Elements for Background paper RT 1.1

Operationalizing mainstreaming and coherence in migration and development policies

Expected outcome

The expected outcome of this Roundtable is a menu of policy options for coordinating mechanisms, implementation and monitoring. Having this menu will help ensure that policy coherence in the realm of migration and development brings measurable outcomes.

Background

Policy and institutional incoherence in the realm of migration and development is costly. Incoherence, by making certain policy objectives unattainable, increases the likelihood of trade-offs, negative spill-over effects, as well as financial costs and wasted resources as a result of policies working at cross purposes. Incoherence at the international level in the form of non-cooperation can also generate large-scale inefficiencies. Policy and institutional coherence for migration and development therefore has potentially tremendous benefits to offer. It can help alleviate the negative effects and costs described above, as well as help avoid trade-offs, or at least provide a starting point for navigating them more effectively, in a way that considers the well-being of all stakeholders, including migrants themselves. The most significant benefits that coherence can potentially lead to are strengthened cohesion and increased synergies. In particular, coherence can help create an environment in which actors share a strengthened consensus on and mutual understanding of priorities, key issues and common challenges.1

Coherence between migration and development policies, mainstreaming migration in national and regional development strategies, and policy coherence for development in the policy area of migration itself have been discussed at the GFMD from the outset. A major focus has been on the role of consultation and coordinating mechanisms (e.g., focal points, intra-governmental coordination mechanisms and national task forces, whole-of-government approach, support by international organizations). Attention has also been given – notably during the Swiss GFMD Chairmanship – to the processes of incorporating migration into poverty reduction strategy papers and development plans (e.g., through initiatives such as the
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1 For further reading about the costs and benefits of policy and institutional (in)coherence for migration and development, see the background paper of the KNOMAD workshop “Strengthening the Migration-Development Nexus through Improved Policy and Institutional Coherence”, which was held at the OECD in December 2013. The examples in this section were largely adapted from those contained in the KNOMAD workshop background paper.
UNDP/IOM mainstreaming projects, involving UN Country Teams and relevant governments).

Less focus has been devoted in the GFMD to actual operationalization of these measures, implementation on the ground, concrete outcomes, and monitoring and evaluation. There has also been limited attention given to how promoting coherence between migration and development has resulted in concrete policy shifts. Also lacking has been a more systematic focus on South-South migration and related aspects of informal labour markets, social protection and migrant integration. Roundtable 2.2 of the 2011 GFMD also highlighted the need to devote more attention to South-South migration and address the data availability and analysis challenges that hamper coordinated evidence-based policymaking. The place of migration in donor agency coordination also remains to be further explored.

This Roundtable seeks to break new ground by identifying legislation and policies that can improve coordination and coherence for migration and development, and highlight the role of local public authorities and dialogue with local civil society and academia in this regard. In short, the Roundtable explores what countries have done to operationalize mainstreaming of migration and development, what their experiences have been, and what tools are needed in this process.

**Key questions to address**

1. **What have been the driving forces (processes, actors and arguments) behind policy coherence in countries where migration has been incorporated into development policy and development into migration policies?**

Coherence between migration and development entails mainstreaming migration into development policy, as well as mainstreaming development concerns into migration policies.

Mainstreaming migration into national development strategies is significant as a statement of political will and national ownership. It demonstrates commitment to acknowledging and enhancing the relevance of mobility in the achievement of national, regional or local policy goals. Actions and goals in a country’s national development plan that expressly state the government’s commitment to migration as an issue is also significant as it provides a mandate for the development of sectoral policies from a migration perspective.

However, mainstreaming migration may not be relevant for all country contexts: the scale, composition, and distribution of migration and its development impacts matter. In cases where, for example, levels of immigration and emigration are very low, and remittances are negligible and few nationals are living abroad, governments may decide to prioritize other issues. Meanwhile, countries that have large diasporas, witness the emigration of skilled professionals that affect critical sectors of their economy, and/or see remittances make up a significant share of their GDP (that perhaps do not reach those who most need support) – to name but a few possibilities – may decide that it is relevant for them to consider migration as an issue in development planning. Having the necessary data and conducting mappings of existing capacities on migration is important to enable governments to make informed decisions (see section on measurement below). That is why some governments have tended to combine the development of Extended Migration Profiles with undertaking a migration mainstreaming exercise.
The specific motivations for pursuing mainstreaming can vary widely depending on the context. In countries in the “South”, for example, the point of departure is often dedicated policies on foreign employment promotion or diaspora engagement and the realization that these will be most effective in contributing to development outcomes if they are coordinated with other policy areas and aligned with the country’s development priorities as laid out in national development plans, poverty reduction strategy papers, national adaptation plans and other planning instruments. In other countries, mainstreaming occurs because pressing development challenges disproportionally affect migrant populations or families left behind, making them a group of particular concern for sector-specific strategies, e.g. in the areas of health, water and sanitation, social protection or financial inclusion. Meanwhile, in many countries in the “North” and emerging economies, policy makers have begun to think about mainstreaming migration into their own development plans against the backdrop of ageing societies, labour market gaps, competition for talent to boost innovation or, as in some countries, gaps between migrants and their children vis-à-vis nationals of non-migrant background in terms of educational outcomes and unemployment rates. The motive for mainstreaming migration into development cooperation, on the other hand, is generally based on a policy coherence for development approach, i.e., to ensure that the range of different policies and tools a government has at its disposal are used effectively towards reaching identified and agreed-upon goals. It should be noted, however, that different public sectors will likely have divergent policy objectives, and in these cases the coherence and mainstreaming approach can serve to help manage trade-offs. Beyond concerns related to policy coherence, some donors such as the European Commission are making increasing efforts to ensure that migration is mainstreamed into their development cooperation initiatives wherever this is relevant for achieving development outcomes, including in sectors such as employment, human rights, trade and agriculture.

Perhaps most importantly, changes in migration dynamics can propel governments into action. Moldova, for example, initially experienced mass emigration of its working age population as a shock, affecting not only the national economy and labour market, but also social relations and family ties. The Government, recognizing that a more facilitative approach can alleviate some of the negative effects of migration (such as family separation), has responded by cautiously embracing policies to support greater mobility, including agreements on visa liberalization, portability of benefits and circular migration. In the case of the Russian Federation, the country has moved from a situation where there was almost no international migration to a situation where international migration has become a familiar fact of everyday life becoming the second largest immigration country in the world over a period of only 20 years. In response, in July 2012, the Government of the Russian Federation approved the Regulations of the Federal Migration Services (FMS) of Russia as a Federal body of the executive authority, responsible for the formulation and implementation of state policy and normative-legal regulation in the sphere of migration and the provision of the state services in the field of migration. Other countries may experience a sudden increase in the influx of migrants or refugees and see their capacity to provide adequate housing and social services overwhelmed. Oftentimes, these effects will be most strongly felt at the local level as migrants and refugees follow social networks and concentrate in particular places. Coherence between national and local levels of government is therefore important.

In many countries, the desire to engage diaspora networks and attract diaspora resources for national and/or local development projects is a driver of greater policy coherence. Sometimes, policies on diaspora engagement, portability of benefits, or simplification of administrative procedures and establishment of “one-stop-shops” may emerge in response to demands from
diaspora groups. With more and more countries establishing platforms for dialogue with diasporas and allowing for dual citizenship, diaspora groups’ influence on political processes and development priorities may well be on the increase. Indeed, electoral gains can be one political incentive for pursuing policy coherence on migration and development.

