

**SIXTH MEETING OF THE GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT (GFMD)  
GFMD 2012 SUMMIT MEETING  
Port Louis, Mauritius  
19 - 22 November 2012**

***ENHANCING THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT OF MIGRANTS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION  
TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITIES AND STATES***

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements.....	2
1. Introduction .....	4
2. The Preparatory Process .....	5
3. The Civil Society Days (CSD) .....	7
4. The Government Days.....	10
4.1. Opening Plenary session.....	10
4.2. The Common Space.....	14
4.3. The Roundtable Sessions .....	24
4.3.1. Roundtable 1 - Circulating Labour for Inclusive Development .....	24
4.3.2. Roundtable 2 - Factoring Migration into Development Planning .....	32
4.3.3. Roundtable 3 - Managing Migration and Migrant Protection for Human Development Outcomes.....	39
4.4. Working session on the Platform for Partnerships.....	50
4.5. Special session on the Future of the Forum .....	53
4.6. Closing plenary session.....	57
5. Conclusion.....	60

## Acknowledgements

On behalf of the Government of Mauritius, I am pleased to present this report on the 6th Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) Summit meeting held on 19-22 November, 2012, in Mauritius, the final event of the GFMD 2012 held under the auspices of the Mauritian Chair. This report gives an account of the approach taken by Mauritius to achieve its desired objectives and the key deliberations that took place in the various plenary and Roundtable sessions at the Summit meeting.

When Mauritius agreed to assume the chairmanship of the GFMD 2012, we set ourselves the following ambitious objectives:

1. Explore concrete, achievable programs and strategies that would result in the improved well-being of migrants. We encouraged the development of programs around best practices that could endure beyond the annual forum and would make a difference for migrants, diaspora, their families, communities and participating countries.

That is why we finally settled on the overarching theme for GFMD 2012, *Enhancing the Human Development of Migrants and their Contribution to the Development of Communities and States*.

2. Place more emphasis on the development dimensions of the Global Forum.
3. Consolidate the consultation process with civil society and international organizations, and engage the private sector and diaspora more closely in the activities and outcomes of the Forum.
4. Produce a common vision for the future of the Forum through the completion of the second phase of the two-year internal Assessment of the GFMD.
5. Bring the Forum to Africa, and reinforce Africa's perspectives on the development dimension of migration. We encouraged the development of a multi-year program of policy reforms and actions on labour mobility and skills and talent development, that could help accelerate Africa's growth and economic transformation in the years ahead.

In trying to meet all these objectives, Mauritius was guided by the constant need to ensure that all activities are underpinned by wide consultations and broad consensus. We wanted a Forum which both aimed at greater partnership and was built on greater partnership. From December 2011, when we assumed the GFMD Chairmanship, we embarked on a broad, multi-phase, multi-stakeholder consultation process, starting with a survey of all Friends of the Forum (FOF) in December 2011-January 2012 on the possible themes for 2012. We held brainstorming meetings with governments, civil society, private sector, diaspora and international organizations around the themes for 2012 in Mauritius in January, June and August 2012. These were in addition to the customary consultations in the Troika, Steering Group and FOF throughout the year.

Let me stress that these preparatory activities and the GFMD 2012 Summit were only possible thanks to the efforts of all fellow member states and observers of the GFMD, our civil society partners and all other stakeholders, who in one way or another contributed to its success. I am also grateful to the valuable contributions made by the many countries and international organizations that allowed so many delegates from Africa and other developing countries to participate in the rich discussions of the Forum Summit.

The role of the Civil Society Coordinating Office, the International Catholic Migration Commission, in coordinating the 2012 civil society process and successfully organizing the Civil Society Days, was critical in reinforcing our message of closer partnership with non-state actors. Our local civil society partners, Caritas Mauritius and the Mauritius Council of Social Services (MACOSS), were important

interlocutors for the Chair and the Taskforce both in organizing local discussions around the Forum and in working with the Civil Society Coordinating Office.

I am very grateful to the Troika members, the Steering Group, the FOF and Sir Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for International Migration and Development for their active engagement and constant guidance throughout the year. The former Swiss Chair, Ambassador Gnesa, warrants a special mention for his warm and substantial support from the outset.

Our first partners among the non-state players, the GMG organizations, reliably and indispensably back-stopped the brainstorming and general preparations for the Roundtables with data, research, good practices, authorial support and active participation in the debates. In particular, IOM Director General Swing is to be commended and thanked for the many ways in which IOM, in Geneva and in Mauritius, came to our assistance, well beyond the official support in the form of transport services to developing country participants in the Summit meeting, the subject expert made available to the Taskforce and the hosting of the Support Unit.

A special note of gratitude goes to my colleague, Ambassador Shree Servansing, who steered the GFMD Assessment to conclusions and outcomes that will serve the GFMD well as it consolidates itself over the coming years.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the members of the Mauritius National Coordinating Committee, comprising the Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment, the private sector and civil society organizations, IOM Mauritius and others, and the international members of the GFMD Taskforce including the international advisers whose expert support to the Chair was funded by Australia, Switzerland, IOM, UNHCR and Macarthur Foundation, and the GFMD Support Unit, for their hard work and dedication throughout 2012.

I wish the future GFMD success in further consolidating the links between migration and development and helping to improve the conditions of migrants and their families through smarter, joined-up policies and programs.

**Ali Mansoor**

Financial Secretary  
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development  
GFMD 2012 Chair  
Mauritius

## 1. Introduction

This Report of the Proceedings provides a summary of preparations, discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the GFMD 2012 Summit Meeting<sup>1</sup> hosted by the Government of Mauritius on November 19-22, 2012, in Pailles, Mauritius. The Mauritius GFMD 2012 Summit marked another major achievement in the international debate on migration and development. It had as its overarching theme “**Enhancing the Human Development of Migrants and their Contribution to the Development of Communities and States**”, with the central objective of achieving concrete outcomes that can make a difference to people’s lives. From all accounts, the organization and substantive discussions of the Mauritius GFMD 2012 Summit were a complete success.

Mauritius was the first African nation to host such an international forum on migration and development. Over 500 delegates, including Ministers and Vice-Ministers, from 129 States participated in the Forum. Of the 76 ACP countries, 65 attended the GFMD 2012. Out of the 54 African Union members, 51 attended. These are record participation numbers in GFMD history, and a reflection of the strong support for the Mauritian GFMD Chair by African and ACP countries.

The Forum was also attended by dignitaries representing several international organizations, including the United Nations Secretary General Special Representative on Migration and Development, Sir Peter Sutherland; the Secretary General of the ACP Group of States, Dr Mohamed Ibn Chambas; the Director General of the International Organization for Migration, Mr William Lacy Swing; the Managing Director of the World Bank, Mr Mahmoud Mohieldin, the Director General for Home Affairs of the European Commission, Mr Stefano Manservigi, the Director General of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Mr Yury Fedotov; and the African Union Commissioner for Social Affairs, Dr Mustapha Kaloko.

For the first time also in 2012, the Global Forum was chaired by a Development Ministry (the Mauritius Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED)), highlighting the need stressed by several governments and observers to strengthen the “D” in the “GFMD”.

Against the background of global discussions on migration and development that have been going on from 1994 in Cairo, Egypt, to 2012 in Mauritius, and following the GFMD summits in Belgium (2007), Philippines (2008), Greece (2009), Mexico (2010), and Switzerland (2011)), the Mauritian Chair aimed in 2012 to move from simple dialogue to achieving some real improvements in the conditions and prospects of people on the move and their families, not just perpetuate a process of dialogue.

Building on the lessons of the past 6 years, and as the Forum has become the largest, most multilateral and inclusive of all international processes dealing with migration and development, Mauritius in 2012 tried to increase the momentum by addressing some of the very specific issues that have emerged in international policy discussions as needing global attention and better international governance. These include (i) skills development as a key to better jobs-based growth and development, also in the south-south context; (ii) a more integrated labour mobility and skills development approach across Africa; and (iii) new modes of protection-oriented collaboration on mixed flows, including and in particular refugees or migrants in distress.

Mauritius has also stimulated a debate at the margins of the Forum on possible labour mobility options for refugees that could lift them out of a dependency spiral and help them realize their human development potential while meeting some real labour needs in host countries. The hope was that, beginning in 2012, we could start shifting the mindset about refugees being purely a humanitarian problem; and possibly pave the way for some concrete pilot programs among willing partners in the years ahead.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex A for the Final Program of the GFMD 2012 Summit Meeting held on 21 and 22 November 2012.

Complementing the GFMD 2012 Government Days, the Civil Society Days took place two days earlier, on November 19-20, 2012. They were coordinated by the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC), upon the invitation of the Mauritius Government.

Section 2 of this Report of the proceedings provides some background on the GFMD preparatory process. Section 3 summarizes conclusions and recommendations of the Civil Society meeting. Section 4 on the Government meeting highlights key messages of the opening and closing ceremonies; the highpoints of the common space panels, the key issues, outcomes and recommendations of the Roundtable discussions; the main findings and recommendations of the special session on the future of the Forum; and observations/ take-away messages from the working session on the Platform for Partnerships. Section 5 concludes with lessons learned and recommendations out of the GFMD 2012 meeting.

## **2. The Preparatory Process**

Consultations in preparation of Mauritius GFMD 2012 were started at the end of 2011 by the Mauritius Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED), under the leadership of Mr Ali Mansoor, the Mauritius MOFED Financial Secretary, who chaired all preparatory meetings of the GFMD 2012, as well as the GFMD 2012 Summit meeting.

The administrative preparations for GFMD 2012 were initiated with the creation of a GFMD 2012 National Task Force headed by Mr Mansoor, and comprising Mauritian public institutions (Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Regional Integration, Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment, Ministry of Social Integration and Empowerment, Ministry of Business and Enterprises, Government Information Service, Ministry of Arts and Culture); private sector (Mauritius Joint Economic Council, Mauritius Tourism Promotion Authority, Mauritius Employers Federation); civil society (CARITAS Mauritius, Mauritius Council of Social Services (MACOSS), University of Mauritius); IOM Mauritius; as well as international advisers selected for their subject knowledge and prior GFMD experience.

Financial resources for the preparation of the Mauritius GFMD 2012 Summit Meeting were provided by the Mauritius Government; and by some 21 other governments<sup>2</sup>, as well as international organizations, and the MacArthur Foundation, that all stepped forward and offered financial assistance amounting to around USD 2,611,000. The Mauritius Government also shouldered many of the organizational expenses of the thematic and preparatory meetings in Mauritius (held in January, June, and August 2012), and provided in-kind resources for the logistical support to the November 2012 Summit itself and subsequent wrap-up work. Some of the preparatory meetings were supported, financially and in-kind, by other governments such as Switzerland and Sweden, international and regional organizations such as IOM, the World Bank, UNDP, UNECA, ADB, civil society organizations and other related entities.

In planning the GFMD 2012 thematic and events programs, the Mauritian Chair and Taskforce consulted closely with the ICMC, the Civil Society Coordinating Office and with Caritas Mauritius and the Mauritius Council of Social Services (MACOSS), which helped organize the Mauritian-based civil society engagement with the Forum. The Chair also authorized the use of non-earmarked international contributions to support the civil society preparations occurring in tandem with the government process.

Substantive preparations of the Mauritius GFMD 2012 started with the Chair's proposal of an overarching theme and a Concept Paper shared with the Friends of the Forum. A survey of possible GFMD 2012 themes was conducted among all Friends of the Forum in December 2011-January 2012;

---

<sup>2</sup> See Annex B for the Overview and Acknowledgement of International Contributions to GFMD 2012.

and consensus was reached on the proposed overarching theme, the Roundtable themes and the related Concept Paper after many formal and informal exchanges and discussions with the GFMD Focal Points, Friends of the Forum, Steering Group, Troika, and extended Troika<sup>3</sup>.

