

GFMD 2011 Thematic Meeting Summary Report

Workshop on Mainstreaming Migration into Strategic Policy Development Location, Date

Organized and hosted by:	Government of the Republic of Moldova, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration. Co-hosted by the Governments of Bangladesh, Mali and Jamaica.
In Collaboration with:	Global Migration Group Working Group on Mainstreaming Migration in Development Strategies (GMG WG); International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Supported by (funding entities):	Government of Switzerland (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation); European Commission (EU ENPI 2008-funded IOM project "Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership").
Workshop Coordinator:	International Organization for Migration, Mission to Moldova (IOM)
Expert advisers:	GMG WG co-chairs Lars Johan Lönnback (IOM) and Paul Ladd (UNDP); Sarah Rosengaertner (UNDP Bureau for Development Policy)
Rapporteur:	Silas Rapold (IOM)
Participants¹:	States Bangladesh, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Ghana, Jamaica, Mali, Moldova, Philippines, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, Viet Nam International Organizations ETF, ILO, IOM, OHCHR, Swedish Public Employment Service, UNDESA, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, WHO, World Bank National line ministries Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration, European Integration Department, Unit of Political Cooperation with EU; Ministry of Health, Directorate of Medical Staff Management Policies; Ministry of Interior. Bureau for Migration and Asylum; Ministry of Labor, Social Protection and Family, Human Resources Development and Employment Policies; Ministry of Labour Social Protection

¹ Are listed only participating entities intervening with a formal presentation and representatives acting as expert discussants.

and Family, Protection of Family and Children Rights' department.

Civil Society/Academia

Himilo Relief and Development Association HIRDA, Somali diaspora organization, Netherlands; African Foundation for Development (AFFORD), United Kingdom; African Diaspora Policy Center, The Netherlands; Moldovan Scientific Diaspora, France; CARIM East; Moldovan State University, Chair of Sociology.

Total number of participants: 80

I. Introduction

The GFMD 2011 concept placed particular importance on sharpening the focus on planning tools required to promote evidence-based migration and development policies, in order to build on the intensive exchange and outcomes on these issues in previous GFMD meetings.

The Republic of Moldova is among the GFMD stakeholders unfurling concrete initiatives at the linkage between data, information and the elaboration of evidence-based policies. Acknowledging the need for adequate analyses of the migration and development nexus at country level, it followed up on the recommendations of the 3rd GFMD Meeting in Athens, 2009, by proceeding with implementing an Extended Migration Profile exercise with the support of the European Union Commission, the EU Member States and IOM.

Viewing the Migration Profile as a vehicle to enhance the design and implementation of evidence-based migration policies and to integrate migration into mainstream policy, Moldova greeted the launch of a complementary tool, the Global Migration Group *Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning*, launched at the 2010 GFMD in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, and initiated a pilot exercise to test the Handbook's practical implementation supported by UNDP, IOM and GMG partners.

In a context of both the National Development Strategy's and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework's renewal, Moldova wished to benefit of the resource of peers' approach to mainstreaming and the Global Migration Group's (GMG) guidance as well as to share its experience of the Extended Migration Profile process and first stage of the mainstreaming exercise. The Chisinau thematic event was organized in order to follow up with practical and action-oriented discussions on the GFMD 2009 recommendation that sustained attention needs to be paid to mainstreaming and integrating migration into development planning processes.

In line with the 2011 GFMD theme of *Taking Action on Migration and Development - Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation*, and the additional key objective of GFMD 2011 of engaging the GMG and civil society, a smaller, focused meeting was organized under Cluster III of the thematic work program of the 2011 Swiss GFMD which deals with Planning tools for evidence-based migration and development policies. Two sub-themes of the 2011 thematic work plan were addressed:

- i) Handbook on 'Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning'
- ii) Implementing Migration Profiles

Conceptually the workshop was therefore designed to advance the synergetic use of two planning tools required for mainstreaming migration and development issues into country and regional level consultation and planning frameworks. The agenda was devised to lead from methodological guidance on mainstreaming of migration to discussion of mainstreaming in various policy sectors, such as education, health and employment. Further sessions were dedicated to fundamental principles informing mainstreaming, such as human rights and gender equality, the involvement of non-governmental actors in mainstreaming policy making and implementation as well as discussion of the data and evidence-base required for mainstreaming processes. The workshop thus generated recommendations both at the sector-specific level, which are rendered the report on discussions, and at the overarching conceptual level related to approaches to migration mainstreaming.

