The 2010 World Bank report on remittances showed that France was the fifth recipient of remittances. It would therefore be useful to include those issues in the discussion, she felt.

Ms. Grange welcomed the research being done on RCPs because it is very hard to find information on those processes especially for academics or members of civil society. It is difficult to know how the discussion is framed and the agenda drafted, who ‘calls the shots’ and who provides the funds.

Finally, she suggested that there is sometimes an element of racism underlying many discussions and policies on migration. As examples, she referred again to the terminology used to speak about North-South migrants; to the fact that in EU parlance, the term ‘returns’ is used to refer to what are often ‘expulsions’; and the fact that within the Schengen visa system most of the countries which require visas are countries with non-white populations.

She concluded by saying that including those issues (North-South migration and racism) in the debate would also make it easier to discuss these with the public.

Mr. Hendrik Garcia commented on the difficulty of achieving coherence between various national ministries, often because of different priorities and interests. Moreover, it is often difficult to get the right people in the same room. He also explained that we **cannot expect countries to move towards more coherence internally without a corresponding move at the global level**. Coming back on Prof. Skeldon’s comments on the effects of trade, trade policies and subsidies on internal and international migration, he remarked that the **countries which try to manage or prevent migration are often also those promoting certain trade policies**. This reveals a lack of coherence at the global level which has to be managed, he thought.

Finally, he touched on the migration profiles developed by the European Commission, which many origin countries are now producing with the help of IOM. He explained that we **need migration profiles of destination countries as well or regional migration profiles that could provide missing information and fill the gaps identified by Ms. Grange** (on expatriates, remittances received by developed countries, etc.). It would bring a comprehensive global picture which could be depoliticized and devoid of emotions, looking at the facts in a broad and balanced way.

Ms. Katja Hujo, (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development – UNRISD), explained that the discussion should **also aim at re-thinking the basic concept of policy coherence**. Similarly to terms like ‘good governance’, **‘policy coherence’ has become a fashionable term** for which we have some sort of ideal understanding but **which calls for a more substantive discussion** about what we think it is and should be: Whether we think it is a positive or a normative concept? Whether we think about the processes involved? etc. This is necessary, she thought, because **policy coherence cannot be achieved through a neutral process**. Whether between different ministries or between governments and civil society, the process of developing policy coherence involves issues of power and unequal power relations.

Moreover, she said that **data is not only lacking for North-South migration flows but also for South-South migration**. UNRISD and the World Bank have started focusing on it but there is still more research needed.

Finally, on Ms. Adjei’s point concerning the need to find attractive and beneficial entry points for policy-makers such as diasporas and remittances, Ms. Hujo asked **how we can ensure that governments take up more difficult issues and do not only focus on the outflows of migrants and brain drain**. For example, Ghana being a host country for migrants from neighboring countries, how could we make sure that the government is interested in managing incoming migration and in granting, for example, social protection or rights to those migrants within the country?

Ms. Godenzi explained that the notion of ‘joint evaluation’ had not been mentioned yet. **Joint evaluations between countries of destination, sending countries and other stakeholders, may be an innovative way to go further**. She therefore asked: What would be the conditions to produce this kind of joint evaluations?

Ms. Jean D’Cunha, commented that **assessments of the migration impact on development need to be contextualized**. For example, if one looks at remittances in the African context where financial infrastructures are not always very strong and robust, remittances might not have a lot of impact. The impact of remittances used for girls’ education is also likely to be limited if there are not more and better jobs for women in countries of origin. Therefore, she concluded, structural changes towards a more equitable distribution of wealth in countries of origin are needed to enhance migration’s development impact.

Ms. Barbara Rijks (IOM), thought there were lessons to be learnt from RCPs as regards the inclusiveness of a variety of sectors and players. Having been part of some of these regional meetings in Africa, she had seen that these include a mix of ministries and sectors sitting together and addressing a variety of migration topics.

Mr. Frank Laczko (IOM) asked the panelists to suggest ways in which we could promote, through the GFMD, a stronger evaluation culture. This issue was discussed at the Marseille thematic meeting, where numerous problems were highlighted: 1) the fact that many migration projects are simply not designed to have a direct impact on development and are therefore not evaluated from that perspective; 2) the fear factor (mentioned by Prof. Skeldon); 3) the often significant cost related to carrying out impact evaluation; 4) timing issues; 5) methodological issues and several other factors.

One possible way forward, Mr. Laczko suggested, would be **for GFMD States (countries of origin and destination) to try to conduct joint evaluations (currently most evaluations tend to be conducted from the perspective of the destination countries)**. Progress could be made in this field, he thought, and this really **should be a key strategic goal for the future given that the *raison d’être* of the GFMD is to understand better what works and what does not work**. Without evidence and evaluation, it is not possible to do that.

Mr. Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie (co-founder of the African Foundation for Development – Afford) noted that, in many cases, very different people come to the GFMD, with very different agenda. This is natural but it creates some confusion. It also relates to the fact that we **do not really have a clear sense of what we mean by development in the context of migration and development**. We do not have a common language and understanding, he said, and **working in this direction could be a contribution to moving forward**.

Mr. Rolf K. Jenny (GFMD Task Force), explained that talking about the issue of GFMD coherence is relatively easy. We know what it means, we can define it by referring to the programmatic or policy coherence or to the more institutional arrangements governments and other actors have to make to act in a coherent manner. Moving beyond those explanations is extremely difficult, he said. Governments really struggle with this, even governments that have a strong intention to act in a coherent manner encounter enormous constraints linked to the democratic process, public opinion, power, the relations between governments and civil society. In this context, the GFMD contributes to a continuing debate and creates better understanding.

The **whole assessment approach is difficult**, he said, and not just because of the fear factor. The issue also relates to money, to the priority of interests of certain governments and other actors, as well as technique and capacity. Moreover, because of the complexity of the issues that have to be assessed, the **longer term impacts of certain problems and policies are also difficult to evaluate**. He considered that the GFMD can continue to promote this culture of evaluation, the notion that governments need to assess what they are trying to do. Coming back on one of Prof. Skeldon's remarks, Mr. Jenny also said that he would like to see much more of GFMD focus on the development impact of migration or on trade policies impact on migration.

On regional processes, Mr. Jenny explained that the term IRF was invented within the GFMD context and that we **should not underestimate the cross fertilization factor between the GFMD and RCPs/IRFs**. The GFMD focuses on development (insufficiently though) but contrary to many RCPs, the GFMD debate is imbedded in the broader migration and development context. The same governments that attend RCPs attend the GFMD. For the last 4 years, the GFMD context and concept has influenced at least certain agendas of RCPs. Therefore, the element of cross-fertilization is essential, he considered.