Based on the survey and ensuing consultations, three roundtables (RT) were selected and organized around the overarching theme to form the basis of substantive discussions during the GFMD 2012 year and Summit meeting. RT 1 focused on *Circulating Labour for Inclusive Development*; RT 2 on *Factoring Migration into Development Planning*; and RT 3 on *Managing Migration and Migrant Protection for Human Development Outcomes*.

As in past GFMD meetings, under the supervision of the Mauritius Chair, the Roundtable sessions were prepared by teams of governments and international organizations, each co-chaired by two/three partner governments and assisted by Roundtable coordinators, drawn from among the international advisers in the GFMD Taskforce<sup>4</sup>. Roundtable team members, Friends of the Forum and international organizations also contributed with their input to the background papers. Throughout the preparatory process, the Mauritius Chair consulted closely with Mr Peter Sutherland, the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative for International Migration and Development, who embodies the connection of this informal process to the UN. Mr Sutherland contributed greatly to the efficiency of the GFMD through his ongoing advice and support to the process, his participation in all Friends of the Forum meetings and his chairing of the Special Session on the Future of the Forum.

The overall work agenda of GFMD 2012 also included the organization of a series of brainstorming debates and workshops in the margins of the Forum on key migration and development themes. The main workshops included: (i) a brainstorm thematic meeting on African labour mobility and skills development, organized by the Mauritian Government with the AU, ADB, UNECA and IOM. (ii) a workshop on factoring migration into development planning, organized by the Swiss Government and UNDP, with support from Sweden; (iii) a workshop on the diaspora, organized by the World Bank, (iv) a workshop co-organized by the Philippine Government with UN Women on migrant domestic workers, in direct follow-up to the workshops in the Caribbean and Africa co-organized by the Swiss Chair in 2011, and (v) a workshop organized in collaboration with UNHCR on labour mobility options for refugees.

As another priority activity of GFMD 2012, Mauritius steered the second phase of the GFMD Assessment process to successful conclusion through the chairmanship of the government-led GFMD Assessment Team by Ambassador Shree Servansing of the Permanent Mission of Mauritius in Geneva. The Consolidated Assessment Report prepared by the 16-government team (including the Mauritian Chair) formed the basis of the Special Session on the Future of the Forum at the Summit meeting on 22 November. The Special Session's report and the Consolidated Assessment Report endorsed at the Special Session form an important part of the full GFMD report to go forward to the UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013.

Throughout 2012, the Mauritius Chair benefitted from the assistance of the traditional GFMD supporting structures including: a) the GFMD Troika comprising past, present and future GFMD Chairs (Switzerland, Mauritius, Sweden); b) the GFMD Steering Group, comprised of 37 member states; c) the Friends of the Forum, open to all states members and observers of the United Nations, specialized agencies of the United Nations, as well as other international organizations, international foundations; and d) the GFMD Support Unit in Geneva which provides administrative, financial and logistical support to the annual GFMD Chair. In line with the tradition now well established in the GFMD, the Focal Point network was crucial for smooth communication with governments and organizations concerned through the GFMD Support Unit.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Mauritian GFMD Chair convened four Friends of the Forum meetings and four Steering Group meetings in Geneva in February, April, June, and September 2012.

<sup>4</sup> About 17 governments from different regions, representing both developed and developing countries came forward to co-chair the Roundtables. Some 50 governments and international organizations joined the Roundtable teams to work with the co-chairs and RT coordinators.

The Friends of the Forum were consulted on all steps in the preparatory process, including the Roundtable themes and the GFMD agenda. The Steering Group provided conceptual and political support, and the Troika provided valuable strategic guidance to the process. The Mauritius Chair also worked very closely with the extended Troika, comprising all past chairs (Belgium, Philippines, Greece, Mexico, Switzerland,) who brought tremendous value to the process and substance through lessons learned, and the future chairs (Sweden, Turkey). The GFMD Support Unit was also instrumental in preserving the institutional memory, helping to deliver necessary outcomes in due time and ensuring critical liaison between stakeholders on behalf of the Chair (Focal Points, Friends of the Forum, Steering Group, Troika and extended troika, participating governments and Observers).

Mauritius GMG partners – IOM, UNDP, World Bank, UN Women, ILO, UNDESA, UNHCR – proved to be excellent partners for Mauritius during the GFMD 2012 year, advising and supporting the Chair at many levels. Most Roundtables benefited from GMG research findings and evidence, with three subject experts lent to Mauritius by IOM/the Australian Government, UNHCR and the Swiss Government, and two international advisers expert in African matters funded by the Macarthur Foundation. IOM Geneva provided the backstop support to the Forum’s administrative Support Unit and IOM Mauritius undertook the travel arrangements for subsidized government participants at the Summit meeting.

In preparing for the November 2012 concluding Summit, the Mauritian Chair urged governments and their partners in their final preparations to keep their gaze fixed on concrete and workable policies and programs, rather than just generate more talk about the same issues, more meetings, workshops and research papers. The Mauritius Government also encouraged all countries participating in the GFMD to take away from the meetings some new ideas, a business plan or a formula to try sometime at home, in order to make a difference to migrants, diaspora, the community and the economy.

### **3. The Civil Society Days (CSD)**

The GFMD 2012 Civil Society Days (CSD) were organized in Mauritius in the Swami Vivekananda International Convention Centre on 19 and 20 November, just prior to the GFMD Government Summit. The CSD brought together 140 delegates<sup>5</sup> from migrant and diaspora groups, human rights, development and labour organizations, academia and the private sector, many of them migrants themselves and with a record number from Africa. Over 100 representatives of governments, international organizations, media and other guests were also welcomed as participants in the GFMD CSD program.

#### **Consultation, partnership and self-organization**

Civil society has become a key stakeholder and an essential actor in processes leading to, during and after the annual GFMD meeting. Throughout its GFMD chairmanship in 2012, Mauritius emphasized the importance of consulting closely and working jointly with civil society in pursuing themes and outcomes and called for “strengthening the interaction with civil society and the Common Space approach” (concept paper 2012). Non-state partners were consulted in the drafting of the states’ concept paper, including a preparatory brainstorming meeting in Mauritius in January 2012. Civil society experts were also invited to participate in thematic meetings organized in Mauritius in June, as well as to contribute to the preparation of the states’ GFMD roundtables.

The Mauritian Chair worked directly with the GFMD Civil Society Coordinating Office that has been established under the auspices of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) at the invitation of the Swiss Chair in 2011. ICMC’s Coordinating Office again assumed overall

---

<sup>5</sup> The 140 civil society delegates were selected out of more than 560 applications from around the world. Following the modalities in place for selection of civil society delegates for each GFMD since 2007, a selection was made collectively by civil society’s GFMD International Advisory Committee (IAC), identifying applicants with positive engagement in migration and development activity, representativity and diversity across sectors and regions

responsibility for the preparation and organization of civil society activities, including fundraising, in close cooperation with a broad range of civil society partners worldwide, representing migrants and diaspora groups, human rights and labour organizations, academia and the private sector.

In Mauritius, ICMC partnered with Caritas Mauritius on logistics, meeting planning, government relations and staff support. The Mauritius Council of Social Services (MACOSS) organized the engagement of national Mauritius-based civil society organizations in the GFMD, which also contributed a set of national recommendations on migration and development. Another set of recommendations was developed at the first-ever continental Africa meeting of civil society organizations focussed on migration and development, urging pursuit of a regional paradigm for direct engagement of civil society actors from both Africa and the African diaspora in migration and development, with specific attention to labour mobility, development opportunities, and migrants' rights.<sup>6</sup>

In aiming “to enhance trust between stakeholders and inspire new partnerships and concerted action on migration and development” the Mauritian Chair also consulted closely with ICMC’s Coordinating Office and its International Advisory Committee of 28 global civil society leaders on the format, focus and speakers for the Common Space (also see section 4.2 on the **Common Space**).

### **Civil Society Days program<sup>7</sup> and outcomes**

Over the two Civil Society Days (CSD), participants deliberated in plenary and working sessions on the central theme Operationalizing Protection and Human Development in International Migration. This theme reflected the priority of civil society to focus on working together with governments and international organizations towards concrete steps and implementable mechanisms and – where feasible - benchmarks against which success can be measured in the next years.

Speaking at the opening of the CSD, GFMD Chair Mr Ali Mansoor urged delegates to remember that migration is “about human beings and about families; communally we need to remember that our objective is to improve human welfare”. In a similar spirit and pointing to the emphasis in the civil society program on identifying practical benchmarks and mechanisms, the Mauritius Minister of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment, Mr Shakeel Mohamed challenged civil society to come up with workable mechanisms: “through your work millions of migrants in the world will see their situations improved very soon. I am impatient to have your recommendations on mechanisms”.

Welcoming these remarks, Civil Society Co-Chair, Cameroonian-born Ms Clariste Soh-Moube of Mali expressed the hope for “these messages to transcend the walls of this forum and to provide hope and new ideas for the protection of labour migrants”. Co-Chair, Mauritian-born Mr George Joseph of Sweden, told a story about the hope of a young Afghan woman, who fled across the world, lost everything on the way, and is now working to rebuild her life in Europe. “We are here not for ourselves,” Mr Joseph said, “We are here for the millions like her, to defend and protect the fundamental rights of human beings”.

The two days of deliberations resulted in a set of working session reports and a formal civil society statement was presented to states during the opening plenary of their GFMD Summit on 21 November.<sup>8</sup>

Some highlights of outcomes and recommendations of the GFMD 2012 Civil Society Days include:

---

<sup>6</sup> National Mauritian and regional African recommendations available at: <http://www.gfmdcivilsociety.org>

<sup>7</sup> See Annex C for the Program of GFMD 2012 Civil Society Days

<sup>8</sup> A full narrative report of the GFMD Civil Society Days, including a report from each of the working sessions will be published in the first quarter of 2013 by ICMC’s GFMD Civil Society Coordinating Office.

### **1. Labour: Operationalizing a rights-based approach to labour mobility, markets and matching**

**a) On regulating and monitoring recruitment, placement and employment practices:** Civil society reaffirmed the call to better license, regulate and monitor recruitment actors and called for the creation of user-led systems to promote good and reliable recruitment channels, while exposing bad recruiters and violators. Civil society reiterated the strong call for increased ratification and implementation of UN and ILO conventions, including the 1990 UN Migrant Workers Convention, and ILO Conventions 181 regarding recruitment processes and 189 on domestic workers. Governments were also urged to ensure the freedom of association and worker organizing.

**b) On improving jobs, skills and education matching:** Re-emphasizing the sine qua non of legal channels of migration and pathways to permanent residence, civil society elaborated recommendations to organize skills and credentials recognition in a better and just manner, by harmonizing education and qualification standards and by introducing sector-specific regional and global training and certification standards.

### **2. Development: Operationalizing human development in international migration**

**a) On engaging diaspora as entrepreneurs, social investors and policy advocates in development:** Recalling its recommendation from previous GFMD meetings to governments to include diaspora and migrant voices in development policy formulation and implementation, civil society called for the creation of national multi-stakeholder migration-and-development policy-making mechanisms in origin and destination countries. Civil society also called for conducive legal and financial frameworks to promote migrants as entrepreneurs through financial support, capacity building, business networking, legal protection and provisions in the law for dual citizenship.

**b) On forging rights-based development solutions:** Moving from strictly diaspora phenomena into broader dynamics of development and migration, civil society echoed government recommendations of prior GFMD meetings to improve data collection and develop national-level indicators on migration and development for monitoring purposes. Further, civil society called forcefully for migration to be incorporated into new policy frameworks of sustainable development goals and the post-2015 development agenda.

### **3. Protection: Operationalizing the protection of migrants and their families**

**a) On protecting vulnerable migrant workers:** Civil society emphasized that the first requisite for protection is binding national and international law, and called for translation of laws into action: e.g. providers of essential public services should not be required to report on immigration status; and migrant workers should not be tied to one employer. Civil society called upon international organizations, governments and their own constituencies to map countries' domestic compliance with international standards and progress towards harmonizing domestic law with international law.