II. Discussion and Key Outcomes of the Workshop

Drawing upon the Mainstreaming Handbook, the main concepts of a mainstreaming process were touched upon, leading to a discussion on the definition of the specific national goals, effectively impacting the most relevant general national planning tools (NDS, PRS, UNDAF/UNPAF) and pursuant synchronized branching out into the concrete activities in relevant sectoral programmes.

Participants were apprised that migration is generally not prioritized in PRSP and strategic documents of this level, yet discussions evidenced awareness among all participants of the significant development potential generated by migration for countries of origin, countries of destination and migrants alike. Migration mainstreaming was equally acknowledged as an engine with the potential to accelerate the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

Given the transversal and cross-cutting nature of migration and the challenges it poses an institutional migration and development structure and mechanism was found to be required to implement and monitor the entire migration mainstreaming process. This structure should also define the actors to be involved, i.e. all concerned government agencies, in a whole-of-government approach, employer organizations, trade unions, international donors and development partners, civil society, research institutions, etc. The pivotal role to be played by GMG, including the World Bank and IOM, and the UN Family on the ground in mainstreaming migration into development planning was stressed by the Swiss government, stating that it is essential to fully engage development partners.

While the Mainstreaming Handbook was already considered a major step forward for concrete action in this crucial field, training for civil servants based on further tools and sector-specific guidance for migration mainstreaming were called for in view of its operationalisation. From the GMG perspective it was mentioned that the mainstreaming method needs to be promoted among international civil servants as well.

Further promotion of a commonality of understanding of the mainstreaming concept and awareness-raising about the Mainstreaming Handbook and available GMG support were recommended to be carried out within the GFMD as well as through regional consultative processes such as the Colombo Process.

In the discussion of concrete stages of a mainstreaming process cycle specific attention was given to the need of setting up appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools/mechanisms to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the devised migration and development interventions. In this context it was mentioned that the GFMD 2011 cluster III comprises the theme of Impact Assessments of Migration and Development Policies and relevant guidance to mainstreaming countries could be provided by the Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research.

Systematic approaches and a common methodology need to inform mainstreaming, yet the execution is context-bound. The reunited mainstreaming countries and other states exemplified

the respective migration situation based on an analysis of diverse parameters like the demographic forecasts, climate change, migration in- and outflow volumes, human capital formation, number of children left behind, brain-drain and waste in certain sectors etc. Accordingly diverse were the preliminary mainstreaming priorities enounced, ranging from a fuller control of labour exporting processes and orienting remittances away from consumption-led growth to the mobilization for mainstreaming of all stakeholders down to the community level.

The difference between migration-sensitive sectoral policies and a comprehensive, systematic, long-term and whole-of-government approach inclusive of all relevant stakeholders was discussed and deemed to require clarification in mainstreaming structures, whose function will be to foster coordination and coherence among sectoral approaches and at times opposing views of institutions and stakeholders. Further awareness-raising on the method of mainstreaming migration and exchange among states with different experiences of mainstreaming were thus strongly encouraged alongside a call for training of national and international civil servants, with a view to enabling the services to carry out such a complex process as mainstreaming.

A strong consensus was expressed that migration mainstreaming needs to be informed by solid and principled fundamentals and grounded in international human rights and gender equality law. In this respect it was found that the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, providing a framework of minimum standards for migrants' rights, requires stronger endorsement and observance in correlation with the contribution of migrants to the development of host countries. Supportive concepts promoted by states, such as migrating with dignity (Bangladesh) and constitutionally anchored universal citizenship (Ecuador) were analyzed with interest.

Women, migrating in progressively higher numbers and often as part of family coping strategies, are disproportionally exposed to abuse and their vulnerability needs to be taken into account at all stages of the migration process. Substantial productivity gains and increased development outcomes of migration can be achieved through addressing violence against migrant women, the devising of gender-sensitive remittances investment and savings schemes and the factoring in of the gender dimension at all stages of policy making including budgeting.