Answering Ms. Åkerman Börje's question on the lack of development experts involved in the GFMD meetings, he explained that we **certainly still look at the link between migration and development mainly from the migration angle**, with questions such as: How can migration contribute to...? So far, the GFM has unfortunately not focused so much on why there is migration due to problems in the development or trade sector.

Finally, because someone had referred to the GFMD as a second best, Mr. Jenny asked: "Compared to what?" The GFMD is certainly not perfect, but it exists. **Coherence might not be perfect but is the United Nations Organization coherent? "Governments have difficulties in being coherent but we, personally, are not always very coherent either"**, he said.

Ms. Achieng said that across the board, RCPs are not very well-known because of their very nature: These are governments' discussions behind closed doors, often not even opened to civil society. This factor is aggravated by the fact that some RCPS are weak and have not existed for long.

On the lack of involvement of development experts, she agreed with Mr. Jenny and suggested that it may be an issue of reframing the discussion in order to bring on board more development experts.

Dr. Omlaniuk wondered whether the **question related to the lack of development experts should not be addressed to the governments**, since they are the ones who come to the GFMD and **they are those who should be bringing the appropriate parties of government with them**. There are difficulties in bringing together migration and development policy-makers: Many development agencies have different objectives for their budgets. To shift budget to migration related areas is difficult. There are also certain reservations among development policy-makers about the link between migration and development. Still, the question should be addressed to the

governments: Why have development agents not been as prominent as they could have been within the GFMD?

Prof. Susan Martin mentioned that the **involvement of development actors is also a problem in the civil society context particularly because it is not the poorest of the poor who migrate.** Major emigration countries are not the poorest and **most development agencies focus on poverty reduction and on trying to get to the most indigents.** Therefore, there is a tension.

She agreed that we should look much more systematically at the impact of development on migration and at the auxiliaries involved, including government policies that go even beyond trade such as the implications of security policies, which implies complicated interconnections.

On migration profiles she explained that it would be useful for the OECD committee producing emigration countries profiles to meet with those producing profiles from an immigration stand point. They could discuss possible improvements in the processes since there is not always agreement between what one sees from a destination or from a source country view-point.

On the issue of joint evaluation, she agreed that such processes would be valuable in assessing some of the interconnections. Since we are talking about a transnational issue, it has to be looked at through a transnational process. In this context, she mentioned that **Mexico and the United States have pioneered recurrent processes of bi-national research and evaluation assessments:** Since 1994, teams of **American and Mexican researchers work together in trying to reconcile data from both countries,** looking together at the processes taking place, the policy implications, etc. This scheme has tremendously increased our understanding, she said, recommending that this approach be replicated in other migration corridors. It could **lead to a more coherent picture of migration that can then feed into the policy process.**

Dr. Omlaniuk said one role the GFMD can play in this respect is to bring those examples to light and to the table, to discuss those as good practices and see if other governments can learn from that.

In reply to Ms. Hujo, **Ms. Adjei** explained that Ghana has done a lot to find solutions to the issues of incoming migration. It has produced migration profiles and a policy brief addressing the issue of managing incoming migration. Ghana is attractive for the sub-region and there are a lot of initiatives to deal with this, using good models such as Moldova, Jamaica and the Philippines.

Coming back on the issue of definition, **Prof. Skeldon** explained that we know what development is: We still have to work with the MDGs because this is the template the countries have agreed on. Whether we like it or not, this is on the table, therefore this is what development means.

He also expressed a **discordant opinion on joint evaluation, considering that “it could be a recipe for disaster”.** In his opinion, the **way forward is based on ‘independent’ evaluations, accepted by both destination and origin countries.** The issue of independence of evaluation is critical, he said.

Finally, on South-South migration, he asked the audience to be **careful because the ‘South’ includes a wide range of countries.** He therefore asked whether this is a meaningful category. It is certainly a convenient one but he considered that we need to be aware of its deficiencies.

Joint Reflections (5): How governments and civil society can move the GFMD forward and towards 2013

Before the last roundtable focusing on 'How governments and civil society can move the GFMD forward and towards 2013', **Mr. Ignacio Packer** (Terre des Hommes, Lausanne) made a short presentation on the process and outcomes of the Swiss civil society organizations' work on recommendations. He started by explaining that, with four languages and 26 Cantons, Switzerland has a quite complex federal system with different levels of autonomy which has been functioning for some time with relative success. Against this background, he explained that **civil society in Switzerland is as diverse as the country itself**. Swiss civil society includes organizations working only on the Swiss territory, organizations focusing on international issues, and others working on and linking both aspects. There are large and small organizations. Some organizations rely mainly on volunteers and others have relatively large contingents of paid staff. There are also international federation networks as well as local dynamics. **The added value to this diversity is that there is a lot of expertise and experiences and proximity to migrants' issues.**

It was quite a challenge and an endeavour to come up with recommendations from a number of diverse Swiss CSOs. The stimulus came from a few organizations (and encouragements from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation). In May 2011, a core group of five organizations was set up in Bern to organize work and try to materialize the drafting of those recommendations. Those organizations were: the *Fédération genevoise de coopération – A la vista! Communication Sociale*; the *Forum pour l'Intégration des migrants et migrantes*; *HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation*; the *Fondation Terre des hommes-aide à l'enfance*; as well as the *Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies – Geneva* providing a coordinating support.

After setting-up a database of about 500 email addresses of different organizations in Switzerland, information about the process was sent out in June along with a request for inputs, especially from those who could not attend the symposium. The feedback received was limited but still useful in developing the text. A first draft of the recommendations was prepared by the core group ahead of the symposium, which was then shared with about 30 other Swiss civil society representatives. It was discussed, amended and improved over the first morning, within groups focusing on specific themes. During a lively plenary discussion on the second day, each group reported on its work and submitted modifications to the text for approval by all participants. Mr. Packer also mentioned how stimulating it had been to join this symposium debate and have the opportunity to exchange with international experts.

is the outcome was certainly not a perfect text given the complexity of working among a group of about 40 people and the limited time available. The aim was also to produce a relatively short but rather well-argued text rather than a long check-list. This may also explain why some points might be missing from those recommendations. The text includes 6 general recommendations, followed by more specific ones which were more or less structured along the Swiss Chair approach for the 2011 GFMD. These included:

- The need to recognize and ensure the empowerment (capacity) of migrants in countries of origin and destination;
- The necessity of greater coherence between all actors at all levels, from local to global;
- The need for further cooperation between civil society actors and governments.