Another prominent incentive derives from regional integration prospects, such as for countries in the European neighbourhood or in regional economic communities. An example of regional policy impetus is the European Union’s Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM), which has proven influential in shaping national policy agendas on migration and development. Since its update in 2011 it places greater emphasis on coherence between internal and external policy priorities. Further, participation in Regional Consultative Processes can be a driver for greater policy and institutional coherence on migration issues at the national level, if and when different ministries and departments are involved in the preparation and coordination of joint inputs and positions.

Integrating a development perspective into migration policies could mean focusing on diasporas’ or remittances’ contributions to development as suggested above, but it could also include an enhancement of the development perspective in fields such as labour regulations (including the mobility of students and researchers), social policies and trade policies. Migration is one of the policy areas in an enhanced approach to policy coherence for development (PCD).

**Policy coherence versus mainstreaming**

Originally, the concept of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) was principally used to draw attention to and help resolve discrepancies between donor countries’ domestic policy agendas, on the one hand, and their commitments to development, on the other. However, in the last decade, PCD has evolved and come to be seen as an approach whose universal application has important benefits to offer, and therefore as important for developing countries as it is for developed countries. Recent years have also seen the application of PCD to a number of different policy realms, including migration.

While the concept of **policy coherence for migration and development** has received little attention by academics, its importance has begun to gain traction within the international policy community, in settings like the GFMD, Global Migration Group (GMG) and the European Parliament. While no “official” definition of the concept has been established and widely accepted, the KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Policy and Institutional coherence – drawing on GFMD discussions and the broader concept of PCD – has offered the following working definition of policy coherence for migration and development.

Policies related to migration and development, across various policy domains, are coherent to the extent that they:
- pursue synergies to advance shared objectives and actively seek to minimise or eliminate negative side effects of policies;
- prevent policies from detracting from one another or from the achievement of agreed-upon development goals.²

Within this context, **mainstreaming migration** into development planning and relevant policy sectors (e.g., health, education and agriculture) has emerged as a critical instrument to enhancing coherence
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² This working definition is outlined in the background paper of the workshop “Strengthening the Migration-Development Nexus through Improved Policy and Institutional Coherence”, which was organised by the KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Policy and Institutional Coherence in December 2013.
for M&D. Drawing from the premise that migration and development policies and outcomes share important interlinkages, the specific aspects of mainstreaming have been described as:
- assessing the implications of migration on actions or objectives planned in development strategies and on other policy sectors;
- considering legislation, programmes and policies at all levels (local, national, regional);
- integrating concerns related to migration and development at all stages of policy making and planning.\(^3\)

**Mainstreaming, therefore, should be seen as a practical tool that is important to achieving coherence.** Not only is one instrumental to the other, but both require similar inputs: explicit, high-level political commitment; co-operation among stakeholders (government, ministries, civil society, private sector, public/international organisations); and co-ordination mechanisms (dedicated committees, focal points, tools for assessment, oversight, monitoring and evaluation).

2. **What have countries, e.g. planning commissions and donor agencies, and international organizations done institutionally, and in policy, to operationalize mainstreaming of migration and development?**

A distinction can be made between what countries do internally (to achieve intra-governmental coherence) once they decide to embark on mainstreaming of migration and development, on the one hand, and international initiatives designed to support other countries’ efforts to operationalize mainstreaming, on the other.

Internally, the summary from the GFMD meeting in Mauritius highlighted that ensuring institutional coherence and synergies between mainstreaming tools requires high-level political will and national ownership, a dedicated coordinating body mandated to engage different ministries, broad-based consultations with non-governmental actors, engagement with local authorities, the inclusion of mainstreaming processes and related institutional activities in key long-term development planning documents, and a designated budget for migration issues.\(^4\) Dovetailing with efforts to mainstream migration, a budget is also needed to support migration data collection and the implementation and monitoring of migration-related policies, strategies, and plans of action. Such financial commitments form an integral part of a successful mainstreaming exercise.

The efforts to achieve intra-governmental coherence among countries in the “North” have thus far mainly focused on including migration and, to varying degrees, migration management objectives in the broader foreign policy framework or in the development cooperation policy. Mainstreaming migration has therefore taken place in an external dimension largely delinked from a domestic context. So, while migration is a factor in social inclusion and labour market policies, the conceptualisation of the migration and development nexus has not meant a comprehensive approach that would fully take into account all aspects of migration in the achievement of national (regional or local) public policy goals that are affected by migration. In Europe, a variety of policy and programming support have been used for highlighting the migration and development nexus, but while countries generally acknowledge the role to be played by policy to promote positive outcomes for development there is still not a clear picture on the exact nature of these inter-linkages and the policies necessary to bring about these positive impacts. This is not only due to knowledge constraints
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in a still evolving policy field, but primarily due to conflicting visions of the objectives to be pursued through migration and development policies. The Russian Federation has placed emphasis on ensuring sustainable manageability of demographic, migration and information processes in the country, as captured in its 2012 Concept of State Migration Policy of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2025 (see Annex II for further information about this strategy document).

**Mainstreaming migration into development cooperation in countries in the global “North”**

Besides countries in the global “South”, donor countries, as well as the EU, also aim to mainstream migration into their development cooperation and vice versa. The Swedish GFMD Chair conducted a survey which saw the participation of 48 government respondents including a number of the traditional destination countries from Europe and North America. Thirty-eight of these countries stated having a mechanism to either mainstream migration into their own national development planning or with regards to intra-governmental coordination between the various ministries and departments. These mechanisms often operate in an institutional setting where different ministries and agencies are responsible for different policy aspects of the migration-development nexus. In many cases, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the lead in developing the overall migration and development approach. Still, the Ministry of Interior is involved in shaping the migration and development approach in many donor countries, and other ministries are also involved, depending on the topic. For example, the Ministry of Finance tends to be involved in remittance-related debates, while the Ministry for Employment or Labour in discussions regarding circular migration. In addition, a number of donor countries have established focal points responsible for coordinating the whole migration and development policy and/or the strategic approach, but the mandates of such focal points presumably differ.

The whole-of-government approach to policy coherence for development, aiming at enhanced cooperation and coordination between governmental departments and thereby working towards achieving policy coherence, is also gaining popularity. As an example, Switzerland adopted a global holistic approach to migration in 2011 which took into account the interdependency between the economic, political and social aspects of migration (see annex for further information). In a number of donor countries, inter-ministerial meetings take place to promote policy coherence between migration and development priorities. The EU’s framework for dialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries is guided by the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) which identifies ‘migration and development’ as one of four thematic priorities and is the main framework for the implementation of the EU’s Policy Coherence for Development agenda in the area of migration. As regards the mainstreaming of migration into development cooperation, the EU has identified this topic a new priority in recent policy revisions, and stands ready to assist partner countries with the effective integration of migration issues into development strategies and sectoral policies. Given the need for a better understanding of the inter-linkages between migration and the
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5 ECDPM and ICMPD; Migration and Development Policies and Practices: A mapping study of eleven European countries and the European Commission; p. 64
6 Information taken from the recent study on “Migration and Development Policies and Practices. A mapping study of eleven European countries and the European Commission”, published by ICMPD and ECDPM in May 2013, commissioned by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The migration and development approaches of 10 European countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and UK) and the EU were mapped and analysed.
various sectors, the EU also intends to deepen understanding of the social and economic consequences of migration in areas such as health, education, employment and agriculture.