**b) Protecting migrants in dire humanitarian situations:** Civil Society strongly suggested to make migrants in crisis a priority area for the yearly agendas of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) and to include all stakeholders in those processes. Civil society further pledged to work with governments and international organizations towards a coordinated protection framework for migrants trapped in dire humanitarian situations, including not only migrants stranded in situations of conflict or disaster but also migrant victims of violence and trauma in transit.

### **4. On governance and the UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development**

Civil Society presented a 5-Point Plan for Strong Civil Society Involvement in the upcoming High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development 2013 (UN HLD), including a list of priority agenda items for the UN HLD focusing on migrants' protection, decent work, gender and migration, and the post-2015 development agenda.

## 4. The Government Days

### 4.1. Opening Plenary session<sup>9</sup>

Mr Ali Mansoor, GFMD 2012 Chair, opened the Summit Meeting of the 2012 Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) by welcoming over 500 delegates representing 129 UN Member States and 36 GFMD observer organizations to Port Louis, Mauritius. He was joined at the podium by **H.E. Dr Mohamed Ibn Chambas**, Secretary General of the African, Caribbean, and Pacific Group of States; **Sir Peter Sutherland**, the UNSG Special Representative for Migration and Development; **Dr the Hon Arvind Boolell**, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration & International Trade, Republic of Mauritius; **Ms Clariste Soh-Moube** and **Mr George Joseph**, co-chairs of the Civil Society Days; and **Mr Yury Fedotov**, Director General of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, representing the Global Migration Group (GMG);

The Chair invited delegates to participate in Mauritius's month-long celebration<sup>10</sup> of migration on the margins of the GFMD. He reported that the strong link between migration and development was highlighted throughout his Chairmanship, and reminded delegates that this link affects real individuals forced to leave their homes, and about whose improved welfare, lives and contributions the GFMD has gathered to confer and collaborate.

Noting that the 2012 Summit meeting was the first GFMD held in Africa, **H.E. Dr Mohamed Ibn Chambas** commended the Government and people of Mauritius for being "a much valued member of the ACP family of nations and a leading example of what prudent economic management and wise leadership could achieve in lifting a nation out of poverty and accelerating the process of economic transformation."

The ACP Secretary General observed that in a rapidly globalizing world, migration has become an increasingly salient issue in domestic policy as well as international political relations. From being seen as a 'problem', the discourse on migration is shifting towards better appreciation of its benefits as well as challenges. In 2011 alone, global remittances totalled US\$370 billion. 80% of this amount was contributed by developing countries' diasporas, who have served as bridgeheads for the mobilization of international capital for investments. Also noteworthy were the significant movements of people from North to South and South to South due to the global economic crisis.

He affirmed that human mobility plays a vital role for the livelihood of many within the ACP Group of States, but it is not devoid of challenges including illegal migration, kidnapping and killing of migrants for their vital organs, lack of conditions and development prospects for young people who comprise 25% of Africa's population, and the impact of political conflicts and ecological catastrophes on migratory patterns.

Calling it one of the "paradoxes of our era", he believed that the liberalization of world markets and capital is taking place against the backdrop of more restrictions on the movement of people. He emphasized that migration can be mutually beneficial when properly harnessed and properly managed. He urged the GFMD to address the tension that migration can generate in local communities, where people feel that migrants are a threat to their way of life. Recounting the story of two Guinean stowaway children who perished inside the cargo hold of an airline in 1999, he enjoined all delegates to forever keep in mind the fact that migrants are not abstract and faceless entities, but real people with real fears, hopes and dreams.

**Sir Peter Sutherland**, UNSG Special Representative (SRSG) for Migration and Development, addressed the GFMD 2012 Summit in the unforeseen absence<sup>11</sup> of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-

<sup>9</sup> Please visit the GFMD web portal, [www.gfmd.org](http://www.gfmd.org) to download the speeches and other presentations.

<sup>10</sup> A series of cultural events were organized to link the Remembrance of Indentured Labourers coming to Mauritius on November 2<sup>nd</sup> and International Human Rights Day on December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> The UN Secretary General earlier accepted the official invitation of the Government of Mauritius to attend the GFMD 2012 Summit, but he failed to attend due to the recent pressing issues in the Middle East.

moon. Mr Sutherland called the GFMD "a unique success of global cooperation on an intergovernmental level" in part due to its crucial link to the United Nations. He echoed former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's belief that the other side to the globalization issue had to be the issue of free movement of people and the opening up of opportunities long denied in the global community.

The SRSG personally thanked the Government of Mauritius, not only for its hospitality, but also for its active chairmanship of the GFMD under the leadership of Mr Ali Mansoor. He was moved by the fact that it was the first GFMD held in Africa, signaling a change from Africa's role being underestimated and underrepresented in global debates on international migration.

Mr Sutherland then read the prepared statement of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon. The Secretary General thanked Mauritius for hosting the Forum in a historic setting, where the fusion of great cultures is on display everywhere. He noted the many struggles of migrants around the world, and expressed the view that "these individuals are like migration itself with the right support they can be a force for prosperity and progress." He believed that the complex factors driving migration are the same problems at the top of the global agenda – war, natural disasters, economic calamities and climate change. By responding to migrants' needs, the wider problems facing people can also be addressed. When empowered, migrants can drive progress for society as a whole.

Secretary Ban Ki-moon praised the GFMD for proving that it is possible to get agreements on sensitive and often divisive topics such as migrants' rights and irregular migration, and for generating a global awareness that no country can manage migration on its own. He commended the Global Forum for creating a space for states to discuss problems surrounding migration and its enormous potential to spur development. He would like the GFMD 2012 Summit to focus not on its accomplishments after six years, but on how to commit to action on practical measures in the lead-up to the United Nations Second High Level Dialogue (HLD) on Migration and Development in 2013. He challenged delegates to bring concrete proposals to the HLD and engage in the process of forging a post-2015 development agenda.

According to the Secretary General, migration can promote development with the right policies. He gave some examples, such as portability of pensions, cross-border skills recognition, international cooperation on training global work forces, reducing red tape and facilitating legal migration. He lamented the fact that the costs of remittances still remain very high, and that only three countries (including Mauritius) have so far ratified the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Domestic Workers Convention aimed at protecting domestic migrant workers' rights. He called on all countries to follow the example set by Mauritius in ratifying the Domestic Workers' convention, as well as the International Convention on the Rights of Migrants Workers and their Families.

In closing, the UN Secretary General emphasized that virtually all countries today are at the same time countries of origin, transit and destination. Thus the challenge is to help migrants so that they can help the countries where they travel and the societies where they live. With the evidence and experience gained through the years, the global community is called upon to collectively reach the end goal of managing migration as a force for development.

The keynote was delivered by **Dr the Hon Arvind Boolell**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mauritius. Dr Boolell informed all delegates that Mauritius, in spite of being one of the smallest nations on earth, has a vast maritime territory and has recently been ranked among the top 20 in the World Bank's 'Doing Business' Index. Mauritius was motivated to undertake the Chairmanship of the GFMD 2012 for a variety of reasons: first, the desire to reinforce Africa's perspectives on migration issues and engage African countries both in GFMD and other related activities; second, Mauritius has always considered migration as an integral part of its sustainable development policies. Migrants are a fundamental part of its history and connection with the rest of the world, as evidenced by the fact that 11% of Mauritians live in OECD countries. As a nation of immigrants and emigrants, Mauritius is a significant part of the South-South migration and South-North migration stories.

Its migration history, geographical location and wealth of human resources positioned Mauritius well to take the lead in the global debate on migration and development. Indeed, since the inception of the GFMD in 2007, it has played an integral role in the process, offering models of its circular migration program with Canada and France that demonstrate how a developing country and small island state can come to the negotiating table with a business plan for shared labour rather than simply a development aid plan. Mauritius has also shared with the GFMD its long tradition of close partnerships between the public and private sectors, trade unions and civil society, with a view to putting more emphasis on the development dimension of the GFMD dialogue.

In choosing the overarching theme, *Enhancing the Human Development of Migrants and their Contribution to the Development of Communities and States*, Mauritius wanted to lead Africa in developing concrete, achievable programs and strategies that would result in the improved well-being of migrants.

During its chairmanship, Mauritius tried to consolidate the consultation process with civil society and international organizations, particularly the Global Migration Group (GMG), and to engage the private sector and diaspora more closely in the activities and outcomes of the Forum. The two-year GFMD Assessment was completed, producing a Common Vision for the forum's future. The importance of the Common Space for building consensus and connecting perspectives of all stakeholders was also underlined. Throughout 2012, Mauritius embarked on a multi-phase consultation process, commencing with a survey of all Friends of the Forum about the possible themes for 2012, followed by brainstorming meetings with governments, civil society, private sector, diaspora and international organizations to ensure that the Forum was both built on, and fostered, greater partnership. Together, governments and partners chose the following focused themes for GFMD 2012: labour mobility, skills and jobs across borders, diaspora engagement, integration of migration into development planning, south-south migration, protective forms of legal migration and global domestic workers.

Anticipating that by 2025, some 10% of Africans will work outside their country of origin, the Foreign Affairs Minister underscored the lack of a comprehensive and integrated labour mobility system in Africa, which could lead to stronger, job-based growth and prosperity through the continent's increased competitiveness and investment-worthiness in global markets. To foster greater interaction with the continent, the Mauritius Prime Minister opened the country's visa regulations for 79 countries, including 29 additional countries from Africa, which will either be exempted entirely or will benefit from visas upon arrival. Labour mobility issues challenge governments everywhere, and the Minister appealed for collaboration of all stakeholders to lower migration costs and raise development benefits through facilitated mobility, make laws work in reality and decrease the divide between countries of origin and destination.

Co-chairs of the Civil Society Days (CSD), **Ms Clariste Soh-Moube** (Mali) and **Mr George Joseph** (Sweden), reported on the conclusions reached during the CSD held on 19 and 20 November, 2012,<sup>12</sup> opening with a moment of silence in memory of migrants who have perished on land and sea crossings. They noted the engagement of 140 civil society delegates during the Civil Society Days, joined by some 80 representatives of governments and international organizations, as well as another 30 special guests and media representatives. Like the government days, CSD boasted the largest number and voices of African civil society delegates and diaspora since the beginning of the GFMD.

“We are here today not for ourselves”, the civil society statement emphasized, “we are here for change”. The statement stressed changes needed to better organize labour mobility, protect migrants and forge inclusive development. “We are co-responsible in these matters,” Civil society underscored to governments “we commit to looking not only at what governments need to do, but at ourselves and what we need to do, as well as what we can do together.”

---

<sup>12</sup> See Annex D for the statement on the Civil Society Days. For other outcome documents of the Civil Society Days visit: [www.gfmdecivilsociety.org](http://www.gfmdecivilsociety.org)

The statement presented a set of benchmarks and highlighted mechanisms directed at shared responsibility and change. Among the many recommendations, civil society called for and committed to better licensing, regulating and monitoring of recruitment practices, ending visa systems that tie migrants to particular employers, and the creation of user-led systems to promote good and reliable recruitment channels, while exposing bad recruiters and violators. Reiterating its strong call for increased ratification and implementation of UN and ILO conventions (including the 1990 UN Migrant Workers Convention, and the ILO Conventions 181 regarding recruitment processes and 189 on domestic workers), civil society further pledged to work with governments and international organizations towards a coordinated protection framework for migrants trapped in dire humanitarian situations.

The statement also presented a *5-Point Plan for Strong Civil Society Involvement in the upcoming High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD)*. Omnipresent in the 5-point plan and throughout the statement was the need to bring more development actors and development policies into the equation, including ensuring migrants' and migration's rightful place on the global development agenda, as the Millennium Development Goals approach expiration in 2015. Civil society promised to present a civil society position paper in 2013 on migration and the post-2015 development agenda.

Addressing delegates in his role as 2012 Chair of the Global Migration Group (GMG), **Mr Yuri Fedotov** reiterated the GMG's primary objective of promoting the application of all relevant international and regional instruments relating to migration and development by providing the institutional structure and space for a coherent interagency voice. The GMG has achieved two important milestones since its establishment in 2006 – the establishment of an interagency Working Group on a) Mainstreaming Migration into Development in 2010 and b) Data and Research in 2011, which laid the groundwork for further joint coordinated action.