After those two days, the document still needed some editing and the work ahead would also focus on filling the gaps in endorsements by getting some more Swiss CSOs to sign the recommendations, including organizations which had not been involved so far such as trade unions and other non-immigrant civil society groups. It was believed that reaching out to more organizations would make the text more legitimate, although it would now be very difficult to modify it.

Mr. Packer explained that this set of recommendations was seen as a tool to be used by organizations for advocacy at all levels: local, national and international. Actually, the challenge Swiss CSOs had faced was to **come up with recommendations which could be addressed to the Swiss authorities at all levels as well as at the international level**. It was one of the tools to be

used, which would add to others such as advocacy strategies of each organizations individually and as a network or group. He concluded by saying that **one value of this initiative had also been to work against the fragmentation of efforts of individual organizations**. There was still a long way to go but it was an important although small step.

Ms. Beata Godenzi then explained that, as a representative of the Swiss government and more precisely of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), she welcomed the efforts and inputs from all participating organizations, especially the five core organizations. She was also pleased to think that they could build on this and committed to continue to work and dialogue with Swiss CSOs, even beyond 2011. She also noticed that the recommendations did not focus much on the responsibilities of all the different stake-holders for contributing to bringing about solutions. She therefore encouraged Swiss CSOs to think more about what they can do in this perspective, with their special constituencies.

Roundtable: How governments and civil society can move the GFMD forward and towards 2013:

Prof. Susan Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University) began by (re)examining why we need a mechanism for global consultations and discussions on the connections between international migration and development. Her starting point was that not only is international migration a major phenomenon today but it is going to be of growing importance in the years to come because of disparity in wealth, climate change, demographic changes, divergences in human security, etc. All those disparities incite people to look for better opportunities in wealthier countries. The push and pull factor are likely to increase in the future.

In this context, we need global consultations because we are dealing with transnational issues. In the last few decades, we have witnessed a **growing recognition that there can be no unilateral responses to those issues**, which by definition involve multiple source, destination and transit countries. Moreover, while much of migration happens within regions, there is an increase in cross-regional and global migration. There are also situations where information exchange between regions is needed, on effective practices and new ideas. Yet, she explained, **migration should not be seen as a substitute for official development aid** even though in an era of increasing fiscal constraints within governments, it is likely that migration, remittances and the role of diasporas will increasingly represent a lifeline for people with no other means of improving their human, economic and social conditions.

According to Prof. Martin, an **important value-added of the GFMD**, which might not have been obvious in 2006, is that **source, transit and destination countries can actually come together and have a civil discourse on a lot of controversial issues** linked to migration. This type of discourse had begun through regional processes, but it was not a foregone conclusion that it could continue. Nor was it a foregone conclusion that governments and civil society organizations could come together and have a civil discourse. Finally, it was not clear at all that any kind of concrete recommendations and proposals could come out of such a process and be able to be moved ahead. Therefore she considered that the past few years' achievements within the Global Forum have been much greater than the sum of its parts thanks to this ability to start a reasonable discussion on an issue which has too often been treated through emotion, lack of evidence and lack of understanding. Now the question was: "Where do we go from here?" One of the issues which will clearly be **on the agenda in 2013** will be **whether the Global Forum should remain a State-owned, informal ad-hoc process or whether it should be moved into a more formalized structure or within the UN**. In the past, she had pushed for this ad-hoc approach because she thought this structure would allow for confidence-building to develop. **Had those discussions developed inside the UN, she thought, they would have failed to provide a venue for developing any type of concrete actions**. Moreover, after many years of listening to discussions within the UN on many issues (including on refugees and migration), she considered that a **vibrant civil society participation could not have existed within a UN process**. The usual suspects would have been there: the larger organizations, the Human Rights groups, the trade unions that have the standing and ability

to participate in UN conferences and activities. However, we would not have seen the participation of migrant organizations and diaspora groups. Therefore, she considered that the GFMD had not been 'a second best' process but the best process one could have founded to achieve confidence building and involve civil society.

She then moved to discussing the **challenges ahead, the largest of which is sustainability**, particularly if it remains outside of the UN structures. The difficulties in identifying hosts and the lack of sustained guaranteed sources of funding for the process continue to be a problem. It has been highly dependent on a few governments, the MacArthur Foundation and other foundations. Therefore, an important challenge for 2013 related to **financial sustainability and institutional sustainability** and it could be addressed by **establishing some type of more formalized secretariat** that could help move the conversations from year to year. Indeed, an important weakness of the GFMD process relates to its follow-up capacity. Good ideas come out of the Global Forum but there is no assurance that everyone will pick up and implement these ideas. This is very much a problem for ensuring that there is continued dialogue and exchange. The GMG has done a good job at picking up on some of the issues and moving these along but this was mainly related to technical assistance or training. There is **no adequate structure to implement concrete policies at a more transnational level** and we **need a more sustainable follow-up mechanism**.

Prof. Susan Martin finally said that we have seen **tremendous progress on civil society participation** from Brussels to Manila and Athens. We really have to give credits to the Mexican Chair of 2010 for developing new ways and mechanisms for the interface between civil society and governments. It is **important that governments can discuss among themselves and that CSOs can also discuss among themselves** but it is **also very important to have a common dialogue and this has to be more sustainable**.

Mr. Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie (co-founder of the African Foundation for Development – Afford) started by expressing the idea that we **still do not have much evidence about the promise of migration, diaspora and remittances** and this is **an important challenge especially for those who have been driven into these discussions mainly out of concerns for development**. This has come out from a lot of discussions about impact evaluation and monitoring.

He explained that GFMD discussions are basically among policy-makers who have to make trade-offs based on scarce resources. In this perspective, he saw a dichotomy between 'policy' and 'politics': Primarily, the GFMD is a vehicle for policy-makers and discussions can be fairly technocratic when civil society debates are often about the politics. Therefore, there can be a **disconnect: civil society tends to speak to the politics of the challenge when policy-makers have fairly precise instructions and want to speak about what works, what to do and how**.

Civil society is also asymmetric since there are some groups we tend not to hear from. **Diaspora has been one of the slightly more marginalized groups, as well as the private sector and development practitioners**. Those are important actors therefore the **challenge to make the process much more inclusive is significant**. He praised the work done over 2011 in this respect, especially by the ICMC team. However, he explained that representation is not necessarily the only thing civil society should do and not necessarily always be the most useful one. Repeating a point made by Amb. Camacho, he emphasized the **knowledge that civil society brings to the table**. There are different types of contributions civil society make and one challenge is to be broad enough to understand and respect very different sorts of combinations.

