Global Forum on MIGRATION & DEVELOPMENT

GFMD | Mauritius 2012

Background Paper

(Original version: English)

Roundtable 2 - Factoring Migration into Development Planning

RT 2.1: *Supporting National Development through Migration Mainstreaming Processes, Extended Migration Profiles and Poverty Reduction Strategies*

Co-Chairs of RT 2.1: Morocco and Switzerland

Team members preparing the session: Bangladesh; Jamaica; Madagascar; Mauritius; Moldova; Niger; Nigeria; Philippines; Tunisia; Sweden; and UNDP, IOM, ICMPD, ECDPM, EU and Georgetown University

Roundtable 2 Coordinators: Dr Rolph Jenny; Viraj Ghoorah Latanraj

Introduction

The Chair-in-Office of the 2012 GFMD has made the topic of "Factoring migration to development planning" one of the priority issues to be addressed by this year's Global Forum summit. Building on earlier GFMD discussions, the session aims to sharpen the focus on the planning tools required for governments to factor migration into development planning, in particular Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning processes and Extended Migration Profiles. Other migration-related development and poverty reduction strategies, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) will be addressed, *inter alia* in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Two preparatory workshops were held in preparation for the session: *'Factoring Migration into Development Planning'*, Mauritius, 12-13 June 2012; and *'Promoting Policy Coherence for Development in International Migration Issues'*, Brussels, 26 June 2012. The session also builds on other activities of the *ad hoc* Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research.

The session will take further earlier GFMD discussions on the *rationale and concepts* underlying the above-mentioned planning tools, in the context of the overall challenge to promote Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) in the field of migration and development policy and practice. The session will take stock of *concrete progress* made by governments and the European Commission in planning and implementing migration and development mainstreaming processes and related Migration Profiles, and also incorporate PRSPs within the mainstreaming component. This will require a systematic analysis of migration and development policy processes at the intra-governmental, inter-governmental, multilateral, and multi-stakeholder levels. A further focus will be on national capacity and required coordination mechanisms, within government and beyond, to ensure enhanced policy, program and institutional coherence. Emphasis will also be placed on how interested governments and other actors, including the Global Migration Group (GMG), share information on the implementation of these planning tools.

Session objectives

a) Following earlier GFMD recommendations, **raise awareness and deepen the understanding of the rationale and concepts** underlying the Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning tool, Extended Migration Profiles, and other migration-related development strategies, including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs);

b) **Take stock of concrete progress made by governments** and other actors in implementing the above planning tools in the light of their overall efforts to promote Policy Coherence for Development in the field of migration and development policy and practice;

c) Pursue the GFMD focus and discussion on **national capacity and related policy, program and institutional coherence** to link migration and development planning and strategies more effectively;

d) Ensure continued **information sharing** among governments and between governments and non-state actors on these tools;

1. Background and Context

1.1 *Rationale, concepts and definitions*

Since the first UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD) in 2006, states have explored, through the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), collaborative approaches to enhancing the benefits and curbing the negative impacts of migration for development. The discussions and issues addressed at the GFMD have considerably evolved since it

was first convened in 2007. As from 2009, the Global Forum has paid dedicated attention to the topic of *factoring migration into development strategies*, together with a sustained emphasis on the need for better migration data and for greater institutional and policy coherence on migration and development. The integration of these elements characterizes the GFMD's comprehensive approach to factoring migration into development planning, as well as the members' understanding of the importance of migration and development in relation to achieving the MDGs and for realising the Millennium Declaration's ambition to ensure that globalisation becomes a positive force for all people. In addition to the planned next UNHLD, 2013 will also feature the high-level event on a post-MDG framework, and as such increases the opportunity for the UNHLD to result in commitments of the UN to further strengthen Policy Coherence for Development (PCD). Discussions in the GFMD have clarified that doing so requires synergetic and systematic support towards the achievement of development objectives within all policies that include migration and development dimensions.

The aggregate implications of migration for the human development aspirations of countries and communities are often harder to track. Few countries have good data and systematic analysis on the migration realities they face; on how these migration realities are affected by their legislative and policy choices; and how they are in turn impacting on the development goals of the country as formulated in the national development strategy; sector-specific strategies; and/or Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The aim of factoring migration into development planning is to address these gaps and inequities, and to enable governments to take a context-specific and proactive approach to reconciling their country's development aspirations with the migration realities it faces. The key planning tools are Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning processes and Extended Migration Profiles, as well as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs).

1.2   *Mainstreaming migration into development planning*

A ubiquitous term in the world of development cooperation (where mainstreaming is a common approach to cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights and the environment) the language of mainstreaming is less familiar to the international 'migration community'. The Global Migration Group's (GMG) Handbook on *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning* was designed to introduce migration practitioners to the process of development planning, and to give development practitioners an idea of how migration could be factored into the development planning cycle as well as sector specific strategies in the areas of employment, health, education etc.