In the lead-up to the 2013 HLD, the GMG recently conducted an internal review of achievements and challenges, which resulted in a number of recommendations for the future – i.e. development and adoption of a multiannual work plan, building on prioritized time-bound and task-specific thematic work, and responding to GFMD priorities as appropriate, as well as new chairing arrangements aligned with the establishment of a small administrative Secretariat for the GMG and the possibility of a funding mechanism to support the joint delivery of results at the country level.

Mr Fedotov drew particular attention to the problems of violence, often accompanied by human rights violations, experienced by many migrants and their families at various stages of the migration cycle. On behalf of the GMG, he urged member states to reaffirm their commitment to improving migrants' safety on six action points: 1) supporting universal ratification and effective implementation of related international instruments; 2) addressing the root causes of forced migration by opening regular migration channels; 3) strengthening government and civil society cooperation; 4) safeguarding fundamental rights and freedoms of migrants and their families; 5) improving efforts to investigate, prosecute and punish crimes against migrants; and 6) providing victims of crime with adequate, efficient, gender sensitive support and protection regardless of migration status. For its part, the GMG proposed to publish in December a thematic paper on the exploitation and abuse of international migrants and a joint report on youth and international migration.

In closing, the GMG Chair announced that the UN Regional Commissions will take over the Chairmanship in the New Year. He gave assurances that the GMG will continue its work and ensure that progress so far achieved will be sustained.

Mr Ali Mansoor concluded the opening session with an appeal to use the GFMD as a platform to strengthen dialogue between governments, private sector and civil society. Before the Common Space and Roundtable deliberations began, he hoped the GFMD 2012 Summit would deliver practical recommendations with real potential for cooperative implementation and broad public support for effective change.

## 4.2. The Common Space

### 4.2.1. Common Space opening plenary

Traditionally comprising three hours of interactive plenary sessions on the first morning of the GFMD Government Days, involving a cross - section of panellists from governments, civil society and international organizations, the Common Space in 2012 divided into an opening plenary session, three breakout panels and a closing plenary session, under the overarching theme of *Migration and Development: Common Ground and Partnerships in Action*.

In the opening plenary, the Common Space moderator, **Dr Khalid Koser**, Deputy Director, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, reminded participants that the Common Space was introduced by the Mexican GFMD Chair in 2010, with three specific objectives: to encourage diverse discussion; promote transparency; and develop a common agenda. It was continued in this spirit by Switzerland in 2011 and by Mauritius in 2012. It offered a unique opportunity for debate among civil society, government, private sector, international organizations and other stakeholders. No other global forum brought together such a diversity of perspectives on migration and development; and it had the potential to make a difference.

Dr Koser observed that participants had a collective responsibility to take full advantage of this opportunity; and urged them to follow three principles in the Common Space debates:

- a. conduct a truly objective discussion, based on evidence rather than on, for example, advocacy.
- b. focus on practical solutions, not only on problems;
- c. identify issues on which stakeholders could work together to achieve the Common Space goals..

Dr Koser introduced the three speakers to set the context and stimulate the Common Space panel debates.

**Ambassador William Lacy Swing**, Director General of the International Organization for Migration, gave the overall introduction to the Common Space. He observed that the aim of the Common Space was to establish a common understanding of the migration phenomenon and find common ground. Migration is an all-encompassing, all-embracing phenomenon, as old as humankind, and humankind's oldest poverty reduction strategy. It is likely to become and remain a mega-trend of this century. To deal with this phenomenon in a humane, orderly and rational way, there was a need for both a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach. He made three quick points on "common ground":

- a. The historical contribution of migrants to development depended largely on inter-state cooperation, and governments were already combining their efforts in the context of the GFMD to address this major transnational phenomenon jointly. There were also at least 16 or more regional consultative processes bringing together countries of origin and destination.
- b. The efforts of the GFMD to find common ground among states, civil society and other actors were a work in progress, but had already been significant. The GFMD had proven itself as a forum where states and civil society can come together, exchange experiences and realize how much they had in common, while accepting their differences. A number of governments held consultations with their civil society counterparts prior to the GFMD Summit, and for these, civil society are not special interest groups promoting their own agendas, but organizations, which, like governments, understand the need for constructive interaction with political processes.
- c. There was a need to explore common actions. The common space was now a permanent fixture in the GFMD, which in itself signified major progress in creating common ground on important issues of migration and mobility. Apart from collaborative projects that require additional funding, stakeholders needed to work together to counter xenophobic myths that harm and endanger migrants, and stereotypes that prevent migrants from making their positive contribution.

Now was the time for governments and civil society to form partnerships and promote mobility, migration and development. While safeguarding migrant rights they also needed to reassure host populations through concrete measures that migration is a positive force and not a threat either to personal or national identity. Ambassador Swing exhorted participants together to find the high road of action and partnership towards meeting the challenges of this era of unprecedented mobility, and to promote safe and dignified migration that can benefit all players.

**Mr Stefano Manservisi**, Director General for Home Affairs of the European Union (EU), saw the EU's opportunity to participate as important for the role it sought to play as global actor and global partner in the GFMD process. He underscored the importance of the GFMD approach in bringing together different actors and perspectives – government, civil society, international and private sector – which fostered inclusive, open and evidence-based discussion. The European Union and its member states have circulated their common position on the GFMD.

Mr Manservisi observed that while migration was traditionally linked to poverty, it is now associated more with freedom, which requires a change in approach. To achieve inclusive globalization, more mobility was needed. Migration partners were also changing, with the tendency towards more selective, skilled migration and an already established global competition for talent. Against this background, he encouraged the Common Space and the GFMD to focus on two issues:

1. Migration governance, or transparent, effective policies and frameworks that create a credible mix of development and mobility at a time of unprecedented movements and changing concepts of borders to manage migration and enforce policy decisions in credible ways. This required more thinking out of the box.

To build more global approaches to managing mobility, Mr Manservisi suggested to start at the regional level, where effective forms of governance can be designed that link state and global realities in a context of shared responsibility. The EU offered a model worth exploring: it had a single market, free movement under the Schengen Agreement and was progressively building a new, increasingly interactive labour market, all underpinned by common policies. The EU also combined national and EU legislation, which is enforced as appropriate. As a result, there is no migration among EU member states, but free movement with full rights, benefits and duties, and no discrimination. Legal migrants from third countries were also subject to harmonized rules for entering, staying and working in the EU space. Africa also has an agenda for regional and sub-regional governance, and could be examined for migration policies that may work in a wider space.

2. Actions to be taken together to build synergies. The European Development Policy was one example of how the European Commission and EU member states can systematically address issues of partnership and mutual accountability relevant for this debate, in regard to sustainable growth, good governance, human rights and democracy, social protection, health and education. The EU has also started promoting evidence-based coherent policies through migration country profiles in partnership with, among others, IOM. In preparation for 2015, there was a need to strengthen coherence among the many migration and development policies. Mr Manservisi saw 2015 as a test of how the migration and development discussions will be identified with concrete MDG-like actions or mainstreamed into the MDGs.

Another example was how to approach these issues from the traditional Home Affairs perspective. The EU paper “The Global Approach for Migration and Mobility” outlined a partnership approach on four interlinked migration areas, including maximization of the development impact of migration and mobility. The EU was implementing these initiatives through regional cooperation, for example with the ACP, AU and regional communities; and in Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America and Asia, in the form of Mobility Partnerships. The experiences gained from these will help with a more focused and effective global approach to migration and development.

Mr Manservisi expressed the hope that the Common Space could be turned into a common approach; and added that the EU and its member states were willing to contribute to that.

The third speaker, **Dr Mustafa Sidiki Kaloko**, Commissioner for Social Affairs, African Union (AU), representing the Chairperson of the African Union, highlighted some current migration and development activities of the AU. Migration had made it to the top of the African agenda; and the overarching theme of GFMD 2012 was in line with various AU policy instruments on migration and development, notably the Migration Policy Framework and the African Common Position on Migration and Development. The latter common position also supports close cooperation with regional economic communities. The AU has signed framework agreements with the EU, including the joint AU-EU Declaration on Migration and Development, to share responsibility and cooperation for better managing migration between the two continents. AU policies open a large area for human development and cooperation to manage migration in a comprehensive, integrated and holistic way.

Mr Sidiki Kaloko asserted that well managed migration can promote closer ties between countries, meet existing and future labour needs, contribute to countries' development and help achieve the Millennium Development Goals. In the context of the AU-EU migration, mobility and employment partnerships, and with EU financial support, the African Union Commission is establishing an African Institute for Remittances (AIR) to strengthen capacities of AU member states, private sector and other partners to develop and implement strategies and instruments to use remittances for poverty reduction. The AIR will soon be operational and further foster human, community and other development in Africa.

Information management is also an important part of the policy framework on migration and development; and both labour and migration authorities needed to be able to collect and work with accurate data. Finally, migration and development policies needed to include respect for and protection of human rights of migrants, both in regular and irregular status. In 2012, the AU and EU had organized technical meetings on the human rights of migrants, specifically domestic workers, and on the protection of refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons. In the spirit of the Ouagadougou Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in human beings, the AU Commission's regional campaign against trafficking in human beings, "AU Commit", has been launched in the African regional processes.

Mr Sidiki Kaloko observed that effective development was not just promoted by aid and trade in goods and services but also by expanding the exchange of experience and skills. Migration reflects the interdependence of all countries as one of the most effective ways of promoting respect and understanding amongst communities.

The Common Space opening plenary was followed by the three breakout panel sessions.

#### **4.2.2. Common Space Panel 1: *Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development***

**Coordinator:** Dr Irena Omelaniuk, Senior Adviser to the GFMD Chair-in-Office

**Moderator:** Ms Kathleen Newland, Director, Migration Policy Institute, USA

##### **Panelists:**

1. Mr Juan José García, Vice Foreign Minister for Salvadorans Living Abroad, El Salvador
2. Mr Gibril Faal, Chair, African Foundation for Development (AFFORD) UK
3. Mr Uwe Kiewelitz, Director, Migration and Diaspora, Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM), Germany
4. Ms Millicent Odongo, Diaspora Business Center, the Netherlands

**Rapporteur:** Ms Carmelita S. Dimzon, DPO, Administrator, Overseas Workers Welfare Administration, Philippines

The GFMD has long recognized the diaspora as key actors in migration and development, and called for public-private partnerships to engage with diaspora as central planks of any development strategy.<sup>13</sup> In this panel, governments, private sector and diaspora sought answers to the following questions:

- a. What are some effective models of diaspora partnerships for development with governments, business, NGOs and international organizations? and
- b. What obstacles still remain for the diaspora to maximize their contribution to development? And how can these obstacles be overcome?

### **Effective models of diaspora partnerships**

In regions with large émigré populations, such as Central America, the diaspora are important both for economic change and political stability. Central American Governments see the future of their countries linked to the future of their diaspora; but stress that the diaspora are also important for social, economic and political development of the country of destination, hence of mutual interest to both countries. The Global African Diaspora Summit in Pretoria earlier in 2012 had identified diaspora as pivotal to a pan-African agenda for development and key players in fostering African unity.

Panelists agreed that there is no simple recipe or model for diaspora partnerships, no one size fits all. Solutions need to be flexible and varied, as they depend on many variables such as the demographic characteristics of the diaspora, their legal status in the host country and the impacts of emigration on the country of origin (and destination). Where small countries like El Salvador experience large-scale outflows, there is merit in a mixed approach combining incentives for diaspora investments and “returns” to the home community with stay-at-home development strategies.

- El Salvador’s recently launched Diaspora Talent program involves government, international organizations and other partners (including GIZ in Germany) in creating jobs and economic opportunities at home. The longstanding Program for Diaspora Investment last year accounted for investments by diaspora of up to \$12M. For El Salvador, these programs are important not just for economic reasons but also for social cohesion.