**UNCTs & UNDAFs**
UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) can be a useful tool not just for galvanizing UN action on migration, but also for placing the issue on the agenda of various sector strategies and helping to foster a greater understanding and commitment across ministries. As of late 2012, 26 UNDAFs made some form of reference to migration. The majority of those references were with regard to international migration, but a number of frameworks also focus on internal, rural-urban migration. Reflecting the cross-cutting nature of the issue, UNDAFs deal with migration in the context of broader development concerns, including: poverty reduction and economic development; population policy and data collection; rule of law and human rights; youth (un)employment; urbanization; HIV/AIDS; peace, security & justice; environmental and climate change; regional cooperation; and private sector development. A number of UNDAFs also focus specifically on enhancing the state’s migration management capacities and improving asylum procedures.

**Migration mainstreaming project**
As part of the global project on “Mainstreaming migration into national development strategies”, implemented by UNDP and IOM in collaboration with other GMG partners, countries and UN country teams have developed different forms of coordination and mainstreaming mechanisms. The project builds on a pilot phase, during which the four pilot countries – Bangladesh, Jamaica, Moldova, and Tunisia – undertook national migration mainstreaming initiatives. The following table provides an overview of country-level achievements under the pilot phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bangladesh | • Mainstreaming Migration Workshop, Dhaka, Sept 2013: an action plan to be taken forward by the Ministry of Expatriates’ Welfare & Overseas Employment (MoEWOE) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) was drafted; and the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee on M&D and of technical working groups was discussed.  
  • Four background papers elaborated on the analysis of migration mainstreaming in the national development plan, on remittances impacts at macro-and micro-levels, on rural migration and poverty reduction and a stakeholder analysis. |
| Jamaica   | • Extended Migration Profile launched in 2012  
  • Broad-based consultations held in 2013 on national position on Post-2015 agenda  
  • National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development developed  
  • Various coordination and technical assistance mechanisms established: National Working Group on International Migration and Development (NWGIMD), eight thematic subcommittees, International Migration and Development (IMD) Monitoring Board |
| Moldova  | • Diaspora Relations Bureau within State Chancellery created in 2012  
  • Extended Migration Profile published in 2013  
  • National consultations for post-2015 agenda included input from Moldovan migrant workers & diaspora associations |
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9 This project being funded by the Government of Switzerland will be implemented in 8 countries – Bangladesh, Ecuador, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Morocco, Serbia, and Tunisia – as a part of the second phase of the project.
Operationalizing mainstreaming of migration and development at the local level

Vertical coherence and cooperation between national and sub-national levels of government, which are instrumental to achieving intra-governamental coherence, is also often key to ensuring that migration-related policies are needs-based and effectively implemented. However, such measures are still limited. Some local and regional authorities have also developed forward-looking practices ahead of national policies. Given that the issue of mainstreaming migration into local development planning has only recently emerged, intra-governemental coherence also needs to ensure that local government actors are in a position to address inward and outward migration and its social, economic and environmental effects, including the integration of migrants and the provision of social services to all residents.

The Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI)\textsuperscript{10}, has set out to effectively link migration and development and achieve an impact at the territorial level by *mainstreaming migration into local development strategies* (see example in annex for further details).

3. What are the tools (needed) for monitoring development impacts of policy coherence in the field of migration and development?

In order to measure and monitor the development impact of policy coherence in the field of migration and development, there is first and foremost a need of a clear definition of the concept of policy coherence in this context. The working definition of policy and institutional coherence for migration and development provided by the KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Policy and Institutional Coherence (see above) could serve as a useful starting point in this regard.

Nevertheless, without a clear framework that conceptualises and defines comprehensive measures of policy coherence, it is difficult to evaluate its effectiveness and impacts on development.

A useful tool for monitoring development impacts of policy coherence would combine self-monitoring and evaluation with external evaluation. Governments should undertake self-monitoring at country level through coordination between different governmental bodies and
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\textsuperscript{10} JMDI is a three-year, global programme implemented by UNDP in collaboration with IOM, ITC-LO, UNHCR, UNFPA, UN WOMEN and funded by the European Commission and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
units. International organisations or other partners can provide external evaluation by collecting and analysing data and disseminating the results.

Attention given to the developmental impact of migration in different policy areas should also continue to strengthen the policy dialogue for coherence. Related to this, both the IOM (as part of the IOM Migration Profiles) and the ACP Observatory on Migration have developed indicators to measure the impacts of migration on development in South.

4. How could the incorporation of migration questions in national development surveys and statistical data improve the visibility and role of migration in development planning both from country of origin and destination perspectives?

Information and data on migration and remittance stocks and flows can be obtained from border and administrative data, central banks, census data, etc. However, border and administrative data is often collected for a specific purpose other than migration, and census data often fall short when it comes to taking into account certain types of migration flows, such as circular and seasonal migration. There are also differences across countries when it comes to how much and which migration information that is collected. This, together with the fact that this type of data most often does not combine the migration information with other welfare indicators and measures, makes it challenging to assess the role of migration for development in both origin and destination countries.

In order to measure the impacts of migration on poverty, redistribution and other welfare outcomes, migration (and remittance) data needs to be combined with general questions on socio-economic variables and welfare indicators. Incorporating migration questions and/or modules into existing national household surveys offers a way to simultaneously collect data on migration and other relevant variables that are important when evaluating the impact of migration on development. Including migration questions in household surveys offers the possibility of adapting the questions to be included to the specific policy concerns to be addressed. With such data, the role of migration for development can more easily be assessed and used in the preparations and implementation the development plans of migration origin and destination countries.

Examples of data sources in which migration modules could be used include Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) surveys and Labour Force Surveys (LFS). LSMS surveys are useful in shedding light on the role of both immigration and emigration. By including questions on members who left the household to live abroad, remittances that the household receives, and on place of birth and migration history, these surveys can capture several dimensions of migration and its important interactions with development. Incorporating more migration questions into LFS would enable further analysis of immigrants’ contribution to the labour market in the country of destination.

Experiences from the production of National Human Development Reports suggest that disaggregation and consultations with key stakeholders affected by migration – including local communities and migrants abroad – are fundamental from the beginning of the process and help ensure legitimacy when conclusions and recommendations are prepared. Inclusiveness and participation in the preparation of the report, and in community level analysis, usually generate better informed, people-centred analysis and more concrete policy recommendations.
Applying a human development analysis to migration issues requires robust data to understand the extent of migration’s impact on all critical dimensions of human development, including those captured in the human development index (HDI),\(^\text{11}\) as well as to assess other key aspects such as security and participation. The possibility of disaggregation is crucial to the application of the human development approach at the national level to identify critical disparities between different religious, racial, ethnic, gender, economic and other social groups. Disaggregation is also essential to understanding if migration-intensive communities fare better than others, identifying the socio-economic characteristics of areas with high migration rates, and understanding the impact on those who are left behind by migrants. Other relevant information to understand migration from a people-centred perspective include qualitative data regarding reflecting the aspirations and experiences of migrants.

Annex I includes a table that summarizes the various data sources used in the NHDRs. Most reports utilise a wide range of national and international data. The latter mostly come from international institutions such as the World Bank or the IMF, but also from administrative sources of destination countries, which can provide a rich source of information on first- and second-generation immigrants. National data range from aggregate national macro-economic data to labour force and household surveys. These sources can help develop migrant profiles or understand the impact and use of remittances. Administrative data are also employed to shed light on education and health achievements among those who migrate and those who are left behind.

Beyond collecting data on inflows and outflows of remittances, the generation of data on diaspora investments, including diaspora foreign direct investment (FDI) and portfolio investment (FPI), seems both feasible and important to assessing the contribution of migrants and diaspora actors to their countries of origin.