Considering the future, he mentioned that he had looked at evaluations from 2010 and realized that the reactions to the common space were generally very positive, which indicates that it contributed to resetting the relationship between civil society and governments in the context of the GFMD. It was a political intervention, both in its form (in having civil society at the heart of the government meeting) and in its substance and content (there were two issues on the table: public perceptions of migration and partnerships). He considered that the **common space played a little better to the strength of civil society, perhaps speaking the truth to power**. In his opinion, **civil society can play an important role in raising the issue of migration and development, explaining why it is important and what it means to the public**.

Finally, Mr. Chikezie came back on the up- and down-sides of being outside of the UN system which Amb. Camacho and Prof. Susan Martin had mentioned. According to him, the dialogue element is vital and it is worth thinking about the GFMD as an evolutionary process, starting from a practical bottom-up approach, which might evolve into norms and principles that can be agreed on.

Discussants:

First discussant, **Mr. William Gois** (Migrant Forum in Asia – MFA) started his comments by explaining that he considered incorrect to say that governments do not want to talk to civil society, or that they do not want civil society to participate in the process. CSOs have been engaging with some governments, sometimes in a critical dialogue. According to him, the **notion – repeatedly voiced since 2006 – that governments do not want civil society to be involved in the GFMD is a myth and this discourse needs to stop** if we want more government and civil society involvement towards 2013. In addition, it would be **important to recognize contributions civil society has brought since the origins**, for example through the participation of some CSOs in a number of working groups established by governments.

In addressing the question “How can government and civil society move together?”, he first inquired who was asking this question (e.g., was it the Swiss Chair? Was it the Steering Committee or the Friends of the Forum?), for he considered it important for civil society actors to get more details. Second, he explained that it seemed a little late to ask this question, which reflected again the myth he had mentioned.

Beyond this introduction, he explained that having participated to the process on a continuing basis since 2006 he could say that every year has been difficult. One particular obstacle is that **CSOs always have to guess which foundation is going to be the host and who is going to be involved** and those issues are usually clarified only 2-3 months in advance. **Another obstacle relates to the magnitude of the tasks:** Mr. Gois explained that between January and August 2011 there were 14 regional meetings which was a lot for civil society to engage with. If we want to develop a collective process, he asked how could civil society follow and become part of these 14 meetings. Given the resources at hand and the other challenges it is facing, it is practically impossible for civil society to do this.

He then expressed his **appreciation for the Swiss Chair which had invited civil society to organize itself** in 2011. In full appreciation of that, he also mentioned that civil society’s lack of resources continued to be an issue and that civil society was still trying to find its place within the process. In this perspective he thought, for example, that **expanding civil society representation in the meetings of the Friends of the Forum (the place where governments gather and decide on agendas, working groups and discussions) would be useful**. It would help civil society understand what is happening in this group and how to engage with it. Another important development would be to **set-up a secretariat**. Indeed, there is **no follow-up process and this lack of continuity is all the more problematic for civil society**. Each year there are new civil society individuals involved, which leads to a ridiculous exercise, he believed: CSOs constantly have to do capacity-building about what the GFMD is in terms of structure, process, themes, history, etc. He concluded his comments by suggesting that a **joint task force of governments and civil society should be established to look at where this process will go**, not just looking at 2013 but also beyond this mark and that the **Swiss government should consider continuing its commitment to civil society** as it might be **worth investing in the current process to make it more sustainable**.

Second discussant, **Ms. Eva Åkerman Börje** (Swedish Ministry of Justice, Migration and Asylum Department) started by saying that, when talking about where the Global Forum is going, we should put things in perspective and remember that **although it has been an ongoing process for quite some time, this process has been developing at record speed in comparison to other processes** (within the European Union for example)

She also thought it **important to consider the Global Forum as still being a pioneering process**. Discussions are often framed as if the GFMD were an organization, an institution with a fixed framework, which is absolutely not the case. States also have to rethink the process every year. According to her, one useful way of discussing options for 2013 was to recognize that the starting point of the Global Forum was the sense of emergency, mentioned by Amb. Camacho, in finding a platform for constructive dialogues between States. There was **no deliberate delimitation towards civil society or international organizations**. It **reflected the need for governments to talk to each others, precisely because the tone in earlier conversations had not been very constructive**. Policy-makers needed to find colleagues with whom they could actually sit down and speak, identifying common challenges. Through the GFMD, the tone has changed and a lot has been achieved. Therefore, she said, it is a **young process, which should be taken care of**. We should not rush to conclusions about its performance. Ms. Åkerman Börje agreed with Prof. Susan Martin in saying that the GFMD is not a second best process: "It is THE process!", she said. Moreover, looking at how global governance can lead to increasing institutionalization, she thought the **way the GFMD has developed a platform for dialogue can be considered as a good model**. She also explained that the **High-Level Dialogue at the UN General Assembly in 2013 will have no mandate to decide on the future of the GFMD. It will be decided within the Global Forum**. Of course, this issue will be debated in New York but the decisions will not be made there. Finally, since Sweden will host the 2014 GFMD, she said the Swedish authorities were looking forward to a good dialogue between the Global Forum and civil society. In particular, they would be interested in looking at issues of circular migration, increased mobility and development. In this perspective Sweden considers it very important to get diaspora groups and the private sectors involved. Getting the private sector to participate would certainly represent an important challenge.

Third discussant, **Ms. Jin Sook Lee** (Building and Wood Workers International) said the topic of this meeting was very important for her trade union because migration is the norm in construction and it involves dealing with temporary migration and contractual labor migration. Moreover, the **trade union movement has been part of the GFMD process since the beginning** and was producing its **own evaluation of its contribution and where it should go in the future (with diverging views about this engagement, some wishing to continue and others having doubts)**.

Commending Prof. Susan Martin's comments, she explained that **sustainability was a critical aspect** and one of the solutions might be to **move towards a more formalized process**. She understood the arguments about the value of a dialogue fostered through informality. However, as Mr. Gois had explained, it has been a real struggle for civil society to follow and adjust to the process each year. The result has often been **very little time for substantive discussions, implementation and follow-up**. Therefore she believed a **more structured framework would allow for more substantive work and longer-term impact**.