This kind of engagement is only possible through effective policies and institutional structures to support diaspora, such as: the Philippines’ Commission on Filipinos Overseas or welfare offices in Embassies and Consulates abroad; El Salvador’s Ministry for Salvadorans Living Abroad; Mexico’s Institute for Mexicans Living Abroad; and Morocco’s Ministry of Moroccans Living Abroad. In host countries, structures to support diaspora are often created by the diaspora themselves (e.g. AFFORD in the UK).

Increasingly, as countries like Germany develop comprehensive migration and development policies, diaspora are factored into these policies. Germany’s approach to diaspora has shifted from development-dependent to development-partnering: Diaspora are no longer seen as just “knowledge or cultural agents/brokers” who should be supported when interested in return to countries of origin by placing them in organizations in the context of development cooperation programs, but more as working and business partners to both the country of origin and destination.

- Mongolia seeks to attract back many of its qualified diaspora to work in the mineral exploration and processing industry. Kenya encourages its diaspora to engage in the stock market and would like to attract its aging diaspora by encouraging the construction of retirement homes. CIM last year organized a conference in Europe on behalf of the German and Mongolian Governments, where the Mongolian government and diaspora in 19 European states could exchange information about their respective needs and contributions (e.g. voting rights for the

---

<sup>13</sup> The moderator explained the working definition of “diaspora” broadly as encompassing any migrant living abroad, temporarily or permanently, who has maintained ties to the country/community of origin.

diaspora); and host countries like Germany could further develop platforms to support such engagement.

AFFORD-UK is a non profit-making diaspora organization which supports diaspora-based business and job creation in countries of origin through various types of partnership. As one practical example of a partnership that delivers business services to microenterprises, AFFORD has recruited African professionals in the UK and sent them as diaspora volunteers to Sierra Leone. In this effort, AFFORD has worked with local business associations such as the Market Traders Association, and with the local University (Post Graduate Institute) to train “business coaches” to support the microenterprises.

The Diaspora Business Centre in the Netherlands is a profit-making diaspora organization which provides services via a slightly different model. The Centre match-makes between entrepreneurs (both diaspora and non-diaspora), businesses and local governments, in this way often facilitating South-South transfer of skills where there are gaps in sectors important for development (“globalized” diaspora).

- A Kenyan diaspora business project implemented in Southern Sudan involves Dutch Government and Kenyan diaspora investors to help support and scale up the business, also for cross-border trade, and expertise from Poland, Kenya, Ethiopia and South Sudan. Similarly, a Somali ship-building project involves Sri Lankan expertise, Somali diaspora, local governments in Somalia and Kenya (also for cooperation on security) and Dutch funding.

Governments are increasingly devising joint diaspora policies. The Africa-Middle East diaspora policy being developed by Italy, France, Switzerland and Netherlands will foster diaspora dialogue, exchange of experience and experts and some pilot projects between these regions, particularly at the south-south level. This all-embracing methodology will help produce a compendium of capabilities and facilitate the assessment of capacity building needs (of the diaspora and partner governments). The Global African Diaspora Summit in Pretoria in May, 2012, sought to reach out to other regions like the Caribbean and strengthen trade and tourism ties through the agency of diaspora.

### **Obstacles to diaspora maximizing their contribution to development; and some solutions:**

- a) Fear by home communities of diaspora competing for business space in the country of origin. *Solution:* be innovative, find a niche, and fill a gap where no one else has an interest.
- b) Mindset of dependency on government support. *Solution:* don't wait for the right structures and policies to be in place first. Just start a business, especially to fill a gap (see a) above).
- c) Information/knowledge gaps among diaspora. *Solutions:* more awareness-raising (by governments and diaspora); web portals; 1-stop shop migrant/diaspora resource centres. .
- d) High costs of money transfers. *Solution:* Websites like the German “Money transfer” ([www.geldtransfair.de](http://www.geldtransfair.de)), which show current rates charged by MTOs and financial institutions, as a transparent way of informing and helping diaspora select cost effective transfer modes.
- e) Limited access to finances. *Different solutions:* Seed funds from government and other donors/lenders; matching grant competitions such as the US's African Diaspora Marketplace; and more innovative solutions like the German “crowd funding” for groups of small investments (preference for small investments by many rather than large investments by few).
- f) Trust (and commitment in the sense of “confianza”) by diaspora in government programs. *Solution:* governments strengthen diaspora outreach and ensure transparency of governance.
- g) Lack of data on where and who the migrants/diaspora are. *Solutions:* diaspora surveys and mapping (see also the RT 1.2 chapter); mainstreaming migration in development projects.
- h) The socio-economic situation in countries of origin (e.g. poor infrastructure, no internet in small villages). *Solution:* better governance and coherent development policies.
- i) Lack of institutional coherence. *Solutions:* still in the making, but models of overarching institutions like Presidential Commissions to coordinate government policies and actions could be examined for their lessons; the links between migrant integration and diaspora engagement still need to be fully researched and understood.

Among the solutions offered by governments and civil society, the Philippines' new 1-stop portal coming on board next year will address at least two of the common obstacles: lack of information and institutional coherence. The portal will inform and guide diaspora on where to invest. Uniquely, Government Ministries, such as Environment, Science and Technology, Agriculture etc) will advertise where there are investment gaps/opportunities in their field; and a poverty map will show where the investment could affect poverty.

#### **4.2.3. Common Space Panel 2: *Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress***

**Coordinator:** Ms Anja Klug, International Adviser to the GFMD Chair-in-Office

**Moderator:** Sir Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary General on Migration and Development

**Panelists:**

1. Ambassador Evan P. Garcia, Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva
2. Ms Catherine A. Wiesner, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, US Department of State
3. Fr Hagos Hayish, C.M., Secretary General, Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat
4. Ms Sue Lemesurier, Senior Officer Migration, International Federation of the Red Cross

**Rapporteur:** Mr Francois Crepeau, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants

The purpose of this dialogue was to identify distress situations that merit specific attention and to agree on possible future steps for collaboration and joint action, including in the context of the upcoming UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2013.

Panelists were asked to give short inputs into the discussion based on the following three questions:

- a) Which situations give rise to particular threats to the life and dignity of migrants?
- b) Which implementation gaps in the current protection systems need to be addressed most urgently (national, regional, international)? How could operational responses be improved through enhanced partnerships?
- c) What guidance could be drawn here from existing practices and partnerships?

The panel discussed a number of different distress situations, including humanitarian crises, abuse and crimes against Ethiopian refugees and migrants en route, including abduction, extortion, human trafficking and organ smuggling and the situation of individuals stranded in countries of transit or destination. The panel and participants highlighted that migrants can be trapped in different kinds of distress situations where their life, physical integrity and dignity are seriously at risk.

The situations mentioned by the panelist were but a few examples. Each of these situations required urgent attention, enhanced international cooperation to prevent abuses and protect the human rights of migrants, rescue migrants in distress, punish the perpetrators and combat the criminal networks. Better information about these threats in countries of origin helps people avoid falling victim to false promises.

Recognizing the need to assist all migrants in distress, it was suggested, nevertheless, that a global initiative could in a first stage most usefully focus on the specific situations of migrants who are, through no fault of their own, caught in humanitarian crises, either because of an outbreak of conflict in their host country or a natural disaster. A number of proposals and good practices were put forward, based, *inter alia*, on experiences in the context of the Libya crisis.

Panelists emphasized the importance of preparedness for an emergency. Appropriate migration policies, pre-established contingency plans on national level and between governments, emergency

funds, established cooperation, partnership and dialogues between countries of origin, host countries, international organizations, civil society and employers ensure quick action when a crisis erupts. Registration by the authorities of countries of origin or of host countries, as well as the establishment of a wardenship system can help to connect with migrants in times of crisis.

Model labour contracts with a series of protection clauses (access to back pay, repatriation, compensation for losses sustained in times of crisis, prohibition of the confiscation of identity and travel documents) have proven a useful tool to protect the rights of migrants in times of crisis. Joint contingency plans could include transportation for the return, allocation of logistical resources, and the creation of emergency funds (for assistance, transport, compensation for the losses of the migrants). Destination countries can put in place, *inter alia*, temporary protection regimes and systems for expedited visa processing.

Employers and recruitment agencies can contribute substantially to the protection of migrant workers in their employ, through the use of the model labour contracts available and/or the establishment of collective private-sector funds for financing protection and return operations during a crisis.

During the crisis, the rapid deployment of multifunctional teams by the country of origin is key. Measures which could be taken by such teams include the provision of consular services (identification, provision of travel documents, facilitation of travel); presence at the border, negotiation of exit or the negotiation of temporary transit and stay with neighbouring countries. But responses also need to be adapted to the specific type of crisis.

The difficulties experienced by migrants in irregular situations were particularly highlighted. The need for access to services in times of crisis is increased by their reluctance to be identified for fear of detention or deportation. Other vulnerable groups of migrants, such as women and children, also need special attention. The IFRC and other civil society actors have assisted migrants trapped in humanitarian crises in an exemplary way. These good practices can be used to further develop response mechanisms.

Some participants also referred to the challenges of migrants who had to return home because of the crisis. Programs may be needed to support them and their communities which suffer from the sudden loss of income.

Establishment of strong partnerships with all stakeholders, including the governments concerned, donors, employers, recruitment agencies, international organizations, such as IOM and UNHCR, and civil society is also key. Some participants also mentioned the importance of regional cooperation. One panelist described the way of cooperation as “One Emergency Approach”. All partners need to contribute to ensuring an inclusive response to all migrants in need. Differentiation needs to take place afterwards, once a safe place has been reached. Host countries also need to speak with one voice, despite the different interests of their various administrations. Mechanisms such as regional cooperation frameworks or the “Migration Crisis Operational Framework”, a tool developed by IOM to enhance the organization’s responses to such emergencies, could facilitate coordination.

Next steps: It was suggested that in preparation for the High Level Dialogue 2013 a working group composed of all the stakeholders, including civil society, be established to bring together all the experience, expertise and good practices in terms of protecting migrants in times of crisis. This working group could, based on good practices, produce practical guidance on how states’ responsibilities under international law could be best implemented in these situations to ensure more systematic and predictable responses. Different international instruments and mechanisms define state responsibility for the protection of migrants. The challenge lay in translating and linking the different applicable legal regimes. A matrix of legal instruments could be developed, which could identify the international instruments applicable to a specific situation, states’ responsibilities and the international organizations responsible.

#### **4.2.4. Common Space Panel 3: *Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs***

**Coordinator:** Mr Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie, International Adviser to the GFMD Chair-in-Office

**Moderator:** Mr Constantijn van Orange Nassau, Deputy Head of Cabinet Vice President Kroes, European Commission

**Panelists:**

1. Mr Arthur DeFehr, President and CEO, Palliser Furniture Ltd
2. Ms Halyna Mohylova, Foreign Worker Program Manager, Ronald A. Chisholm Ltd
3. Mr Dennis Sinyolo, Senior Coordinator for Education and Employment, Education International
4. Mr Alex Zalami, Advisor to the Minister of Labour, United Arab Emirates

**Rapporteur:** Ms Audrey d'Hotman de Villiers, Manager, Corporate Social Responsibility, Rogers & Company Limited

Common Space Panel 3 explored three areas of potential collaboration between governments, civil society, international organizations, and the private sector: regulation and monitoring of recruitment agencies; information flows to facilitate labour mobility; and a proactive approach by businesses in shaping immigration policy.

#### **Regulation of recruitment**

The session heard that migrant workers' vulnerability to abuse is in an inverse proportional relationship to their levels of skills. Where large numbers of relatively low-skilled workers (some may be illiterate) are recruited from Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa to work in the Gulf Cooperation Council countries (GCC), abuses often take place at the earliest stages of recruitment, in villages, where informal and unregulated subagents will demand cash payments to help people secure employment abroad. Thus, by the time these workers enter the formal parts of the system that are regulated, they may already be in debt. Civil society organizations' (CSOs') presence at the village levels in poor sending countries makes them a potentially important partner with governments, employers, and recruiters in reducing or eliminating abuse.