The Handbook defines migration mainstreaming as **"*the process of assessing the implications of migration for any action or goals planned in a development and poverty reduction strategy*"**. (ibid.) Mainstreaming thus means taking a systematic, rather than ad-hoc, approach to the inter-linkages between migration and development, based on a substantive assessment or analysis of those linkages. The mainstreaming process brings focused attention to: 1) a country's policy framework, including legislation, policies, and programmes that affect migration and development; 2) its institutional framework, including the role of different government and non-government stakeholders and the establishment of sustainable consultative mechanisms; and 3) bilateral and regional cooperation frameworks, including development.

The benefits of taking a mainstreaming approach are multi-faceted: First and foremost, the decision to mainstream migration into a country's national development strategy is a significant statement of political will, which provides a mandate for greater institutional and policy coherence and the development of sectoral policies by introducing a migration perspective. It supports the view that migration is an issue that affects all aspects of human development, including human rights.[1] It helps identify gaps in existing legislative and policy frameworks, and prompts the inclusion of relevant

---

[1] Migration also has socio-economic impacts on children and adolescents (i.e. children and adolescents left-behind, on the move and in destination countries). Mainstreaming migration can address the needs of this vulnerable social group which also includes adolescent girls and young women. Particular difficulties are also faced by the elderly left behind migrating relatives.

international instruments and conventions. And, it can be expected to facilitate funding and technical assistance for migration and development-related activities through mobilisation of resources from international partners for development plans (GMG Handbook 2010, p. 16).

The structured and consultative nature of the development planning process, with its sequencing of successive stages – from an initial situation analysis over the prioritization of objectives and formulation of an action plan to implementation planning and Monitoring & Evaluation - provides the procedural framework for migration mainstreaming. Steering this process, countries will need to create a dedicated institutional structure to ensure follow-through and ownership by national stakeholders.[2]

1.3 *Extended Migration Profiles*

The Migration Profile (MP) concept was first introduced by the European Commission (EC) in its Communication on Migration and Development [COM (2005) 390] as a basic tool for the collection, analysis and sharing of migration-related data. Since then, MPs have evolved considerably in terms of format, content and objectives, and a diverse range of different types of MPs have been prepared. In recent years, the GFMD and GMG have tried to promote a common understanding of the MP concept between the different actors developing such country reports. A Migration Profile could be defined as *"a country-owned tool, prepared in consultation with a broad range of stakeholders, which can be used to enhance policy coherence, evidence-based policymaking and the mainstreaming of migration into development plans."[3]* The Migration Profiles Repository created in the framework of the GFMD Platform for Partnership contains information on approximately 150 MPs by mid 2012 and includes reports ranging from statistical snapshots to in-depth country analyses (for 15 countries, more than one MP is available). The Repository also contains a range of guidance materials to assist governments interested in preparing a MP.

More comprehensive approaches, called 'Extended Migration Profile (EMP)', have been developed in recent years with the support of the EC. What defines a MP as an "Extended MP", is not always clear. The Migration Profiles Repository created in the framework of the GFMD Platform for Partnership provides **three possible ways to define EMPs:** 'Extended' can be interpreted as "*1) broadening the range of themes discussed in the report (e.g. including also social and human development aspects and/or a migration impact analysis), 2) implementing complementary capacity building activities run in parallel with the development of a country report (e.g. conduct a data assessment, setting up an institutional framework, carry out specific thematic studies), and/or 3) preparing all MP activities in consultation with the government and a broad range of stakeholders including the civil society.*" Out of these three characteristics, the consultation and ownership by the national counterpart appears as *a condition sine qua non* to be considered as 'extended' and guarantee the sustainability of the MP exercise.

Particularly in its 'extended' format, MPs represent a useful way to mainstream migration. Indeed, rather than an end in itself, an MP may be the beginning of a process, as some governments have established permanent inter-ministerial working groups on migration (and development), which represents the first step to the mainstreaming of migration into development planning. In this regard, the MP itself aims to enable policymakers to access the existing data in a simple and time-efficient way, while the exercise helps build policymakers' skills and practices in correctly interpreting available migration data and applying it directly to their policy making decisions. Inter-ministerial working groups also facilitate joint discussions about migration policy, coherence and coordination

---

[2] While each country will find its own, context-specific solution as to who will guide the process and which stakeholders are to be involved, the GMG Handbook provides an indicative set-up for a support structure consisting of: A national focal point within government, in charge of leading and coordinating the mainstreaming process; an expert facilitator to support the national focal point; a small support group of government, UN country team (UNCT) and potentially civil society stakeholders to provide expert advice and technical assistance to the focal point and facilitator; an inter-ministerial mechanism; a larger multi-stakeholder consultative mechanism.

