



PROTECTING AND EMPOWERING MIGRANTS FOR DEVELOPMENT

SECOND MEETING OF THE GFMD (MANILA) 27-30 October 2008

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

1. Introduction

The Manila GFMD 2008, hosted by the Philippines on 27-30 October, marked another major achievement in the international debate on migration and development. It was the second meeting of the new global state-led process on migration and development, established by governments and the United Nations Secretary-General in the context of the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD) in 2006. The inaugural GFMD meeting was hosted by the Government of Belgium in July 2007 in Brussels.

More than 1130 delegates participated in the Manila GFMD, representing some 163 Member States and Observers of the United Nations, 33 international organizations and 220 participants in the Civil Society meeting. It was the **first truly global meeting on migration and development** for the Philippines and for Asia.

The Manila GFMD followed more than a decade of international debate on the need for a more global engagement with migration and development. The Manila GFMD Chairperson, Undersecretary Esteban B. Conejos Jr., described the meeting as a “big milestone on an ever widening and lengthening road towards better understanding and addressing the links between migration and development”. Earlier milestones include the International Conference on Population and Development in 1994, the Global Commission on International Migration set up in 2003, the UN High level Dialogue (HLD) on Migration and Development in 2006 and the first GFMD in Brussels in 2007.

In line with the September 2006 HLD and the GFMD Operating Modalities endorsed in Brussels, the GFMD is a voluntary, informal and government-led process to advance understanding and cooperation on the mutually reinforcing relationship between migration and development and to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes.

The Manila GFMD brought together around the same table countries of migrant origin, transit and destination, countries at all stages of economic, social and political development, represented by policy makers from a wide range of government agencies, including Ministries and Departments of Immigration, Development, Labour, Foreign Affairs, Gender Equality, Home Affairs, Justice, Interior, Integration, and Nationals Abroad.

The Manila GFMD also drew on the knowledge and experience of international agencies, including those that make up the Global Migration Group (UNCTAD, ILO, IOM, World Bank, UNHCHR, UNHCR and others), regional organizations and bodies, academia, NGOs, trade unions, the private sector, and above all the migrants.

While the Brussels meeting focused on the first two priorities identified by governments in a survey undertaken at the outset of the GFMD process – labour mobility, and remittances and other diaspora

resources - the Manila meeting took up the next two priorities, namely **rights** and **security**. The Philippine Government chose as its flagship theme “**Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development**” to highlight the human face of migration in a debate that often only addresses the rational economic implications of migration for development.

These two priorities formed the basis of the Roundtable 1 discussions on protecting and empowering migrants, and the Roundtable 2 discussions about the policy frameworks that could foster such protection and empowerment by better balancing facilitation and control of migration. The third thematic Roundtable on policy and institutional coherence and partnerships aimed at providing the underpinnings of roundtables 1 and 2, and continued the debate on this critical issue launched at the GMFD in Brussels.

What has the Manila GFMD achieved? Delegates agreed that the GFMD has energized a change of perception about migration and development and sparked a broader recognition of the enormous benefits that migration can bring. The informality of the GFMD process was widely recognized as a key element for frank, in-depth and open exchange amongst participating states and other stakeholders. Governments from both origin and host countries welcomed the opportunity to discuss the rights of migrants and ways of protecting and empowering them to enhance their contribution to development, without being doctrinaire and without rancor. Governments that are embarking on comprehensive migration governance adjustments are ready to consider both the needs of origin and host countries in their policy planning. And governments revealed that they participated in the Forum in a spirit of “**shared responsibility and partnership**”.

In the Roundtable session on the Future of the Forum, the UN Secretary-General’s Special Representative on Migration and Development confirmed that the GFMD had established itself as a most useful tool to promote effective dialogue and exchange between government policy-makers in a constructive atmosphere. It has also had a real impact at the national level by generating greater policy coherence, including through the GFMD national focal points.

The concrete outcomes of the Manila meeting – follow-up working groups, studies, compendia of good practice, pilots and assessments – both extrapolate on the key outcomes of the Brussels meeting and take the discussions of Manila forward to the third GFMD meeting to be hosted by Greece.

2. The Preparatory Process

Preparations for the Manila GFMD were spearheaded by the Department of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with other concerned Government agencies of the Philippines. **Mr. Esteban B. Conejos Jr.**, Undersecretary for Migrant Workers’ Affairs (OUMWA), DFA, was appointed by the Philippine Government to be the Special Envoy to the GFMD and Secretary General of the Philippine National Organizing Committee for GFMD. In this capacity, he headed all substantive and administrative preparations for the Manila meeting, both local and international.

As the overall Chairman of the Manila GFMD, Mr. Conejos continued to use the **structural framework** and working methods set up in Brussels in 2007: a Chair’s **Taskforce** comprising national and international experts, a network of country **focal points**, the **Friends of the Forum (FOF)**, and a **Steering Group (SG)** of some 30 participating Governments.¹ The Taskforce supported the Chair with the substantive preparations for the Manila meeting; the Steering Group provided political and conceptual support to the process and the Chair; the Friends of the Forum helped with governance of the process through the country focal points; and the **Troika** of past, present and future Chairs (Belgium, Philippines, Greece) provided strategic guidance.

The GFMD Roundtable discussions were prepared by **voluntary teams of governments**² and other experts with the assistance of the **Roundtable Coordinators**. This highly inclusive, yet informal, character of the GFMD sets it apart from other international meetings of this kind.

¹ The Steering Group comprised: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom.

² See Annex 2 for the list of Roundtable country teams.

Throughout the preparatory process, the Chair consulted closely with **Mr. Peter Sutherland**, United Nations Secretary-General Special Representative for International Migration and Development. Mr. Sutherland participated in all Friends of the Forum meetings and chaired the Special Session on the Future of the GFMD at the Manila meeting on October 30.

In the course of the 14-month preparation for the Manila GFMD, three Friends of the Forum meetings were held in Geneva on 17 December 2007, 26 May 2008 and 4 September 2008; and six Steering Group meetings were convened, also in Geneva. The Steering Group assisted the Chair in reviewing and achieving majority agreement on such issues as the themes and treatment of the Roundtables, the program of the four-day Manila GFMD, the budget, and the establishment of a light Support Unit to assist future Chairs with administrative matters. The Friends of the Forum debated all these issues at the FOF meetings. Of note, the Friends of the Forum gave majority support to the idea of a small support unit to assist future Chairs with basic administration, financial management and website maintenance. All these meetings were key to ensuring that the GFMD remains a government-led and participative process.

The financial resources for the Manila meeting and its preparation were provided by the Philippine Government, a range of other governments, international bodies and one private foundation³. The major share of the budget was dedicated to the travel, accommodation and *per diem* costs of participants from developing countries and panelists, and to the logistical arrangements of the meeting (e.g. simultaneous interpretation, translation of documents and reports, preparatory meetings, conference services, catering, and event organizer). Two international advisers were funded by their governments (Netherlands and Switzerland), one by IOM and Australia, and one by MacArthur Foundation⁴.

The preparatory process and the conclusions during the special session on the Future of the GFMD have ensured that the necessary modalities and structures are in place to take the GFMD process forward to the next meeting in Greece and beyond 2009.

3. The Civil Society meeting (27-28 October)

220 delegates from non-state organizations and bodies all over the world met at the second Global Forum on Migration and Development in Manila to consider the rights and protection of migrants, the expansion of legal avenues for migration and the challenge of policy coherence within states and across borders⁵.

The Civil Society component of this year's GFMD was broader in scope and more engaging than in 2007 on five counts:

- a) Expansion of the meeting from one to two days;
- b) Incorporation of constructive input from many civil society national and regional consultations involving thousands of migrants, NGOs, trade unions, and faith-based organizations;
- c) Introduction of three workshops called "voices from the region" to spotlight regional perspectives;
- d) Interface of government representatives with Civil Society; and
- e) Generally closer cooperation between government and Civil Society in preparing the GFMD.

The Civil Society meeting was organized by the **Ayala Foundation, Inc. (AFI)** at the request and with the support of the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines. AFI has 13 years extensive and direct experience in development-related projects involving Filipino migrants and diaspora, for example by mobilizing cash or in-kind contributions, supporting and empowering hometown associations, and organizing dialogues on migration. AFI belongs to the Ayala Group of Companies, which contributed logistical, financial, and technical support to ensure the successful organization of the Civil Society meeting.

³ Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Africa, Caribbean and Pacific Group of Countries (ACP) Secretariat, MacArthur Foundation, International Organization for Migration, International Labor Organization.

⁴ See Annex 3 for Financial Contributions to the Philippine Hosting.

⁵ See Annex 4 for the Civil Society Day Program.

A structural framework comprised of the **Philippine Organizing Committee (POC)** and the **International Advisory Committee (IAC)** supported AFI in the organization of the meeting. The majority of the budget was provided by the **MacArthur Foundation** and **Ayala Foundation**, but other entities also contributed to the organization of the event⁶.

The themes and Roundtable sessions mirrored those of the government meeting to ensure that governments and Civil Society would address the same issues and challenges on migration and development. At the opening session of the government meeting on 29 October, a five-member Civil Society delegation led by **Ms. Sharan Burrow** submitted to the GFMD Chair the report on the Civil Society meeting held on 27-28 October 2008. Following were the **key recommendations** for governments:

- Consider the benefits of migration and resist the temptation to cut migrant numbers in the current economic circumstances;
- Recognize the need for the development of a global architecture to ensure a rights-based approach to migration.
- Re-affirm the commitment to development through realizing the MDGs, full employment and decent work as priorities for development.

The complete report of the Civil Society meeting⁷ which contains key recommendations for each of the Roundtable sessions can be found in the GFMD Civil Society website (www.gfmd2008.org). In conclusion, Civil Society acknowledged the generosity of Ayala and MacArthur Foundations and other donors, the work of the IAC, the support and hard work of the Government of the Philippines and, in particular, the GFMD Chair, Mr. Conejos. They also expressed their readiness to work in partnership with governments at all levels to achieve more policy coherence, find mechanisms to enhance rights and support the opening up of regular migration opportunities.

3. The Government meeting (29-30 October)

The Government meeting⁸ comprised two plenary sessions at the opening and conclusion of the two-day meeting, and eight break-out roundtable discussions over the major part of the two days (including the special session on the Future of the GFMD for Heads of Delegation).

3.1. Opening Plenary Session

GFMD Chairperson **Undersecretary Esteban B. Conejos Jr.** contextualized the Manila GFMD within the growing global debate on migration and development. He stressed the GFMD's informality and its *interactive focus on concrete and cooperative solutions* to today's challenges. This set it apart from other, more formal processes that can tend to get stuck on points of doctrine or form. The Philippines had chosen to broaden the concept of development and *focus on the human face of migration* in light of its own extensive experience in protecting and supporting migrants abroad.

In his welcoming address, **Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Alberto G. Romulo** paid tribute to the immense contribution migrant workers make to the well-being and prosperity of both countries of origin and host countries. Filipino health professionals, for example, fill critical jobs in hospitals, clinics, hospices and healthcare homes in many parts of the world. Yet the conditions still did not exist in many countries to support and protect migrants in these roles. *The GFMD can help foster an enabling environment for migrants* through national, international and multi-stakeholder dialogue and partnership.

⁶ MacArthur Foundation, Microsoft, Ayala Corporation, Bank of the Philippine Islands, Ayala Land, International Organization for Migration, Open Society Institute, United Nations Children's Fund, All Japan Seamen's Union, International Mariners Management Association of Japan, International Labour Organization, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University, Oxfam Novib, Human Rights Watch, Center for Global Development, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Globe Telecom, BayanTel, Coca Cola, Ammodo.Com, Fundacion Santiago, Coca-Cola Foundation and League of Corporate Foundations.

⁷ See Annex 5 for the complete Report of the Civil Society meeting of the Manila GFMD.

⁸ See Annex 6 for the comprehensive Manila GFMD 2008 Program.

UN Secretary General, Mr. Ban Ki-Moon, emphasized that the GFMD was occurring at a time of global financial crisis, and called on governments to be especially vigilant about the circumstances of migrants. Now more than ever it was incumbent upon governments to reaffirm how migration can and should be a tool to help lift countries out of economic crisis. But only by safeguarding the rights of migrants and ensuring that they are treated with the dignity and respect due to any human being, can governments create the conditions for migrants to contribute to development. *Exploitation is the antithesis of development.* Politicians and policy makers needed to cooperate across borders. Deep cooperation was also essential between governments and Civil Society.

In her keynote address, **Her Excellency President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo** observed that people are a country's biggest national asset at any time in the course of its economic, social and political development. *Development could not occur in the economy without human development.* She thus called on all countries to ratify the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. The Philippines' comprehensive system for protecting expatriate workers abroad is recognized by international agencies as a model for others. In 2007, the Philippines led the ASEAN region in coming out with a Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers. Manila also hosted the International Conference on Gender, Migration and Development in September 2008.

But the Philippine Government also understands that migration was not the only or best solution for development. To ensure that going abroad as a career option would not be the only choice for Filipino workers, the Government is working to create appealing employment opportunities focused on the development of certain sectors that give high-income jobs. One example is business process outsourcing, which has created about 400,000 jobs in the Philippines in the last 7 years. In this way, the best and brightest can stay closer to friends and family, and help build communities as well as the next generation of leaders.

The wellbeing of migrants and their families is a concern that crosses borders in every conceivable direction. Hence, countries share a responsibility for better protecting migrants, particularly against financial and economic shocks and the side effects of such shocks, exploitation, abuse and other forms of ill treatment. Globalization should be for everyone, not just for the fittest. We need a world, where we are all equally part of a *"caring and sharing" global community*. Governments need to care for their workers in times of financial stress and even when there is no financial stress.

Other speakers from the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Belgium, the Philippines, the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific Group of Countries (ACP) and the Global Migration Group (GMG) gave their support to the Government of the Philippines during the opening plenary session: **Mr. Ghobash Saqr**, United Arab Emirates Minister of Labor, supported the Manila GFMD's call for shared responsibility and partnership among governments to protect the rights and improve the quality of life of millions of contractual workers employed in the Gulf States. The UAE government recognized the significant contribution of migration to the personal development of contractual workers, and to the development of both their countries of origin and destination. **Ambassador Rudi Veestraeten**, Belgian Special Envoy for Immigration and Asylum, reiterated Belgium's commitment to promoting dialogue and cooperation on migration and development, and its appreciation for what the Philippines has done to further the cause of the GFMD process. Philippine **Labor Secretary Marianito Roque** stressed that the management of migration is a *shared responsibility*. Agreements or treaties at bilateral and international levels can be useful vehicles for establishing benchmarks to protect migrants, assure mutual recognition of skills, and empower migrants as agents for development.

ACP Secretariat Secretary-General **Sir John Kaputin** underscored the need for political will, effective action and dynamic change today as governments join forces and build partnerships in search of measures and policies that protect and empower migrants for development. IOM Director General **Mr. William Lacy Swing**, speaking on behalf of the Global Migration Group (GMG), expressed hope for a continuing and strengthening collaboration with the Global Forum, making full use of GMG member agencies' respective areas of expertise and operating within their respective mandates, while at the same time promoting coordination of their responses to GFMD needs.