The session discussed an example from Ghana, which has piloted a scheme involving agricultural workers migrating to Italy. Consultation and planning involved relevant government departments including Labour, Interior, and Foreign Affairs; development partners including the Italian Government, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the European Union; as well as the Ghana Agriculture Workers Organization. Through its affiliates in Italy, this trade union was able to ensure protection for its members while abroad.

Another example came from Nigeria, which has encouraged self-regulation of recruitment practices involving a code of conduct implemented by private recruitment agencies. Recruitment agencies have organized themselves into an association and affiliated as a subgroup under the employers' association. Trade unions are also involved. When problems emerge, the agencies first try to resolve them themselves and only escalate such situations to the Ministry of Labour as a last resort.

In both these instances, however, informal agents operating outside the formal system of licensing and recognition can evade regulation and control, emphasizing a potential role for CSOs to, in the first instance, monitor malpractice and identify practical ways of eliminating abuse.

If recruitment agencies in countries of destination could identify credible agencies in countries of origin with whom they might work, this could also help reduce abusive practices. Some sort of government accreditation scheme for agencies based in the country of destination as well as accreditation for foreign recruiters visiting a country of origin in search of workers would help.

Scope also exists for the private sector and governments to collaborate further to provide the right mix of incentives for migrant workers. Efficient remittance transfer services and access to financial

literacy training are two such examples. Furthermore, CSOs could play useful roles in providing training and orientation at various stages of the migration lifecycle from pre-departure through to post-return.

It was noted that a lot of this collaboration is already happening but could be scaled up for much greater impact.

### **Barriers to labour mobility/information flows to facilitate labour mobility**

The session also considered at some length the various barriers to mobility that affect migrant workers. These barriers include lack of information and data that can hamper planning at governmental level as well as information flows that can assist migrant workers to make sound destination choices and prepare adequately. Non-recognition of qualifications can result in deskilling of workers and/or lower pay while they acquire local accreditation of their skills, which can take years. The session also heard the paradox that African workers appear to face more legal barriers moving across the continent that are laid down by countries than they do moving around other continents. The result is that countries often fail to attract the brightest and best to work in their economies. Abuses of migrant workers' rights and non-ratification of various ILO and UN treaties were also cited as barriers to mobility.

The meeting mentioned how Education International is developing a web portal for migrant teachers as a practical solution to the information gaps they face. In taking a holistic approach to providing information at every stage of the migration lifecycle, the web portal is another example of collaboration between civil society, employers, government bodies and others as part of the solution to challenges revolving around labour mobility. If successful, this sort of web portal might be extended to service migrant workers in other sectors.

### **Business shaping immigration policy**

The session heard how businesses operating in Manitoba, Canada, had taken proactive steps to initiate policy reforms in light of threats to their long-term survival stemming from declining population and unfavourable demographic trends. A federal policy shift toward more talent-based immigration worked to the disadvantage of Manitoba, one of the coldest regions on earth. In response, businesses proposed a new provincial nominee program that emphasized permanent rather than temporary migration and focused on families. There was a division of labour where businesses took care of most issues except for health and security, which remained the responsibility of governments.

In selecting immigrants, business leaders placed strong emphasis on maintaining healthy diversity in Manitoba and avoiding the emergence of ethnic enclaves. The program was relatively successful. Immigrants hail from 137 countries around the world. Manitoba saw the fastest rate of population growth at 170% of Canada's growth as a whole. Some 85% of the immigrants stayed in Manitoba even though there were no restrictions on their movement elsewhere in Canada. Unemployment in Manitoba is below the national average, and immigrants enjoy a higher level of home ownership than the national average (even among Canadians). There were no adverse social reactions to the program among the host population. The program attracted support across the political spectrum, and broad community support.

The wider implication of this case study, it was suggested, is that business has a role in shaping public policy and not just being a receiver that then complains when the policy is unfavourable. Critical to the success of the program, it seems, was the holistic approach to problem-solving that leaders across the spectrum took in ensuring that resistance was understood in its proper context (for instance, businesses provided training to one community who felt that they should receive priority attention for employment rather than allow their opposition to derail the program).

#### 4.2.5. Common Space closing plenary

Following the breakout panel discussions, Common Space participants reassembled in plenary under the moderatorship of Dr Khalid Koser, for the outcomes of the panel discussions.

**Ms Carmelita S. Dimzon**, rapporteur for Common Space Panel 1 on *Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development*, reported on the excellent moderatorship, panelist contributions and broad cross-sectoral engagement in the panel discussion. The discussion had closely followed the two agreed questions about effective models of diaspora partnerships for development and how to overcome the remaining obstacles to diaspora maximizing their contribution to development. Ms Dimzon outlined the key issues and outcomes of the panel discussion, as reflected in the Common Space panel 1 report above. She was assisted in this by the session note taker, Ms Ndidi Njoku, AFFORD-UK.

The key action items pointed to the multiplicity of models offered by some governments of countries of origin and destination, and the private sector and non-profit-oriented diaspora organizations. The outcomes focused mostly on legal frameworks for mobility, trust-building and transparency of relations with diaspora, institutional frameworks to deal with diaspora and trans-border coordination, information for diaspora and their partners, support and capacity building of diaspora and business partners across borders, and above all the need to better define and understand diaspora, their attributes, aspirations and needs, as a basis for improved diaspora policies and partnerships.

**Mr Francois Crepeau**, the rapporteur for Common Space panel 2 on *Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress*, reminded participants that, as stated by the panel moderator, Mr Peter Sutherland, the object of the discussion had not been the fate of all migrants in distress, but specifically how to respond to migrants in distress in times of crisis. As reflected in the Common Space panel 2 report above, key actions proposed in the panel discussion covered the need for a typology of crisis, a matrix of legal frameworks, institutional coherence within and between governments, pre-established contingency planning and partnerships, better deployment of consular services, closer engagement of employers and recruiters in protecting migrants, trust-based relations among all players across borders, adequate protections of persons in irregular circumstances, and finally a proposal for a working group to pull together the experience, expertise and good practices in protecting migrants in distress, for the HLD 2013.

**Ms Audrey d'Hotman de Villiers**, the rapporteur for Common Space panel 3 on *Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs*, identified a number of points of convergence for joint action between governments, businesses and civil society resulting from the wide-ranging and dynamic discussion in that session. These included a web portal to help migrants be better informed and prepared for the destination countries, licensing and engagement of recruitment agencies towards protecting the rights of migrant workers and their families, a multi-stakeholder forum of government, business, civil society on migration, minimum training standards towards worldwide recognition of qualifications and transferability of skills, harmonized human resource practices across regions (including regional remuneration benchmarking, job exchange schemes, job-matching web portals), and closer collaboration among governments, business and civil society on identifying country needs, collecting data on migrants and jobs, and policies for longer term, temporary and circular migration.

In the ensuing discussion, the moderator welcomed the fact that the rapporteurs' reports had given prominence to business and the private sector, high on the agenda of the GFMD. However, as one delegate pointed out, private sector was likely to have little time for engaging in forums like the GFMD; and action-oriented discussion was more likely to achieve this.

One government reminded participants that structures and frameworks already existed to deal with diaspora and skills development, both nationally, as in Angola, or through the migration forum in SADC, and these just needed to be strengthened. Multi-sectoral partnerships with diaspora were particularly important for capacity building, mentoring and monitoring. Regarding the protection of migrants in distress, recruitment agencies also had to be part of the solution, as they are often part of

the problem. Countries of origin and destination needed to bring them more into the conversation. One delegate suggested that regional processes should revamp their dialogue on labour mobility and skills development.

The proposal from breakout 2 for a working group in preparation for the HLD 2013 should pool the experiences of civil society, international organizations and states, especially of the recent crisis in Libya and other natural catastrophes and crises, for better planned policies in the future.

In closing, the moderator observed that delegates had succeeded in being i) objective, ii) practical and iii) focused on collective action both in the breakout panel debates and the plenary sessions. Follow-up on the many good ideas out of the Common Space was now important. Since governments had dedicated more than a quarter of their time to the Common Space, they should take some of the ideas/inspiration from the panels forward in the ensuing Government Days' discussions.

### **4.3. The Roundtable Sessions**

#### **4.3.1. Roundtable 1 - Circulating Labour for Inclusive Development**

**Coordinators:** Dr Irena Omelaniuk and Dr Salomon Samen

**General Rapporteur:** Costa Rica (Mrs Marcela Chacon, Vice Minister for Public Security)

This Roundtable focused on cross-border skills and jobs as drivers of development, and migrants and diaspora as potential agents for socio-economic change in globalized economies. An underlying assumption was that working abroad can accelerate human development if, in addition to assured protection of basic human rights, mobile workers are able to acquire new skills, use their skills productively, and return or re-invest in the development of their families and communities.

These issues were equally relevant in the South-North and South-South contexts. They called for joint actions and the engagement and incentivization of the private sector and diaspora to partner with governments and other civil society actors, also to ensure a wider and more inclusive distribution of the developmental benefits of migration. The challenge for governments and private sector in both origin and destination countries was to leverage the beneficial effects of migrant labour, skills, earnings and other gains from migration while protecting and empowering migrants and diaspora abroad.<sup>14</sup>

##### **4.3.1.1. Roundtable 1.1: Beyond-the-Border Skills and Jobs for Human Development**

**Co-chairs:** Mauritius (Mr Ali Mansoor) and United Arab Emirates (Mr Alex Zalami)

**Sub-session moderators:**

- Sweden (Mr Kristof Tamas)
- Costa Rica (Vice Minister Marcela Chacon)
- Philippines (Ms Carmelita S. Dimzon).

**Session Rapporteur:** Bangladesh (Dr Md Shahidul Haque)

This session shifted the focus of earlier GFMD debates on global labour and skills mobility to the specific issue of skills and jobs as enablers of human development.<sup>15</sup> It addressed a gap in policies on labour mobility, where even if migrants' rights are fully respected, there are often mismatches between their skills and jobs, which can lead to brain waste, lower earning capacities, higher costs to employers, possibly irregular migration status; and generally lower human development gains from working abroad. These can occur both overseas and upon return home; and can be a result, *inter alia*, of inadequate information, planning, institutional structures, resources and cross-border cooperation.

---

<sup>14</sup> For more information, refer to the GFMD 2012 Roundtable 1.1 and 1.2 Background Papers at <http://gfmd.org/en/docs/mauritius-2012>.

<sup>15</sup> Education and income are key indicators in the UNDP's Human Development Index: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/>

The session divided into 3 sequential sub-sessions moderated by Sweden, Costa Rica and Philippines, to examine migrant skills and jobs across the 3 major phases in the migration cycle: pre-departure, employment abroad, and return and employment in the country of origin. A concluding sub-session moderated by the co-chairs sought to draw some models and lessons from the discussions.

### **Issues and observations**

Cross-border skills and jobs were among the most critical challenges at the interface between migration and development today. A key question was who has the responsibility? Or who should share the responsibilities and burden for skills development, certification and recognition across borders? For example, training in the country of origin sometimes benefits employers in the country of destination more than in the country of origin. How can employers, countries of destination and countries of origin work together on skills recognition?

Effective legal frameworks are an important vehicle for clarifying such roles; and were a cross-cutting issue throughout the session. Skills development is usually the responsibility of governments as part of their national education, human development or skills development plans. But in countries of origin such plans often do not take account of overseas skills/qualifications needs and standards.<sup>16</sup>

Bilateral agreements with the country of destination can, however, effectively link the skills development and recognition with job-matching abroad. Information was critical for preparing workers and managing expectations. A number of websites or web portals already exist to inform potential overseas workers about jobs, skills requirements, work conditions and remuneration. These can play an important role in ensuring the right job-skills match. For Germany, a web portal “Make it in Germany” is the first check for foreign workers, and German advisers are also posted abroad (India, Indonesia and Vietnam) to provide information and advice to those wishing to go to Germany. Responsibility for this could also be shared between countries of origin and destination, and be included in labour agreements.