There are three principal ways to collect data on this issue. These are not mutually exclusive and any combination of these and other strategies would generate useful information.

First, most countries require foreign investors to have an investment permit or a specific license, which often has to be renewed annually or every other or third year. Forms for such permits could contain a self-declaration question on the extent of diaspora investment.

Second, according to the World Population Policies database, maintained by the UN Population Division, in 2013 at least 50 countries had special policy incentives in place to encourage diaspora investment, most importantly streamlined bureaucratic procedures. It is paramount to collect data on the capital flows that are channelled through specific schemes. For example, Tunisia, Senegal and Ethiopia are collecting this information based on investment licenses that fall under special diaspora investment schemes. Such reporting

\(^{11}\) The Human Development Index combines indicators of life expectancy, educational attainment and income into a composite index, by setting a minimum and a maximum for each dimension, called goalposts and showing where each entity stands in relation to these goalposts, expressed as a value between 0 and 1. The educational component of the HDI is comprised of adult literacy rates and the combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schooling, weighted to give adult literacy more significance in the statistic. The life expectancy component of the HDI is calculated using a minimum value for life expectancy of 25 years and maximum value of 85 years. For the wealth component, the goalpost for minimum income is $100 (PPP) and the maximum is $40,000 (PPP). The HDI uses the logarithm of income, to reflect the diminishing importance of income with increasing GDP. The scores for the three HDI components are then averaged in an overall index. For more details refer to [http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_Tech_Note_1.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_Tech_Note_1.pdf).
mechanisms should also have follow-up processes that assess, a year after the granting of such authorizations, if and how much of the planned investment has been realized.

Third, enterprise surveys and investor surveys could include a few questions on diaspora-owned companies. For example, UNIDO’s Africa Investor Surveys 2010 and 2012 include such questions. It would be advisable to include differentiated questions on the extent of diaspora-ownership in the respective companies (e.g., < 5%, 6-20%, 21-50%, 51-99%, 100% diaspora-owned), on the country of residence of diaspora investors, and on the investment history and diaspora involvement that would allow analyzing the scale and effect of such investments. Further, these surveys should spell out how “diaspora investors” are defined to avoid problems with the internal validity of the questions.

**Possible recommendations**

1. Promote the assessment, and mainstreaming of migration into national development planning and vice-versa, from the perspective of sending and receiving sides of the migration spectrum, as well as adequate support from international organizations in analysis and, at the request of states, implementation as well as in policy dialogue;

2. Promote synergies between development-related and mainstreaming migration-initiatives at the sub-national, national, regional and international levels, including in pan-governmental and sectoral initiatives and regional and international dialogue and coordination mechanisms;

3. Integrate migration in the post-2015 development agenda and explore how this inclusion subsequently can be mainstreamed into development planning at the both national and global levels;

4. Enhance peer-to-peer learning and sharing of experiences between countries in the implementation of mainstreaming migration in development planning, in particular in the production of relevant evidence; in the incorporation of migration in specific pan-governmental and sectoral policies; in the achievement of vertical and horizontal coordination mechanisms and broad consultations both within government, and between governmental and non-governmental key migration stakeholders; and in the establishment of participatory monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in this regard.

5. Enhance cooperation between countries of origin and countries of destination in mainstreaming migration and development efforts;

6. Promote enhanced coordination and cooperation within/between the United Nations System and IOM, especially between the GMG and UNDG, in the realm of mainstreaming migration in development planning at the country and international level, in accordance with the HLD recommendation to adopt a coherent, comprehensive and coordinated approach to migration and development.
# Annex I Data sources on migration in National Human Development Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National HDR</th>
<th>International sources</th>
<th>National Statistical Accounts</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>National Administrative Sources</th>
<th>Household Surveys</th>
<th>Labour Force Surveys</th>
<th>Other National surveys</th>
<th>Community surveys or Studies</th>
<th>Surveys of migrants</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>México 2006-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Kerala 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Maharashtra 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional HDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Annex contains descriptions and references to examples of relevant frameworks, policies, programmes, projects and other experiences in relation to the issues raised in the policy part of the Background paper. This second part of the Background paper aims to form the basis of an evolving catalogue of policies and practices with a view to be stored and displayed on the GFMD PfP website in a Policy and Practice Database.

Main issue areas

Examples of operationalizing mainstreaming of migration and development (policy and programmes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Ecuador, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Morocco, Serbia, and Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner(s)/Funder(s)</td>
<td>Switzerland, UNDP, IOM, GMG Working Group on Mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s)</td>
<td>Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, Capacity Building, Data and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The purpose of the project on Mainstreaming migration into national development strategies is to enable the governments involved and their UNCT partners to develop a context-specific, evidence-based, participatory, and holistic approach to migration and development at the national level, based on guidance provided by the GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning that was endorsed by governments at the 2010 GFMD in Mexico. In projects' context and with international partners support, some major changes took place: 1. Institutional Changes: BRD creation and development (2012). BRD role is to enhance Diaspora- Government communication, to coordinate national diaspora policies and to provide bases for policies coherence, to be a creative and innovative policy and programs unit for the Government and to support Diaspora capacities enhancement. 2. Policy changes: Mainstreaming process began in 2013. The novelty of the Moldovan Mainstreaming is based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies - Moldova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner(s)/Funder(s)</td>
<td>Switzerland, UNDP, IOM, GMG Working Group on Mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s)</td>
<td>Diaspora, Policy coherence and mainstreaming, Strategies for addressing irregular migration and enabling regular migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags</td>
<td>Evaluation and impact assessment, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Policy coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The purpose of the project on Mainstreaming migration into national development strategies is to enable the governments involved and their UNCT partners to develop a context-specific, evidence-based, participatory, and holistic approach to migration and development at the national level, based on guidance provided by the GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning that was endorsed by governments at the 2010 GFMD in Mexico.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In projects’ context and with international partners support, some major changes took place:
1. Institutional Changes: BRD creation and development (2012). BRD role is to enhance Diaspora- Government communication, to coordinate national diaspora policies and to provide bases for policies coherence, to be a creative and innovative policy and programs unit for the Government and to support Diaspora capacities enhancement.
2. Policy changes: Mainstreaming process began in 2013. The novelty of the Moldovan Mainstreaming is based
on two key items – empiric-based approach to policy design and policy coherence issue. In this regard, every policy designing unit will calculate the Migration impact when elaborating new policies (ex-ante) and when assessing policy implementation (ex-post).

The Mainstreaming process is supported with budgetary programming changes (2013). One new Budgetary sub-Program that would address specific Diaspora needs has been approved, 12 diaspora programs are implemented (Birth right, Medical Insurance for Students) etc. 18 new programs are designed in all domains (UN Women and BRD concept on Migrant Women Financial Habilitation, Diaspora bonds, Migrants Investment Fund, bilateral agreements on social security, etc.)

Government Action Plan (2013, 2014) has 47 cross-cutting actions addressing Migration and Diaspora.

**Web Links:** GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development

---

**Title:** Deputy Ministry for Human Mobility

**Country:** Ecuador  
**Partner(s):**

**Thematic Area(s):** Diasporas, Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue, Policy coherence and mainstreaming, Rights of migrants, Labour migration and mobility

**Tags:** Capacity Building, Diaspora Empowerment and Engagement, Policy Coherence, Social Cohesion and Integration, Temporary and Circular Labour Migration

**Summary:**
Ecuador’s former National Secretariat for Migrants (Secretaria Nacional para el Migrante - SENAMI) has been elevated to the level of Deputy Ministry for Human Mobility (Viceministerio de Movilidad Humana).