For lack of time, the **General Debate** could only accommodate the interventions of Bangladesh, El Salvador and France. **Bangladesh** proposed that labour placement fees, if they are to be paid at all, should have a

ceiling rate of one month's salary, to prevent exploitation of migrant workers and to limit their pre-departure debts. Bangladesh also suggested that countries of origin and destination develop mechanisms to make the contracts of migrant workers fair, transparent and enforceable, urging them to set realistic minimum wages for all combinations of skill and experience. **El Salvador** underscored the need for open public policies and adjusting foreign policy to address migrants' concerns. The purpose of the newly established Vice Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Salvadorans Living Abroad was to integrate Salvadorans abroad with El Salvador and to protect and empower them wherever they were. **France**, as current President of the European Union, announced the recent adoption of the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum, which gives the highest political commitment to facilitating migrant remittances, strengthening the role of the diaspora as actors in development, and encouraging the circulation of competencies while limiting the negative impact of brain-drain. Other delegations, shortlisted for the General Debate,⁹ were requested to submit their respective proposed interventions, copies of which are posted on the Philippine GFMD website.¹⁰

3.2. The Roundtable sessions

ROUNDTABLE 1 – MIGRATION, DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

(Coordinator: Ms. Estrella Lajom Roman)

Roundtable 1 discussed the condition of migrants and their families, and showed how the protection and empowerment of migrants could strengthen their personal development and the development of their countries of origin and destination. Migrants are best able to contribute to development in both the countries of origin and host countries, when they are protected and empowered socially, economically and in terms of their basic human rights.

Countries along the migration continuum - origin, transit, and destination - share a common obligation and responsibility to ensure that the rights of migrants are respected. They also need to provide an enabling environment that will help migrants optimize the potential gains of crossing borders. Such enabling policy environments can only be fostered if governments approach migration in a holistic manner and engage multi-sectoral and non-traditional stakeholders, including the private sector and diaspora communities.

RT 1.1 Protecting the Rights of Migrants – A Shared Responsibility

(Co-chairs: Philippines and United Arab Emirates)

Roundtable 1.1 focused on the rights of migrants and what countries have been doing to protect these rights. The following areas were tackled in the session:

- Ratification and implementation of the 1990 UN Convention and relevant ILO Conventions.
- Need to devise mechanisms that would improve rates of ratification and implementation of the 1990 UN Convention, and look at complementary approaches in applying the principles of international treaties in practical and concrete ways.
- Need for political will in order to translate the concept of “shared responsibility” into tangible policies and programs on protecting migrants' rights.
- The role of the GFMD in facilitating an exchange of good programs and policies in deepening dialogue and cooperation among governments, and in promoting a sense of shared responsibility among various stakeholders.
- The continuing need for international cooperation that will enhance and ensure protection, particularly regarding international organizations like the UN and its family of agencies like ILO,WHO,UNIFEM and others such as the International Organization for Migration.

Main Observations and Findings

⁹ Australia, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Ecuador, Germany, China, Republic of Korea, Colombia, Iran, Norway, India, Malaysia, European Commission.

¹⁰ See <http://government.gfmd2008.org/>

The panel presentation brought to light many good practices of host and origin countries in protecting migrants' rights.

The **Philippines'** comprehensive approach is a model of protection supported by legal and institutional mechanisms that look after migrants' interests at every stage of the "life-cycle" of migration, i.e., pre-departure, on-site, and return and reintegration. Managing labour migration for over thirty (30) years has taught the Philippines the key elements of effective protection: engagement of bilateral, regional, and multilateral partners, a domestic consultative decision-making process that involves migrants and their families, and a system of regulation, protection, reintegration and support, which involves the private sector.

As a country of destination with unique demographic characteristics (e.g., 90% migrant workforce), the **United Arab Emirates** (UAE) has taken the initiative to deepen dialogue and cooperation with Asian countries of origin as well as to upgrade its legal and policy framework to integrate a human rights-based approach to managing labour mobility. As a direct result of the Colombo Process and Abu Dhabi Dialogue, UAE, Philippines, and India have embarked on a pilot project to improve practices and cooperation between them in administering the employment cycle of Indian and Filipino contract workers in the UAE. Now, in the Manila GFMD, the UAE has actively participated in promoting the concept of shared responsibility and shared interest in protecting migrants' rights.

Ecuador called for the right of migrants not only to legal migration but also to voluntary return. The Ecuadorian Government issues a Universal Passport as a symbol of the aspiration of every person to travel anywhere in the world. **Norway** identified key elements of effective protection, including implementation of human rights standards and sharing of responsibility in ensuring decent work.

In the general discussions, delegates were challenged by **two questions**: 1) Do you agree or disagree that there is a connection between protection of human rights and the ability of migrants to contribute to development? 2) Do you know of examples of cooperation between countries of origin and destination?

Connection Between Protection and Development

Generally, there was consensus that migrants' rights must be protected, not only because protected migrants contribute more to economic development, but because it is their basic human right. **Protecting the rights of migrants is not only the right thing to do, but also the smart thing to do.** Protecting the rights of migrants allows them to contribute better to development in origin and destination countries and to live better and fuller lives for themselves and their families.

People are the country's biggest national asset. Economic development cannot occur without human development, that is, without human beings who are healthy, educated, employed, and able to care for their families. In this regard, the need to protect the rights of women migrant workers, child migrants and migrants in irregular situations was emphasized.

One delegate underlined the importance of ensuring that the rights and labour standards of migrants, including refugees, are upheld. Refugees can become agents of development if they are provided with opportunities to make use of their skills and productive capabilities while living in a country of asylum.

Migrants are covered by specific international conventions, many of them from the ILO, that focus on terms and conditions of work, access to host country services such as housing, family reunification and redress of grievances. But while many of these conventions have already come into force, their application in practice remains an issue and is, in part, a function of ratification by both origin and host countries.

Thus, delegates of countries that are party to the 1990 International Convention and relevant ILO Conventions echoed the call for ratification of these instruments. Others gave their views on the need to devise mechanisms to improve rates of ratification and implementation of the 1990 Convention. Many called for the continued forging of bilateral and other agreements where no binding protocols exist, and to

look at complementary approaches in applying the principles of international treaties in practical and concrete ways. Actual protection in practice is the critical measure.

Shared Responsibility

Protecting the rights of migrants is a shared responsibility of governments of origin and host countries, as well as Civil Society stakeholders and the private sector. Enhanced dialogue, cooperation and genuine partnership between these actors is necessary for more effective protection of migrants' rights, while recognizing the different, yet complementary roles of each of these sectors. Close cooperation is needed to ensure that migration happens by choice and not out of necessity.

Political will needs to be exercised in both origin and destination countries to make shared responsibility operational in terms of tangible policies and programs on protecting migrants' rights. But non-government actors from Civil Society and the private sector also play an important role.

Some delegates emphasized the importance of having a skills-based work permit system rather than a sponsorship-based system, so that migrants' rights are protected even if the sponsor terminates the contract. Others suggested the establishment of grievance mechanisms in host countries. Capacity building through twinning projects between origin, transit and host countries is also important.

Domestic policy interests need to be considered. In a democratic society, we need to balance competing interests especially in situations where the numbers of migrants impact on the basic public service delivery systems.

Good Practices of Shared Responsibility

A number of good practices were mentioned during the general discussions, such as: the **Quito Declaration** of 2008,¹¹ which has served as the basis of the work of the South American States in 2008; the **Montevideo Declaration on Migration, Development and Human Rights of migrants** adopted by 11 Latin American countries in 2008 on proactive approaches to protection of migrants' rights;¹² the **Abu Dhabi Declaration** of 2008 establishing four partnerships for development between countries of origin and host countries in Asia, and the resulting UAE/India/Philippines pilot projects; and the **EU cooperation** with Moldova and Cape Verde that includes re-admission arrangements, capacity-building, facilitation of entry for third country nationals, as well as limited residence titles.

Chile has a national migration policy that protects the rights of Peruvians in the country. By working with neighbouring countries on joint consular assistance, Chile has regularized 60,000 undocumented migrants, who were also given access to justice and health. To replicate this good practice, it was proposed that countries promote a culture of reception of migrants.

Portugal authored a Resolution at the 61st World Health Assembly in May 2008 on the "health of migrants", which calls for a coordinated approach at international level among competent agencies, and the need to promote migrant health at the national level to help the integration and social development of migrants.

France proposed the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum, which was recently adopted by the European Council, and which gives the highest political commitment of the European Union and its Member States to a common policy on immigration matters vis-a-vis EU citizens and non-member countries.

Other delegates underscored the important role that **GFMD** plays in promoting the protection of migrants' rights. While there may seem to be no discernible singular global protection regime for migrants to date, it is the duty of the international community and the GFMD to promote an agreeable global system of protection based on sharing of actual experiences and lessons learned. The GFMD is about governments informing

¹¹ The Quito Declaration was adopted in 2008 at the First Andean Forum on Migrations (4-5 September 2008).

¹² The Montevideo Declaration on Migration, Development and Human Rights of Migrants was adopted by on 19 September 2008 at the 8th South American Conference on Migration.

other governments on what they are doing, and how they are doing it in cooperation with other countries, international organizations, and other actors.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions:

1. *Set up a Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development*, which could conduct a study on the actual links between protection for migrants and their capacity to contribute to development.
2. *Develop a compendium of best practices at national, regional and international levels on protecting migrants*, which may be replicated and monitored on a continuing basis.
3. Continue forging *bilateral and other* agreements where no binding protocols exist to ensure protection in practice.
4. *Undertake capacity building in both origin and host countries* for ensuring welfare and protection of migrants through relevant institutions, structures and mechanisms.
5. *Monitor and evaluate* GFMD outcomes/proposals and recommendations.
6. Explore closer linkages with the UN Human Rights system.

RT 1.2 Empowering Migrants and Diaspora to Contribute to Development

(Co-chairs: Belgium and El Salvador)

This RT session discussed the three tracks by which migrants and diaspora could contribute to development, and the challenges for governments in providing the necessary enabling environment to empower migrants to become agents of development, i.e:

- i) facilitate diaspora engagement in development activities;
- ii) leverage the voluntary contribution that remittances can make to development;
- iii) provide diasporas with investment opportunities for development.

The discussion drew links with RT 1.1 on protecting the rights of migrants abroad, and drew in part on the work and outcomes of the Brussels GFMD on diaspora resources for development. It identified some effective practices for migration and development policy makers in countries of origin and host countries, and the policy environments which have made these work.

Main Observations and Findings

Migrants and diaspora contribute to positive development in both host and home countries through remittances, investment, knowledge transfer, technology transfer, sharing of ideas, creation and expansion of networks, and the establishment of business partnerships.

To maximize the use of the resources they bring or send home, migrants need a conducive policy environment, the key elements of which include strong reliable domestic institutions in countries of origin, secure legal status for migrants, and incentives and tools in origin and host countries that encourage migrants to contribute to development. Likewise, partnership between origin and host countries is needed to facilitate the diaspora's financial, technological, and social contributions in both countries.

In **Ghana**, members of the diaspora who were previously regarded with suspicion have been redefined as "angels of development" in the last 20 years, a marked change in attitude towards the diaspora's potential to

contribute to development. However, the conditions for realizing this potential are not simple. Economic and political reforms at home and in host countries need to be combined with active recognition of the roles of the diaspora and returnees. Government actions to foster diaspora engagement in development may include setting up coordinating structures, conducting skills audits, providing incentives through domestic policies, building on the existing capacity and role of migrant organizations such as Home Town Associations (HTAs), improving research and data, and developing residency rules that facilitate movement and allow migrants and diaspora to serve as bridges between home and host country development efforts.

In **El Salvador**, the Vice Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Salvadorans Abroad recently conducted studies with the Central Bank and two major universities, which found that Salvadorans abroad have a growing interest in investment opportunities in their home country, even as they continue to send remittances. The studies showed the importance of property investments, and pointed to the need to create migrant-friendly financial instruments and services to facilitate and increase savings and investment, such as mutual funds, investment funds, special savings accounts, insurances and other instruments.

Like protection, empowering migrants and diaspora to contribute to development is a function of all actors in the migration process: states (origin and destination), workers, employers, intermediaries, Civil Society, and the international community. Partnerships and cooperation among these varied stakeholders are essential.

A number of delegates urged governments to promote the exercise of political rights of migrants by allowing them to vote and hold dual citizenship, to ensure continued connection to the home country. Some presented the option of issuing diaspora bonds to tap into the wealth of nationals abroad. Others recommended that governments establish a standard lexicon or dictionary of terms that will cover the migration process, in order to promote commonality of understanding. For example, how is a diaspora truly defined: is it a biological link or an emotional and patriotic link?

Good Practices in Empowering Migrants for Development

Various country programs have demonstrated good practices in terms of facilitating diaspora contributions to development. **Germany's** recent policy to open a larger number of legal migration channels is complemented by incentives and tools to help the diaspora invest in their countries of origin. For example, Germany provides a grant line for investment in home countries, a web page to identify safe and economical means to transfer remittances, and a returnee program that includes financial assistance and livelihood opportunities at home. Another facility provides finance for enterprise development to returnees.

Norway has launched a pilot program in Pakistan to encourage public-private partnership by matching diaspora contributions to development with an equivalent sum of official development assistance (ODA). The project also promotes capacity building of diaspora organizations in development projects so that they can compete for ODA funds. The Immigrant Council in Oslo is a model of diaspora empowerment and engagement, which facilitates communication between immigrants and the host society and gives the immigrants a voice in local affairs. Diaspora communities are represented on the Council, thus giving them leverage and ensuring that "someone speaks for the diaspora" in policy-making.

France has supported a recent survey conducted by the African Development Bank on remittances by migrants between France and Morocco, Senegal, Mali, and the Comoros. The survey aimed to establish an inventory of financial flows, identify the mechanisms that govern the remittance market, and determine the formal and informal channels used to remit. The co-development savings account, introduced in 2006, enables a migrant to save up to €50,000 and to benefit from a tax deduction as soon as these savings are invested in economic development projects in the home country. The tax deduction can amount to 25% of the net global income of the tax household. Nationals of some fifty countries are eligible for this account.

The **United Kingdom** actively engages diaspora in the development of poverty-reduction strategies; helps inform diaspora through websites about the comparative costs of remittances (sendmoneyhome.com), and promotes diaspora volunteerism. The UK is looking at technological devices (e.g. mobile phones) to reduce the costs of sending remittances home, and has established remittance partnerships with Nigeria, Ghana and Bangladesh. It has developed programs to support recovery in post-conflict countries, for example by

funding diaspora members to fill senior positions in newly re-established governments. **Switzerland** has arrangements with 40 countries on portability of social benefits, which cover 90% of the immigrants in Switzerland.

From the country of origin perspective, the **Philippines'** national reintegration center provides the diaspora with education and training on entrepreneurship as well as language instruction, skills upgrading, and family circles or support groups. **Comoros** has a system for inviting diaspora members back to the country for 1-3 months, which has worked well. **Chile** maintains a registry of nationals abroad in cooperation with host countries. **Israel** has a "birthright" program that allows diaspora youth to connect with Israeli Jewish culture and language.

With 12 million Mexican-born in the US, **Mexico** sees a greater long-term potential for development through the networks of diaspora talents abroad than through remittances. Mexico is thus helping its emigrants to integrate in the US. **Portugal** also emphasized the "virtuous cycle" between integration in the host country and development contributions in the country of origin.

Like other origin countries seeking to engage the diaspora more intensely, **Mali** has set up a social and cultural council for Malians abroad. Mali's co-development agreement with France also includes organizing visits to Mali of young people of Malian origin and twinning villages in Mali with communities in France.

India, with some 20 million of its nationals abroad, believes that expatriate investments have been the drivers of 17 industries at home. It ascribes its success in attracting investments (rather than just remittances for consumption) to its reliable domestic institutions as well as the fact that most Indians abroad enjoy secure legal status in host countries.

Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA) programs have employed thousands of people through the creation of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and agricultural cooperative projects. MIDA programs have been launched by **Italy** with Senegal and Ghana. **Belgium** conducted an assessment study of MIDA programs in the Great Lakes region and found that medical doctors, nurses, farmers and teachers belonging to the Central African diaspora living and working in Belgium return to their home countries for a limited amount of time to participate in designing development policies in the field of health, education and agriculture. They help strengthen the government institutions of their home countries.

Networking with the diaspora is a common strategy of countries of origin to maintain links and to engage them in development-oriented programs. **Jamaica organizes** an annual gathering of Jamaican diaspora groups in the country. **Chile's** President meets with communities abroad whenever she travels to encourage the involvement of diaspora. Chile has an inter-ministerial committee that keeps track of the diaspora's engagement in promoting human rights, social agendas, education, and aid to development. Some delegates also proposed greater exploration of "virtual return" of diaspora through the use of new technologies.

