I. Background & Objectives

The GFMD, currently presided over by the Swiss Chair-in-Office for 2011, convened a workshop on “Managing Migration for Development: Policymaking, Assessment and Evaluation” in Marseille on June 13th-15th 2011. This event was prepared and jointly organized by the World Bank and IOM.

The Marseille workshop was a concrete response to the recommendation made by governments at the 2010 GFMD meeting in Puerto Vallarta to harness data and research tools to help promote policy and institutional coherence and a ‘culture of evaluation’ around migration initiatives. This was the second thematic event to be organized in support of the work program of the 2011 GFMD under the Swiss Chairmanship. The workshop was co-chaired by the governments of Morocco and Belgium. The outcomes of this thematic meeting as reported below will be shared and discussed at the extended Friends of the Forum meeting in early December 2011.

This global event also had a specific regional focus on MENA countries in the current context of the Arab Spring. The list of invitees included a large number of policy-makers and migration practitioners from MENA and other regions of the World, but also experts from the academia and international organizations involved in migration policymaking and evaluation.

It provided the opportunity for regional and global knowledge sharing on migration management and set the stage for policy dialogue among key stakeholders on the role of monitoring and evaluation for improved policy making and enhanced development outcomes.

The specific workshop objectives were as follows:

1. Promote sharing of best practices on migration policy among participating governments, with technical inputs from relevant expert organizations, and a particular focus on policy objectives, design, assessment and evaluation of specific interventions;
2. Inform participants about the importance of assessment and evaluation of migration interventions to strengthen policymaking, and provide useful ideas and
tools to help governments assess the impact of their migration policies on development outcomes;
3. Share and discuss innovative examples of previous evaluations conducted by some governments or international agencies in the migration or development policy fields;
4. Set the stage for dialogue between senior policy makers and international experts for improving human development outcomes through international cooperation in migration-related areas.

II. Lead Questions & Discussion Outcomes

The opening session of the workshop addressed the core questions that the workshop as a whole would address - why improving migration policymaking is important, and the benefits that can be derived from making effective migration and development policies; and the current status of migration-related evaluation and assessment, the barriers which have prevented more assessment and evaluation from taking place, and how these barriers might be overcome.

The rest of the first day of the workshop explored the rationale for migration interventions, the design of policies and programmes in a couple of specific case study areas, and how assessment and evaluation contributes to the development and improvement of those interventions. The main questions addressed were the following:

- What does managing migration for development involve in terms of policymaking?
- What kinds of interventions are commonly used?
- Why does assessment and evaluation of migration interventions matter to strengthen policymaking?

The sessions highlighted some key points:

(1) Highly developed migration management systems in countries of origin (such as Moldova, Jamaica, and the Philippines) have many components (addressing social protection, rights protection, diaspora engagement, remittances etc). Bringing these dimensions together for coherent policy making implies clear policy goals for migration policies within national planning/development strategy, a clear legal and institutional framework, a lead public agency and good inter-ministerial cooperation;

(2) Some countries of origin have a very comprehensive set of interventions, regulations and institutions for migration management but lack data collection, policy assessment and evaluation to understand the outcomes and to improve policymaking over time. The reasons for this could range from the intrinsic complexity of the evaluation methods, their high cost, and long gestation lags between undertaken effort and measuring results.
The second day focused on the importance and methodology of monitoring and evaluation for evidence-based policy making as well as opportunities for knowledge sharing and cooperation. The main questions addressed were the following:

- What does monitoring and evaluating migration interventions involve and what tools and techniques are available?
- What are the barriers preventing monitoring and evaluation to be more commonly applied to migration interventions?
- What kinds of international cooperation and knowledge sharing mechanisms are needed to move forward?

The sessions on the second day stressed issues such as:

(1) The benefits of conducting assessment and evaluation in terms of understanding a project’s impacts and benefits, building support for successful projects amongst key stakeholders, and improving policymaking over time;
(2) The need to address the “fear factor”: evaluation is not a threat but an opportunity to learn about the effectiveness of governments’ interventions.
(3) The need for training and capacity building of government officials to overcome technical difficulties, using experts from international organizations and academia on an on-demand basis;
(4) The need to integrate M&E from the onset as integral component of policy design and build a sound results framework including objectives, intended outcomes and policy trade-offs. This can be done by mapping out the way the decisions to be taken (using a ‘decision tree’), and the process by which the policy or programme is expected to achieve the desired effects (using a ‘results chain’). It is important too to move beyond project outputs to assess actual outcomes;
(5) There is a menu of M&E tools from participatory and qualitative monitoring to quantitative impact evaluations with counterfactual: use adapted methods according to context & issues.

III. Conclusions & Recommendations

1. Developing a culture of evaluation and evidence-based policy-making: In order to improve the human development outcomes of migration policies and programs in the long run, policymakers and development practitioners need to address the “fear factor” and really examine the effectiveness of their interventions. Evaluations should not be viewed as a burden but an opportunity to learn from past experiences and improve policies and programs.