Children affected by migration equally present a higher vulnerability profile. Children migrating unaccompanied and children of migrant parents, especially irregular, may face detention, separation, discrimination, reduced access to public services. Children left behind by one or both parents due to migration often enjoy material benefits from remittances and better educational outcomes but present psycho-social needs which can affect the social tissue on a longer term. The Republic of Moldova showcased an evidence-based strategic approach to this publically sensitive topic, which addressed children left behind in a mainstream child-policy document, but implemented qualitative and quantitative research targeting specifically children left by migrants before designing responses including psycho-social counselling at both ends of the migration corridor and economic empowerment measures for separated families.

The insufficient interface between national education strategies and national labour market needs was highlighted in a number of contexts. Due to persistent wage differentials, national labour markets are in direct competition with the foreign labour markets, and the choice of adapting education and training policies to the former or the latter is operated by states in correlation with respective demographic outlooks and demand and offer on national labour markets. Depending on the context, recommendations and current approaches range from labour force retention through the obligation to serve the country upon attainment of a qualification to the setting up of burden-sharing mechanisms (direct financial compensations or voluntary educational funds) with destination countries in order to allow for training of required specialists in larger numbers than domestically needed.

In this context it was observed that education policies necessitate more complex decisions involving considerations of national and international nature, for instance taking into account

existing skills pools and needs in-country, within destination countries, the diaspora and other sending countries likewise, highlighting the need for multi-stakeholder mainstreaming coordination.

Transfer of skills and innovation in relevant sectors through temporary return of expatriate highly-skilled nationals was recommended as a programmatic intervention facilitative of brain-circulation and creation of knowledge and innovation networks with host institutions in destination countries.

The recognition of qualifications and both formal and informal skills was strongly debated, as an issue arising both for migrants while integrating the labour force of destination countries and migrants returning with skills acquired abroad. A cited multinational survey established that skills acquired abroad were subjectively indicated by migrants as the single most beneficial element of their migration experience. In particular medium skilled migrants can improve their skill level through migration, measured as a proportion of the migrants by ISCED level, yet in most cases mechanisms to recognise these skills are inexistent. This systematically arising issue was suggested to be addressed by (a) increasing transparency and trust between countries, (b) recognizing both formal and informal skills, (c) sharing information about demand and supply in labour markets, and (d) concluding bilateral agreements. While the pursuing of bilateral solutions was recognised as the most viable course of action, corresponding initiatives through regional frameworks such as ASEAN, APCC and CARICOM CSME were reported.

Discussions on the migration challenges in the health sector focused on two distinct issues, access to health services of migrants and families and the migration of medical staff as a specific aspect related generally to the challenges of transnational management of migration and employment.

Mention was made of the shift in perception of migrant health, from the disease prevention to social exclusion based on the stigma of towards more modern approaches based on inclusion, reduction of inequalities and social protection as well as integration. The need for more policies and strategies that focus on migrant-sensitive health systems was reiterated and a call made to factor in considerations for the mental health of migrants. It has been estimated that the costs of identifying and addressing migration health challenges are inferior to the costs engendered by neglecting them. In this context it was mentioned a need to strengthen dialogue between services of Ministries for the Interior and Ministries of Health at the national level.

Special emphasis was placed on challenges faced by health systems in dealing with migration of skilled health workforce, current trends, opportunities and interventions aimed at mitigating negative impacts of this prevailing phenomenon. The Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel, adopted by the World Health Assembly in 2010, was considered an important reference in a context where the European Union, for instance, estimates that until 2020 it will lack one million of health workers countries to report on its implementation. In this context the need to ensure private health sector actors' endorsement of ethical recruitment standards was stressed. Models based on circular migration of health professionals or temporary return of permanently emigrated staff, as offering respectively post-graduate training and an opportunity to support the homeland, were promoted as proven efficient palliative measures.

Salary top-ups to re-attract migrants with relevant skills and expertise were upheld by some representatives as an effective means to cover skills gaps and in cases concerning public positions enhance the good governance impacts of migration. Opposing positions were registered to the effect that top-ups distort natural work-force competition, generate frustration and propensity to migrate among existing personnel. A system of incentives addressing migrants and resident nationals equally was thus accorded priority. For states concerned with returning their labour force, exploring the potential of public-private partnerships was recommended as well as incentives for the employers to engage returning migrant workers and continuous dissemination of information on job opportunities among migrants abroad. A successful migration and employment sector policy was judged to hinge on its coherence with the general economic

growth and development strategy as well as the structural demands in partner countries, thus benefitting in the first line of multi-stakeholder mainstreaming coordination.