Alongside the good practices, **some needs** were also identified: **Comoros**, for example, has 30% of its population abroad, with high remittance returns to the banks. But the remittances are not used productively, because people have no training in money management or investment. Systematic investment in the second generation of emigrants helps overcome low educational attainment, which has limited their contribution to Comoros. For **Algeria**, the challenge is to channel remittances towards productive development-oriented projects that would prevent increased migration. **Switzerland** sees the need to raise awareness in the financial sector of immigrants' needs and business potential. Many remittances still flow through informal channels because migrants do not understand how to access financial services. **Senegal** is looking at the need to create "banks" of projects which could be supported by diaspora groups.

The **World Bank** reports that, since only 3% of the world's population migrates, migrants are hardly able to drive development. The international agenda on migration and development should be to tap the wealth of diasporas, not just their incomes. One way of doing this is by issuing diaspora bonds at "patriotic" discounts, such as Israel and India have done successfully (admittedly under special political circumstances). Since diaspora have local currency needs, they do not demand as high an exchange rate risk premium as other investors. While diaspora bonds may be promising, governments called for more diversified financial and

networking tools in order to channel family remittances into community activities. Networking and twinning arrangements between diaspora and home communities may well be effective tools for this.

Delegates encouraged the **GFMD** to support and promote specific, concrete projects for diaspora participation, especially during this time of global financial crisis, which may result in unemployment of skilled immigrants whose expertise is needed in their home countries.

Given the mutual benefits of migration and diaspora activities, a number of countries of origin see a shared responsibility between origin and host country in empowering diaspora and their resources for development. One country of origin has challenged the World Bank to do a study on the balance of costs and benefits of migration for countries of origin and host countries.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions:

1. Prepare a *catalogue of good practices* in joint arrangements to support and empower migrants and diaspora in their contributions to development.
2. Establish a *standard lexicon or dictionary of terms* that will cover the migration process, to promote greater commonality of understanding;
3. Consider issuing *diaspora bonds* to tap diaspora wealth for development;
4. Create '*banks*' of projects that could be supported by diaspora groups;
5. Support programs such as the G8 Global Remittance Working Group and the Africa Remittances Institute.
6. Encourage measures to promote the exercise of political rights and political participation, such as overseas voting and dual citizenship, to promote continued connection to the home country.
7. Respect human dignity and fundamental rights, regardless of the residence status of migrants and diaspora members.

ROUNDTABLE 2 SECURE, REGULAR MIGRATION CAN ACHIEVE STRONGER DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

(Coordinator: Dr Irena Omelaniuk)

This Roundtable was intended to complement the discussions of Roundtable 1 on protecting and empowering migrants by addressing the assumption that *regulated migration programs* provide the best frameworks for such protection and empowerment. The two Roundtable sessions explored ways to foster regular migration programs that generate income benefits to migrants and a sustainable labour supply for both the origin and host countries, while taking action against irregular migration that can disempower migrants and reduce their potential gains for development.

Good practices were offered, particularly in taking a comprehensive approach to managing migration. There was a specific focus on temporary labour mobility and the criminal forms of smuggling and trafficking that can flourish where regulation is weak and labour market policies contradict migration policies. Capacity building was another key factor emphasized to develop credible partnerships, particularly in regional settings.

RT 2.1 Fostering More Opportunities for Regular Migration

(Co-chairs: Bangladesh and Canada)

This session examined practical ways to foster more opportunities for temporary foreign worker programs that optimize benefits for migrant workers, employers, source countries and host countries. The working paper outlined some basic features of managed temporary foreign worker programs and the Chair identified some policy questions that governments and other stakeholders need to address: in particular how migrants can access information about regular migration, and how governments can actually reach the migrants.

The panel discussion comprised two parts: Reports on four follow-up projects implemented or pursued following the Brussels GFMD in 2007, and a discussion of the Chairs' working paper on basic elements of a workable temporary labour migration program.

The follow-up projects included a workshop on circular migration held by Mauritius and the EC in Mauritius in September 2008, a compendium of good practices in bilateral temporary labour arrangements prepared by Morocco and Spain (with OSCE, IOM and ILO) and an experts' workshop on the compendium in Madrid in October 2008; and the first stages of a study on engaging the private sector in lowering the costs of migration for the migrants and their families.

Main Observations and Findings

Governments agreed that migration policies - be they for temporary or longer term migration - need to be *comprehensive, coherent and transparent*, both in terms of their goals and by including all relevant government agencies. They should take into account the interests of employers, migrants, Civil Society, and so forth. In other words, there needs to be institutional coherence, where all relevant actors know what their roles are and how they relate to the roles of others. A number of countries pointed out that comprehensive labour migration policies could also help avoid brain-drain.

Following on from the Brussels GFMD discussions on bilateral and circular migration, **Mauritius** and other governments reported how they had already embarked upon bilateral agreements for circular migration. Bilateral arrangements between **Spain and Morocco** are featured as good practices in the *Compendium on Good Practice Policy Elements in Bilateral Temporary Labour Arrangements* compiled by OSCE, IOM and ILO after the Brussels GFMD. These show how governments can together devise programs that are accessible, flexible and meet the needs of all concerned. They include mutually agreeable terms for admission, work abroad and return or repeat migration.

Effective matching of workers and skills to labour market needs is crucial to ensure that migration programs offer more opportunities to migrate in regular ways, particularly for lower skilled migrants. **Sweden** is undertaking labour migration reform, which will be based on employer requests for foreigners that cannot be filled by local workers. Similar to the traditional immigration countries, Australia, Canada and USA, **Sweden's** new work permit system would allow for both temporary and permanent immigration, according to labour demands and the migrants' own livelihood needs. **Norway** is looking at the possibility of offering temporary work opportunities to low skilled employees from developing countries in connection with development projects back home. The **Morocco-Spain** seasonal labour migration programs are based on careful selection and placement of contract workers to meet labour needs of both countries,

Countries of origin and their labour market needs were considered, for example, in the context of avoiding brain drain. **Mauritius'** circular migration pilots with countries like **France** help meet labour needs in both countries, but also assure migrants' reintegration into the Mauritian job market by combining pre-departure cross-sectoral job training with upgrading of skills and accumulation of capital abroad. **The Philippines**, with more than 30 current agreements with host countries, prepares its labour emigrants for reintegration before departure, re-trains them overseas and builds into its agreements foreign employer support for human resource development programs back home. The **European Commission** calls for the engagement of employers, unions and Civil Society in migration management to better match migration with labour needs.

Circular migration was seen as central to the migration-development debate. It challenges the traditional concepts of temporary bilateral labour migration by linking migration planning to labour market and development planning at both the origin and host country ends of the process. It potentially creates a *tension* between immigration policies of destination countries and the development aspirations of source countries.

These tensions can be resolved by mutual agreement and commitment between countries. Migrants must be given the opportunity to accumulate relevant, new skills in the host country, but also to use them productively upon return, if they are to contribute to development.

The temporary labour migration programs of **France, Spain and Portugal** are based on legislation that allows more circular movement. The Morocco-Spain programs prepare and train the migrants for voluntary return and economic reintegration, and result in a migrant return rate of some 95%. The new pilot circular migration program between **Mauritius and France** offers lower skilled workers incentives both to go abroad and return to greater work and business opportunities at home. **Sweden**, which in 2008 chaired an IGC workshop on Circular Migration,¹³ is introducing a flexible regime to permit short and long term entry and re-entry of foreign workers, and is looking at repatriation grants, portability of pensions, dual citizenship and simplified application procedures to foster more circularity of migration. **Argentina** advocates an open door policy for temporary foreign workers and allows for longer term stay and citizenship after 2 years.

But increased opportunities for legal migration also have potentially negative effects such as brain drain and remittance dependency; and smart, flexible policies involving all stakeholders – government, private sector, migrants, civil society – are needed to avoid or mitigate these. **Mauritius** sees comprehensive migration policies as the first ingredient of any successful circular migration program. It has also set up a multi-sectoral Empowerment Program to better manage and encourage the economic reintegration of its migrant workers.

A number of developing countries, both receiving and sending migrants, called for *more universal temporary and circular labour migration programs*, along the lines advocated by Sweden, in preference to country-specific preferential circular migration agreements.

Governments generally wanted to know more about how labour migration policies can best be designed to contribute to development in origin and host countries. Temporary and circular migration are not the only solution to development challenges. but where managed properly, they have an enormous potential to contribute to development. Temporary migration is often a livelihood strategy by migrants (the old paradigm of permanent settlement does not always apply). The more accessible and flexible migration programs are, the more beneficial they may be for the migrants and their families. Policy makers need to review the potential barriers and facilitators for mobility, and develop more enabling legislation for global mobility.

For example, a number of states mentioned that the time limits for temporary labour migration may be too short for migrants to save enough and not resort to overstaying. Procedures should be simpler and less bureaucratic, and allow for multiple entry and change of status and employer in the host country. A number of host countries allow temporary migrant workers to leave the country for short periods without forfeiting their temporary residence status. Sweden permits absences of up to 12 months without loss of residence status. Other enabling measures and incentives to empower migrants as agents of their own development are:

- lower the costs of migration (through cheap loans (subsidized until banks learn the risks; or no fees);
- repatriation grants;
- access to social security; portability of pensions; refund of social security payments;
- recognize the rights of migrants and their families;
- dual citizenship;
- include civil society and the business sector in preventing exploitation of workers;
- bilateral- and multilateral agreements and dialogues;
- equal employment opportunities for migrants;
- mutual recognition of skills/qualifications.

For greater policy coherence, these should be accompanied by empowering measures such as reducing the cost of remittances and enhancing investment and business start-up capacities of migrants and their families.

Delegates saw a need to further explore and consider the **rights of migrants** engaged in circular migration or temporary labour migration programs. Seasonal migrants, for example, often do not have full access to social security or pension funds. More needs to be known about the impacts of reduced migrant rights in the host

¹³ The workshop was held by the Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees, Geneva, 9-10 April, 2008.

country on the wellbeing of children and families left behind in the country of origin. The GFMD should encourage *comprehensive legal frameworks* in origin and host countries for the protection of migrant rights and to promote cooperation between countries in this respect. Civil Society gave some clear messages about addressing the social costs of migration through policies and measures on: family reunification, reintegration, security fund/retirement packages, and information packages for migrants and their families.

Public information programs, and facilities to disseminate information and training, such as Migrant Information (or Resource) Centres, were an effective way for people to better avail themselves of the legal opportunities and rights. The Chair discussed the role that governments and official information programs can play in a world where informal, Internet-based information outlets abound. He posed the questions: What does a potential migrant worker need to know, and how does s/he access it? How can governments best reach migrants and provide them information that may lead to safe, productive migration choices.

Web portals for persons seeking work abroad or information on how to remit their earnings had been set up in some countries, and these could be adapted in other countries. **Colombia** has a portal called www.colombianetworks with information for Colombians on service provision, consular services and diaspora contacts abroad, which has some 15,000 users. The **Sri Lankan Government** posts all information about job opportunities, salaries, recruitment agencies etc on its website, and regulates the signing of job agreements. Information centres are being established by the EU and the ACP in countries like **Mali**, and their usefulness in fostering more regular migration needed to be assessed for future GFMD meetings.

Governments saw a clear need for **capacity building**, particularly in countries of origin seeking to use migration as a means of expanding labour market opportunities. Drawing from the Moroccan-Spanish program, Spain believes that sustainable management of migration flows requires a strengthening of capacities of migration administration in the countries of origin. This extends also to strengthening pre-departure information/orientation and setting up Migrant Information Centres. The EU has recently launched a) a migration information centre in Mali to provide pre-departure information about legal opportunities and rights of migrants and how to manage remittances; and b) a Mobility Partnership with **Moldova** to help set up databases, manage labour supply to local and overseas markets and integrate migrants.

Finally, there was a repeated call for a compilation of best practices in how to set up the structures to strengthen opportunities for regular migration and reduce irregular migration. Governments were reminded of the Compendium on bilateral temporary labour arrangements prepared by the Governments of Spain and Morocco and the training handbook *Essentials of Migration Management* developed by IOM, which were both available on the GFMD website. The question was how to keep the Compendium a live process - how to continue updating and expanding it to address evolving concerns and practices of governments.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions

1. Undertake *assessments of some pilot circular migration schemes* (e.g. Mauritius-France) to evaluate and highlight best practices and to enrich the below Compendium of good practices.
2. Expand and update the *Compendium of Good Practice Policies on Bilateral Temporary Labour Arrangements* prepared for Spain and Morocco by OSCE, IOM and ILO, and include contact information on persons in countries with experience in these types of program.
3. *Complete the project begun in 2007* to assess how to lower the costs of migration through greater involvement of banks and financial institutions.
4. *Compile information* for all governments on available websites and other information vehicles regarding jobs abroad and/or available supply of labour that can facilitate regular labour migration.
5. Explore how international and other organizations inform migrants; and assess how Migrant Information Centres (e.g. in Mali) are working to achieve better informed migration.

RT 2.2 Managing Migration and Minimizing the Impacts of Irregular Migration

(Co-chairs: Australia and Thailand)

This session discussed the *links between irregular migration and development*, and how unregulated forms of migration can weaken personal and public security and the potential flow-on gains for development. The chairs and panelists gave examples of effective, comprehensive practices already in place in countries across diverse regions: Australia, Czech Republic, Greece, Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Thailand, and the UK. They considered areas for further work to fill the knowledge gaps, particularly relating to the link between irregular migration and development. There was a special focus on trafficking, which offered some important models of comprehensive and cooperative policies.

Main Observations and Findings

There is a strong conviction, and some evidence, that irregular migration increases personal risks and reduces developmental gains. When migrants find themselves in irregular status, particularly through the criminal actions of *migrant smugglers and traffickers in human beings, or the exploitative behaviour of recruiters or employers*, they are at high personal risk. For example, they have less access to social welfare and medical attention, or to formal banking and other financial systems, and little access to grievance mechanisms in case of exploitation or abuse. Finally, migrants can lose all the economic or social benefits they had hoped to accrue for themselves, their families and communities.

Exploitation, abuse, reduced income and other negative side effects of smuggling, trafficking and illegal recruitment can reduce the welfare of the migrants and their capacity to remit earnings or transfer other kinds of benefits back home. Such disempowerment of migrants also has negative consequences for the country of origin and the host country, and strategic relations between them, as well as for the credibility of migration. This in turn can turn public opinion against migrants and negatively influence migration policies.

Governments agreed that enforcement policies alone have failed to prevent or solve irregular migration. Countries like **Australia, Czech Republic, New Zealand, Thailand and the UK**, have found that a comprehensive approach, which balances more effective admission arrangements to match workers with real jobs, enforcement against illicit forms of migration, and capacity building and international cooperation, can bring benefits for all concerned. A comprehensive package approach includes labour migration programs coupled with employer sanctions, criminalization of people smuggling and trafficking, information campaigns, capacity building, and international cooperation, particularly at bilateral and regional levels.

It was noted that most countries – both emigration and immigration – already have systems in place to regulate the movement of people. Some of these intentionally or unintentionally aim at maximizing the benefits of migration for migrants, their families and their countries. The models differ from country to country, in accordance with different needs and capacities, different stages of development and of management of migration. Diverse geographical situations, ranging from the long green borders between South Africa and its neighbours to the expansive stretches of sea between Northern Africa and Southern Europe, influence policies in different ways.

While there may be no standard or universal solutions, there are some essential, common elements of good practice to guide new policies and programs. The **United Kingdom** is seeking to balance stricter e-border operations and penalties against employers hiring unauthorized foreign workers with a more flexible, transparent points-based admissions system and voluntary return and reintegration options for irregular migrants. The UK is also exploring the linkages between labour market needs and migration, and monitoring the impacts of its points-based immigration program on developing countries, to report to the GFMD in 2009. The **Czech Republic** works with partner countries like Georgia to combine labour market planning, information to migrants, incentives to return and support for reintegration in a comprehensive approach to fostering regular migration and reducing irregular migration.