[3] *Migration Profiles: Making the Most of the Process*, IOM, 2011

between a large range of ministries, and, depending on their set-up and mandate, they can support national and regional initiatives to mainstream migration into development plans through country situation analysis and monitoring and evaluation of outcomes. One challenge for the future will be to move from compiling existing data through MPs to gathering new evidence. MPs provide a useful baseline starting point for a mainstreaming exercise, and can help to define a new migration and development research agenda. But new research and data collection, particularly age and sex disaggregated data, are likely to be required in most contexts in order to understand better the complex linkages between migration, development and poverty reduction.

1.4   *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)*

The preparation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers is the principal mechanism through which low income countries develop and present their development strategies. These strategies are expected to be country-driven, results-oriented, comprehensive and long-term in perspective, and foster domestic and external partnerships for poverty eradication and development.[4]   The PRSPs are prepared by low income country governments with the participation of domestic stakeholders and international development partners, including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. They are updated every three years with annual progress reports. The PRSPs describe the country's macroeconomic, structural, and social policies and programs over a three year or longer horizon to promote broad-based growth and reduce poverty, as well as associated financing needs and major sources of financing.[5]

As described by IMF and World Bank, "National poverty reduction strategies recognize that sound growth requires investment, not least in human capital and infrastructure, as well as the right macroeconomic and structural policies, good governance, and healthy institutions.

Countries are seeking to build an improved investment climate, to compete in world markets, and to foster development that is less dependent upon official financing in the long-term."[6] The first GFMD meeting in Brussels took up the issue of the inclusion of migration issues into PRSPs, recognizing that migrants and their remittances can play an important role in assisting their home countries to achieve this type of long-term development, and also that migration should be a choice rather than a necessity. PRSPs have been on the agenda ever since. The year by year review of PRSPs demonstrated that many governments recognized that both internal and international migration was occurring but few had systematically assessed the importance of this phenomenon for development. That analysis led to the decision to prepare the GMG Handbook.

2.   Policies and Practices – Practical steps towards factoring migration into development planning: tools and progress made

2.1   *Piloting the GMG Handbook on mainstreaming migration into national development strategies*

Since the beginning of 2011, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the GMG Working Group on Migration Mainstreaming co-chaired by UNDP and IOM are supporting the practical application of the GMG handbook in four countries, including Bangladesh, Jamaica, Moldova and Tunisia[7], through the pilot project "Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies". It marks a collaborative effort to translate the discussions of the GFMD –

---

[4] IMF and World Bank staff, "Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Approach:
Main Findings, 2002 available at http://www.imf.org/External/NP/prspgen/review/2002/031502a.pdf
[5] http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.aspx
[6] IMF and World Bank staff, "Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Approach: Main Findings, 2002.
[7] Tunisia has replaced Mali as the 4th pilot country as of September 2012

and States' endorsement of the GMG handbook as a useful tool – into tangible results at the country level.

The project aims to enable the participating countries to comprehensively address migration and development inter-linkages in their national development strategies, policies and programmes; and to create sustainable consultation and monitoring mechanisms within government and with other relevant stakeholders in society. It also aims to strengthen the capacities of UN Country Teams (UNCTs), in the pilot countries and globally, to advice and support governments and their partners on migration and development issues.[8] A number of global events were held to promote the exchange of experiences and peer-to-peer learning among the participating countries and with other governments, including a thematic workshop on "Mainstreaming migration into strategic policy development" held in Moldova in October 2011 as part of the GFMD process; an informal meeting of pilot countries with members of the GFMD working group on policy coherence, data and research, which took place in April 2012 in Geneva; a two-day conference on "Mainstreaming migration into development planning" convened in May in New York by IOM and the Center for Migration Studies in partnership with the SDC and UNDP; and a preparatory workshop for GFMD session 2.1 that took place in Mauritius on 12-13 June.

While all pilot countries are using the GMG handbook as guidance, the project's design and its progress to date vary from country to country. In Jamaica and Moldova, where implementation is most advanced, the project is guided by long-term development strategies – 'Vision 2030 Jamaica' and 'Moldova 2020', respectively – and builds on the simultaneous development of Extended Migration Profiles (EMP) for both countries.

In Jamaica, the main expected result of the pilot project is the formulation of a National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development. Both the EMP and policy development process are anchored institutionally in a newly created National Working Group on International Migration and Development (NWGIMD), which is co-chaired by the Planning Institute of Jamaica and the State Minister in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, thus combining political level leadership with technical level expertise. It includes experts from other ministries and departments as well as from academia, the private sector, international development partners (including the UN Country Team) and non-governmental organizations. The NWGIMD operates with eight thematic sub-committees that are charged with developing specific thematic chapters of the new national M&D policy.