The need to consider the employment conditions were mentioned in the discussion of benefits for both countries of origin and destination, and that legal migration channels through organized recruitment schemes or regulated circular migration schemes as a win-win proposal for all stakeholders are to be promoted to ensure the security and protection of labour migrants.

The relevance of a bottom-up approach engaging local actors for the mainstreaming process involving local authorities, NGOs and other parts of civil society was mentioned. The EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI), with its Project Cycle Training and its on-line Community of Practice, proposes an effective model targeting the local communities and local authorities alongside transnational civil society. In this respect complementary facilitative means of exchanges and information sharing which are not based on electronic means of communication were recommended.

Sustained discussions evolved around diaspora both as a policy target and as interlocutor and actor in the design and implementation of migration and development policies. A number of represented states related experiences of diaspora engagement through the functioning of dedicated government structures at ministerial or departmental level dealing with issues of and ties to nationals overseas.

The judiciousness of establishing regular dialogue with constituted national diasporas was generally recognized. Cited models ranged from a parastatal umbrella foundation as reference point for diaspora organizations in destination countries (Jamaica), regular Diaspora Congresses (Moldova) to more targeted platforms such as the Forum of Malian Diaspora Intellectuals and Scientists. The legitimacy of diasporas' involvement in political processes, on the other hand, was deemed problematic, especially in contexts where emigrants form a substantial ratio to the overall population, and potentially leading to an effect of polarization of the diaspora. Diaspora engagement was thus recommended to focus more on their provision of expertise, potential of supporting nationals abroad and contributions to the homeland's development. It was also noted that depending on the conditions of their emergence and position in the maturity cycle diaspora associations require targeted capacity building prior to becoming a relevant migration and development actor to be involved not in a parallel development process but integrated in mainstream North-South dialogue.

While positive infrastructure impacts and investment in national schooling systems through diaspora and returning migrants were registered by a number of countries, a lack of indicators to capture the impact of diaspora on development outcomes was deplored. Attention was also given to the fact that diasporas present varying profiles and that specialized researches and surveys to determine their socio-economic profile, needs and capacities are warranted. Such endeavours were recommended to be coupled with the establishment of databases of diaspora associations or skill pools represented by individuals in the diaspora. Given the need for consistent data flows on diaspora it was recommended to explore ways of enhancing the use of data generated through diplomatic missions in destination countries.

Questions related to migration-relevant data emerged throughout the workshop, evidencing thereby significant progress in a domain which was consistently prioritized in GFMD proceedings in previous years as reflected inter alia in the workings of the GFMD Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research. The seminar agreed on the need to move the migration discourse away from rhetoric to informed decisions based on a full body of evidence.

Migration Profiles, in particular Extended Migration Profiles, were recognized as essential tools in supporting national mainstreaming processes. Through their focus on the product and lesser attention to a participatory whole-of-Government approach, results of Migration Profiles were often not mainstreamed in policy making. Extended Migration Profiles, with their focus on inter-

ministerial and inter-agency coordination and building of national capacities and expertise, are process-oriented and represent a high potential of synergy with mainstreaming processes, which may be enhanced by the use of common coordination mechanisms and policy-making fora.

In the context of heightened attention to migration allocation of resources to implement UN guidelines on migration statistics was recommended as well as more consistently exploiting administrative data and census figures possessed by states. The harmonization of concepts/definitions/metadata of existing data with international standards for regional and international comparability of the Migration Profiles was deemed of a higher priority than collection of new data. Yet, various data gaps mentioned by participants (social and other impacts of migration; migration propensity; diaspora profiles; skill levels of migrants; sex-disaggregation, in-country regional breakdown) outlined a need of discussions focusing not on the purposes of Migration Profiles in relation to mainstreaming but on the types of (additional) evidence needed and the process of generating that very evidence. A GFMD event dedicated to these aspects was suggested and a recommendation made to consider the necessity of a UN-supported world migration survey program.