She then moved to discuss diaspora community and the private sector mentioned by Ms. Åkerman Börje. The trade union movement welcomes the increased participation of diaspora organizations, she said, notably because of the impact diasporas have had on the development of unions everywhere. Moreover, she explained that although trade unions are often seen as being anti-private sector, they **actually also welcome the participation of the private sector**.

Finally, expressing her **doubts about the idea that the GFMD is the best process**, she reminded of the **existence of other international fora**. The one process trade unions know best internationally is certainly the ILO process, where migration is becoming more and more important. In this perspective, she explained that one important **challenge was to find coherence and interconnectedness between the existing fora because civil society has to engage with all those fora with limited resources**.

Questions, Comments and Answers:

Mr. Rolf K. Jenny came back on the doubts voiced concerning the need for a global platform, saying that **migration is probably the global issue that has the most interconnected relationships with other global and local issues**. Domestic aspects of migration make it difficult for

governments and other actors to connect with each other at the global level. Therefore, the GFMD was probably the best process possible at this juncture. Remembering the comments he heard during the Global Commission consultations in 2003-2006, he said that the focus had really been on national and local aspects. At the time, it was difficult for all actors to realize the global nature of migration issues.

Moreover, he explained that what mattered was not whether this was the best or second best process but rather that it could function and improve. There were aspects to improve and he particularly agreed with Mr. Gois in saying that it is not good to have to start from scratch each year. It is indeed not easy to set up a new structure and funding each year. However, **so far the follow-up capacity has really been the responsibility of governments.** The GFMD has been run on the basis of the Operating Modalities agreed by the governments which clearly said that follow-up was voluntary and that it was the governments' decision to use or not some of the recommendations.

Referring again to the 'civil society vs. governments' argument, he explained that there was a strong perception in 2005-2006 of a need to create something which would allow governments to talk to each other quite informally. In this context, he could **not remember that civil society involvement had been discussed in New York in 2006.** It was the **first Chair, Belgium which in a way decided to create a second forum for civil society.**

Mr. Colin Rajah commented that a **recurrent aspect of GFMD discussions was the dichotomy between an annual event and a process.** When discussing civil society participation, many seem to focus mainly on the year end event. Therefore he **asked what could be done to increase and build upon each year's discussion.** In this context he explained that he had been surprised to hear so few references to the GFMD process and its achievements at the May 2011 UN General Assembly Informal Thematic Debate on International Migration and Development. Therefore, he asked how we could ensure that civil society and governments build more upon past achievements, especially when looking towards the HLD 2013.

Prof. Susan Martin insisted that the issue of whether this is an event or a process is important and thanked the Swiss Chair for having decided to go beyond one single event with a series of thematic meetings. One issue with debates in New York, she noted, is that there are often many diplomats who do not know much about the issues and talk on the basis of notes from their capital. One of the real **positive aspects of the GFMD is that it has been composed of State actors who are familiar with the issues and thus able to engage in a more nuanced and interesting dialogue and to exchange practices.** She concluded by saying that in this respect, it is fundamental to **ensure that the High Level Dialogue 2013 is not left to diplomats in New York.**

Ms. Eva Åkerman Börje remarked that there are indeed a multiplicity of fora and levels where migration is discussed, but the uniqueness of the Global Forum should not be underestimated. The **GFMD is State-led which means governments' engagement and ownership, which is not always the case in other arenas.** Here, governments can set the agenda, take the responsibility for preparing sessions and framing issues so that there is a need for answers to their own policies. The decision-makers actually come to these meetings. In comparison the IOM annual meeting provides for many interesting debates and papers prepared for States but those are not the ones in charge.

She concluded by saying that the GFMD was a good opportunity to have dialogue with civil society once a year but that the Global Forum also required to have this dialogue all year round, at the national and local level, where there is actually often a greater impact.

Mr. John Slocum (John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation) endorsed Mr. Chikezie's comments on the question of development and how things were changing so rapidly in the developed and developing world (to the extent that these categories were still meaningful). Not only has the GFMD failed to fully engage with the development community, but he thought we need to learn from changes in the way economies are evolving around the world and to take that into account in how we think about migration.

Mr. Chikezie said that because the GFMD and indeed its civil society element was so informal, it was strange to hear comments such as ‘we welcome diaspora’ or ‘we welcome the private sector’. He asked: “Who is the “we” to welcome?” It should be an inclusive process and he hoped we would get to that point. Of course there are critical actors who can help to do that but he thought it important to be careful about that ‘we’ because it could make people feel they are simply allowed in. He finished by referring to a comment he had heard in the audience about the need for developing a convention on migration. In this connection, he explained that the discussion was about migration AND development and that the lack of development experts in the debate was linked to such approaches: Many of the persons involved are migration experts who, therefore, inherently frame the issues mainly as migration issues.

Prof. Susan Martin agreed that the involvement of the private sector was a weakness. There have been **many efforts to get the private sector interested** in the process and one of the answers companies gave was to say that **they ‘would love to attend if this were the Global Forum on Migration and Economic Competitiveness’**. They could **not see their role in development, which in itself was a larger problem**. She therefore considered that work was still needed to develop the mechanisms, the framework and language with which companies would feel comfortable.

Finally, on the issue of institutionalization, she explained that one of the important aspects to **discuss over the next few years is whether there are some mechanisms and frameworks that could help to create greater sustainability**. This does not necessarily mean building new institutions but some way of ensuring the process moves more smoothly from year to year.

Conclusions:

Mr. John Bingham (Head of Policy at the ICMC and 2011 GFMD Civil Society Coordinator) felt that participants had reached three broad elements of consensus:

1. There was a **broad sense that these processes of joint reflections, including the GFMD, are important and constant emphasis on the relevance, value and the need for measuring the outcomes** from this kind of discussions. For example, it was mentioned that 11 countries changed their legislation on domestic workers during the discussions which led to the adoption of the ILO Convention on Domestic Workers, at times going further than the positive protections of the convention. This is clearly one illustration of the values these kinds of discussions can have. The audience also heard that the GFMD is very relevant because it is, and will be for the foreseeable future, the ‘only thing we have’. Therefore, ‘we should take care of it’ and this means working on sustainability and conducting honest assessments.
2. The second consensus that emerged from this symposium is that beyond joint reflections, there was a **need for joint engagement and joint follow-up by civil society, governments and international organizations** working together. **Five governments from Europe, the Gulf and Latin America spoke of the unique role of civil society** in this process. There was also a **need for a practical collaboration** where civil society participates ‘intelligently, substantially and constructively with all the knowledge and experience they have.’ Those were comments from government representatives and Mr. Bingham expressed his appreciation for that.
3. Finally, there was a **broad acknowledgement of the sensitivity of some specific issues, particularly irregular migration**. However, **none of those aspects were so sensitive to hamper a debate**. For example there was broad recognition and full consensus on the rights of migrants as human beings in countries of transit and destination, regardless of their migration status. Nevertheless, many participants noted specific challenges. Thus, in many countries, there are challenges linked to the political system, processes and pressures, particularly when it comes to parliamentary politics and sensitive issues such as irregular migration. In this context, one challenge resides in looking for common ground when framing the issues. Mr. Bingham suggested this may well mean **trying to avoid over-representing and over-reacting to the**

more absolute arguments at each end, especially when looking at issues such as irregular migration: **'enforcement only' on one end and 'no returns, no borders' at the other end.**