2. Assessment and Evaluation as an integral component of policymaking: Assessment and evaluation should be integrated upfront in policy design, starting with determining the objectives, trade-offs and intended outcomes of an intervention.
3. **Choosing relevant approaches in the menu of M&E tools:** From qualitative and participatory monitoring approaches to state-of-the-art quantitative impact evaluations, policymakers and development practitioners can selectively from a broad range of methods to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of migration programs. The M&E tools used by the evaluators must be adapted to the context and policy issues at stake.

4. **Capacity building:** Governments are very often absorbed by daily operations and do not always have the expertise or resources required for evaluation. International organizations and experts can help to strengthen the capacities of governments requesting assistance with evidence-based policy making.

5. **Engaging local expertise:** When providing policy advice to governments, international experts should try to engage local experts and researchers but also migrant associations and civil society organizations. This should more comprehensive and context-sensitive policy design, data collection and evaluation exercises, while also building capacity locally to carry out similar exercises in future.

6. **Ensuring a demand-driven process:** International experts and development practitioners should be led by the views of Governments who are the ultimate operators of migration policies and programs. This means ensuring that Governments have ownership of each element of work being undertaken.

7. **Using the momentum:** The broader context of the Arab Spring and the launch of the joint WB-IOM initiative at the Marseille Center for Mediterranean integration provide major opportunities to make a difference in the field of migration for human development in MENA and beyond. This special moment should energize decision makers, development practitioners and international experts to come up with innovative tools and ideas for improved evidence-based policymaking.

8. **Informing and facilitating policy dialogue:** International organizations have a role to play in convening meetings between sending and receiving countries and between different ministries within countries to inform and facilitate policy dialogue. This can contribute to the promotion of a big picture approach to migration management, moving beyond narrow, short-sighted interventions.

9. **Promoting Human Development:** Migration policymaking should not only focus on the economic perspective but also take into account the broader social impacts of cross-border movements of people. A more comprehensive approach would intend to promote Human Development outcomes for migrants and their home and host societies.
10. Partnership building and knowledge sharing: Migration policy is inter-national by nature and should therefore involve cooperation and knowledge sharing on local and regional practices at the global level. The partnership spirit of the GFMD aims at fostering such cooperation.

IV. Messages from the Middle East and North Africa

The recent events across the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) have highlighted the importance of providing safe and productive jobs at home and abroad to the large cohort of young and increasingly well-educated labor market entrants. The current inability to provide sufficient numbers of quality jobs as well as economic and demographic imbalances within and outside the region contributes to migration towards the Gulf, Europe, and North America. The large number of migrants displaced by the Libyan conflict adds to existing pressures on unemployment and basic social services in the already strained regions of Egypt and Tunisia bordering Libya. In such a critical context, the Marseille workshop provided the opportunity to initiate the policy dialogue with senior migration policymakers and experts from MENA governments on more effective management of migration to face the intensifying employment and development challenges of the Arab World.

The MENA region was represented by the following countries: Algeria (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Egypt (Ministry of Manpower and Migration), Jordan (Ministry of Planning), Morocco (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Ministry in charge of the Moroccans Residing Abroad (MRE), National Agency for Employment & Skills (ANAPEC), Permanent Mission of Morocco to the UN in Geneva), West Bank and Gaza (Ministry of Labor), and Tunisia (Ministry for Professional Training and Employment, and National Employment Agency (ANETI)).

The government representatives from MENA countries made an active contribution to this event: Tunisia presented on the public provision of international intermediation services and the challenges and opportunities of the recent liberalization of private recruitment agencies; Egypt exposed the main patterns of inward and outward migration flows and related policy challenges and institutional arrangements to face the current context; Jordan and West Bank & Gaza both chaired a plenary session; and as co-chair of the meeting Morocco intervened in the opening and the closing remarks.

The main messages conveyed by the MENA government representatives on the challenges and opportunities to strengthen their labor migration systems were as follows:

1. In order to move towards a mutually beneficial and concerted approach of migration management between MENA and EU countries and meet the
expectations of young potential Arab migrants as well as the current skill needs of European employers, the scope of current bilateral agreements should be broadened beyond mere seasonal migration in the agricultural sector and provide targeted access to the European labor market according to identified labor market needs and skills available in sending countries;
2. The capacities of MENA sending countries for international labor intermediation services must be reinforced and administrative constraints curtailed in cooperation with European receiving countries in order to fully exploit the potential benefits offered by existing bilateral agreements;
3. There is a need for relevant skill matching mechanisms to better connect potential Arab migrant workers to European employers’ need, possibly through web-based platforms and automated recruitment tools;
4. Special provisions and mechanisms to protect migrant workers need to be established, especially in the context of liberalization of private international recruitment services as recently introduced in Tunisia.

Beyond those specific policy issues, a major immediate concern voiced by Egypt, Morocco and especially Tunisia is the assistance to and reintegration of return migrants and Libyan refugees displaced by the Libyan conflict. This problem has become particularly acute in underserved areas of Tunisia or Egypt neighboring Libya.