Following new EU thinking on linked-up approaches to migration and development, the dialogues between Europe and Africa or the West Mediterranean countries are promoting partnerships between origin and host countries that foster regular migration, reduce irregular migration and support development back home. **France** has in the past two years introduced new migration legislation and policy, and set up a Ministry of Migration, Integration and Development to better link these policy areas. **France** has six co-development agreements with African countries that combine migration management with development projects.

Most countries have legislation and programs in place to prevent, prosecute and protect against **trafficking in human beings**. Special institutional structures have been set up in Australia, Belarus, Greece, Egypt, Italy, Netherlands, Pakistan, UAE and the UK to coordinate national counter-trafficking strategies. But few governments connect their counter-trafficking policies with development initiatives, as does **the UK**, which links trafficking prevention projects in developing countries of origin to its poverty reduction programs. Few governments allow victims of trafficking temporary residence with work rights as do **Greece** and **Italy**. Different policy approaches may also be needed today to respond more pre-emptively to the economic and labour dynamics of trafficking.

Delegates identified the following key elements of “good practice” policies to combat trafficking in persons:

- Incorporation of international treaties in national legislation, policy and practice;
- A National Action Plan against Trafficking in Persons;
- A “whole of government” approach to coordinate the activities of all agencies involved in managing irregular migration;
- Public information campaigns;
- Closer management of the migration/employment nexus at origin and destination ends;
- Strong sanctions against employers, traffickers, smugglers and others, as a deterrence;
- Effective victim protection; giving particular regard to gender considerations, children and those fleeing persecution;
- More operational cooperation among authorities across affected countries;
- More systematic study of the economics and economic impacts of trafficking in persons.

Delegates repeatedly urged that efforts to combat irregular migration should not criminalize the migrant. In the **MERCOSUR** sub-region, irregular migration had been reduced in recent years through a more open policy of residence and resettlement for nationals of the member countries. Immigrants are generally granted the same civil, social and economic rights as nationals. **Mexico** has a comprehensive program to assist unaccompanied minors returned from the USA, also to reintegrate them into communities of origin in other countries. **Thailand** has introduced stricter penalties on traffickers, illegal networks and corrupt officials, but also has MOUs with neighbouring countries to register and regularize their irregular migrants. Thailand has also created farming projects along its borders with large migrant source countries, expected over time to generate revenue and income for the partner countries as well as job opportunities for the migrants.

As in RT 2.1, **public awareness-raising** campaigns were seen as effective tools of prevention of irregular migration, particularly smuggling and trafficking. Among the good practices are a West African musician/rapper who warns youth against the evils of irregular migration (compare the Ricky Martin campaign against trafficking in Latin America). In addition to pre-departure information, diplomatic channels were often used to disseminate information to migrants once abroad, as well as to Home Town and migrant associations. Training workshops and radio broadcasts in local languages can also work.

There was a call for more specialized services for migrants, such as offered by **Morocco**, **the Philippines** and others in the host countries. There was also a need for more web-portals for potential migrants, such as in **Sri Lanka**. The **EU** and the **ACP** were establishing facilities in Africa to inform, train and/or prepare migrants for work abroad (e.g. the Mali job centre). Governments also needed to talk more with NGOs and the private sector at the very outset of any new policy thinking.

As in RT 2.1, **capacity building** was seen as critical to ensuring viable inter-governmental cooperation in managing migration. Not all countries are as yet equipped and ready to take a comprehensive approach to managing migration. The lack of policies, institutions and implementation capacities has in many countries contributed to a higher incidence of irregular migration. Governments admit that even where there are

comprehensive programs and MOUs between partner/neighbouring countries, the cost of migrating legally may be higher than for irregular migration, and the incentives too low to persuade migrants to migrate legally. Governments saw a need for better management of the issuance of passports, travel documents and entry/re-entry visas, all of which are frequently too costly for low income migrants from poorer countries.

Most examples of effective capacity building partnerships are at the bilateral level, also with non-state expert agencies and within regional processes. The **Czech Republic** works with the Government of **Georgia** to strengthen information and overseas job referral services to potential migrants. The **UK** links training, awareness raising and poverty reduction strategies in migrant source countries to its migration management. **Australia** supports a five-year regional project in Asia to strengthen specialist and law enforcement responses to trafficking in persons.

Regional and inter-regional cooperation may offer the best means of jointly building capacity to curb the harmful effects of people smuggling and trafficking, and jointly reap the benefits of orderly migration. For example, the *Bali Process on People Smuggling, Human Trafficking and Related Transnational Crime* has demonstrated success in international cooperation, partly due to the freedom that members have to discuss difficult issues frankly and work towards solutions on matters of common interest and shared priority. It was recommended to implement an earlier GFMD proposal and bring the collective experiences of regional consultative processes (RCPs) together at an inter-RCP meeting in Asia in 2009 prior to the Athens GFMD.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions

1. Conduct *targeted research on costs-benefits and impacts of regular and irregular migration* on development for developing countries with significant inward and outward migration flows.
2. Organize a *meeting of heads of regional consultative processes*, possibly in Bangkok, to share information on migration and development-related activities and achievements (see also RT 3.3).
3. Establish a *systematic method of data collection and analysis of trafficking* (eg. based on IOM's CTM database; and expand this to include e.g. the economic circumstances of the victims).
4. Explore *what the discussions in the GFMD and RCPs can learn from each other* about good practices between origin and host countries, including capacity building and international cooperation to curb people trafficking and smuggling. This would follow up on the outcomes of the Brussels GFMD and link with RT 3 outcomes.

Finally, there were two messages common to both RT 2.1 and RT 2.2 sessions relevant to RT session 3.1:

a) Urgent need for information – for migrants and policy makers alike. This was a recurring theme, and pointed to the following areas for further attention:

- Information on migration flows (e.g. are flows becoming more temporary or circular quite naturally or by policy design?); demand and supply; impacts of temporary vs. permanent, or high skilled vs. low skilled migration on development; best practices to set up labour migration/circular migration programs; and on temporary vs. permanent migration as voluntary choices.
- Migrants and diaspora need information on temporary legal migration programs, salary and working conditions, laws and regulations in destination countries, risks of irregular migration, how migrants can engage in development work, send remittances cheaply and effectively.

b) The effects of the global financial crisis on regular and irregular migration, and its impacts on development: A number of delegates called for further discussion on this; but a cautionary note was also struck about over-estimating the current crisis in migration terms. It was agreed that better linked-up labour market and migration planning is likely to help governments make projections about migrants' situations in

times of financial or economic strife. There is a need to study more deeply the effects of the financial crisis on migration in general and remittances in particular. The crisis brought to light the critical need for partnerships between origin and host countries to mitigate any negative impacts at either end.

ROUNDTABLE 3 - POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL COHERENCE AND PARTNERSHIPS

(Coordinator: Dr Rolph K. Jenny)

This Roundtable looked at how policy and institutional coherence and partnerships can optimize the beneficial impact of migration on development, and vice versa, and how these can be strengthened at the national, regional and international levels among the diverse stakeholders in migration and development.

The logic underlying the three sessions that made up Roundtable 3 was: What do policy makers need to know in terms of data and evidence to develop coherent policies; how can coherent policies, institutional arrangements and partnerships be developed and assessed at the national and international levels; and how do regional and inter-regional processes and fora contribute to coherent policy making in the field of migration and development.

Following the pattern established by the first GFMD meeting in Brussels, the three sessions focused their discussions and findings on a) strengthening data and research tools; b) achieving policy and institutional coherence; and c) regional consultative processes, inter-regional consultative fora and regional organizations and economic integration processes. These issues of coherent governance, administration and cooperation in the two interlinked fields of migration and development directly underpin the topics and achievements of the other two Roundtables.

The Roundtable sessions also built on such GFMD Brussels follow-up activities as the survey on policy and institutional coherence conducted by the Swedish Government and the data and research expert meeting hosted by Finland.

Roundtable 3.1 Strengthening data and research tools on migration and development

(Co-chairs: Argentina and Finland)

Following the debate on migration data at the GFMD Brussels, this session aimed at broadening the discussion by focusing more on the necessary tools and mechanisms to strengthen the collection of relevant and timely data and looking at the priority areas for more specific and policy-relevant research. All delegates reaffirmed the paramount importance of good data and research for better identification of the migration-development interplay and for good policy making by governments and other actors.

Main Observations and Findings

The two panelists pointed, *inter alia*, to the following areas: The need to focus research on poverty reduction through skill transfers to migrant origin countries, rather than remittances only; impact and causes of migration; transit migration; the problem of varying migration definitions and concepts; the relationship and cooperation between data collectors in government and specialised non-governmental entities, including accessibility of data gathered by governments; the absence, in some developing countries, of migration registries; the need for comparable data and same survey methodologies; in the context of the development impact on migration, more research on the relation between out-migration of labour and the flow of capital and technology; more in-depth research on the multiple benefits and negative aspects of migration in both origin and host countries, the longer-term advantages/disadvantages of regularizing migrants.

A representative of the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) explained the outcomes of the expert seminar on data and research hosted by Finland, placing special emphasis on the recommendations resulting from this meeting, including the creation of a data and research expert group. The Center for Global Development (CDG) reported on the work undertaken by the Commission on International Migration Data for Development Research, highlighting, *inter alia*, the need for better administrative data, reliance on existing survey results, building capacity for better data collection and dissemination, and the inclusion of country of birth and citizenship in the national censuses.

The ensuing discussions focused on three broad questions: why **better data and research** is particularly important in the area of migration and development and what better working methods are needed; what the **key priorities** are in this area, and **how the GFMD process could help** facilitate better data and research.

It was suggested that data collection methods should be standardized at the national level before proceeding with harmonization at regional and international levels. Research was needed on such issues as separation and reunification of families, gender and children, and the impact of foreign exchange rates on the value of remittances. More effective exchange of information among relevant government offices and with non-governmental actors would ensure that relevant information reaches policy makers in a timely way. Capacity building was needed to equip border control bodies to collect more reliable data; and for research on the impact of climate change. Delegates supported the working paper proposal to create a *Working Group on Data and Research*, comprised of government experts and academia. A pilot project could develop a model on universal data collection and analysis.

Delegates recognized the need to focus on the link between the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs), migration and poverty reduction strategies, and the role of diaspora in this context. More in-depth studies of South-South migration were needed, as well as assessments of the impact of migration on development and *vice versa*. The following areas were identified for further study: capacity building for better data collection; country experiences on return and reintegration programs; better use of existing resources and researchers; making available all existing data; analysis of labour market developments and skills training; easier access to data from destination countries; an action agenda to make data accessible and reliable; the need to disaggregate OECD data by age, occupation and gender; the difficulty of measuring diaspora populations; inclusion of migration-relevant data in the 2010 round of censuses; the EU-ACP migration observatory, etc.

Better data and research

Several reasons were given for the need to improve data and research on migration and development:

- Given the complexity of international migration, understanding its **reality** is a task of paramount importance, requiring sufficient time and effort to develop **better, more timely data** and undertake **policy-relevant research**. Combating **myths** through robust facts was also critical.
- There is a need to work towards a better understanding of the holistic nature of the **migration-development and development-migration nexus**, i.e. a better understanding of how **development may drive or deter migration**, and of how **migration shapes development outcomes** in origin, transit and destination countries.
- Given the opportunity that the GFMD and other initiatives in this area present for developing better and more coherent policies, it is necessary to know **what policies work, and don't work**, in promoting development, and how policy-relevant information and evidence can support this.
- We also need to know quickly how the **current global economic turmoil** will shape migration flows and impacts.

What are the priorities?

While there are countless areas in which data and research could be improved, the session identified the following priorities: a) more robust, timely **raw data** on the scale and nature of migration flows, b) better analysis of the **policies, causes and impacts** of migration, and c) better **assessments of the impacts of different policies**.

Within these priorities, the session identified as specific priorities: i) **clearer definitions of the terminology and concepts** around migration; ii) **greater comparability** of data across countries; iii) **making existing and new data and research outcomes more accessible** to policy-makers; and iv) fast **availability of data** given the current **financial and economic crisis**.

Areas that would require more attention in the coming years were: 1) how migration impacts **children, gender relationships and families**; 2) how migration affects **progress towards the MDGs**; 3) the nature of

South-South migration; and 4) how to make better use of the **diaspora** in promoting sustainable development in origin countries.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions

1. Set up a *Data and Research Working Group* to bring together *government experts from developing and developed countries, international agencies and academia* to consider how to improve data and research. This would be an ad-hoc group acting as a clearing house to keep abreast of relevant data and research initiatives, promote comparability and accessibility of existing activities, advise GFMD meetings on the most relevant findings and recommendations, and identify ways to take forward data and research-related conclusions from GFMD meetings. Several measures could be explored by the Working Group such as promoting regional cooperation on improving data and research, and piloting a project to promote best practice on data collection and sharing.
2. Individual states should *ensure that adequate and appropriate migration questions are included* in all censuses of the *2010 round of national censuses*, considering the important opportunity presented by the 2010 round to collect good migration data.
3. Pursue *capacity building efforts on data and research*, recognizing the shared interest and necessity to improve *technical capability* in this area, yielding direct benefits for individual countries – including how countries could improve their input into their *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)* – but also generally contribute to *improving a shared understanding of migration and development* and its impacts around the world.

Roundtable 3.2 Policy and Institutional Coherence

(Co-chairs: Indonesia and Switzerland)

This session addressed the critical question of how to achieve policy, program and institutional coherence in the area of migration and development. It gave recognition to the fact that such coherence is crucial to maximizing the benefits of migration for development, and to assessing the impacts of development on migration. Two main policy challenges had been identified in the session working paper: How to move from rhetoric to implementing initiatives to increase policy and institutional coherence, and how best to assess the impact of programs and institutional arrangements.

The session was also informed by the second survey on policy and institutional coherence undertaken by the Government of Sweden among a significant number of governments, following the Swedish survey undertaken for the Brussels GFMD in 2007. Also discussed were the many other policy areas that affect both migration and development – not least the financial and economic crisis that is likely to have a profound impact on development as well as on migration and the protection of migrants.

Given the multiple government agencies with responsibilities for migration and development, and the complexity of inter-linkages between migration and development (and other policy areas, such as trade, health and welfare), coherence is essential but difficult to achieve. Without it, however, policies and institutional responses will continue to be ad hoc and uninformed.

Main Observations and Findings

Most delegates agreed that there was an urgent need for greater policy and institutional coherence within government, between government and non-state actors and between the many different fora working on migration and development.

Priority areas

A number of priority areas were identified both in the discussion and in reviews of Poverty Reduction Strategies, national development plans and donor policies, where coherence was particularly lacking:

- **Remittances**, with a particular focus on reducing costs, strengthening financial institutions through which remittances could be transmitted, and strengthening financial literacy of senders and recipients of remittances; where governments and diaspora could work together more coherently.
- Working with the diaspora and with migrants abroad: Delegates saw as comprehensive and effective **Colombia's outreach program to its diaspora** through consulates, embassies and websites, an approach based on the notion that coherence at home attains coherence internationally.
- **Return and reintegration of migrants** in the context of a) **circular migration** and coherence around **pension portability**, b) coherence between **regular and irregular migration policies** (mutually reinforcing and beneficial, and not simply contradictory) and c) greater international coherence on **post crisis reintegration** of migrants and refugees.
- **Involving migration policies in the development of PRSPs**, national development plans and donor development programs; and the **capacity building** required to achieve this
- **Protection of migrants** at all stages of migration, in both source and destination countries, with particular focus on a) **information** for migrants about their rights and responsibilities, b) special needs of **women and children**, and c) combating **trafficking** in persons.
- **Legal mechanisms for migration**, to **reduce irregular migration** and offer greater policy coherence for admission of migrants. The particular focus was on youth, preferably through educational programs that train them for jobs at home, when possible, and legal migration opportunities abroad.
- **Improving data**, particularly on diaspora and migrant communities and their potential contributions to development of home and host countries.