Finally, closing this Symposium, **Mr. Konrad Specker** (Head of the Institutional Partnership Division, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) made the following speech:

Ladies and Gentlemen, these two days of joint reflections have been a good and welcome opportunity to exchange knowledge of different actors and show the relevance of bringing different points of view together. In this sense these two days aimed at contributing to the collaborative and cohesive debate that we hope will take place at the end of the year. Against this background, in the name of the Swiss Chair, I would like to thank the organizers and participants.

This gathering is a chance and at the same time a challenge, namely to create better conditions for the comprehension of complex issues. I think the **involvement of civil society is very important** and the **Swiss Chair heard the message that it should, beyond its chairmanship, undertake efforts to promote civil society thinking in the GFMD process.** My colleague Ms. Godenzi will follow up on that.

Therefore, we all agree that civil society has to play a role in this process, but the **question is which civil society are we talking about?** Civil society organizations were clearly identified as the consciousness of society and as a bearer of knowledge. In his keynote address Amb. Camacho referred to the tone of the debate and the potential difficulties linked to emotions and psychological issues. His message was also directed to civil society organizations, basically asking them to forget about politics in order to promote policies. It was also said that relevant policies need transparency and democratic debate and that civil society is a guarantee of this. So many positive elements but still, what type of civil society are we talking about? Are we talking about civil society as such or about civil society organizations? When talking about civil society organizations, **are we talking about NGOs or also about social movements, human rights and other activists, trade unions, churches and other civil society actors that have hardly been mentioned like parliaments, the media, and political parties?** All these actors are part of civil society, which is not homogenous, nor is government or business. It is very heterogeneous and diverse. Public opinion is part of civil society and it is very relevant when it comes to politics. Public opinion is often determined by perceptions, created by politics also. **Public opinion and therefore civil society can be manipulated and instrumentalized by politics and political interests.** Xenophobic parties are sometimes very much listened to by parts of civil society.

Therefore, **civil society is not in itself good or bad: It can be vibrant, it can be indifferent and it can be sleepy.** It can be educated but it can also be manipulated. It can be a force but it can also be terribly divided. Therefore, the **key challenge for civil society actors in this process is to be relevant actors.** This civil society relevance can be determined by two aspects: One is **knowledge, encompassing evidence-based advocacy, analysis, good capacity** (knowing what one is talking about), and the other is **promotion of good information to the public**, to allow the public to form ideas which are not based on perceptions but on reality.

Civil society actors, as any other actors, have to engage into critical reflections about their own positions. It is against this background that cooperation between civil society and governments becomes crucial for good policies and policy coherence. There are some conditions to be fulfilled for this to be a fruitful process: There must be mutual trust and openness and the willingness to listen to each other, which is very important for confidence building. Every body involved in this dialogue has to show that there is knowledge, that advocacy is based on evidence for example. **There must be mutual challenging: Not only civil society challenging governments but also governments challenging civil society. Organizations become relevant when they become unavoidable actors, based on their knowledge.** When this happens, they can play a very important role. Moreover, the question of being a relevant actor is not only related to being a good actor. A good actor is someone who is doing a good job but you can be a good actor without being relevant. A relevant actor manages to make contributions to change and to reflect

about change. In any respect, in this civil society–government partnership, it is **important that the relevance of each actor is being proven.**

This brings me back to the issue of polarization between politics and policies. Yes, we should not care too much about politics in order to go ahead in policy terms. But implementation of policies is being done through politics. Therefore, we cannot just ignore politics and the important question is **how to impact on policies without falling into the traps of politics?** One way of doing that is by ensuring that it is not so much perceptions but evidence and reality that do determine politics.

An important challenge is also to **develop multi-stakeholder partnerships:** There must be dialogue; there must be debate and mutual engagement. There must be **joint policy constructions,** but there must also be **room for genuine, constructive controversy and even for conflict.** Each actor in this type of multi-stakeholder dialogue and partnership must accept that there is a need for conflict also. It is also important that the actors remain autonomous in those joint endeavors, from reflections through to decision-making and implementation. **Genuine partnership is based on autonomy. An actor which is not autonomous in its actions and thinking cannot be a good partner.** This is the approach the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation has been promoting.

Much has been said about coherence of policies. It is indeed very important but it is also a **very relative concept.** It depends on the point of view from which you are looking at coherence. Trade politicians want to make everything coherent in terms of trade; health politicians want to make everything coherent in terms of health, etc. So it is very relative. **What the coherence debate is really about is conflicting interests.** I think we have to accept that there are conflicts of interest in society. Conflict of interest in itself is not a problem. The **problem is that we are not talking about it.** So it is very important to analyze those conflicting interests, field of tensions and ambiguities and to debate about all this. These are political debates and at the end of the day, **coherence is a matter of political choices.** The key issue is to have **good preparation so that intelligent political choices are being made** and that the **choices are being implemented.**

In this sense, the **involvement of development actors is very important.** The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation has identified ‘migration and development’ as one of its five key issues which are considered as global challenges and which therefore should be dealt with through a global program. As you know Ms. Godenzi is leading the Global programme on migration and development. Our development agency is involved in these issues, but we also have to admit this is not an easy issue. We are also **looking for evidence and experience on which this involvement can be based.** We have to admit also that there is a **risk of instrumentalizing development policies for the purpose of migration policies.** And the weaker the basis of experience, knowledge and evidence is, the bigger is the risk of instrumentalization through politics. Therefore, it is a challenge for us all to promote a good basis of knowledge and evidence. In this regard it is also certainly important that we have to know what we are talking about when we talk about development. What is development? **Development is not limited to the implementation of the MDGs; it is not just about economic growth. Development is about sustainable development; social, ecological, economic sustainability. Development has to do with causes of poverty and conflict, access to resources, implementation of rights, etc.** Again, the model of development that we are pursuing is a matter of choices and so is the policy of migration. A key challenge is to **ensure that informed choices are being made** and I would like to conclude by expressing the hope of the Swiss Chair that the GFMD 2011 will contribute to enhancing the basis for governments and the international community to make informed choices. At the end of the day, it is the substance that this forum can promote which makes its relevance. We therefore **hope that all the upcoming discussions about the future of the GFMD will not simply focus on formalities and structure but also address the real substance that can come out of this forum.**