A similar, inclusive mechanism has been set up in Moldova in the context of the development of the country's EMP and it is expected to continue to serve the mainstreaming process, which is led by the State Chancellery of Moldova. Further, the UNCT has created a dedicated working group that follows the mainstreaming process, the latter being firmly embedded in the recently adopted Partnership Framework between the Government of Moldova and the UNCT for the period 2013-2017. An expert consultant is undertaking a mapping of the legislative, policy and institutional framework relating to migration that exists in the country, and a number of initial workshops and consultations with national stakeholders, the UNCT, and international partners have been held. The project in Moldova is expected to lead to the formulation of a comprehensive national policy framework on migration and development.

Initial lessons from both pilots include: the important role of a coordinating body with a cross-cutting mandate (i.e. the planning commission; state chancellery and prime minister's office) to foster a

---

'whole-of-government' approach to migration and development; the need for high-level political buy-in to ensure the sustainability of the process; the benefit of broad-based stakeholder consultations including with civil society partners; the opportunity to use the mainstreaming process to advance dialogue with major destination countries; the synergies that exist with other M&D related initiatives such as the EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI), Extended Migration Profiles and Mobility Partnerships; and the usefulness of the GMG Handbook in providing guiding principles. One of the main obstacles encountered is the difficulty of accessing specialized migration and development expertise to support policy development. Further, there is a need to look beyond national level efforts and to engage with bilateral and regional partners if the policy strategies that are being developed are to be fully effective.

Featuring the example of Jamaica, the GFMD preparatory workshop on "Factoring Migration into Development Planning" on 12-13 June 2012 in Mauritius brought together around 80 participants from national and local governments, international and civil society organizations to discuss existing migration mainstreaming experiences at local and national levels of development planning and identify key lessons and recommendations regarding the institutional, policy, and partnership dimensions of migration mainstreaming. The workshop also discussed some overarching considerations such as the conceptualization of the migration-development nexus; the role of internal migration and local governments in the GFMD context; and potential linkages with other global processes, such as the discussion on a post-2015 development agenda.

An integral part of migration mainstreaming is to create a shared understanding of migration and development dynamics across government and with multiple stakeholders. Yet, the positive outlook on migration as a force for development, fostered by the 2006 UN High-Level Dialogue and nurtured by the GFMD process, is not universally shared, and differences in perspective between various actors still need to be bridged at all levels of governance. There was agreement that migration mainstreaming into development planning must respect – and in fact aim to enable and facilitate - the individual choice to migrate in an informed and safe manner. At the same time, it should serve to better address the positive and negative consequences of individual migration decisions for local and national level human development. Presentations by national and city governments made the case for looking at internal migration dynamics as an integral part of development processes and climate change adaptation strategies. And, several governments raised the question whether it is time for the GFMD to consider internal migration as part of its deliberations.

The workshop also called on the GFMD to link up with other global development processes to advocate for the inclusion of migration concerns and ensure coherence across different fora, including, among other, Rio+20, ICPD Beyond 2014, the UNFCCC, the UN Conference on LDCs, the WTO, and the post-2015 development agenda. It was observed that all these processes could be fora to discuss migration issues in the context of development challenges, climate change adaptation, and as part of larger population dynamics. Civil society could play an important advocacy role using, for example, a set of migration and development goals to influence the post-2015 agenda. The GFMD might also attempt to formulate target outcomes in areas where there is wide-spread consensus among governments, such as on lowering the costs of remittances and recruitment.

A number of countries shared their experience of developing a more or less comprehensive migration (and development) policy based on, and/or feeding into, their national development strategy. The added value lies in fostering a more strategic, outcome-oriented perspective for policy making and monitoring and evaluation. Reported challenges pertained to the lack of data and capacities to support migration mainstreaming. Data gaps include: a) missing migration data; b) missing data and analysis on how migration relates to development impacts; and c) a lack of sharing and harmonization of data among government entities. Capacity gaps affect all groups of stakeholders including national and local governments, civil society, UN country teams, and regional bodies. Suggestions for addressing some of these shortcomings touched on the establishment of an expert pool on migration and development; increased South-South cooperation; and synergies with adaptation-related projects under the UNFCCC Cancun Adaptation Framework.