Institutional coherence

Delegates identified a number of mechanisms to promote **institutional coherence within government**, including inter-ministerial taskforces, national focal points, working groups and commissions. The newly created French Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Mutually Supportive Development, bringing together a wide range of migration, development and other relevant competencies under one umbrella within government, was recognized as a most useful approach.

But governments also needed to provide sufficient **human and financial resources** to promote such structural coherence, and to ensure comparability between **resources allocated to irregular migration** issues and those dedicated to facilitating **regular migration**. Coherence also implied involving migration policies in the development of PRSPs, national development plans and donor development programs; the capacity building required to achieve this, and the inclusion of migrants in such planning processes.

Lastly, existing **national, regional** (RCPs and other fora) and **international** (GFMD) mechanisms for policy dialogue and action needed to promote policy and institutional coherence.

The key challenge in moving forward was how to sustain and broaden the momentum of the GFMD discussion on this theme. Sweden's second survey indicated that some 80% of governments recognized the importance of the migration-development nexus, but only some 50% had integrated this understanding into their national development plans.

Also, while there are many new institutional arrangements and initiatives, these have not yet been evaluated for their effectiveness in achieving coherent governance, or their impact on development. The Swedish survey itself was a useful tool to take forward, but could include a question about how governments were actually devising policies that fed into their Poverty Reduction Strategy Programs (PRSPs). It could be broadened to cover more information that governments were prepared to contribute. Such survey action should be repeated, not necessarily each year to give governments more time to adjust their policies.

Capacity building was repeatedly mentioned as critical for many governments struggling with a lack of resources and means to achieve greater policy and institutional coherence. In response to what role the GFMD could play in building governments' capacity, delegates indicated that the GFMD already plays an important information-sharing role, but reaffirmed the need to move from words to action.

Recommendations and Possible Follow-up Actions

1. *Policy and institutional coherence should stay firmly on the GFMD agenda* to ensure continued focus and momentum.
2. The *survey on policy and institutional coherence* should be conducted again, perhaps every two years, and include open-ended questions to supplement the yes/no questions in the current survey.
3. Set up a *GFMD Platform or Working Group on Policy and Institutional Coherence*, using the GFMD website to ensure on-going exchange and stimulate the identification and dissemination of best practices in policy and institutional coherence. This would also ensure that the critical issue of policy and institutional coherence remains on future GFMD agendas.
4. GFMD could *stimulate assessment and evaluation* of the array of new policies and initiatives, including the integration of migration into PRSPs and donor development policies. The working paper recommends that the *GFMD bring experts together before Greece* to discuss best research methodologies for evaluating the policies and programs. A Handbook was one possibility.
5. *The GFMD national focal points should be strengthened* to enhance institutional coherence, and to help governments adopt new inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms.

RT 3.3 Regional consultative processes, Inter-regional Consultative Fora and Regional Organizations and Economic Integration Processes at the Interface of Migration and Development

(Co-chairs: Brazil and France)

This session looked at three forms of regional and inter-regional consultation and cooperation in the field of migration and development:

- Regional Consultative Processes on migration (RCPs);
- Inter-regional consultative fora; and
- Regional organizations and economic integration processes.

Pursuant to the outcomes and follow-up actions of the GFMD Brussels meeting, the session explored ways of strengthening the role of RCPs in enhancing the contribution of migration to development, and encouraging closer links between RCPs and regional economic integration processes and global processes such as the GFMD. It addressed more recent inter-regional fora and conferences that group together countries of origin, transit and destination to find common solutions in the migration-development context. It also looked at regional and sub-regional organizations and economic integration processes that have recently added migration to their agendas, offering yet another venue for inter-state cooperation on migration.

The session considered the extent to which these various processes are concretely affecting change in national policies and how their respective recommendations are implemented. It assessed, at the national level, whether government positions taken in regional processes and fora are consistent and coherent with those taken in international fora and *vice versa*, and whether there could be a mutually reinforcing role between the GFMD and such regional activities.

Main Observations and Findings

Delegates saw regional and inter-regional consultation and cooperation processes as offering a useful means to inform and support the discussions of the GFMD. Regional cooperation can usefully draw together neighboring countries of origin, transit and destination in their efforts to promote coherent governance of migration within and across countries, and enhance the contribution of migration to development..

Three principal forms of regional cooperation were explored through the presentation of case studies:

- **Regional Consultative Processes** on migration – informal, non-binding dialogue fora on migration that increasingly focus on migration and development. Their flexibility and focus on practical outcomes were seen as crucial to their success, and needed to be maintained. The Colombo Process and its spin-off, the Abu Dhabi Dialogue, were presented.
- **Inter-regional initiatives** - formal, inter-regional conferences gathering origin, transit and destination countries in the context of specific migration flows, concerned with concrete solutions and partnerships on migration and development. The November 2008 Paris Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, in follow up to the 2006 Rabat Ministerial Conference, was presented as the most recent example of this inter-regional approach.
- **Regional Economic Integration processes** – the example of MERCOSUR was presented to highlight how regional integration processes focused on economic growth and development are increasingly integrating migration issues in their work.

Delegates agreed that regional activities have greatly strengthened policy approaches within regions, but there was still a need to develop a framework for dialogue between regions, such as the Asia-European Meetings (ASEM) were achieving. It was suggested that a GFMD virtual group could exchange best practices on regional and inter-regional processes. The need to build trust among governments was also emphasized. A delegate speaking on behalf of the South American Community of Nations presented the Montevideo recommendations of the 8th South American Conference on Migration, Development and Human Rights; and highlighted the progress made in these areas in the sub-region. The GFMD was urged to give sufficient time and space for more in-depth exchange on regional activities.

One delegate called on the GFMD to establish clear criteria for the participation of regional fora in GFMD meetings. Other delegates rather saw a need to maintain the informality and outcome-oriented nature of regional processes, their ongoing role in capacity building, and the freedom of RCPs to decide whether to integrate development considerations in their agendas. Yet the GFMD was an important venue to exchange information on regional activities and the mutually reinforcing roles of regional activities and the GFMD, and to help with implementation of understandings reached at the regional level. **One delegate confirmed his government's intention to sponsor a meeting involving all relevant RCPs in the first half of 2009.**

Many other delegates presented their concrete experiences in RCPs, sub-regional bodies and integration processes and inter-regional initiatives and conferences, emphasizing the specificities of these regional activities. They also stressed the mutually reinforcing role of these regional efforts and the global debate of the GFMD in achieving coherent policies on migration and development and better governance of migration.

The session reaffirmed that there is a role for each of these types and levels of inter-state dialogue and cooperation. There is also a key role for bilateral cooperation, which often brings the most concrete results, targeted at specific situations. Each has its specificities, and hence there is value in a wider forum such as the GFMD offering the possibility of sharing regional experiences and providing 'a political voice from the regions at the global level'.

Governments also agreed that all such fora, regional sub-regional, global, needed to be informed by basic principles, foremost among them respect for the rights of migrants

The challenge was how to achieve coherence, how to get good information and how to take this forward in practice. Some governments considered that RCPs could develop virtual platforms for information sharing and exchange, and that **the GFMD could contribute to this by creating a platform for information exchange ('observatory') on regional fora** dealing with migration and development. The GFMD website could be a useful tool for such information exchange.

Several RCPs, including the South American Conference on Migration and the League of Arab States have organized themselves in preparation for the GFMD, and to prepare their common approaches. They propose to do this on an annual basis.

Some delegates felt it was still too premature to develop any formal linkage between the GFMD and regional fora. Such fora were successful because governments considered them necessary, and because there were concrete interest and participation. However, the next GFMD meeting in Greece could offer a good opportunity for regional fora to present their most recent achievements and to support information sharing and emerging synergies between regional and inter-regional activities and the GFMD. Delegates concluded that the RCP exchanges continued to be important for the GFMD.

Recommendations and Possible follow-up Actions

1. Hold a *meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs)*, possibly in Bangkok in the first half of 2009, to share experiences and lessons learned. The meeting would be sponsored by Australia and organized by IOM; and its results presented in Athens in 2009.
2. The GFMD should continue acting as a *venue for informal exchange among RCPs, inter-regional fora and initiatives, and regional integration processes*, including by using the GFMD website for ongoing information exchange on the activities of such fora.
3. Consideration should be given to holding *side events at the next GFMD meeting in Greece* for regional fora that wish to share their experiences.

Roundtable 4 - Special Session on the Future of the GFMD

(Coordinator: Mr. Francois Fouinat)

This session was intended for heads of delegations to review the GFMD Operating Modalities adopted in Brussels in line with the evolving needs of the GFMD process. It was chaired by Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Migration and Development. Since its inception at the UN High Level Dialogue in New York in 2006, the GFMD had established itself as an ongoing process to promote useful dialogue and exchange between government policy-makers in a constructive atmosphere.

The immediate future of the GFMD seemed secure, thanks to the hosting offers by Greece, Argentina, Spain and Morocco. The foundation of the GFMD process nevertheless still needs to be strengthened. The Operating Modalities adopted in Brussels have proven to be appropriate, but as agreed by the Troika of Chairs, and their supporting Steering Group, they should continue to be adjusted according to evolving needs of the process.

Main Observations and Findings

Based on an earlier assessment of needs by the Chair-in-Office, followed by a series of consultations with the GFMD Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum throughout 2008, the last Friends of the Forum meeting in September 2008 agreed to create a light **GFMD Support Unit** to assist future Chairs-in-Office with basic administrative matters. A majority of Friends of the Forum states also agreed that the light support unit should be hosted by IOM in Geneva, following a selection process by the Chair, in consultation with the Troika and Steering Group. The Support Unit would be directed by, and report to, the GFMD Chair-in-Office. Progress on the establishment of the unit and the related negotiations with IOM were to be reported on in Manila by the Chair-in-Office.

Under-Secretary Conejos reported to the session that the MOU governing the establishment of the GFMD Support Unit had been negotiated with IOM. The budget had been reduced to USD 355,000 and its staffing would comprise two positions: a Head of Unit (P4) and an Administrative/Finance Assistant (G5/6). Funding for the first year could be secured by making use of contributions from donor countries, including through the possible earmarking of unspent contributions.

Mr. Conejos also announced that, after consultation between the Troika and the countries which have offered to host the Forum in the future, some modalities for the rapid recruitment of staff had been agreed. The Chair-in-Office would immediately post the vacancy notice for the Head of Unit position on the GFMD website, inviting applications to be submitted on or before 30 November 2008. These would be reviewed by the Chair-in-Office and a short list submitted to the other Troika members and the future hosts (Argentina, Spain, and Morocco) for comments. The Troika (Philippines, Belgium, and Greece) would then select a candidate by 15 December, and IOM would be requested to issue a contract in order to have the Unit established by January 2009. The Administrative/Finance Assistant would be recruited through the regular procedure by IOM, which would submit a short list to the Chair-in-Office for final selection.

Delegations generally supported this procedure. One delegation recalled its earlier objection to IOM involvement, on grounds that the Support Unit should be hosted by a UN entity. The Chair and several other delegations re-affirmed that hosting was a purely administrative matter, which should not entail any substantive involvement in the Forum process on the part of the hosting agency.

The session then proceeded to a general debate on the **longer-term future of the GFMD**.

Regarding possible *follow-up action and reporting on GFMD outcome activities*, there was a consensus that the Forum is not directly responsible for monitoring projects and for follow-up actions that emanate from its meetings. It would however be in the interest of all participants to be informed about initiatives connected to the Forum and learn about their results and impact. A website, administered by the Support Unit, could help achieve this goal. In other instances, when interested governments wish to focus on specific issues, they could establish working groups to report their findings to the Forum. The session also noted with interest the offer by the outgoing Chair-in-Office to look into implementation of follow-up actions devised during its presidency.

On the subject of *GFMD links with the UN*, UN Assistant Secretary-General Stelzer informed the session that a recent survey of UN Member States conducted by UNDESA confirmed that GFMD is considered an effective follow-up to the UN High-Level Dialogue, while, at the same time, migration continues to feature on the General Assembly agenda. Possible modalities for linking the two are indicated in the recent report by the Secretary-General on the HLD follow-up. In the ensuing debate, in spite of a minority view about stronger links, there was general consensus that while light, the GFMD links with the UN were also strong. The continuous backing of the Secretary-General and the important role played by his Special Representative for Migration and Development in the process are proof of this. There was also clear agreement that the Forum and the UN serve different purposes, but are complementary. There was an overwhelming view that the links should therefore stay as they are.

The Global Migration Group (GMG) should be considered an obvious partner for providing expert support in the preparation of GFMD meetings, and for implementation of GFMD outcomes. The preparations of the Manila GFMD enhanced the working relationship between GFMD actors and certain GMG agencies. The Chair, for instance, benefited from the expertise of IOM and ILO, and inputs from the Committee on Migrant Workers, in conceptualizing its flagship Roundtable session on “Migration, Development and Human Rights.” Most of the Roundtable session teams were also assisted by at least one GMG member agency in the development of the working paper and/or conduct of the Roundtable session.

Relationships with Civil Society were also reviewed. There was a consensus that the fundamental purpose of the Forum is to permit a dialogue between governments. There was also a recognition that this dialogue needed to be informed by a relationship with Civil Society. The approach undertaken at the Manila Forum was deemed to have achieved a proper balance in this regard. At the same time, the relationship could evolve in several ways, including a more extensive interface with governments, an expansion of the range of stakeholders, with special emphasis on private sector, fostering a continual consultation process at the national level and a greater involvement in the preparation of the Civil Society meetings.

The issue of *relations with regional organizations and processes* elicited a number of comments from the floor. The value of regional consultations and processes was emphasized by certain delegations, that also encouraged a better communication between GFMD and these initiatives, notably to disseminate ideas and

promote dialogue on concrete approaches to deal with regional migration and development issues. Governments engaged in regional consultations and processes should keep the GFMD abreast of regional migration and development initiatives, in line with the recommendations of RT 3.

Although *GFMD Funding* was not considered a burning issue, thanks to governmental and non-governmental contributors, a number of delegates pointed to the need to broaden the donor base. The rationale for this was twofold: ownership of the GFMD by an increasing number of countries; and a need to dispel possible perceptions that the GFMD is a donor-driven process. While the suggestion of an assessed contribution system was deemed impractical, a number of delegations encouraged voluntary contributions, even symbolic ones. The contributions could be made directly to the Chair-in-Office or to the special GFMD Support Unit account set up by IOM to be dedicated to funding GFMD related activities. Donors from governments and private foundations are invited to limit their earmarking to the minimum.

The Chair encouraged participants to resolutely adhere to the features that make GFMD a unique endeavor, a place of true and frank dialogue where government representatives can share their ideas and experiences, even when they fail. He also advocated a better balanced approach between migration and development, and called for deeper involvement of development policy makers in the future.

4. Closing Plenary

The General Rapporteurs for the three Roundtables reported on the key findings and proposed follow-up action items from the RT discussions: Ms. Patricia Sto. Tomas (Philippines) for Roundtable 1; Mr. Han-Maurits Schaapveld (Netherlands) for Roundtable 2; and Ms. Judith Macgregor (UK) for Roundtable 3. The substance of their statements is reflected in this Final Report. The list of concrete follow-up actions likely to be addressed and/or implemented before the next GFMD meeting in Athens is available in Annex 1.

Summing up the outcomes of the Future of the GFMD session, **Mr. Peter Sutherland** reported that there had been a chorus of support for the achievements of the Forum, particularly in changing the thinking, the language and the way governments are dealing with each other on migration and development issues.