The Deputy Ministry provides information via its website on all relevant services for migrants, including how to access services and obtain dual citizenship. It is mandated to administer and evaluate the management of the Policy for Human Mobility in migration, consular and refugees, in order to protect the rights of Ecuadorian citizens abroad and of foreign citizens in Ecuador. It also develops internal and external coordination processes in order to comply with institutional and national development goals. It comprises the following Under-Secretariats:
- Migrant Protection Secretariat;
- Citizen’s Services Under-Secretariat, and;
- Refugee Under-Secretariat.

**Links:** [http://cancilleria.gob.ec/movilidad-humana/](http://cancilleria.gob.ec/movilidad-humana/)

---

**Title:** Permanent Migratory Statute (Estatuto Migratorio Permanente)

**Country:** Ecuador  
**Partner(s):**

**Thematic Area(s):** Labour migration and mobility, Rights of migrants, Strategies for addressing irregular migration and enabling regular migration

**Tags:** Capacity Building, Legal framework on migration, Policy Coherence

**Summary:**
The Permanent Migratory Statute is an instrument that aims to facilitate the migratory regularization and stay of migrants between Ecuador and Peru in order to eliminate irregular migration on the basis of the principles of transparency, coherence, shared responsibility, good faith and the defence of migrants’ human rights with non-discriminatory and fair treatment practices.

**Links:**
- Information brochure: [http://www.oimperu.org/oim_site/documentos/Cartilla%20Ecuador-Peru.pdf](http://www.oimperu.org/oim_site/documentos/Cartilla%20Ecuador-Peru.pdf)
**Title:** Labour immigration reform  
**Country:** Sweden  
**Partner(s):** -  
**Thematic Area(s):** Labour migration and mobility  
**Tags:** Enabling regular migration, Legal frameworks on migration, Low and unskilled migration, Skilled migration  

**Summary:** Sweden reformed its labour immigration rules in 2008. The reform is designed to create a demand-driven, effective and flexible system which will make it easier for people to come to Sweden and work, and for Swedish companies to recruit labour from outside the European Economic Area, EEA. The underlying presumption is that circular migration can increase development effects in the country of origin, and also affect national development positively in the country of destination.

The Swedish system recognizes that we need workers of all skill levels and in many different branches and sectors. The reform is therefore designed to allow workers of all skill levels to migrate to Sweden under one general framework and with access to a wide range of rights. The reform has been praised by the OECD as one of the most liberal among the organization’s members.

The reformed Swedish labour migration rules thus provide the individual migrant with a chance to increase his or her income while reflecting our understanding that migration is a necessary element of Sweden’s own development potential. Sweden needs labour migrants and will increasingly do so. There are labour shortages in Sweden that cannot be filled by persons living in Sweden or in other EU countries, i.e. Swedish employers have difficulties in finding employees with the right skills. The Swedish population is also ageing, just as the populations of most European Union members and OECD countries. The growing numbers who are retiring leave significant gaps in our labour market. Although migration alone cannot solve the challenges of an ageing population, it can be one of several instruments to prevent labour shortages and maintain well-being and quality of life.

The Swedish labour migration reform is a first step towards an enabling legal migration framework that encourages mobility and contributes to development in both countries of origin and in Sweden, as well as increasing the opportunities for the women, men and children who migrate. As a step towards creating an even more flexible system, Sweden has examined the link between circular migration and development. The Swedish government is preparing proposals to make it easier for migrants to move between Sweden and other countries and to remain active in the development of both places. This could enhance the transfer of new skills and knowledge and increase trade flows and investments.

**Web Links:** [http://www.government.se/sb/d/14293/a/114169](http://www.government.se/sb/d/14293/a/114169)

---

**Title:** Policy Coherence for Development (PCD)  
**Country:** Sweden  
**Partner(s):** -  
**Thematic Area(s):** Policy coherence and mainstreaming  
**Tags:** Policy coherence  

**Summary:** The political framework for Sweden’s practice on Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) was set out already in 2003, in the Government Bill “Shared Responsibility: Sweden’s Policy for Global Development”. The policy is aimed at supporting poor people and countries to meet global challenges in promoting synergies between different Swedish policy areas. Both development cooperation and other policy areas must contribute to these aims.

Migration flows is one of six global challenges that the Swedish Government focuses on in its PCD-work. Swedish PCD-work on migration is based on the insight that the development potential of migration is far from being fully realised. Migration and development are linked in many ways, such as in remittances to developing countries, in the “brain gain” of circular migration, and in contributing to the protection and durable solutions for refugees. The three areas remittances, circular migration and protection and durable solutions for refugees have been identified for special attention in the Swedish PCD work on migration. For these three focal areas, objectives have been
identified, and follow-up is made, based on three levels of coherence as identified by the OECD, namely: policy formulation, coordination and cooperation, and knowledge and analysis.

The responsibility for the issue of migration and development lies mainly within the Swedish Ministry of Justice, and the coordination of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD), lies within the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. But several policy areas and actors are concerned. Strong parliamentary and public support underpins the commitment. The policy commits the Government to regularly report to the Parliament on progress on PCD -implementation. In the next communication to Parliament, due in spring 2014, the focus will be on the global challenge Migration flows and potential conflicts of objectives and interests within this challenge. Areas that might come up are “brain drain”, migrants’ rights, facilitating remittances and aid money for refugee costs.

Web Links: [http://www.government.se/sb/d/14232](http://www.government.se/sb/d/14232)

Title: Global Program on Migration and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: Switzerland</th>
<th>Partner(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s): Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue, Labour migration and mobility</td>
<td>Thematic Area(s): Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue, Labour migration and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags: Addressing Irregular Migration, Immigration, Irregular Migration, Legal Framework on Migration, Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, Migration and Trans-organized Crime, Policy Coherence, Social Cohesion and Integration</td>
<td>Tags: Addressing Irregular Migration, Immigration, Irregular Migration, Legal Framework on Migration, Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, Migration and Trans-organized Crime, Policy Coherence, Social Cohesion and Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Switzerland, for one, has mainstreaming migration as a clear priority. Mainstreaming migration into development planning and influencing international policy processes are central components of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation’s (SDC) strategy and in coherence with the Swiss Federal Council Dispatch 2013-2016 which has identified migration and development as one of its 9 thematic priorities. This is also the reason for SDC’s support to the project on “Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning” (see below). A focus of this project’s global knowledge component will be to explore the question of “reciprocity” in migration mainstreaming for destination countries, what this could mean in practice, and how it ties in with the shifting landscape of global partnerships and the rise of South-South Cooperation.

The section, Global Programme Migration and Development, is a thematically oriented unit that makes use of its operational activities to make a contribution to finding a solution to the global challenges linked to labour migration, internally displaced persons, refugees, and victims of trafficking in human beings. It supports programmes on these themes both financially and by providing know-how, while contributing its experiences within the scope of multilateral dialogue on migration.


Title: Cadre d’intervention transversal Migrations internes et internationales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: France</th>
<th>Partner(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s): Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
<td>Thematic Area(s): Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags: Mainstreaming migration into development planning</td>
<td>Tags: Mainstreaming migration into development planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: The French Development Agency intends to promote a specific approach of migration, both internal and international. Its goal is to avoid developing specific migration projects and instead to mainstream migration issues into other development sectors: private sector development; education and employment; health; environment and climate change; urban development; rural development and food security.

In order to do so, a mainstreaming strategy has been developed and approved by the French government in 2010 “Cadre d’intervention transversal migrations internes et internationales”. Through awareness raising activities...
(studies on specific migration-other development sector linkages, trainings, internal events), migration issues have become more integrated into AFD operations.