Annex (1): AGENDA – Joint Reflections on Migration and Development, 23-24 August, 2011

[Note: Sessions highlighted in blue were reserved to registered Swiss civil society delegates]

Tuesday 23 August 2011

9.30-11.00 Civil Society Reflections on Migration and Development (1)

Moderator: John Bingham (GFMD Civil Society Coordinator; ICMC)

- Introduction
- Break out session (1): work on specific themes in small groups leading up to draft recommendations

11.00 – 11.15 Morning tea/coffee

11.15 – 12.45 Civil Society Reflections on Migration and Development (2)

- Break out session (2): work on specific themes in small groups leading up to draft recommendations

12.45 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 16.00 Joint Reflections on Migration and Development (1)

- Opening/welcome – Jussi Hanhimäki (Programme for the Study of Global Migration, Graduate Institute – Geneva)
- Introductions by Beata Godenzi (Global Programme Migration, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation - SDC) and John Bingham (GFMD Civil Society Coordinator; ICMC)
- Key note speaker: Ambassador Juan José Gómez Camacho, Mexico
- Roundtable on **Labour Mobility and Development**

Moderator: Mr. Md. Shahidul Haque (International Organization for Migration)

- Theme leaders: Phil Martin (UC-Davis Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics); Robert Holzmann (Senior Advisor (Consultant), The World Bank)
- Discussants: Gibril Faal (GK Partners); Colin Rajah (National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights – NNIRR); Alex Zalami (UAE Government); Elizabeth Warn (International Organization for Migration)
- Swiss Civil Society perspective and open debate

16.00-16.15 Afternoon tea/coffee

16.15 – 17.45 Joint Reflections on Migration and Development (2)

Moderator: Denise Efonayi-Mäder (Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies – SFM)

- Roundtable on **Gender, Family, Migration and Development**
 - Theme leaders: Juan Carlos Calleros (Centro de Estudios Migratorios, México); Jean D'Cunha (UN Women)
 - Discussants: Helen Schwenken (University of Kassel, Germany); Ignacio Packer (Fondation Terre des hommes aide à l'enfance, Lausanne); Gloria Moreno-Fontes (International Labour Organization)
- Swiss Civil Society perspective and open debate

17.45 – 18.45 Cocktail Reception

Wednesday 24 August 2011

9.30 – 11.15 Joint Reflections on Migration and Development (3)

Moderator: Susan Martin (Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University)

- Roundtable on **Irregular Migration and Development.**
 - Theme leaders: Stephen Castles – by video (Department of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Sydney); Phil Martin (UC-Davis)
 - Discussants: Michele LeVoy (Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants – PICUM); Ambassador Eugenio Arene, Deputy Permanent Representative of El Salvador to the UN; Vincent Chetail (Programme for the Study of Global Migration, Graduate Institute – Geneva)
- Swiss Civil Society perspective and open debate

11.15 – 11.30 Morning tea/coffee

11.30 – 13.30 Joint Reflections on Migration and Development (4): Parallel Sessions

Moderator: Irena Omelaniuk (GFMD Task Force)

- Roundtable on **Policy and Institutional Coherence:**
 - Theme leaders: Susan Martin (Georgetown University); Maureen Achieng (International Organization for Migration)
 - Discussants: Elizabeth Adjei (Government of Ghana; Migration Policy and Advocacy Network); Ronald Skeldon (Centre for Migration Research, Sussex University)

Moderator: John Bingham (GFMD Civil Society Coordinator; ICMC)

Reserved for Swiss Civil Society Delegates

- Swiss Civil Society (SCS) Roundtable:
 - Report on the SCS break out sessions and consolidation of the draft recommendations.
 - Outline of specific questions and debate themes to be discussed with the experts. (work will continue over lunch time)

13.30-15.00 Working lunch

15.00–16.40 Joint Reflections on Migration and Development (5)

Moderator: Jussi Hanhimäki (Graduate Institute – Geneva)

- Swiss Civil Society reports back on their work, and exchange with the experts
- Roundtable on **How Governments and Civil Society can Move the GFMD Forward and Towards 2013**
 - Theme leaders: Susan Martin (Georgetown University); Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie (co-founder of the African Foundation for Development – Afford)
 - Discussants: William Gois (Migrant Forum in Asia – MFA); Eva Akerman-Borje (Government of Sweden); Jin Sook Lee, (Building and Wood Workers International)
- Swiss Civil Society perspective and open debate

Plenary discussion

16.40–17.00: Afternoon tea/coffee

17.00–18.00 Conclusions

Rapporteur's report (Jérôme Elie, Graduate Institute – Geneva)

- Concluding comments – John Bingham (GFMD Civil Society Coordinator; ICMC)
- Concluding comments – Konrad Specker (Head of the Institutional Partnership Division, SDC)

Annex (2): Recommendations on Migration and Development produced by a group Swiss Civil Society Organizations (23-24 August 2011)

1. Introduction

The following are recommendations from a number of Swiss Civil Society organizations drafted during the *GFMD Symposium for Civil Society and Governments* on 23-24 August in Geneva, Switzerland. The overall aim is to promote migration and development in a way that is beneficial to migrants, the country of origin and the host society.

2. General Recommendations

Many people suffer from violations of their rights while on the move or when reaching their destination. States are required to safeguard the dignity and rights of migrants at all stages of their migration process (i.e. at the point of departure, when crossing borders, in transit and high seas, at their destination and when or upon returning to their place of origin).