As the incoming chair of the GFMD, **the Greek Deputy Minister of Interior, Mr. Athanassios Nakos**, reported that Greece's preparations for next year's GFMD have begun, with the establishment of a multi-agency team including national and international subject experts. The Government has entrusted the organization of the Civil Society component to the public welfare foundation **Alexandros Onassis**, which already assumed its new function following the handover ceremony with the Ayala Foundation on 28 October in Manila. Greece will work to ensure the continuity and institutional memory of the Forum. The new GFMD Support Unit can be a useful tool in this respect. The objective of continuity can be better served by a small flexible unit to serve each Chair according to its specific needs.

Greece proposes as the overarching theme of the Athens GFMD 2009 meeting, "*Integrating Migration Policies in Development Strategies for the Benefit of all, and especially Countries of Origin*". The Greek Government pledged its full involvement and support for the next GFMD meeting. Greece plans to host the next GFMD meeting **in Athens on 4-5 November 2009**.

In his **Final Conclusions and Recommendations**, the GFMD Chair, **Mr. Esteban Conejos**, identified the two overriding achievements of the Manila GFMD as **continuity and change**: continuing and advancing the process of consultation and collaboration begun in Brussels last year, and changing the way the world looks at migration and development. The meeting had moved forward by a few more decisive steps an ongoing process that is changing governments' thinking and actions on migration and development, and changing the way governments deal with each other on these two interrelated issues. It had done this by building on the substantive achievements of the first meeting in Brussels and consolidating the structures that would assure continuity of the process.

As part of the change, the Philippines had chosen the theme "*Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development*" in order to shift the debate away from the usual rational arguments about the economic benefits of migration, and back to the migrants and their families. The greatest wealth of any country is its

people, and the development benefits they can bring are only possible when they are properly protected and supported.

The informality of the process, without declarations or formal commitments, has helped governments to achieve more in terms of partnerships and good practices than may be possible in other formal debates about principles and doctrine. The concrete outcomes reported by the Roundtable rapporteurs are a testimony to the fact that governments are beginning to achieve a certain **consensus of understanding** about what the important connections are between migration and development, where the gaps of knowledge are and how to fill those gaps. They take governments one step closer to agreeing on common solutions to common challenges. They bring them closer to a **consensus on action**.

The GFMD was now firmly established as an ongoing, government-led, non-donor-driven process with links to the UN. Relations with the GMG and Civil Society generally would continue to evolve. Thematic priorities should also adapt to changing global circumstances, such as the current global financial crisis. Policy and institutional coherence should continue to be on the GFMD agenda. The Forum can provide the framework for periodic reviews of data, research, methodologies, evaluation techniques, pilot programs, how governments integrate migration into their national development strategies etc.

The Philippines would pass the GFMD torch to the Hellenic Republic on 15 December 2008 in Athens.

In his closing address, **Philippine Vice President Noli de Castro** reiterated the Government's commitment to the **"Manila Call to Action"** which enjoins governments and all other stakeholders to ensure coherent, fair and gender-sensitive migration and development policies and practices. He observed that the Manila GFMD had achieved its aim of moving beyond the "what" to tackling the "how" of migration and development, e.g. how to include migration in national and local development strategies, circulate the skills of migrant workers, and measure the effectiveness of international efforts to protect migrant workers, among others. Close collaboration between government and Civil Society, and between origin and host countries, could achieve the necessary programs on the ground and distribute the responsibilities for migration and development. But in shifting the focus from the macro plan to the specific programs on the ground, governments now needed to give priority to resource generation to ensure that programs for migrants are properly and sufficiently funded.

Annex 1

Proposed Outcomes of Manila GFMD 2008*

RT 1.1

1. Set up a **Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development**, which could conduct a study on the actual links between protection for migrants and their capacity to contribute to development.
2. Develop a **compendium of best practices** at national, regional and international levels on protecting migrants, which may be replicated and monitored on a continuing basis.
3. Continue forging bilateral and other agreements where no binding protocols exist to ensure protection in practice.
4. Undertake capacity building in both origin and host countries for ensuring welfare and protection of migrants through relevant institutions, structures and mechanisms.
5. Monitor and evaluate GFMD outcomes/proposals and recommendations.
6. Explore closer linkages with the UN Human Rights system.

RT 1.2

7. Prepare a **catalogue of good practices** in joint arrangements to support and empower migrants and diaspora in their contributions to development.
8. Establish a **standard lexicon or dictionary of terms** that will cover the migration process, to promote greater commonality of understanding.
9. Consider issuing diaspora bonds to tap diaspora wealth for development.
10. Create 'banks' of projects that could be supported by diaspora groups.
11. Support programs such as the G8 Global Remittance Working Group and the Africa Remittances Institute.
12. Encourage measures to promote the exercise of political rights and political participation, such as overseas voting and dual citizenship, to promote continued connection to the home country.
13. Respect human dignity and fundamental rights, regardless of the residence status of migrants and diaspora members.

RT 2.1

14. Undertake **assessments of some pilot circular migration schemes** (e.g. Mauritius-France) to evaluate and highlight best practices and to enrich the below Compendium of good practices.
15. Expand and update the **Compendium of Good Practice Policies on Bilateral Temporary Labour Arrangements** prepared for Spain and Morocco by OSCE, IOM and ILO, and include contact information on persons in countries with experience in these types of program.
16. Complete **the project begun in 2007** to assess how to lower the costs of migration through greater involvement of banks and financial institutions.

17. *Compile information* for all governments on available websites and other information vehicles regarding jobs abroad and/or available supply of labour that facilitate “matching” and regular forms of labour migration.
18. Explore how international and other organizations inform migrants; and assess how Migrant Information Centres (e.g. in Mali) are working to achieve better informed migration.

RT 2.2

19. Conduct **targeted research on costs-benefits and impacts of regular and irregular migration** on development for developing countries with significant inward and outward migration flows.
20. Organize a *meeting for heads of regional consultative processes*, possibly in Bangkok, to share information on migration and development related activities and achievements (see also RT 3.3 below).
21. Establish a systematic *method of data collection and analysis of trafficking* (eg. based on IOM’s CTM database; and expand this to include e.g. the economic circumstances of the victims).
22. Explore what the discussions in the GFMD and RCPs can learn from each other about good practices between origin and host countries, including capacity building and international cooperation to curb people trafficking and smuggling. This would follow up on the outcomes of the Brussels GFMD and link with RT 3 outcomes.

RT 3.1

23. Set up a **Data and Research Working Group** to bring together *government experts from developing and developed countries, international agencies and academia to consider how to improve data and research*. This would be an ad-hoc group acting as a clearing house to keep abreast of relevant data and research initiatives, promote comparability and accessibility of existing activities, advise GFMD meetings on the most relevant findings and recommendations, and identify ways to take forward data and research-related conclusions from GFMD meetings. Several measures could be explored by this Working Group such as promoting regional cooperation on improving data and research, and piloting a project to promote best practice on data collection and sharing.
24. Individual states should *ensure that adequate and appropriate migration questions are included* in all censuses of the **2010 round of national censuses**, considering the important opportunity presented by the 2010 round to collect good migration data.
25. Pursue *capacity building efforts on data and research*, recognizing the shared interest and necessity to improve *technical capability* in this area, yielding direct benefits for individual countries – including how countries could improve their input into their *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)* – but also generally contribute to *improving a shared understanding of migration and development* and its impacts around the world.

RT 3.2

26. **Policy and institutional coherence should stay firmly on the GFMD agenda** to ensure continued focus and momentum.
27. The *survey on policy and institutional coherence* should be conducted again, perhaps every two years, and include open-ended questions to supplement the yes/no questions in the current survey.

28. Set up a ***GFMD Platform or Working Group on Policy and Institutional Coherence***, using the GFMD website to ensure on-going exchange and *stimulate the identification and dissemination of best practices* in policy and institutional coherence. This would also ensure that the critical issue of policy and institutional coherence remains on future GFMD agendas.
29. GFMD could *stimulate assessment and evaluation* of the array of new policies and initiatives, including the integration of migration into PRSPs and donor development policies. The working paper recommends that GFMD ***bring experts together before Greece to discuss best research methodologies*** for evaluating the policies and programs. A Handbook was one possibility.
30. ***The GFMD national focal points should be strengthened*** to enhance institutional coherence, and to help governments adopt new inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms.

RT 3.3

31. Hold a ***meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs)***, possibly in Bangkok in the first half of 2009, to share experiences and lessons learned. The meeting would be sponsored by Australia and organized by IOM; and its results presented in Athens in 2009.
32. The GFMD should continue acting as a ***venue for informal exchange among RCPs, inter-regional fora and initiatives, and regional integration processes***, including by using the GFMD website for ongoing information exchange on the activities of such fora.
33. Consideration should be given to holding ***side events at the next GFMD meeting in Greece*** for regional fora that wish to share their experiences.

* Note: the practical outcomes likely to be implemented in the short-medium term are highlighted in bold.

ANNEX 2**ROUNDTABLE SESSION TEAMS****ROUNDTABLE 1: Migration, Development, and Human Rights**

Coordinator: Estrella Lajom Roman

RTD 1.1: *Protecting the Rights of Migrants – A Shared Responsibility***Co-leaders:** Philippines and UAE**Team Members:** Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, Chile, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan**RTD 1.2: *Empowering Migrants and Diaspora to Contribute to Development*****Co-leaders:** Belgium and El Salvador**Team Members:** Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, China, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Portugal, Switzerland**ROUNDTABLE 2: Secure, Regular Migration can Achieve Stronger Development Impact**

Coordinator: Dr. Irena Omelaniuk

RTD 2.1: *Fostering More Opportunities for Regular Migration***Co-leaders:** Bangladesh and Canada**Team Members:** Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Mauritius, Morocco, Nicaragua, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, UAE**RTD 2.2: *Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impacts of Irregular Migration*****Co-leaders:** Thailand and Australia**Team Members:** Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Korea, The Netherlands, South Africa, United Kingdom**ROUNDTABLE 3: Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships**

Coordinator: Dr. Rolph Jenny

RTD 3.1: *Strengthening Data and Research Tools on Migration and Development***Co-leaders:** Argentina and Finland**Team Members:** Mexico, Morocco, Senegal, Turkey, UNCTAD**RTD 3.2: *Policy and Institutional Coherence on Migration and Development within Government*****Co-leaders:** Switzerland and Indonesia**Team Members:** Argentina, Australia, France, Ghana, India, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, United Kingdom, Thailand**RTD 3.3: *Regional Consultative Processes, Inter-regional Consultative Fora and Regional Organizations and Economic Integration Processes at the Interface of Migration and Development*****Co-leaders:** France and Brazil**Team Members:** Argentina, Australia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, UAE

ANNEX 3**FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PHILIPPINE HOSTING**

Donor	Amount	Purpose
Countries		
Australia	USD 20,000	Adviser Fees
Netherlands	Euro 285,000	Non-earmarked
Norway	Euro 100,000	Participation of LDC
United Kingdom	GBP 35,000	Participation of LDC
Switzerland	CHF 230,000	Preparatory Activities/Adviser Fees
Sweden	SEK 700,000	Participation of LDC
Belgium (thru IOM)	Euro 100,000	Participation of BDP/Conference Services
Greece	Euro 100,000	Preparatory Events/non-earmarked
Denmark	Euro 100,000	Non-earmarked
Ireland	Euro 100,000	Non-earmarked
Spain	Euro 100,000	Non-earmarked
Others		
ACP Group of Countries	Euro 200,000	Participation of ACP countries
MacArthur Foundation	USD 236,000	Participation of LDC

ANNEX 4

PROGRAM OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY DAYS
27-28 October 2008

<p><u>GFMD Civil Society Days</u></p> <p>PROTECTING AND EMPOWERING MIGRANTS FOR DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>27-28 October 2008</p> <p>Philippine International Convention Center, Manila, Philippines</p>	
<u>Sunday, October 26</u>	
10:00am – 7:00 pm	Registration of Participants / Delegates <i>The Heritage Hotel Manila</i>
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm	Welcome Reception <i>Grand Ballroom, The Heritage Hotel Manila</i>
<u>Monday, October 27</u> <i>All sessions will take place at the 2nd floor, Secretariat Building, Philippine International Convention Center unless otherwise specified.</i>	
7:30 – 8:30 am	Registration <i>Lobby, Secretariat Building</i>
8:30 – 9:30 am	Opening Plenary <i>Meeting Rooms 2 and 3, Secretariat Building</i> Opening Ceremony of the GFMD 2008 Civil Society Days Welcome Message: JAIME AUGUSTO ZOBEL DE AYALA Chairman and CEO, Ayala Corporation Co-Vice Chairman, Ayala Foundation, Inc. Opening Address: SHARAN BURROW, Conference Chairperson President, International Trade Union Confederation Report from Brussels Civil Society Day 2007 FRANCOISE PISSART Director, King Baudouin Foundation
9:30 – 10:15 am	<u>Plenary Session:</u> <i>Meeting Rooms 2 and 3, Secretariat Building</i>

	<p>Roundtable 1: Migration, Development and Human Rights</p> <p>Speaker: MANOLO ABELLA Chief Technical Adviser Asian Programme on Governance of Labour Migration International Labour Organization</p> <p>Roundtable 2: Secure, legal migration can achieve stronger development impacts</p> <p>Speaker: KHALID KOSER Fellow, Foreign Policy Deputy Director, Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement Brookings Institute</p> <p>Roundtable 3: Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships</p> <p>Speaker: SUSAN MARTIN Executive Director, Institute for the Study of International Migration Herzberg Professor of International Migration, Georgetown University</p>
10:15 –10:30 am	<p style="text-align: center;">Refreshment break</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Delegates Lounge, Secretariat Building</i></p>
10:30 – 12:00 pm	<p><u>Concurrent Workshops</u></p> <p>Voices from the Regions: Regional perspectives, essentials, and recommendations in international migration and development</p> <p>These workshops will be dedicated to discussing specific concerns of the world’s leading regions of migrants. Discussions will focus on crosscutting issues such as the roles and risks of women migrants; the families left behind; tapping remittances for development; and others. Additionally, discussions will also focus on the dynamics of intra- and extra-regional migration flows such as South-North and South-South trends and their impact on development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asia-Pacific / Middle East <i>(Meeting Room 5)</i> <p>Chairperson: ELLENE SANA Executive Director, Center for Migrant Advocacy, Philippines</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Africa / Europe <i>(Meeting Room 6)</i> <p>Chairperson ADERANTI ADEPOJU Coordinator, Network of Migration Research in Africa</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Americas & Caribbean countries

	<p><i>(Meeting Room 2)</i></p> <p>Chairperson OSCAR CHACON Executive Director, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean communities</p>		
<p>12:00 – 1:30 pm</p>	<p>Lunch <i>Banquet Hall, Secretariat Building</i></p> <p>Theme The Migrant Worker: Development Partner in Host and Home Countries</p> <p>Chairperson: FR. EDWIN CORROS Executive Secretary, Episcopal Commission for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People, Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines Member, Philippine Organizing Committee</p> <p>Panel of Speakers: OSCAR CHACON Executive Director, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities</p> <p>CHUKWU-EMEKA CHIKEZIE Executive Director, African Foundation for Development</p>		
<p>1:30 – 3:30 pm <u>Roundtable Sessions</u></p>			
<p>1. 1 Protecting the Rights of Migrants - A Shared Responsibility <i>Meeting Room 5</i></p> <p>Chairperson: NISHA VARIA Senior Researcher Women's Rights Division Human Rights Watch</p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i></p> <p>PATRICIA STO. TOMAS Former Secretary of Labor and Employment, Philippines <i>Chairman, Development Bank of the Philippines</i></p> <p>HAMIDOU BA International Migration Expert, Senegalese Migrants Foundation</p>	<p>2.1 Fostering Opportunities for Migration <i>Meeting Room 6</i></p> <p>Chairperson: SOFI TAYLOR Founder and Coordinator Unison Overseas Nurses Network, United Kingdom</p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i></p> <p>PHILIP MARTIN Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics <i>University of California at Davis</i></p> <p>GRAEME HUGO University Professorial Research Fellow and Professor of Geography Director of the National Centre</p>	<p>More Legal</p>	<p>3.1 Strengthening Data and Research Tools on Migration and Development <i>Meeting Room 2</i></p> <p>Chairperson: LEONIR CHIARELLO Executive Director and Head of Policy Scalabrini International Migration Network</p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i></p> <p>RICHARD BLACK Co-Director, Sussex Centre for Migration Research Professor of Human Geography, University of Sussex</p> <p>MICHAEL CLEMENS Research Fellow, Center for Global Development</p>