The workshop also brought focused attention to the integration of migration concerns into local development strategies, featuring a first set of experiences from local actors involved in migration mainstreaming. Local government representatives highlighted a few essential elements for successfully including migration concerns into local planning, and also stressed the importance of easily accessible service delivery and active engagement with migrant communities and families. A key enabling condition for local actors to do planning and mainstreaming is a certain degree of decentralization and devolution. Political leadership and horizontal coordination across sectors are other ingredients for success. As an example, in some countries the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund's (MDGF) programmatic window on Youth, Employment and Migration (YEM) has demonstrated concrete results and lessons on mainstreaming migration processes by integrating migration into sectoral strategies in the areas of youth employment and entrepreneurship. Further, local actors called for realism and a focus on what can best be done at the local level within the confines of national policies, while also recommending an active involvement of relevant central government entities in the mainstreaming process. Lastly, regional and international cooperation with other cities and local administrations was deemed important, as well as, in the case of internal migration, an active dialogue with communities of origin. Further insights can be expected to result from the second phase of the EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative.

A final consideration that was touched upon is the introduction of *reciprocity* in migration mainstreaming processes, whereas mainstreaming would be undertaken jointly or in parallel by countries of origin and destination that are connected by the same migration corridor. Such a 'tandem' approach could enhance the effectiveness of national policies by ensuring a coordinated and matching approach between countries that introduces development considerations into migration policies and vice versa, reconciling the interests of both sides, ideally with broad national-level buy-in from various stakeholders, as well as those of migrants and their families. The operationalization of concepts such as "labour and skills matching", "protection of migrants throughout the migration cycle" and "migration as part of climate change adaptation" could potentially be better facilitated in this way. Reciprocity could also be envisioned to include several partner countries, for example as part of regional level development planning and cooperation. Existing experiences in this area, e.g. in the EU and ECOWAS region could be examined in more detail and shared with other interested regional processes.

2.2 *Implementing Extended Migration Profiles*

The experience of implementing Migration Profiles has revealed a number of positive outcomes as well as challenges, which are linked to both the development and the use of MPs. Ever since the idea of a standard migration report template was introduced and first MPs implemented in 2006[9], one of the main issues has been ensuring continuous government ownership of the process and use of MPs for strategic policy development. Ownership of developing MPs, which means that they are planned, managed and implemented according to the country's needs, is dependent on national capacity as well as political endorsement. When there has been a general lack of capacity among government officials without measures to build this capacity, activities have sometimes been concentrated around the most

---

[9] IOM was the first international organization supporting governments in developing Migration Profiles. In collaboration with the EC, IOM tested the basic migration profile concept in Ecuador and Senegal in 2006, followed then by different national initiatives and/or linked to regional consultative processes or dialogues. In addition to those mentioned above, most prominent projects include 7 Non-EU Member States in South-Eastern Europe in 2007; 12 MPs in the Black Sea Region in 2008 as a component of Black Sea Economic Cooperation project to promote effective migration management and combating migration-related organized crime; 10 MPs in West and Central Africa in 2008-2010 as part of a broader research and capacity-building project; 8 MPs developed in South America between 2009 and 2012; the MP Zimbabwe as part of the larger capacity-building project "Zimbabwe Migration and Development Strategies" including a strong health component in 2009-2010; the MP project Sudan in 2009-2011 leading to the establishment of a "Sudan Migration Research and Information Centre"; 4 MPs part of the current EU-LAC Dialogue project including additional research and capacity building activities and linkages with the pilot phase of the GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning; and some prominent forthcoming MPs exercises such as in Afghanistan, the Republic of Korea, Madagascar, to mention a few. More info is available here: http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/migration-research/migration-profiles.

able. But when individuals or experts outside of government rather than institutions carry the whole MP development process, sustainability suffers as a consequence.

Ongoing MP exercises supported by IOM in Moldova and Serbia highlight how sustainability and strategic use of MPs can be achieved. In *Serbia*, for instance, the government discussed measures on how to institutionalise the MP: Serbia's draft National Law on Migration Management identifies data sharing mechanisms and foresees a regular MP production; the national MP Guide indicates data to be shared by different national actors; the MP is one of the objectives of the National EU Integration Programme and National Migration Management Strategy, and integrated in the tasks of the Commissariat for Refugees. In *Moldova*, the government is about to establish the yearly EMP production under the coordination of the Bureau for Migration and Asylum, while the inter-ministerial technical working group (TWG) established in 2010 for coordinating the execution of the first Extended Migration Profile of the Republic of Moldova becomes the platform for discussions within the UNDP/IOM-led Migration Mainstreaming pilot project. Further, the EMP Report serves as a key reference document for consultations on Moldova's 2020 National Development Strategy and the UN in Moldova's Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2013 – 2017, as well as provided some quantitative benchmarks for the pilot comprehensive evaluation exercise of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership (and forthcoming National Migration and Asylum Strategy adopted in 2011). Finally, the recommendations from the initial data assessment build the basis for forthcoming activities aiming to improve existing evidence base[10].