As members of Swiss Civil Society we urge the Swiss authorities and the International Community:

- 1) To adopt a rights-based approach in any legislative, policy and intervention measures on migration and development.
- 2) To promote legal and safe channels of migration and maximise, through mutual collaboration, the positive impacts of migration in the development of the country of origin and destination.
- 3) To recognize that phenomena like migration and development challenge the concept of the State as based on territorial power and therefore require common and global efforts.
- 4) To stress that the root causes of migration are not solely linked to economic factors and that it is therefore necessary to shift away from a migration management approach that concentrates on short term economic benefits and to seek a more human, sustainable and comprehensive approach in migration and development matters.
- 5) To recognise that children and youth are also largely affected by migration. They move on their own, with families or with peers, or could be left behind by their migrant parents. Therefore we urge States to make sure that any legislative, policy and intervention measure on migration responds also to the protection and development needs of children and youth.
- 6) To adopt a gender-sensitive perspective in any legislative, policy and intervention measure on migration and development, especially because women are increasingly involved in migration processes.

3. GFMD thematic program recommendations

According to the core principles of the 2011 GFMD thematic work program, the following recommendations will focus on three overarching themes:

- 3.1. The need to recognize and ensure the empowerment (capacity)⁶ of migrants in countries of origin and destination.
- 3.2. The necessity of greater coherence between all actors at all levels, from local to global.
- 3.3. The need for further cooperation between Civil Society actors and governments.

3.1 Empowerment of Migrants

The respect of human dignity and protection of the rights of migrants is a State obligation. As members of Swiss Civil Society we also recognise that migrants can be active agents of development both in their places of origin and destination. The International Community should recognise this development role of migrants and ensure a legal framework as well as a political and social environment that allows migrants to develop such a potential to the full. In particular, migrants' integration in their host society should be

⁶ Although the 2011 GFMD Concept paper refers to 'capacity' only, the representatives of the Swiss Civil Society consider that the term 'empowerment' should be used here because of its broader meaning.

eased through ensuring access to income-generating activities, education, health and other public services.

We urge the Swiss authorities and the International Community:

- 1) To respect and promote the human rights of migrants irrespective of their migrant status.
- 2) To counter xenophobia and racism against migrants in the host society by implementing legal instruments as well as creating opportunities for communication and debates countering the promotion and dispersion of false, negative and accusatory information and images of migrants.
- 3) To ratify relevant instruments such as the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW) and the Convention Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers.
- 4) To revise existing national laws and devise adequate legal procedures to ensure that they foster the potential of migrants and do not entail discriminatory practices.
- 5) To ban detention due to migration status.
- 6) To grant access to legal representation at arrival in the destination country for all migrants, in particular foreign, unaccompanied, and separated children and youth.
- 7) To show a determined effort in addressing all forms of discrimination against migrants in the labour market (private and public sector).
- 8) To eliminate discrimination in migration policies on any grounds, including on geographic origin, skills and/or nationality.
- 9) To value and recognise migrants' skills and knowledge and to offer adapted and realistic options for migrants to obtain recognition of diplomas acquired in their country of origin.
- 10) To respect the unity of the family and promote family reunification through facilitated procedures. Whilst children and youth should be able to maintain links with their family and other protective actors in their place of origin, any decision on return or not of the child should be based on his/her best interests.
- 11) To ensure equal access to health, education, vocational training and social assistance regardless of the respective residence status in the country and the elimination of all discrimination against migrants in housing and public services.
- 12) To offer real opportunities for migrants to take part in social and political debates as well as decision-making processes, especially on issues that concern them.
- 13) To ban practices which sentence with expulsion out of the country migrant spouses who divorce a national.

3.2 Coherence at the national, regional and global level

As members of Swiss Civil Society we reiterate that:

It is crucial to enforce and promote coherence on migration matters while adopting a migrant-centred focus. Often coherence and cooperation is lacking at the national level between different policy making bodies and governmental branches. Moreover, the aim is to achieve improved coherence between various spheres, such as policies on migration, development, economics and human rights. All laws, policies and practices with regards to migration – be it on the local, the regional or the global level – should first and foremost comply with International Human Rights Treaties and Conventions such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, their Protocols and other existing instruments.

Despite its contribution to countries of origin and destination, migrants' remittances (economic, social and cultural) shall not be considered as a substitute for efficient policies and interventions by States aiming at economic, human and capacity development. States shall fulfil their responsibilities and obligations represented in MDG 8.

In particular, we urge the Swiss authorities and the International Community:

- 1) To make sure that any policy, debate and measure on migration and development is based on the recognition that migrants contribute positively both to the development of countries of origin and destination.

- 2) To ensure that civil society stakeholders, along with governments and international organisations are associated with any measure undertaken on migration and development.
- 3) To measure the impact that bilateral, regional and international trade agreements have on the livelihoods and human rights of the people concerned.
- 4) To ensure that educational and employment policies do not have discriminatory and detrimental effects on the human rights and living standards of migrants.
- 5) To ensure that external and internal migration policies are coherent, transparent, and efficient and simultaneously lead to a true win-win-win strategy for migrants, countries of destination and origin.
- 6) To shift away from a migration management approach that concentrates on short term economic benefits and seek a more humane, inclusive, equitable and responsible approach to migration and development.
- 7) To implement policies that would stimulate correlations of private and public financial flows in the effort to promote further development in countries of origin and destination.
- 8) To invest adequate resources in the protection of children and women in vulnerable situations, by taking into account not only those left behind, but also those who migrate, whether with families, with peers or alone.

3.3 Cooperation among States and between States and other actors

As members of Swiss Civil Society we reiterate that:

Cooperation is an important tool that should aim to improve the status of migrants. Cooperation has to emanate from a rights-based and migrant-centred framework and should not be based on a migration-control approach. It must involve all stakeholders and equally consider all levels – from local to global.

We hence urge the Swiss authorities and the International Community:

- 1) To base international cooperation on migration and development on truthful partnerships between developed and developing countries, as well as between migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries.
- 2) To develop and ensure broad participatory processes with all relevant stakeholders for the development of policies on the protection of the human rights of migrants, including consultation processes with all migrant groups.
- 3) To recognize and support the special role of migrant associations as agents of development in origin and destination countries by:
 - a. recognising their role in promoting mutual understanding between migrants and the host country population;
 - b. supporting migrant associations in creating effective evaluation and follow-up tools for their projects;
 - c. creating strategies and programs to enhance dialogue between the migrants' associations and home country institutions.
- 4) To facilitate transnational communication and collaboration between civil society organizations, other relevant actors and governments across borders, especially through information sharing, translation assistance etc.
- 5) To ensure that development policies maintain a level of independence from foreign policy and genuinely aim at development, and are not conditional on migration policies.
- 6) To ensure that migrant remittances are not considered as a substitute for foreign development aid or international pressure on governments of origin countries for reform and social investment.