Until now, issues related to diaspora, remittances, investment have been more easy to integrate. More sensitization work should be done on internal migration and urbanization, migration and labour markets. One lesson learnt has been the need to gather specific evidence (at sector or country level) to convince non migration experts on the advantages to foster migration/development sectors linkages.

Ghana's Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA) 2010 - 2013 identifies the major policy thrust for migration among others as: establishing a comprehensive institutional framework for the management of migration, harmonizing legislation on migration, creating a comprehensive database on migration, mainstreaming migration into the national development policy framework and building the human, technical, and logistical capacity of migration institutions for better migration management.


**Title:** Policy Memorandum International Migration and Development 2008

**Country:** Netherlands

**Partner(s):** Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Security and Justice, IOM, Local NGO's, diaspora

**Thematic Area(s):** Policy coherence and mainstreaming, diaspora, remittances, Labour migration and mobility

**Tags:** circular migration and brain gain, capacity building, return and reintegration, Diaspora empowerment and engagement, Temporary and circular labour migration, Migration management, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Policy coherence, Transfer of values, ideas, knowledge and skills

**Summary:**
The policy memorandum sets out the migration and development policy framework for the Government of The Netherlands, focusing on six key policy priorities aimed at areas in which the Netherlands can make a difference, such as institutional development in migration management; promoting circular migration and brain gain; strengthening the involvement of migrant organizations; strengthening the link between remittances and development and encouraging sustainable return and reintegration. For the implementation of several of these policy priorities The Netherlands work together with organizations in the field, like local NGO's but also with diaspora organizations and IOM. Main government actors are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Security and Justice. But also other ministries can be involved.


**Title:** AMEDIP pilot project “Strengthening of the ability to coordinate policies on Emigration and Development between Intra-Government Actors”

**Country:** Cape Verde

**Partner(s):** ICMPD and IOM

**Thematic Area(s):** Diaspora; Civil society and the private sector; Policy coherence and mainstreaming

**Tags:** Capacity building; Mainstreaming migration into development planning; United Nations, International Organizations and the Global Migration Group

**Summary:**
The overall objective of this pilot project implemented in the framework of the bigger AMEDIP initiative was to strengthen the ability to coordinate the implementation of policies on M&D between actors at inter-governmental, private and civil society levels, through the creation of a National Committee on Migration and Development (CONED) as a step to generate increased contributions of the diaspora in the development of Cape Verde. More specifically, the project aimed to incorporate new and upgraded techniques and tools to support an efficient inter-institutional coordination on M&D policies and strengthen South-South cooperation. A major output
of the pilot project was a National Strategy on Migration and Development (ENED), with the consultation of diaspora associations in major host countries (Portugal, USA and France) for approval. The ENED was ratified by the Ministry’s Council and presented in Cape Verdean municipalities. As regards to South-South cooperation, the government of Jamaica offered to share their experience on mainstreaming migration by sending their government focal point on M&D to Cape Verde. The expert’s visit was highly relevant as the focal point recently developed a National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development and they are also participating in the pilot project Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies.

Web Links: http://www.icmpd.org/AMEDIP.1821.0.html

**Title:** State Commission on Migration Issues

**Country:** Georgia  
**Partner(s):**

**Thematic Area(s):** Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue; Policy coherence and mainstreaming  
**Tags:** Migration management; Policy coherence,

**Summary:** The State Commission on Migration Issues was set up on 13 October 2010 on the basis of Governmental Decree #314. The Commission is the government’s consultative body to discuss issues related to migration management and other important matters. The Commission is Chaired by the Ministry of Justice and co-chaired by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Analytical and administrative support is provided through the Secretariat created and supported by European Union and hosted by the Public Service Development Agency of the Ministry of Justice. The Commission consists of the following 12 agencies: Ministry of Education and Science, Office of the State Minister for Diaspora Issues, Office of the State Minister for European and Euro-Atlantic Integration, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees, Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, National Statistics Office, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs

Since its establishment, the Commission has become a platform for discussing current migration-related issues and an effective instrument for coordinating matters falling under the competence of various bodies. The donor community cooperates with the Secretariat which has resulted in eradicating earlier thematic overlaps, where projects with very similar or sometimes the same activities were initiated; today, the contents of current projects implemented in the field of migration are agreed with all the agencies and are consistent with the needs of the country.

Web Links: http://migration.commission.ge/index.php?article_id=1&clang=1

**Title:** United Nations Development Assistance Framework - Thailand

**Country:** Thailand  
**Partner(s):** UNCT

**Thematic Area(s):** Policy coherence and mainstreaming  
**Tags:** Policy coherence, Mainstreaming migration into development planning; United Nations, International Organizations and the Global Migration Group

**Summary:** The UNDAF for Thailand (2012-2016) identifies three areas where the UN Country Team’s skills, knowledge and comparative advantage have the potential to support and assist the Government in achieving concrete results with respect to:

- Migration policy formulation – using the UN’s cross-sectoral expertise and convening power to promote the development of a comprehensive and coherent migration policy in order to maximize the potential contribution of migrants to national development.
- Capacity building – enhancing the capacity of a broad range of stakeholders to strengthen the application of national, regional and international commitments to protect the rights of migrants and their families.
- Regional (ASEAN) cooperation – fostering, promoting and supporting the documentation of Thailand’s approaches on migration management as good practices for replication in other countries in the region.

Web Links:
### Country: Switzerland

**Partner(s):**

**Thematic Area(s):** Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue; Policy coherence and mainstreaming  

**Tags:** Migration management; Policy coherence,  

**Summary:** In 2011, the Federal Council acknowledged the *international migration cooperation report (IMZ Bericht)* to introduce a new global and more coherent orientation of the Swiss foreign policy on migration, which further strengthened areas of cooperation such as regular migration, international governance as well as M&D. Previously existing structures of inter-departmental cooperation, notably the platform on return assistance and the former platform for migration cooperation, were merged and given a new and stronger mandate, to enhance the effect of coordination and coherence. The IMZ report presents the three principles underpinning any Swiss migration initiative, including those on M&D. The principles are the following:  
1. Switzerland will apply a *global holistic approach to migration*, where the interdependency between the economic, political and social aspects of migration is taken into account.  
2. The Swiss administration will work in a *whole-of-government* approach in order to achieve more coherence with the often conflicting mandates of the different actors.  
3. The relationship between Switzerland and other countries will be marked by the concept of *partnership* where the vested interest of both sides can lead to a considered, mutual understanding and where solutions are decided accordingly.  


---

### Title: Interrelations between public policies, migration and development of partner countries: case studies and policy recommendations

**Country:** Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Haiti, Malaysia (tbc), Morocco and the Philippines  

**Co-Funder(s):** European Commission, OECD Development Centre  

**Partner(s):** National governments of and research institutions in 10 partner countries  

**Thematic Area(s):** drivers and impacts of migration; South-South migration; public policies, migration and development; policy coherence  

**Tags:** Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, Data and Research, Policy Coherence, Capacity Building  

**Summary:** Co-funded by the European Commission and being carried out by the OECD Development Centre, the overall objective of this project is to enhance the capacity of partner countries to incorporate migration into the design and implementation of their development strategies and other public policies through a better understanding of the implications of public policies on migration issues. More specifically, the project will bring evidence-based analysis on the importance of incorporating migration into development through its fieldwork in partner countries. This project will also provide policy makers with guidance on incorporating migration into the design of development strategies, while ensuring policy coherence, social cohesion and achieving other relevant development goals.  