Another way of anchoring the MP process is to develop MPs within a regional setting, which the member states of the Prague Process, the Budapest Process, the Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM)[11], the EuroMed Partnership on Migration and the Rabat Process are currently doing or have plans to do in the near future.[12] The main purpose of MPs developed in the framework of these RCPs is to support evidence-based inter-governmental cooperation and joint policy development. The *Prague Process*, for instance, declared MPs as a main objective already in its founding declaration of 2009. Today, the knowledge base of the Prague Process contains 16 EMPs, including five EU member states.[13] The results of these EMPs have found their way directly into further programming of the dialogue: the Prague Process Action Plan for the years 2012-2016 is almost exclusively based on priorities formulated in its migration profiles. This and other examples prove that MPs, once finalized, can have a direct and positive impact on the discussion at the political level; not only do they provide a common evidence-base for regional migration dialogues, but they can also serve as politically endorsed reference points for concrete cooperation, a quality which is of particular relevance in multilateral frameworks.[14]

The biggest hurdle usually encountered when starting to develop an MP is the lack of relevant data and existing data scattered over several different agencies and ministries, with varying mandates and institutional frameworks which may impede information sharing. Producing an MP therefore both necessitates and supports enhanced inter-agency cooperation. The example of *Moldova* presented above shows that parallel measures addressing data gaps and supporting inter-agency cooperation and coordination have ensured a sustained government ownership of the process. While it is generally desirable to improve data quality and engage in capacity building, each state should establish the purpose and scope of their MP. Improving data on migration can be a costly and long-term exercise.

---

[10] For example, a review of the Integrated Information System on Migration and Asylum according to international standards and Border Police (MoI) estimates' migration flows .

[11] The MTM has not implemented MPs in the strict sense of the word, but collects information on irregular migration and migration and development since 2006 through questionnaires, on-site information collection, compiling information of MTM Partner Agencies, and open sources. The resulting country profiles, maps and visualisations are shared through the *i-Map* in Arabic, English, and French as well as through informal intergovernmental expert-level meetings and workshops gathering officials of all participating states. For more information, please see http://www.icmpd.org/MTM.1558.0.html

[12] For more information on these RCPs, please see http://www.icmpd.org/Migration-Dialogues.1527.0.html

[13] See http://www.imap-migration.org/index.php?id=474 for a list of completed EMPs.

[14] Since a comprehensive picture of migration usually requires cross-checking or collecting data also from countries of origin or destination, bilateral cooperation between members of the Prague Process has also been strengthened.

Nonetheless, the MP exercise can be an important step towards developing a migration and development data strategy to facilitate the mainstreaming of migration into national development plans. There may be a variety of ways in which governments can obtain better data at relatively low cost, for example, by adding migration questions to existing surveys or, by promoting cooperation between sending and destination countries to ensure that they share their respective data in a timely and effective manner.

Sharing data at the regional level can be facilitated by using web-based tools such as the *i-Map*[15], an online interactive map which currently visualizes several RCP country profiles/MPs on one common platform thereby supporting regional and inter-regional information exchange. At the global level, the Migration Profiles Repository[16] on the GFMD Platform for Partnerships provides online access to a global MP database and offers background information and guidance tools in order to support governments to prepare MPs. The GFMD Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research and the GMG Working Group on Data and Research also promote use of MPs by governments and contribute to development of the MP concept and methodology.

As MPs are a relatively recent initiative, only a few countries have so far updated their MPs. The frequency of producing an MP should be related to its purpose and whether it is a lean version consisting mainly of statistical data or a full analytical EMP with policy recommendations. As has been highlighted since the 2009 Athens GFMD and during the three GFMD thematic workshops in New York, Batumi and Manila in 2011[17], the added-value of having all national migration data in one document goes beyond an instant snapshot. Firstly, the compilation of all national data into one report may reveal ambiguities, overlaps or gaps regarding the capacities to correctly define, identify, collect, save and/or analyse those data that really are needed. Secondly, standardising and systematising national migration data through an MP offers the possibility to use it as a monitoring tool and compare data over time. Thirdly, and more importantly, MPs can be used as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of migration and development policies, and then adapting or developing new policy recommendations if deemed necessary. The role MPs can play as a policy planning and mainstreaming migration tool should continue to be promoted.

2.3 *Integrating migration into Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)*

Numerous countries have already included migration concerns into their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. However, a review of recent PRSPs demonstrates that few have yet taken the comprehensive approach advocated by the GMG Handbook, at least judged by the substance of the reports. The evidence about whether countries are following the consultative approach recommended in the GMG handbook is harder to gauge. Indeed, little is known about the process followed at country-level; the evidence base underpinning existing PRSP references to migration; the external context in which these were introduced (e.g. what role the priorities of cooperation partners have played); and whether there has been any follow up in terms of policy formulation and implementation.