Key Outcomes

1. Among the broad range of States represented at the Policy Seminar a clear reaffirmation of the relevance of migration for the sustainable development of countries was expressed as well as the necessity of grounding migration policies in international human rights and gender equality law.
2. It was furthermore reaffirmed that increasing the capture of the input of migration for development would hinge upon more systematic approaches such as the method formulated by the Global Migration Group endorsed by the GFMD in 2010.
3. A long term approach is advocated enabling engagement of a broad range of stakeholders (NGOs, private sector, diaspora etc.) and critically enabling national goals on migration and development to effectively be inserted into the general national development planning tools.
4. The seminar strongly supported the evidence-based approach and thereby using the full range of materials available as well as methodologies developed for instance through the Extended Migration Profiles. Extended migration profiles and mainstreaming are both processes, and not static tools, and very complementary.
5. States are at different levels of development of their own concepts of mainstreaming and further awareness-raising, including through the translation of the Mainstreaming Handbook and further guidance into a number of languages, and exchange among states with different experiences of mainstreaming was strongly encouraged.
6. Peer exchanges and coaching between governments of different regions of the world on issues of common interest were recommended as a powerful strategy to strengthen capacity of governments. Furthermore a strong demand exists for targeted training of both national and international civil servants on the concept and actual operationalisation of mainstreaming migration into national development agendas.
7. States are encouraged to utilize the two existing mechanisms within the GFMD process to generate awareness and help implement the recommendations of the meeting, namely: A) the ad hoc WG on Policy Coherence, Data and Research - co chaired by Switzerland and Morocco and comprised of about 13 member states and a number of GMG agencies, whose work plan includes mainstreaming migration into development and encouraging the use of migration profiles, evaluation tools and other mechanisms that promote an evidence-based approach to policy-making; and B) the GFMD Platform

for Partnerships (PfP) - an online and offline space that enables governments to showcase concrete practices on Migration and Development, make calls for action, and establish networks with other governments and also with non-governmental stakeholders to implement GFMD outcomes and recommendations.

III. Conclusion

Core message for the EFOF (2011 CD)

The strong message emerging from the meeting was that there is significant development potential generated by migration for countries of origin, countries of destination and migrants. The need for more balanced, proactive instances of dialogue was recognized in order to address at integrated level migration and development and implement the commitment to move towards actions with the migration mainstreaming method.

Mainstreaming of migration as a complex process hinges on strong ownership of concerned governments; coherence and coordination at intra-governmental level and among multiple associated stakeholders; appropriate timing of onset in policy-making cycles and length of the planning horizon; better data and better awareness, understanding and use of data for informed decisions and evaluation of progress achieved; approaches which are inclusive of civil society, the private sector and diasporas; solid and principled fundamentals related to human rights and international legal frameworks, gender dimension and the situation of children; efforts of the UN system, international organizations and donors to improve coordination and adjust responses to challenges while reducing transaction costs for governments.

Migration mainstreaming translates into a great demand on the capacities of the authorities in translating challenges into sectoral policies through mainstreaming. The GFMD represents a useful platform to promote a better understanding of and further exchanges on mainstreaming of migration into development planning and should aim at involving a broader range of ministries in the GFMD process in order to strengthen discussions on inter-sectorial coherence in the mainstreaming debate. Regional dialogue and consultations among governments can foster common mainstreaming approaches and promote mutual understanding, while the GMG and UN Country Teams on the ground should be crucially engaged to effectively support governments in their mainstreaming processes.

Proposed additional questions for the EFOF (2011 CD)

1. How can peer-assisted learning on migration mainstreaming be leveraged at regional and global levels? Is there a need for further mechanisms within or besides the GFMD ad-hoc WG on Policy Coherence, Data and Research and the GFMD Platform for Partnerships?
2. Which are the best modalities to capture and make broadly available the experiences of ongoing migration mainstreaming processes in the four GMG pilot countries and precursor initiatives in Ghana and Morocco?
3. How can interaction and synergies between the GFMD and GMG and their respective working groups be leveraged, generally, and specifically with regard to the mainstreaming of migration?
4. How can interaction and synergies with the European Union as a migration and development policy actor and as major donor in the field be enhanced? How can GFMD outcomes, on the one hand, and national mainstreaming processes, on the other hand, interrelate with the EU Global Approach to Migration and its tools such as Mobility Partnerships?
5. Is there need for a world migration survey program, comparable to Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey and Labour Force Survey programs?

Date of Summary Report: 23 October, 2011