**Web Links:**

---

### Title: Assessing the economic contribution of labour migration in developing countries as countries of destination

**Country:** tbc  

**Partner(s):** EU, OECD, ILO  

EU contribution: EUR 2 700 000  
Total Budget: EUR 3 376 506  

**Thematic Area(s):** Data and research, Labour migration and mobility, Strategies for minimising costs/maximising human development  

**Tags:** Data and research, Immigration, Skilled migration, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Labour market matching  

---

12 The fieldwork is carried out in ten partner countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Haiti, Malaysia (tbc), Morocco and the Philippines).
**Summary:** This study aims to improve the current lacuna in evidence on the relationship between labour immigration and economic development in low and middle income destination countries, by looking specifically at i) the contribution of labour immigration to partner countries' GDP and economic growth, ii) the impact of labour immigration on their labour market and iii) the impact of labour immigration on their public finances and social services. The study should result in the development of a methodology for assessing the economic contribution of labour immigration with the following further outcomes i) a comparative analysis of key features of the contribution of labour migration in c. 10 LICs/MICs, including in specific sectors with significant migrant employment ii) dialogue is held with all relevant national stakeholders in partner countries on the methodology and its application to national situations iii) Dialogue is held with global partners and other EU institutions to integrate the dimension of destination countries in the migration and development approach.

**Web Links:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Migration, Environment and Climate Change: Evidence for Policy (MECLEP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong> Dominican Republic, Haiti, Kenya, Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner(s):</strong> EU, IOM, University of Versailles Saint-Quentin (UVSQ), UK Foresight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU budget contribution:</strong> EUR 1 935 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget:</strong> EUR 2 419 028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area(s):</strong> Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tags:</strong> Addressing push factors of migration, Capacity Building, Data and research, Immigration, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Migration, climate change and environment, Policy coherence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** The overall objective of this action is to contribute to the global knowledge base on the relationship between migration and environmental change, including climate change, and the formulation of related policy options with particular emphasis on migration as an adaptation strategy. The specific objectives are: 1) to strengthen knowledge and information sharing about migration and environmental change and the implications for adaptation 2) to enhance government capacity to take action on environmental migration and 3) to facilitate policy coherence and cooperation on environmental migration nationally and across regions. The objectives are to be achieved through i) national and household surveys, which will result in 12 new country specific publications, in addition to a Final Comparative Report and the development of environmental migration maps. The maps and the findings from the studies will be published online following the creation of a Global Online Information Sharing Platform to facilitate knowledge exchange, much like the Asia-Pacific Migration and Environment Network (APMEN) ii) development of training manuals and workshops e.g. Technical Working Groups on migration, environment and climate change for Government officials iii) National Level Consultations, which will present the research findings and policy recommendations to various Governments, civil society and international organisations.

**Web Links:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong> Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Morocco, Senegal, Tunisia, the Philippines and Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area(s):</strong> Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tags:</strong> Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning, Policy coherence,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** The JMDI has identified in eight countries existing initiatives implemented by local authorities in partnership with civil society organizations that will be scaled up. The objective is to move from isolated and individual approaches towards more structured forms of intervention and to come forward with policy options and road maps for action through the experiences drawn from the supported initiatives. Taking into account the specific challenges for local authorities to integrate migration within local development planning, the JMDI will develop tailor-made training material and knowledge tools which aim to support local authorities in policy design and implementation, and the securing of funding and technical assistance to design and kick-start the implementation of such initiatives. Equipped with the necessary tools, local authorities should be able to establish regular consultations with their national counterparts, align their local interventions with national
Examples of tools for monitoring development impacts of policy coherence in the field of migration and development

**Title:** The Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Russian Federation

**Country:** Russian Federation

**Thematic Area(s):**

**Summary:** When Russia became a centre of gravity of world migration processes, the Government in 2012 carried out direct leadership of the special executive authority responsible for migration issues – the Federal Migration Service (FMS) and issued a leading document for all the agencies and ministries involved in the migration service - the Concept of State Migration Policy of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2025. The main implementation mechanism of the State Migration Policy of Russia gives weight to: development of international cooperation in the field of migration, harmonization of the migration legislation of the country, unification of statistical accounting, monitoring and analysis of the events on the territory of Russia, considering migration process and its influence on the country’s development as well as adjustment of Russian migration policy measures. In the framework of the Concept’s implementation (during its first stage from 2012 to 2015), it was decided to develop and adopt normative legal acts of the Russian Federation for the prevention of illegal migration as well as strengthening administrative and criminal liability for violation of immigration laws, including illegally crossing the state border of the Russian Federation by foreign citizens and organizing illegal migration. In 2013 there were 27 laws passed in this regard. From 2009 there were five Representative Offices of the FMS of Russia created abroad (in Latvia, Kyrgyzstan, Armenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan) and two representatives of the FMS of Russia were sent to Moldova and Ukraine to ensure a direct communication with local people, authorities and Russians living abroad. It may also be noted that by the end of 2013 the dialogue on visa-free regime between Russia and the EU was significantly promoted by the readmission block though signing all 27 Executive Protocols with each of the 27 EU Member States. Russia has also begun to provide foreign nationals with the opportunity of combining work and learning with the common purpose of entry to the territory of the Russian Federation (adopted in July 2013).


**Title:** African, Caribbean and Pacific Observatory on Migration

**Country:** Angola, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago

**Thematic Area(s):** Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming

**Summary:** The ACP Observatory on Migration is a reference network of migration researchers and specialists working on South-South migration and producing data on South-South migration flows for migrants, researchers, civil society, general public, governments and policymakers. Major areas of research include the following themes, with a South-South focus: migration and development, financial and social remittances, diasporas, labour migration, internal migration, irregular migration, forced migration, migration and the environment, migrants’ human rights, and assessments of national data on migration for several ACP countries. Specific studies were carried out in Angola, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago.

**Web Links:**

ACP Observatory on Migration research studies and migration data assessments: [http://www.acpmigration-obs.org/Our%20publications](http://www.acpmigration-obs.org/Our%20publications)

Migration and development within the South: [New evidence from African, Caribbean and Pacific countries: http://www.acpmigration-obs.org/MigrationandDevelopmentwithintheSouth](http://www.acpmigration-obs.org/MigrationandDevelopmentwithintheSouth)

Indicators of the impact of migration on human development:
In the Policy Coherence for Development literature these three levels are distinguished as follows:

**Policy input indicators** “are useful where it may be hard to quantify or summarise the output of a policy in a single indicator” (King et al., 2012, p.39). They usually monitor donor expenditure in a particular area, such as financial contributions for migration and development projects. Financial contributions may be considered as a proxy for commitment to a policy area, as well as for policy outputs in cases where these outputs are difficult to measure (King et al., 2012).