Since the last GFMD gathering in Geneva, three countries published a new PRSP (Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyz Republic and Lesotho) and six (Djibouti, Guinea, Haiti, Kenya, Liberia and Tajikistan)

---

[15] In line with the geographic/thematic specificities of each RCP or other regional framework, the i-Map profiles provide (1) a key source of information on actors, legislation, policies, initiatives, projects, cooperation efforts, data, and main challenges as identified by the respective country; and (2) act as a portal, as all information sources are hyperlinked, thus facilitating access to further reading, supporting the broad dissemination of existing information sources, and significantly decreasing time required to identify key sources. Some RCPs use both public and restricted user-faces. See http://www.imap-migration.org for more information.

[16] The MP repository was initiated by IOM and the GFMD Support Unit and aims to promote the discussion on the MP approach and a common understanding of the MP concept, highlight good practices and common challenges, avoid overlapping of MP exercises in the same country, encourage the sharing of MP experiences, and enhance the potential for collaboration with civil society

[17] The GFMD WG on Policy Coherence, Data and Research as well as the GMG WG on Data and Research also promote use of MPs by governments and contribute to development of the MP concerto and methodology.

provided a progress report.[18] They range from countries with significant levels of emigration and remittances to those with substantially lower levels. Estimated emigration and remittances are presented for the nine countries in Table 1.

Table 1: Migration and Remittance Data				
Name	Emigrants (in thousands)	% of Total Population	Remittances (in millions)	Remittances (% of GDP)
Djibouti	13.5	1.5%	35	2.9
Guinea	103.1	14.9%	61	1.3
Guinea-Bissau	290.1	16.6%	52	5.0
Haiti	1009.4	9.9%	1571	11.7
Kenya	457.1	1.1%	2467	5.4
Kyrgyz Republic	620.7	11.2%	1500	20.8
Lesotho	427.5	20.5%	753	28.6
Liberia	431.9	10.5%	33	2.5
Tajikistan	791.1	11.2%	2680	31.0
Sources: World Bank (2012) *Migration and Remittance Factbook 2011* and "Remittance Flows in 2011: An Update"				

There appears to be little correspondence between the absolute level and relative size of remittance flows in relationship to GDP, or levels of emigration, and the mainstreaming of migration and development issues into the reports. A comparison of the two Central Asian republics is illustrative. Tajikistan and the Kyrgyz Republic both have high levels of emigration and in both countries, remittances account for more than 20 percent of GDP. Yet the Kyrgyz PRSP had almost no analysis of migration, except for broad statements about the need to improve working conditions for the migrants and address the low coverage of migrants in social security schemes. The term 'remittance' did not appear in the PRSP; neither was there discussion about potential investment or other contributions from the diaspora. On the other hand, Tajikistan's progress report included many references to labour migration. Among other issues referenced were the findings of a survey on migrants, remittances and poverty; drafting of a 'National Strategy of labour migration of citizens of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period of 2010-2015' and actions plan; implementation of an Agreement between Federal Government of Russia and the Republic of Tajikistan about labour activity and protection of rights of Tajik citizens, including a joint Tajik-Russian meeting to discuss mechanisms for systematization and regulation of migration to ensure protection of rights and interests of Tajik migrants; opportunities for employing specialists of the Republic of Tajikistan in construction of Olympic premises in Russia; public awareness campaigns to be held in Tajik vocational schools; and mechanisms for credit organizations and their affiliates to open and establish centres of banking service and points of remittances.

Contrasting the African countries, most with relatively high levels of emigration, also highlights inconsistencies in approach. Liberia which has been in the process of reintegrating a large refugee and displaced population, has a vibrant diaspora in a number of countries and was host to hundreds of thousands of refugees from Cote d'Ivoire during the period of the progress report, included no discussion of any of these issues. This is in sharp contrast to its 2008 PRSP, in which reintegration of refugees was discussed as a serious challenge. The progress report included detailed analysis of the financial flows from government and foundation donors but included no references to remittances. At the same time, news reports indicated that remittances had increased to $235 million in the first quarter of 2010 (official data appear to underestimate levels of remittances and therefore show them as only 2.5% of GDP). Also, even though almost 15 percent of Guinea's population has emigrated, there is little discussion in the PRSP about migration and development, except for one reference to

---

[18] This analysis was prepared for the GFMD by Georgetown University.

refugees in the context of steps to improve food security. It is likely that official data for Guinea underestimates levels of remittances in absolute numbers and as share of GDP.