<p>ROLA ABIMOURCHED Researcher, Institute for the Study of International Migration Georgetown University</p>	<p>for Social Applications of GIS <i>The University of Adelaide, Australia</i></p> <p>LAWRENCE DACUYCUI Chair, Department of Economics De La Salle University – Manila, Philippines</p>	<p>ANDREA ROSSI <i>Research Fellow, Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex</i></p>
<p>3:30 – 3:45 pm Refreshment break <i>Delegates Lounge, Secretariat Building</i></p>		
<p>3:45 – 5:45 pm Roundtable Sessions</p>		
<p>1.2 Empowering Migrants and Diaspora to Contribute to Development Meeting Room 5</p> <p><i>Chairperson:</i> KATHLEEN NEWLAND <i>Executive Director</i> <i>Migration Policy Institute</i></p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i> AGUSTIN ESCOBAR LATAPI Ciesas Occidente, Guadalajara, Mexico</p> <p>FR. FABIO BAGGIO Director, Scalabrini Migration Center, Manila, Philippines</p>	<p>2.2 Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impacts of Irregular Migration Meeting Room 6</p> <p><i>Chairperson:</i> RAUL DELGADO WISE Executive Director International Network on Migration and Development Universidad Autonoma Zacatecas</p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i> NASRA SHAH Professor, Faculty of Medicine, Kuwait University</p> <p>RONALD SKELDON Professorial Fellow in Geography, Sussex University</p> <p>JEFF CRISP Special Advisor on Policy and Evaluation Policy Development and Evaluation Service United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</p>	<p>3.2 Policy and Institutional Coherence in Migration and Development Within Government Meeting Room 2</p> <p><i>Chairperson:</i> GEMMA ADABA Representative to the UN International Trade Union Confederation</p> <p><i>Resource Persons:</i> SUSAN MARTIN Executive Director, Institute for the Study of International Migration Herzberg Professor of International Migration, Georgetown University DENIS DRECHSLER Policy Analyst/Outreach Coordinator, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</p>
<p>6:00 – 6:30 pm Departure for Ayala Museum</p>		
<p>7:00 – 9:00 pm</p>	<p>A Night at the Museum</p>	

	<p><i>Ayala Museum, Makati City</i></p> <p>Ayala Museum is a museum of arts and history located in the business and financial district of Makati. It is best known for its exhibit on Philippine history known as the Dioramas, its collection of classical paintings, and for its collection of ancestral gold from Mindanao dating to the 9th and 10th centuries. The Museum will be open exclusively to the delegates of GFMD Civil Society Days for private viewing and a reception for GFMD Delegates.</p>
<p><u>Tuesday, October 28</u> <i>All sessions will take place at the 2nd floor, Secretariat Building, Philippine International Convention Center unless otherwise specified.</i></p>	
<p>8:00 – 10:00 am</p> <p><u>Roundtable Sessions</u></p> <p>3.3 Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) at the interface of migration and development</p> <p><i>Meeting Room 6</i></p> <p>Chairperson: WILLIAM GOIS Regional Coordinator Migrant Forum in Asia</p> <p>Resource Persons:</p> <p>MICHELE KLEIN SOLOMON Director, Migration Policy, Research and Communications Department International Organization for Migration</p> <p>JOHN BINGHAM Head of Policy International Catholic Migration Commission</p>	<p>8:00 – 10:00 am</p> <p><u>Workshop</u></p> <p>International Migration for the Benefit of Workers and Business: Best Practices from the Business and Professional World</p> <p><i>Meeting Room 5</i></p> <p>Chairperson: RICHARD EVANS Country Manager Manpower, Inc. Philippines</p> <p>“The Foreign Crews’ Role in the Continued Viability of the Japanese Maritime Industry”</p> <p>Speaker: YOJI FUJISAWA President, All Japan Seamen’s Union</p> <p>“Lessons Learned from the Global Shipping Industry: The Japanese Experience”</p> <p>Speaker: CAPT. TAKAO MANJI Chairman, International Mariners Management Association of Japan</p> <p>The global maritime industry is a self-regulated industry that looks after the interests of both its workers and its businesses. This session will focus on how ship owners, ship managers, and seamen work hand-in-hand to create and sustain a vital industry that has lasted centuries, indeed since the times of early international trade.</p> <p>“Ethical Recruitment in the Healthcare Industry”</p> <p>Speaker: MAY MAYOR</p>

	<p>President, Philippine Nurses Association of America</p> <p>Pressures on the healthcare systems in developed countries brought about by demographic change are forcing many health systems to recruit healthcare professionals from developing countries. What is being done to make sure that ethical recruitment practices are being followed for the protection of migrant healthcare workers.</p>
10:00 – 10:30 am	<p>Refreshment Break <i>Delegates Lounge, Secretariat Building</i></p>
10:30 – 1:00 pm	<p>Plenary Session <i>Meeting Rooms 2 and 3, Secretariat Building</i></p> <p>Beyond GFMD : From Advocacy to Policy to Action</p> <p>Chairperson: SHARAN BURROW</p> <p>Message: JONATHAN FANTON President, MacArthur Foundation</p> <p>Presentations on all Roundtable Sessions and Workshops on Voices from the Regions and International Best Business Practice. Conclusions and Recommendations.</p> <p>To be followed by a discussion on Next Steps and the Future of the GFMD</p>
1:00 – 3:00 pm	<p>Lunch <i>Banquet Hall, Secretariat Building</i></p> <p>Communication and Connection : Empowering Migrants for Development</p> <p>Chairperson: DORIS MAGSAYSAY – HO President & Chief Executive Officer, Magsaysay Maritime Corporation Member, Philippine Organizing Committee</p> <p>Panel of Speakers LORI FORMAN Regional Director, Community Affairs, Asia-Pacific, Great China, and Japan Microsoft</p> <p>MANUEL OROZCO Director of Remittances and Development Inter-American Dialogue</p>
3:00 – 5:30 pm	<p>Closing Plenary Session <i>Meeting Rooms 2 and 3, Secretariat Building</i></p> <p>The Interface Between Civil Society and Government</p>

	<p>Co-chairpersons: SHARAN BURROW</p> <p>ESTEBAN CONEJOS Undersecretary, Department of Foreign Affairs, Philippines Chair, GFMD Steering Committee</p> <p>Plenary Discussion and Open Forum with Civil Society and Government delegates. Response from the Government</p> <p>Closing Remarks: SHARAN BURROW</p> <p>Official turnover of GFMD Civil Society Days from Ayala Foundation (Convenor, 2008 Civil Society Days) to the Onassis Foundation (Convenor, 2009 Civil Society Days) with the King Baudouin Foundation (Convenor, 2007 Civil Society Day).</p>
5:30 – 7:30 pm	<p>Farewell Reception <i>Executive Lounge</i></p>

ANNEX 5

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY MEETING

Global Forum on Migration and Development
Civil Society Dialogue
Manila 2008

220 delegates from all over the world, representing concerns for some 200 million migrants met at the second Global Forum on Migration and Development in Manila to consider the rights and protections of migrants, the expansion of legal avenues for migration and the challenge of coherence within nations and across borders.

Our deliberations took place at an extraordinarily challenging time: as the world's governments struggle for responses to the global financial crisis, and the threat of climate change, and as migration policies in many regions became more restrictive.

We see the challenge to develop global architecture for recognition, respect, rights and protections for migrants as the responsibility of the UN and no less urgent than the need for transparent global governance of the financial system or that required to reduce carbon emissions. The ILO predicts that some 20 million workers will lose their jobs as economic growth stalls, and the number of people who struggle to live on less than \$2US a day will grow by another 100 million. Many migrant workers will be affected, and their families will be amongst the newly impoverished.

We must work to see that all migration is by free and informed choice.

Voluntary migration can contribute in important ways to development, but we all realize that migration is not and cannot be used as a substitute for development policy. Governments have an obligation to create a framework of laws, policies and institutions that allows this positive potential to be realized. Above all, governments of migrant-origin countries must not allow the short-term financial benefits of emigration—remittances—to divert them from the imperative of pursuing sustainable development with, at its core, an empowered citizenry that migrates only out of choice. Governments of destination countries, on their part, should not use development policy—or development assistance—as a tool for enforcement. In an increasingly integrated world, migration can carry benefits for both origin and destination countries as well as for those who migrate out of choice.

Key Recommendations:

- All governments are urged to consider the benefits of migration and resist the temptation to cut migrant numbers in the current economic circumstances.
- Governments are asked to recognize the need for the development of global architecture to ensure a rights-based approach to migration. Further we ask that they urge the UN to bring the GFMD back within its formal mandate.
- Governments should re-affirm their commitment to development through realizing the MDGs, full employment and decent work as the priorities for development

The civil society delegation considered the very themes that the Governments themselves will discuss over the coming days. Our deliberations can't possibly be summarized in this report but a much more complete record can be found on the website GFMD 2008.org. This is a record of the key recommendations, with the contents of the regional workshops integrated, and we ask that you consider them in your deliberations.

Session 1.1 Protecting the Rights of Migrants – A Shared Responsibility**Key recommendations**

Governments should:

- ratify and enforce core UN human rights treaties providing for equal treatment and the protection of migrants. This must include the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families and ILO conventions 97 and 143.
- harmonize national laws and migration policies with these existing human rights and international labour standards and ensure respect for a range of rights, including those to health, education, and freedom of association.
- recognize that freedom of association applies to all workers, including migrants irrespective of their status.
- reaffirm and reinforce protections for family unity, not only as a right itself but as a practical, proven, essential value for human development, integration, and social cohesion. Special attention, and remedies, are urgently needed to address:
 1. the social costs that long-term migration-related separation exacts on families, especially the millions of children “left behind,” and
 2. the effects of immigration policies that de-unify families, including a growing recourse to family-blind enforcement approaches and inclinations to treat lesser-skilled migrants in particular only as “temporary” workers—denied family rights—even those who are, in fact, structurally needed and engaged in employment that is long-term.
- demonstrate concern for the unacceptable, often inhumane, circumstances of domestic workers and;
 1. ensure that national labour laws offer full protection to domestic workers
 2. establish a legal complaints framework for immediate action on grievances with swift and appropriate remedy
 3. support the ongoing work of the ILO and work to build consensus to see the adoption of a Domestic Workers Convention in 2011.
- develop standard language concerning rights and protection of migrants for bilateral and multilateral agreements.
- combat criminalization of undocumented migrants, and pay specific attention to the risks faced by women migrants, including but not limited to trafficking.
- take the responsibility of investing in long-term development, including creating local opportunities for decent work, so that individuals can truly migrate out of choice and not necessity.
- recognize the large numbers of children involved and;
 1. ensure that migrant children enjoy the full range of rights, including access to health and education services, irrespective of their status.
 2. implement a moratorium on the detention and deportation of child migrants, and
 3. ensure that all migrant children have access to birth registration and the right to a nationality.

Session 1.2 Empowering Migrants and Diaspora to contribute to Development

Key recommendations

All Governments should:

- recognize the voice and the contribution of migrant organizations and the diaspora in their development of policies as they are greatly contributing to the development of their homelands and their countries of destination.
- allocate appropriate funds to enable migrant organizations and diaspora to contribute more effectively.
- facilitate the transfer and reduce the cost of remittances of all migrants through formal channels.
- Increase access to information for countries of origin with regards to the skills distribution of its migrants and diaspora so as to facilitate and enhance the current level of contribution to the country of origin.
- revise immigration policies and laws in countries of destination in order to allow migrants to return temporarily to their countries of origin in order to use their skills to benefit both country of origin and country of destination.

2.1 and 2.2 Fostering More Opportunities for Legal Migration and Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impacts of Irregular Migration

Key recommendations

- The migration and development agenda should be separated from national security issues, which not only criminalize migrants and their families (including children), but also permit discrimination, exploitation, and de-humanization of migrants. Instead, the agenda should re-centre on development issues and fundamental rights.
- Governments and society as a whole should recognize and promote the contributions of migrants to destination countries. This should imply that policies should be based on the principle of reciprocity between countries of origin and destination.
- Every person has the right to decent work. Government should expand channels for regular migration, recognizing their own workforce shortages and accommodating the demand of migrants desperately seeking employment opportunities.
- Ongoing regularization programs should be in place for undocumented citizens to become documented on the basis of fair and transparent criteria.
- All migration should lead to steps to full citizenship in destination countries, if desired. Choice should be the key component of citizenship, including the possibilities of dual citizenship. This must also be afforded to people who are stateless.
- All migrant workers have the right to labour law protections and should be able to access and seek redress to any transgression. Grievance procedure should suspend the execution of deportation or other administrative measures.

3.1 Strengthening Data and Research Tools on Migration and Development

Key recommendations

Governments should;

- accept their primary responsibility for data collection, but recognize the valuable role that civil society organizations can play in 1) filling in existing data gaps, and 2) offering constructive critiques of government data.
- recognize the importance of maintaining and sharing data in order to create a comprehensive pictures of migration and development issues.

- along with international organizations facilitate data collection in both countries of origin and destination including sex-disaggregated data.

Governments should:

- **Increase access to data**
 - ✓ To support access to micro data for research purposes
 - ✓ To increase North-South data sharing and access
 - ✓ To support a clearinghouse function of migration research and data
- **Ensure civil society is more engaged in data collection:**
 - ✓ To be more rigorous in how they collect and use data;
 - ✓ To strengthen linkages and partnerships with research networks and diaspora organizations
- **Address data gaps on “difficult” issues, including:**
 - ✓ Deaths at border, racism occurring at the border.
 - ✓ Specific groups of migrants: children, women, trafficked, forced and child labour and internal migrants.

3.2 Policy and Institutional Coherence in Migration and Development within Government

Key recommendations

Institutional coordination and coherence requires governments to:

- ensure structured dialogue between the government entities dealing with migration, including ministries of immigration, labor, foreign affairs, health, and justice, and between the law enforcement, executive, and policy-making branches of government.
- coordinate how best to structure dialogue and cooperation between relevant international agencies.
- Governments should ensure that national laws, bilateral agreements, and multilateral agreements are brought into accordance with human and labour rights standards.
- Governments should adopt policies aimed at extending social security and at ensuring the portability of entitlements of migrant workers through bilateral agreements.
- The European Union should reconsider provisions in the EU Return Directive that conflict with basic human rights of migrants and their children, particularly with respect to periods of detention, deportation and other repressive measures.
- All governments are asked to avoid detention of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, to consider and pursue alternatives to detention and never place certain groups such as pregnant or lactating women, children, survivors of torture, abuse and trauma, elderly, disabled or persons with serious health conditions, in detention.
- Temporary labour migration programs must be reformed to ensure they are framed in a rights based approach.

Governments should be alarmed by social dislocation and the all too frequent incidence of violation of the fundamental human and trade union rights of migrants in relation to temporary labour programs. Temporary work schemes should only be used to respond to established temporary gaps in labor market needs, ensure protection for the rights of migrants and be based on genuine choice.

These programs should not be used as a means of depriving workers of their rights and entitlements, replacing permanent employment or avoiding obligations in terms of social security and other protections.

Workers involved in temporary schemes should enjoy the rights to equal treatment and opportunity and wherever possible to longer-term employment opportunities and residency and/or citizenship options for those migrant workers.

3.3 Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) at the interface of migration and development

Key recommendations

- We urge governments to work with CSOs to develop better models of participation in the RCPs; models that respect diversity.
- Likewise we urge governments to apply these models at the national and global levels. The challenge now is in how to link these different levels.