**Policy output indicators** “capture concrete changes in efforts designed to make policy more ‘development-friendly’” (King et al., 2012, p.39). Here, examples would include changes in remittance policies and the number of visas allotted for poorer countries. For this, a “clear story” and empirical justification linking the indicator to development outcomes is necessary. **Outcome indicators** “measure real trends that are a result of both policy and societal changes and may be only partially influenced by policy instruments” (King et al., 2012, p. 39). The number of irregular immigrants is one example of an outcome measurement. In addition it is relevant to apply **process indicators** to measure institutional coherence, such as whether policy processes include the participation of migrants and whether their voices are adequately heard. (See: King et al. 2012 cited from: Hong, Amy and Anna Knoll: *Strengthening the Migration-Development Nexus through Improved Policy and Institutional Coherence*, Background paper for the KNOMAD workshop on policy and institutional coherence, 4-5 December 2013)
**Title:** Interrelations between public policies, migration and development of partner countries: case studies and policy recommendations

**Country:** Costa Rica, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Morocco, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Georgia, Cambodia, Malaysia, Philippines

**Partner(s):** EU, OECD Development Centre

EU contribution: EUR 3.5 million

Total Budget: EUR 4 million

**Thematic Area(s):**
- Data and research, Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue, Labour migration and mobility, Policy coherence and mainstreaming, remittances

**Tags:** Capacity Building, Data and research, Diaspora empowerment and engagement, Diaspora investment and entrepreneurship, Enabling regular migration, Gender, Immigration, Local development, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Migration and education, Migration and health, Migration, trade and investment, Policy coherence, Remittances, Social cohesion and integration

**Summary:** Implemented by the OECD, this state-led project works with 10 low and middle income countries and aims to enhance partner countries’ capacity to incorporate the migration dimension into the design and implementation of their development strategies and other public policies, through a better understanding of the implications of public policies on migration issues. The three pronged conceptual framework considers i) migration policies narrowly conceived ii) migration related development policies iii) non-migration sector policies. Research will be conducted in cooperation with partner countries through initiatives such as field interviews with migrants and (non-) migrant households, NGOs and policy makers etc. A global conference is to be planned to discuss the findings and facilitate sharing of best practice. Capacity building workshops are to be organised with each country to discuss formulation and implementation of the policy recommendations adapted to the country context. The results and lessons learned from this pilot initiative will also provide other stakeholders such as donors with guidance for policy dialogue and how to address migration in programming and development planning.

**Web Links:**

---

**Title:** Informal Inquiry on Migration Profiles and Extended Migration Profiles

**Country:** GFMD participating states

**Partner(s)/Funder(s):** GFMD Support Unit, ICMPD, IOM

**Thematic Area(s):** Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming

**Tags:** Migration profiles, Data and Research, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Capacity building, Evaluation and impact assessment, Policy coherence

**Summary:** The PfP Call for Action “Informal Inquiry on Migration Profiles and Extended Migration Profiles” was launched at the GFMD 2012 Summit working session on the Platform for Partnerships held on 22 November 2012, endorsed by the Governments of Morocco and Switzerland, as Co-chairs of the ad hoc WG on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, at the GFMD Summit Meeting. The GFMD support unit disseminated the call for action by email to the GFMD focal points. The Informal Inquiry presents the first significant attempt to assess the impact and the use of migration profiles since they were first discussed in 2005. The main aim of this survey was to identify elements for a more sophisticated and better utilised MP tool in the future and to learn more about the extent to which MPs/EMPs have developed into a sustainable tool contributing to greater policy coherence and the mainstreaming of migration into development plans.

So far out of 30 responses, 15 completed questionnaires have been received. The preliminary results show the lack of a common understanding of migration profiles, such as what they can entail and how they differ. In addition, results suggest that the link between the migration profile exercise and policy making is not clearly established. Although the preparation of the MPs in itself is policy-relevant as it helps to contribute to policy coherence by bringing different stakeholders together, migration profiles are not yet seen by all respondents as an important tool
Examples of incorporation of migration questions in national development surveys and statistical data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Empirical-based approach to Policy Development (Diaspora Relations Bureau)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner(s):</td>
<td>OIM, ENPI, UE, IASCI, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s):</td>
<td>Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags:</td>
<td>Data and Research, Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>For having an empirical approach, data-bases and studies are needed. DRB, in cooperation with International Organizations developed and are still working on important studies that would provide realistic data on migration: Extended migration profile (OIM, 2010) is to be renewed, Cartography of Moldovan Diaspora (OIM, ENPI, UE 2012, 2013), Migration Profile in Moldova (NEXUS, 2012, 2013), Children Left behind are quantitative benchmarks, that allows institutions to build need-based and high impact policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>‘Enhancing Georgia’s Migration Management’ - Eastern Partnership Integration and Co-operation (EaPIC) Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner(s):</td>
<td>EU, ICMPD, IOM, Georgian authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area(s):</td>
<td>Data and research, Governance of migration and coordination of dialogue, Policy coherence and mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags:</td>
<td>Capacity Building, Data and research, Mainstreaming migration into development planning, Migration profiles, Migration management, Policy coherence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>One of the objectives from this EU-funded programme is to improve the mechanisms in Georgia for collecting and managing data on all migration aspects. To this end, support will be provided for the inclusion of migration questions in the November 2014 National Population census. IOM and ICMPD will assist “GeoStat” (The National Statistics Office of Georgia) with the development of an extended migration module for inclusion, including through providing training for the survey management coordinators and for data analysts by international experts. Assistance will also be provided for the analysis of the migration-related results of the population census, including through comparative analyses with other migration surveys that have already been implemented in Georgia and are to be reviewed. The results of the 2014 census will be available in Spring 2015. The census will support the elaboration of a new Extended Migration Profile for Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Links:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Migration in National surveys (National Bureau of Statistics)

**Country:** Moldova  
**Partner(s):** OIM, ENPI, UE,  
**Thematic Area(s):** Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming  
**Tags:** Data and Research, Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning

**Summary:** National Bureau of Statistics is using Migration Items in 3 national surveys: Labor force Migration (2012, 2013), Labor Force Survey (quarterly), and Research on Household Budget (quarterly). Every Survey is focusing on different aspects of Migration (labor, remittances use, etc).  

**Web Links:**  
http://www.demografie.md/files/3217_informatia_cheianu_migratia_profesorilor_si_diaspora.doc

### National Human Development Reports

**Country:**  
**Partner(s):** UNDP  
**Thematic Area(s):** Data and research, Policy coherence and mainstreaming  
**Tags:** Data and Research, Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning

**Summary:** Of the approximately 20 NHDRs that have dealt with migration issues, few have been able to go beyond national aggregate data to illustrate emigration rates at different geographical localities. An exception is El Salvador, where municipal poverty maps developed by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO/FISDL) have allowed the sub-national disaggregation of the HDI, as well as of data on remittances and poverty. The data was used to compare demographic, education, employment and income indicators among the ten municipalities receiving the lowest amount of remittances and the ten municipalities receiving the highest. One of the most important features of the report is the recognition that migration affects the territory in different ways. The authors review a multitude of municipal-level socio-economic and anthropological studies in selected localities with a high propensity to migrate, covering the period 1993-2005. Additionally, the report develops two case studies through interviews, surveys and focus groups to analyse, with the local population, changes in life standards due to migration and their impact on the community life.  

Priorities emerging from case studies in areas with a high prevalence of migration include quality and sustainable employment; investment in education, science and technology; identification of strategic sectors such as agriculture, tourism and handcrafts; a more transparent and accountable civil service; policies to increase the saving rate and a new fiscal pact; and more coordinated and participatory policy making. In the vision proposed by the El Salvador NHDR 2005, migration can be turned into a resource for rural communities by using the by-products of migration such as remittances, return-tourism and export of nostalgia products to nationals abroad to re-invigorate local development. The authors advocate for strategies developed at the local level through the understanding of the complexity of rural coping strategies, the empowerment of local self-governments and the development of non-agricultural opportunities in rural areas related to tourism and handcrafts.

**Web Links:**
**Further Reading**


KNOMAD background paper and summary report on Policy and Institutional Coherence for Migration and Development

Migration Mainstreaming – Policy and Programme experiences on the GMG website
http://www.globalmigrationgroup.org/content/mainstreaming-policy-and-programme-experiences