One-stop shops for information, counseling and training can be cost effective, such as the Philippine Government offers its departing workers, also abroad in its Embassies and Consulates, or as offered by migrant resource centres run by either governments or NGOs in destination and origin countries.

The session showcased different models for skills development and assessment in countries of origin and destination, and between the two, for their potential to be replicated elsewhere. These included National Qualifications Authorities (NQAs), which in countries like the United Arab Emirates and South Africa, covered national vocational education needs, standards and quality control, including skills and qualifications recognition, in line with the respective national human resource development plans. For the UAE, with more than 90% of its labour force foreign, the NQA is also relevant for overseas workers.

Some major labour source countries like Mauritius and the Philippines had national skills development policies, which also took account of international standards and expectations. But many if not most countries of destination and origin had neither a national qualifications framework nor a skills development policy that accounted for international standards. Where these existed, they tended to be modeled on the longstanding qualifications assessment schemes in traditional immigration countries such as Australia, Canada or the UK.

A key concern was how to harmonize or complement skills requirements between countries of origin and destination to optimize labour mobility, job matching and the attendant benefits for human and economic development, while minimizing de-skilling or brain waste either abroad or upon return. National Qualifications frameworks are important mechanisms that can work both in the destination and origin countries, but are usually a long term, resource-intensive undertaking. Developed countries

---

<sup>16</sup> For example, Bangladesh has major skills development, training and enhancement projects funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Swiss Development Corporation, European Union, International Labour Organization and the World Bank; but these are domestically focused, not across borders.

of origin like Australia, Canada and the UK have taken decades to establish them. For many labour source countries with limited resources (and an immediate need), the more practical solutions are: a) bilateral agreements, e.g. on mutual recognition of skills; or b) burden-sharing on skills training and recognition programs for specific sectors, involving the employers in the destination country.

Both government and private sector have key roles to play in this. For example, the Senegalese Government sends postal workers for apprenticeship training abroad, and upon return enables them to attain supervisory positions back home. In the Philippines, major foreign shipping companies have invested in training facilities for seafarers whom they will employ on their vessels. The Mexican Ministry of Education has negotiated with local education/training institutes in the USA for skills certificates to be issued to the local Mexican workers (mostly in illegal status) that are recognized for employment purposes. Training and skills that are recognized across borders can assure higher wages, and as in the case of the Philippines, strengthen the case for factoring a minimum wage into overseas work contracts.<sup>17</sup>

The biggest challenge lies in the lower skilled sectors. A number of models exist to ensure portability of skills recognition and effective matching of skills to jobs that could be replicated or adapted elsewhere, although these mostly relate to higher skills and professionals. For example:

1. The UAE's National Qualifications Authority, which is based on other models (e.g. the UK) and is relatively new, still faces the challenge of appropriate assessment tools to verify migrants' qualifications, because of the proliferation of individual certification systems in the many countries of origin of its foreign contract workers.
2. Sri Lanka has a 7-step skills recognition system based on the Australian model, and all migrant workers are now being graded on this system.
3. Sri Lanka has also set up three specialized technical colleges around destination country qualifications requirements. Other countries like the Philippines have done the same.
4. The Philippines provides skills/occupational training to international standards (e.g. seafarers, nurses, live-in caregivers); and makes provision in migrant worker contracts for recognition of their skills and appropriate remuneration (e.g. for domestic workers).
5. Senegal has a professional classifications agreement with France to determine salary categories per profession.
6. The Mauritius-France agreement on circular labour mobility includes a subsidy for skills training.
7. Korea's bilateral agreement with Bangladesh and many other countries combines skills development, skills recognition, and job matching within a single process.
8. Georgia has a bilateral agreement on circular migration with Germany, via the German Development Agency GIZ, for example in the hospitality and care sectors. And there is a Memorandum of Understanding with higher education institutions to help train them.

Many countries of origin are not prepared for the volume of emigrating skilled migrants, and do not have mechanisms to develop and certify migrants' skills for recognition at destination, or to recognize their enhanced or new skills upon return. Training should be adapted to the origin countries' needs, but also harmonized with destination countries' systems, to minimize brain waste or de-skilling through migration. The Philippines trains nurses for domestic needs, but also to international standards. Bangladesh now has a policy and a program with the EU to assess and recognize the skills of its returnees. Mali sends its students abroad for training, but selects them for labour needs back home. With incentives and job opportunities at home, most of the students return and find work in tourism and hotels.

Countries of origin and destination could share the costs of such training, to address potential brain drain or waste for the country of origin. Employers in the country of destination have invested in training and certification of the workers they would employ, as for example some European and Asian

---

<sup>17</sup> Under its Labor Code, the Philippines sets a basic wage of USD400 a month for its domestic workers abroad, which is factored into the bilateral labour agreements.

shipping companies have done to prepare their seafarers in the Philippines. This solution combines labour mobility objectives with some infrastructural development support in the country of origin.

Cooperation and cost-sharing between governments was paramount. An incremental approach may be most efficient and cost effective, commencing with an agreement between countries on a few sectors and the standards required for overseas employment in those sectors (e.g. Germany’s agreement with Georgia focuses on the hospitality and health sectors, where Germany has a labour need). Apprenticeships and training abroad, such as Mali and Senegal engage in, or France offers with its “young professionals” program, and on-the-job training schemes supported by employers (and/or the government), can also work to combine labour and development objectives.

Adequate legal frameworks can also facilitate better job-matching. An example is the Swedish, demand-driven labour migration policy, which facilitates circular migration by allowing foreign temporary workers to return home and re-enter Sweden without loss of status. Legal certainty for the migrant through flexible work permits, multiple entry permits, eventual access to citizenship rights or dual citizenship (in countries like Sweden where national immigration laws provide for such paths to citizenship), can enable migrants to meet both short term and more structural labour market needs in countries of origin and destination.

Bilateral agreements on labour exchange in specific sectors, such as between the Philippines and more than 40 other countries on Filipino seafarers; between the Philippines and UK for nurses; or between Mexico/Guatemala and Canada for seasonal farm workers, still seemed to offer one of the most expedient solutions. Circular migration arrangements that provide for mutual recognition of qualifications and shared funding of training can offer one of the best protections against de-skilling and brain waste. But bilateral agreements also often failed in the implementation, for example job quotas have remained unfilled in some bilateral programs, among others because of a lack of interest or knowledge by the employers about the process of acquiring the foreign workers.

The question was raised: should there be a global skills rating system or agency? How could the ILO’s International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO), which was already adapted nationally in a number of countries, be of assistance in this? This remained open to further discussion.

Finally, it was felt that in the context of temporary or circular labour mobility, the primary responsibility lay with the governments of countries of origin to recognize their people’s skills and clear the way for their productive return home. There was still a large gap in the area of skills assessment and recognition in the country of origin for returning migrants. Most productive reintegration upon return home seems to happen at the informal level. There was a need for countries of origin to seriously take account of skills

recognition upon return; and for this to be included in bilateral labour agreements in the future. Where such systems already existed in the country of origin, it was suggested that they be shared with the destination country to facilitate cross- border portability of skills.

## **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. Models to support effective skills recognition and job matching in the context of labour mobility include:
  - a. National Qualifications Authorities (e.g. in the UAE) – these are longer term, resource-intensive, and need to adjust for a myriad of other certification systems and standards.
  - b. Legal frameworks and demand-driven systems that facilitate employers’ hiring of the skills they need, adapted to both short term and structural labour market needs.
  - c. Bilateral or circular labour agreements; including MRAs, in specific sectors (e.g. Filipino seafarers, nurses or domestic workers, or the Mauritius-France/Canada circular migration agreements) – these are expedient, more targeted, mutually agreeable, and cost effective.
  - d. Skills training cost-shared by country of origin and destination (e.g. employer-subsidized).

- e. Information, websites or web portals for potential overseas workers about jobs, skills requirements, work conditions and remuneration.
  - f. One-stop shops in the country of origin (e.g. Philippines) and country of destination (e.g. Migrant Resource Centres, such as in Tajikistan).
  - g. Language skills training - often overlooked, its absence can be an obstacle to skills portability.
2. Bilateral circular labour agreements should include a country of origin responsibility for skills recognition of workers when they return.
  3. The GFMD should further develop the theme of closing the gap between skills assessment and recognition in the country of origin for returning migrants.

#### **4.3.1.2. Roundtable 1.2 Supporting Migrants and Diaspora as Agents of Socio-Economic Change**

**Co-chairs/moderators of the sub-sessions:** France (Ambassador Francis Hurtut)  
 Kenya (Mr Zaddock Madiri Syong'oh)  
 Morocco (Mr Mohammed Bernoussi)

**Sub-session:** El Salvador (Ambassador Eugenio Arene)

**Rapporteurs:** World Bank (Ms Sonia Plaza)  
 IOM (Ms Michele Klein Solomon)

This session proceeded on the assumption that the competencies, ideas and financial resources of migrants and diaspora can support and advance socio-economic development at home. The session sought to identify effective strategies at the policy, legal, institutional, and programmatic levels to strengthen the capacities of migrants and diaspora. Particular emphasis was placed on engaging the private sector, promoting entrepreneurship and strengthening economic, trade and investment links between countries. The focus on private sector and entrepreneurship is complementary to diasporas' philanthropic, social and cultural contributions to their home and host countries; and is in line with the RT 1.1 focus on skills circulation for development.

To set the context, some key findings and lessons were shared in plenary from a recent joint OECD-French Government study of diaspora across 6 world regions.<sup>18</sup> The report reinforced the need to remove obstacles to easy diaspora movement and transactions between countries. It called for increased support for development-oriented initiatives by diaspora that built on diaspora social networks. Among the key policy areas for further action were: more detailed data about migrants/diaspora and their skills and needs; the institutional mechanisms to follow up and support diaspora abroad; and full integration of diaspora in the labour markets of destination countries as a prerequisite to investment in countries of origin (integration and development impact are two sides of the same coin). Policies aimed at business/private sector partnerships needed to be different for those diaspora returning and those who do not return.

#### **Breakout 1: Partnerships**

(Moderator: France)

This sub-session showcased a range of partnerships variously involving governments, migrants, diaspora, private sector, international organizations, civil society and regional processes. Of note was the predominance of development, diaspora and business-oriented participants in the debate.

An increasing number of countries today include diaspora strategies in their broader development or migration and development programs and partnerships. Spain works with Togo to strengthen its

<sup>18</sup> The OECD/AFD publication on *Connecting with Emigrants: Global Profile of Diaspora* offers 140 country notes on diaspora across 6 regions, and some key lessons about the behavior of diaspora and appropriate policies.

institutional capacities for “diaspora management” in the context of a larger program with ECOWAS on poverty reduction. The Netherlands, a pioneer in migration and development policy,<sup>19</sup> finances programs that strengthen diaspora organizations (including the European Network of Diaspora Organizations) to contribute to development, assess the impacts of remittances on country of origin and development and enhance the capacity of African governments to interact with their diaspora. Also at the regional levels diaspora are being integrated more into development planning.<sup>20</sup>

Some countries increasingly focus their development support in this area on business and investment between countries. Germany, for example, has tools and programs to support diaspora as bridge builders and drivers of SME partnerships between countries; and has placed “development scouts” in Chambers of Commerce to this end. France supports a platform of migrant and diaspora organizations (FORIM), and increasingly has shifted the focus from social projects with the country of origin to business development and productive investment by diaspora in the home country. Support to diaspora as an aid effectiveness strategy stimulated a debate about how much development aid should support private sector initiatives. USAID supports a business plan competition for diaspora from Sub Saharan Africa (African Diaspora Marketplace), which has been evaluated for its effectiveness, and in El Salvador provides remittance-backed housing loans to labour migrant families back home.