Business Practices: International migration for the benefit of workers and business: Best practices from the business and professional world**Key recommendations**

- We urge governments to consider the structure of global governance in the shipping industry as a model for development in other sectors, such as for instance health, with particular reference to recruitment, workers rights, social security, safety and health, and global training standards.
- Governments should start by regulating the recruitment industry by licensing, meaningful sanctions and the prohibition of fees to migrant workers. Policy should also be in place mandating information sessions for migrant workers, which include cultural preparation, expectations, rights and protections.

Conclusion.

We recognize the leadership of the Philippine Government in shaping the interface between government representatives and the civil society delegates. We found this valuable and were heartened by the Government's commitments.

There were four significant innovations in this year's civil society program, including the 1) expansion from one to two days, 2) incorporation of constructive input from many civil society national and regional consultations involving thousands of migrants, NGOs, trade unions, and faith-based organizations, 3) the introduction of three workshops called "voices from the region," to surface regional perspectives, and 4) the new interface of state representatives with civil society at the close of the program.

Civil society found these innovations of solid value and hope they can be built upon. Participants noted the difficulty of funding the pre and post-forum activities that are so important to the civil society days.

We congratulate the Government of the Netherlands for setting the gold standard with their program of engagement with civil society delegates in pre-planning, a briefing from civil society on issues raised and the commitment to follow up in 2009.

It was heartening to hear a number of governments, including Norway France and Australia, indicate an interest in working with civil society representatives at the national level prior to next year's forum and we urge the national contact points to report on these processes, resulting action and progress in 2009.

The commitment of your chair, Mr. Esteban Conejos, to ensure that outcomes of the GFMD are monitored throughout 2009 gives us great heart that progress will be made.

Let me thank the Government representative of the UAE, a new participant, for his openness in sharing the optimism he feels in regard to the role that dialogue with sending countries can play in regard to the protection of migrant rights.

In this spirit we urge the governments to consider a full day of shared discussion on key themes at the GMFD in 2009.

Finally let me acknowledge the generosity of our hosts and the Ayala and MacArthur Foundations, the work of the IAC, the support and sheer hard work of the Government of the Philippines and your chair in particular.

Migrants and their families live in our neighbourhoods, care for our children, contribute to our economies, pay taxes and take responsibility for a role in supporting families in their home country.

We are proud to have had the opportunity to stand with and for migrant workers, to raise the veil on their invisibility and call for the respect recognition and rights that must underpin the guarantee of the choice to migrate and a confidence in equal treatment when they do.

We stand ready to work in partnership with government at all levels to drive coherence, find mechanisms to enhance rights and support the opening up of regular migration opportunities.

ANNEX 6

MANILA GFMD 2008 PROGRAM

Agenda of the Government Meeting

29-30 October, 2008
Manila

Wednesday, 29 October 2008

07.30 - 08.45

Registration at Meeting Site

*Venue: Registration Counter, Delegation Building
Philippine International Convention Center (PICC)
CCP Complex, Roxas Boulevard, Metro Manila*

Plenary Session

*Plenary Hall, Philippine International Convention Center (PICC)
CCP Complex, Roxas Boulevard, Metro Manila*

09.00 – 10.00

Opening Session

Call to Order

The Hon. Esteban B. Conejos, Jr.
Chair, Second Meeting of the GFMD

Speeches to Launch the General Debate

H.E. Saqr Ghobash, Minister of Labor, United Arab Emirates
H.E. Ambassador Rudi Veestraeten, Special Envoy for Immigration and Asylum, Belgium
The Hon. Marianito Roque, Secretary of the Department of Labor and Employment, Philippines
H.E. Sir John Kaputin, Secretary-General, ACP Group of States Secretariat
Mr. William Lacy Swing, Director General, International Organization for Migration, on behalf of the Global Migration Group (GMG)

General Debate

The Hon. Esteban B. Conejos Jr.
Chair, Second Meeting of the GFMD

H.E. Ambassador Rudi Veestraeten
Co-Chair
Special Envoy for Immigration and Asylum, Belgium

The Hon. Athanassios Nakos
Co-Chair
Vice-Minister of Interior
The Hellenic Republic

10.00 - 11.00

Opening Ceremony

Welcome Address

The Hon. Dr. Alberto G. Romulo
Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Republic of the Philippines

Opening Address

H.E. Ban Ki-moon
Secretary-General of the United Nations

Keynote Speech

H.E. Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo
President of the Republic of the Philippines

11.00 – 11.20

Coffee Break

11.20 - 12.30

General Debate (Continuation)

12.30 - 13.00

Report of the Civil Society Meeting

Ms. Sharan Burrow
Chair, Civil Society Meeting

13.00 - 15.00

Lunch hosted by the Government of the Philippines

Venue: Reception Hall, Philippine International Convention Center (PICC)

15.00 - 18.00

Roundtable Sessions

Roundtable 1:

Migration, Development, and Human Rights

Session 1.1:

Protecting the Rights of Migrants – a Shared Responsibility

Venue: Summit Hall C, Delegation Building, PICC

Listening Room: Meeting Room 10, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Ms. Estrella Lajom Roman**

Co-Chairs:

- **The Hon. Esteban B. Conejos, Jr.**
Chair, Second Meeting of the GFMD
- **Mr. Yousuf Abdelghani**
Asst. Undersecretary for Strategy
Ministry of Labor
United Arab Emirates

Panelists:

Speakers:

- **Ms. Rosalinda Baldoz**
Undersecretary
Department of Labor and Employment
Republic of the Philippines
- **Mr. Alex Zalami**
Advisor to the Minister of Labour
United Arab Emirates
- **Mr. Richard Perruchoud**
Legal Adviser and Director, International Migration Law Department
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Geneva, Switzerland

Discussants:

- **H.E. Minister Lorena Escudero**
Presidencia de la Republica
Secretaria Nacional del Migrante
Quito, Ecuador
- **Ms. Astrid Helle Ajamay**
Coordinator for Migration and Development
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Oslo, Norway

Rapporteurs:

- **H.E. Ambassador Ali Saleh Mourad**
Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for Consular Affairs
and Migration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

Cairo, Egypt

- **Mr. Ibrahim Awad**
Director, MIGRANT
International Labour Organization (ILO)
Geneva, Switzerland

Roundtable 2: Secure, Regular Migration can Achieve Stronger Development Impact

Session 2.1: Fostering More Opportunities for Regular Migration
Venue: Summit Hall D, Delegation Building, PICC
Listening Room: Meeting Room 11, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Dr. Irena Omelaniuk**

Co-Chairs:

- **Dr. Hamid Rashid**
Director General
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Dhaka, Bangladesh
- **Mr. Brian Grant**
Director General
Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Ottawa, Canada

Panelists:

- **H.E. Ambassador Youssef Amrani**
Director General
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Rabat, Morocco
- **Ms. Marta Rodriguez Tarduchy**
Director General for Immigration
Ministry of Labour
Madrid, Spain
- **Ms. K. Fong Weng-Poorun**
Permanent Secretary
Prime Minister's Office
Home Affairs
Port Louis, Mauritius
- **Ms. Eva Akerman-Börje**
Director
Department for Migration and Asylum Policy
Ministry of Justice
Stockholm, Sweden
- **Mr. Kristof Tamas**
Policy Officer
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security
European Commission
Brussels, Belgium
- **Prof. Philip Martin**
Chair
UC Comparative Immigration and Integration Program
Davis, California, USA

Roundtable 3: Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships

Session 3.1: Strengthening Data and Research Tools on Migration and Development

Venue: Summit Hall E, Delegation Building, PICC

Listening Room: Meeting Room 12, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Dr. Rolph K. Jenny**

Co-Chairs:

- **Ms. Marjatta Rasi**
Under-Secretary of State
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Helsinki, Finland
- **H.E. Ambassador Felix Cordova Moyano**
Director General of Consular Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Panelists:

- **Mr. Abdellatif Lfarakh**
Directeur du Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Démographiques
Haut Commissariat au Plan
Rabat, Maroc
- **Prof. Lelio Marmora**
Director of Master Studies on International Migration Policies
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Rapporteur:

- **Dr. Danny Sriskandarajah**
Director
Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR)
London, United Kingdom

18.30 Dinner Reception hosted by the Chair-in-Office

Venue: Reception Hall, PICC

Thursday 30 October 2008

08.00 - 09.00 Side Meetings (to be arranged upon request)

Deadline for scheduling is on 29 October, 12:00 noon, Information Desk

Venue: Delegation Building, PICC

09.00 - 12.00 Roundtable Sessions

Roundtable 1: Migration, Development, and Human Rights

Session 1.2: Empowering Migrants and Diaspora to Contribute to Development

Venue: Summit Hall C, Delegation Building, PICC

Listening Room: Meeting Room 10, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Ms. Estrella Lajom Roman**

Co-Chairs:

- **H.E. Ambassador Rudi Veestraeten**
Special Envoy for Immigration and Asylum
Kingdom of Belgium

- **Mr. Ernesto Nosthas**
Director General of Foreign Affairs for Salvadorans Living Abroad
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
San Salvador, El Salvador

Panelists:

Speakers:

- **Dr. Elizabeth Adjei**
Director, Ghana Immigration Service
Accra, Ghana
- **Mr. Roméo Matsas**
Global Governance program
Egmont Royal Institute for International Relations
Brussels, Belgium

Discussants:

- **Dr. Volker Ducklau**
Deputy Director General
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Germany
- **Mr. Dilip Ratha**
The World Bank
Washington D.C, USA
- **Mr. Akhenaton Al-Madi Oddvar De Leon**
Founder and Director
The Organization Against Official Discrimination
Oslo, Norway

Rapporteur:

- **Mr Nourredine Gaouaou**
Deputy Director for Migration
Directorate General of Legal and Consular Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Algiers, Algeria

Roundtable 2: Secure, Regular Migration can Achieve Stronger Development Impact

Session 2.2: Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impacts of Irregular Migration

Venue: Summit Hall D, Delegation Building, PICC
Listening Room: Meeting Room 11, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Dr. Irena Omelaniuk**

Co-Chairs:

- **Mr. Peter Hughes**
Deputy Secretary
Department of Immigration and Citizenship
Canberra, Australia
- **H.E. Mr. Sihasak Phuangketkeow**
Ambassador
Permanent Mission of Thailand to the UN
Geneva, Switzerland

Panelists:

Speakers:

- **Ms. Lee Ann de la Hunt**
Legal Adviser, Ministry of Home Affairs
Pretoria, Republic of South Africa

- **Ms. Eugenia Tsoumani**
Secretary General for Gender Equality
Ministry of Interior
Athens, Greece

Discussants:

- **Mr. Robert Visser**
Director-General for Legislation, International Affairs and Migration
Ministry of Justice
The Hague, the Netherlands
- **Dr Khalid Koser**
Fellow in Humanitarian Affairs
Deputy Director, Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement
The Brookings Institution
Washington D.C, USA

Rapporteur:

- **H.E. Ambassador Alfonso López Araujo**
Ambassador and Under-Secretary for Consular Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Quito, Ecuador

Roundtable 3: Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships

Session 3.2: Policy and Institutional Coherence on Migration and Development within Government

Venue: Summit Hall E, Delegation Building, PICC

Listening Room: Meeting Room 12, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Dr. Rolph K. Jenny**

Co-Chairs:

- **H.E. Ambassador Thomas Greminger**
Head of Political Affairs
Division IV Human Security
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
Berne, Switzerland
- **H.E. Ambassador I Gusti Agung Wesaka Puja**
Chargé d'Affaires, Deputy Permanent Representative of Indonesia
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia
Geneva, Switzerland

Panelists:

- **Ms Eva Åkerman-Börje**
Director
Division for Migration and Asylum Policy
Ministry of Justice
Stockholm, Sweden
- **Mrs. Jaifa Mezher El Kareh**
Director of the Program Colombia Nos Une (Colombia Unites Us)
Ministry of foreign Affairs,
Bogota, Colombia
- **Ms Kathleen Ferrier**
Member of Parliament,
The Hague, the Netherlands
- **Mr. Gerhard Sabathil**
Director, Directorate-General for External Relations
European Commission
Brussels, Belgium

Rapporteur:

- **Prof. Susan Martin**
Director, Institute for the Study of International Migration
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C, USA

12.00 - 13.30 Lunch hosted by the Government of the Philippines

Venue: Banquet Hall, PICC

13.30 - 16.00 Roundtable Sessions

Roundtable 3.3: Regional Consultative Processes, Inter-regional Consultative Fora and Regional Organizations and Economic Integration Processes at the Interface of Migration and Development

Venue: Summit Hall C, Delegation Building, PICC

Listening Room: Meeting Room 10, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Dr. Rolph K. Jenny**

Co-Chairs:

- **Ms Mitzi Gurgel Valente da Costa**
Director of the Department of Immigration and Legal Affairs
Ministry of External Relations
Brasilia, Brazil
- **Mr. Kacim Kellal**
Chef du service des affaires internationales et du développement solidaire, Ministère de l'immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du développement solidaire
Paris, France

Panelists:

- **Mr. Moustapha Ly**
Conseiller du Ministre de l'Intérieur Sénégalais
Dakar, Sénégal
- **Mr. Patrick Cohen**
Ministère de l'Immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du développement solidaire
Paris, France

Rapporteur:

- **Ms Michele Klein Solomon**
Director, Migration Policy, Research and Communications
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Geneva, Switzerland

Special Session: The Future of the GFMD
Venue: Summit Hall D, Delegation Building, PICC

Coordinator: **Mr. Francois Fouinat**

Chair: **Mr. Peter Sutherland**
Special Representative of the UNSG
for Migration and Development

Co-Chairs:

- **The Hon. Esteban B. Conejos Jr.**
Chair, Second Meeting of the GFMD
- **H.E. Ambassador Rudi Veestraeten**
Special Envoy for Immigration and Asylum
Belgium

- **The Hon. Athanassios Nakos**
Deputy Minister of Interior
The Hellenic Republic
- 16.00 – 16.15** **Break**
- 16.15 – 18.15** **Plenary Session**
- 16.15 – 17.15** Reports from Roundtables
 - General Rapporteur for Roundtable 1:
 - **Ms. Patricia Sto. Tomas**
Chairman, Development Bank of the Philippines
Makati, Philippines
 - General Rapporteur for Roundtable 2 :
 - **Mr. Han-Maurits Schaapveld**
Director, Movement of Persons, Migration and Aliens' Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
The Hague, the Netherlands
 - General Rapporteur for Roundtable 3:
 - **Ms. Judith Macgregor**
Director, Migration Directorate
Foreign and Commonwealth Office
London, U.K.
- 17.15 – 17.30** Future of the GFMD
Mr. Peter Sutherland
Special Representative of the UNSG for International Migration and Development
- 17.30 – 17.40** Statement by the Incoming Chair
The Hon. Athanassios Nakos
Deputy Minister of Interior
The Hellenic Republic
- 17.40 – 18.00** Final Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chair
The Hon. Esteban B. Conejos Jr.
Chair, Second Meeting of the GFMD
- 18.00 – 18.15** Closing Address
H.E. Noli de Castro
Vice-President of the Republic of the Philippines
- 19.00 – 21.00** **Farewell Dinner hosted by the Philippine Government**
Venue: Hotel Sofitel, Poolside

The Second Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development is organised under the responsibility of the Government of the Philippines, in consultation with Mr. Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for International Migration and Development.

The Government of the Philippines extends its gratitude to the many governments and other partners that have taken an active part in the preparation of the Roundtable working papers and sessions.

The Government of the Philippines also expresses its appreciation for the support it received from the following countries and organisations, in the form of secondments and/or financial contributions: the Commonwealth of Australia, the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Hellenic Republic, the Republic of Ireland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Norway, the Kingdom of Spain, the Kingdom of Sweden, the Swiss Confederation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP), the International Labour Organization, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the MacArthur Foundation (USA).





**Department of Foreign Affairs
Republic of the Philippines**