By contrast Guinea-Bissau, which has about 17 percent of its population living outside its borders, discussed a number of migration and development related issues, including ways to promote remittances through a new investment code that would reinforce the capacity and formalize banking and business sectors. There is also reference to the intent to mobilize the contributions of the Diaspora as one part of a strategy for high, sustainable, pro-poor growth. Lesotho, also a country with high levels of emigration, focused primarily on shifting employment patterns in the mining industry in South Africa, which has reduced migration into that sector. The PRSP includes data from a recent household survey that showed that households with migrating males tend to be better off economically than others. It also discussed the need to build partnerships with its diaspora and revise its own immigration policies to augment trade in services. More consistent with expectations, the PRSPs prepared by Kenya and Djibouti have relatively little on international migration (only 1-1.5% of their populations are emigrants). Djibouti discusses internal migration, especially rural to urban movements, in greater detail.

The four African countries with substantial levels of emigration reflect inadequacies in data collection on remittance flows. There are no official statistics in Guinea and what appear to be underestimates in the other countries, compared to unofficial reports on remittances. Kenya, by contrast, shows robust levels of remittances from a comparable number, if not proportion, of emigrants.

Perhaps most surprising, given the volume of remittances and the importance of migration to the country's economy, the progress report on Haiti had few references to migration, remittances or the contributions of the diaspora, even in the context of post-earthquake reconstruction. The PRSP did discuss the need to address social problems that stem from emigration, deportation and mass repatriations.

This review indicates that there is still great need for the Handbook. The results of the pilot projects will be informative in moving forward in identifying the type of technical assistance and training that will be needed to have more uniform attention paid to the multi-variant issues raised by migration and development. The PRSPs and progress reports that have integrated migration into their development planning could usefully be shared as models for others. Hence, a more comprehensive review should be carried out of PRSPs and PRSP progress reports to draw lessons that would be applicable in mainstreaming migration into development planning.

3.   Questions and Possible Outcomes

3.1   *Questions to guide the discussion*

a) **What are the lessons learnt with respect to the planning, preparation and implementation of the three tools (migration and development mainstreaming, Migration Profiles and PRSPs) ?**

b) **How have development agencies worked to mainstream migration into development cooperation?**

c) **How can governments and other stakeholders ensure coherence and relevant synergies between these tools?**

d) **What assistance do governments, in particular governments of developing countries, need from international organizations that support the preparation and implementation of these tools, and how can better coordination be ensured between donors and supporting international organizations?**

e) **How can governments better plan to integrate migration at key international development platforms, particularly in regards to the MDGs/Post-2015 framework?**

3.2   *Possible outcomes*

a) Governments design/develop comprehensive national policies on Migration and Development Mainstreaming, Extended Migration Profiles and other migration-related development strategies, to ensure that overarching national development plans analyse and take full account of the contribution of migration to development.

b) The inter-relation, mutually reinforcing role and synergetic use of these tools is promoted for evidence-based and coherent migration and development policies at all levels (intra-governmental, inter-governmental, multilateral and multi-stakeholder).

c) Methods and indicators are developed to measure and evaluate the impact of migration on development.

d) Government capacity to conduct mainstreaming processes is strengthened, which can be achieved through complementary initiatives such as
   - *The establishment of a pool of M&D experts that can advise governments and their partners, and the enhanced role of UN Country Teams (UNCTs).*
   - *The facilitation of reciprocal mainstreaming exercises along migration corridors, involving countries of origin, transit and destination;*
   - *The facilitation of South-South exchanges and technical assistance missions to support migration mainstreaming processes.*
   - *The establishment of best practices of mainstreaming migration into development planning.*

e) Governments put in place appropriate arrangements for enhanced policy, programme and institutional coherence, both within government and between governments and other actors. Related inter-ministerial/departmental coordination should take place at the highest possible level.

f) Involvement and valued added of civil society in government mainstreaming processes and related results is encouraged. The aim should be to discuss and assess results and added value, if any, of participatory partnerships between governments, civil society actors, and/or private sector stakeholders that have been established as part of mainstreaming processes.

g) Advocating for inclusion of relevant development agenda issues into migration and development discussion and vice versa (such as issues addressed in the MDGs/post-2015 Development Agenda, the Rio+20 follow-up, ICPD Beyond 2014, UNFCCC, UN Conference on LDCs, and WTO).

h) Greater consideration to internal migration and urbanization dynamics should be ensured in the migration mainstreaming process, including the need for coordination between national and local level governments on migration and development; and to the establishment of a dialogue between the GFMD and city networks.

i) Governments and non-state actors, including the GMG and other international organizations, share all relevant information on migration and development planning tools, bilaterally and at the regional and global levels.

j) The GFMD's Platform for Partnership's repository, where such information on migration and development planning tools is made available, is tested as a useful information sharing and awareness raising mechanism;