A wide range of models were demonstrated by governments, diaspora and private sector, which illustrated similar objectives, methods and outcomes tied to business and entrepreneurship:

1. MITOS – a German web-based training and capacity building toolkit for diaspora entrepreneurs and businesses (Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM))
2. SEVA Network Foundation in the Netherlands - supports diaspora enterprises in developing countries.
3. Diaspora Business Centre (DBC) – a profit-making diaspora entity based in the Netherlands, with outposts in Ghana, Kenya and Somalia, provides services, equipment, office space, training and funding support to diaspora for business creation and SME partnerships. The DBC is now using the German MITOS toolkit for this.
4. African Diaspora Marketplace (ADM) - a US-based business plan competition for Sub-Saharan Africa diaspora, which funds matching grant schemes.
5. Diaspora-based agricultural programs – supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (e.g. Filipino diaspora in Italy investing in farming cooperatives back home).
6. African Foundation for Development (AFFORD-UK) – diaspora-based NGO offering similar support and capacity building to diaspora enterprises as the DBC.
7. EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI) – provides capacity building and training for local authorities in support of decentralized, city-to-city cooperation.

Diaspora initiatives are likely to have the most immediate impact at the local level and between communities across borders, e.g. USAID’s remittance-backed housing loans in countries like El Salvador; or the well-studied GhanaCoop initiative out of Modena, Italy, where the Ghanaian diaspora have partnered with local government and local business to set up agrarian cooperatives back home, which in turn trade their produce with the community in Italy. When local authorities have the relevant budgetary powers and commitment (Italy, France, Spain), there is greater scope for sustainability of diaspora initiatives and in turn, their development impact. Local authorities can be catalysts and enablers and can ensure that diaspora are well connected with actual needs on the ground.

Stronger ties to, and capacity building of, local authorities are important, but have been missing from the diaspora debate. Web-based information tools and capacity building of diaspora, relevant

---

<sup>19</sup> See the 2008 Migration and Development Policy Memorandum of the Ministry of Justice, also featured in the GFMD Platform for Partnerships: <http://gfmd.org/en/pfp/practices/item/177-policy-memorandum-international-migration-and-development-2008>.

<sup>20</sup> The World Summit in South Africa (2012) discussed the integration of diaspora into the region’s development agenda highlighting the urgent need for funding and resources to implement projects in countries of origin and destination.

government agencies and NGOs can assist (e.g. how to strategically select business initiatives and partnerships, manage them, and advocate for them). Governments, private sector and others need to provide incentives, technical assistance and financial support, e.g. through grant matching, to diaspora organizations and their partners in the country of origin. Workable models exist, also with some evaluation results (e.g. ADM).

Institutional structures were essential to coherent diaspora engagement policies: El Salvador, Morocco, Philippines and other countries of origin today have well-functioning Government Ministries, departments or commissions dedicated to diaspora affairs. The Guyana Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in collaboration with IOM, is seeking to formalize its links with the diaspora and match skills and interests, towards developing a framework/methodology to respond to the diaspora ([GUYD](#)). Embassies, consulates and the private sector are involved in engaging the Guyanese diaspora by documenting skills, resources and return interests and plans of those willing to support national social and economic development by coming home to relocate or spend time there.

The compendium of good practices in the Annex of the RT 1.2 Background Paper was held by many to be a useful GFMD reference on diaspora, which could be completed and showcased on the GFMD website.

## **Breakout 2: Financial services**

(Moderator: Kenya)

This sub-session looked at how to incentivize diaspora as catalysts for development of capital markets and private businesses.

It was agreed that investment must be based on a political and social platform that governments and other partners needed to create. This required appropriate mechanisms to manage financial and security aspects of transactions balanced against sufficient social services and support to allow migrants to continuously invest/give remittances. Access to credit could complement capital investments. For example, Morocco imposed a 15% capital investment requirement, but combined this with the creation of a fund linked to the central bank, to provide credit and encourage diaspora investment in housing.

How to ensure continuous engagement during economic downturns? Tax concessions and portability of benefits can incentivize retirees considering return to the country of origin to firm up their plans. Another incentive relates to affordable and available housing for returning diaspora. For example, private sector housing companies in Kenya are partnering with the government to provide housing and loan facilities to diaspora when they come home. The Kenyan Central Bank has been key to creating incentives for diaspora engagement. Toolkits can prepare migrants to depart and return and deal with economic downturns. The GFMD could offer a platform of good practices to support diaspora strategies.

Lowering the cost of remittance transfers and easing the transaction process of remittance transfers can also leverage the use of migrant earnings for development purposes back home.

The Kenyan program, M-PESA (“mobile money”; <http://www.safaricom.co.ke>), enables money transfers via mobile phones without the rigidities of formal banking systems. M-PESA has reached previously inaccessible rural communities, ensured their financial inclusion and created local jobs. The program was set up by the private sector (Safaricom), which now partners with the Central Bank for greater regulatory control and consumer protection.<sup>21</sup> 85% of Kenyans engaged in mobile banking today use M-PESA; and many salaries are paid via this system. The system is operational in East

---

<sup>21</sup> The use of unique numbers for each transaction, a unique and secret code for each user and unique reference numbers for the many outlets guarantees a high level of security. All service providers must be registered; and dishonest users are ‘blacklisted’.

Africa, but will be extended to Europe, with a platform already set up in the UK. The success of M-PESA has depended on the right business environment and political support.

Remittances can improve debt sustainability, sovereign ratings and access to international capital markets. Remittances to developing countries are increasing. Top recipients include India, China, Kenya and Nigeria. Remittances to Sub-Saharan Africa are the most expensive in the world, one of the reasons why M-PESA is so important for Sub-Saharan Africa. By contrast, in the UAE transactions cost \$1. Lack of competition in the African context is still a major obstacle.

Diaspora can also be catalysts for the development of capital markets. Diaspora Bonds and Investment Funds were briefly discussed as instruments for developing countries to raise capital from the diaspora. Securitization of future exports and remittances can improve ratings on external financial transactions. Diaspora bonds can be useful tools for tapping into the wealth of diaspora. Governments or the private sector can issue these types of bonds. They can be used to retire foreign debt. They do not replace remittances, which are private money; and the remitter can choose how they invest that money. Foreign exchange from remittances could also be channeled into infrastructure development.

Countries that have successfully used diaspora bonds over a longer period include Israel and India. India issued bonds at a moment of crisis in relation to their balance of payments. Israel issued bonds for development projects. Kenya has issued infrastructure diaspora bonds. Ethiopia has issued millennium bonds. Nigeria is planning to issue diaspora bonds. Diaspora funds have not been as successful as diaspora bonds. Any instruments that are issued must be secure to generate trust and confidence.

Institutional structures are key to delivering effective financial services to diaspora: The Government of Ghana has established a Diaspora Support Unit within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in coordination with IOM, has launched a website (<http://www.ghanaiandiaspora.com/>) to create links between Ghana's three million-strong diaspora and development projects back home. The Philippines this year established the Remittance for Development Council, a multi-stakeholder advisory and policy body to optimize the development benefits of remittances and reduce the cost of remittances to the World Bank's standard.

Questions remained about marketing strategies, incentives to generate interest, management and coordination of bonds; and the monitoring and oversight of their use in development projects back home.

### **Breakout 3: Non-financial services**

(Moderator: Morocco)

The third breakout group focused its discussion largely on a program between France and South Mediterranean countries to support diaspora-based investments in countries of origin. This is a multi-stakeholder program based on a coalition of stakeholders supporting the many scientific and PhD-trained foreigners in France with the potential to create businesses at home. The assistance and intervention starts in the country of destination and carries over to the home country. Key lessons are that entrepreneurship is long-term and requires investment over a more sustained period; expectations need to be managed; and persons not naturally inclined to do business may require coaching and assistance. The success of the program was dependent on a strong country of origin counterpart and network.

Among the many challenges facing diaspora is the need to adapt to the home culture, which can be quite alien also in terms of the perceptions of diaspora by those who did not migrate. Returning diaspora often face the perception that they are only returning home because they failed abroad. The local regulatory, business and cultural environment may also be unfamiliar and foreign for long term residents returning

Building capacities of diaspora is the responsibility of both country of origin and destination. The country of origin needs to minimize the brain drain or waste through smart policies that allow the

mobility of their skilled people, while recruiting back those that can help with development back home. This requires a better matching of skills training and employment opportunities. It also requires migration policy measures to facilitate mobility, including dual citizenship, multi-entry visas to allay migrants' fear of loss of status while absent from country of destination, and inclusive integration and reintegration measures.

### **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. Following were identified as key elements of a comprehensive diaspora support strategy:
  - a. Comprehensive diaspora surveys and mapping – beyond demographic data to include information on, e.g., investment profiles and history, savings profiles and history, age and risk tolerance, terms under which diaspora would invest, etc. These will assist in the creation of targeted marketing strategies. (Note that Malaysia, Jamaica and Kenya may be mapping diaspora profiles and organizations as well as existing obstacles to investment.)
  - b. Support mechanisms for the diaspora to build bridges, networks and partnerships across borders (e.g. MITOS); and appropriate training and capacity building.
  - c. Create the conditions and incentives to stimulate investments back home, including accessible financial instruments through banks, micro-finance institutions and others.
  - d. Migration mainstreaming at the national and local levels to ensure that policy makers understand how migration supports initiatives at all levels. Capacity building of local authorities.
  - e. Improve communication and coordination among all stakeholders, including central and local governments, businesses and financial institutions, chambers of commerce and diaspora organizations.
  - f. Improve diaspora outreach: train Embassies and foreign services in diaspora engagement and services.
  - g. Local diaspora-focused grant matching competitions such as the African Diaspora Marketplace.
2. Complete and showcase on the GFMD website (PfP) the compendium of good practices in the Annex of the RT 1.2 Background Paper (held by governments and partners to be a useful reference on diaspora).

### **4.3.2. Roundtable 2 - Factoring Migration into Development Planning**

**Coordinators:** Dr Rolph Jenny and Mr Viraj Ghoorah Latanraj

**General Rapporteur:** Nigeria (Ambassador Abdulaziz Dankano, Director, Consular and Immigration Affairs, Foreign Affairs)

In line with GFMD's continued focus on enhancing the positive impact of migration on sustainable development, and following earlier GFMD discussion on this topic, the first session of Roundtable 2 sought to sharpen the focus on the practical tools available to governments to design coherent and effective programs and policies in the field of migration and development. Key tools discussed to this effect included migration and development mainstreaming processes, extended Migration Profiles and poverty reduction strategies, including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs).

The second session of Roundtable 2 addressed South-South Migration and Development Policies, a first-ever topic addressed by the GFMD in a full Roundtable session. The focus was on most recent data reflecting the full range of human mobility in the South-South context –including related drivers

of such migration; harnessing the development potential of labour mobility among countries of the Global South; governance capacity gaps; and environment-induced migration.<sup>22</sup>

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

**Co-chairs:** Morocco (Ambassador Omar Hilale)  
Switzerland (Ambassador Eduard Gnesa)

**Session Rapporteur:** Sweden (Mr Justin MacDermott)

The purpose of RT session 2.1 was to further 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). The session took 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, 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, and ensure continued information sharing among governments and between governments and non-state actors on these tools.

More specifically, the session addressed the question of how governments have worked, and which lessons they have learned, in mainstreaming migration into their development planning, including through extended Migration Profiles and PRSPs; how institutional coherence and synergies between these mainstreaming tools can be achieved; what assistance governments need from the international community; and how migration can effectively be integrated into the post-2015 development agenda.

#### **Issues and observations**

In his introductory remarks on the RT 2.1 Background Paper, The Swiss Co-chair reaffirmed, *inter alia*, that migration is a key part of the development processes around the world. A global approach to integrate migration policies into development agendas and perspectives is required, which should enhance and influence development agendas as much as it would migration agendas. And governments should also consider the various aspects of migration when planning sectoral policies, such as education, health, employment, environment, agriculture and rural development, trade and infrastructure.

Referring to the three planning tools that can support national development, i.e. the Migration and Development Mainstreaming process, Extended Migration Profiles and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, the Co-chair underlined their synergy and complementary nature, and stressed the significant achievements over recent years at the global, regional and national levels in furthering the understanding of, and implementing these tools. The GMG Migration Mainstreaming Handbook had greatly contributed to this effort, as had the UNDP/IOM 2-year pilot project implemented by Bangladesh, Jamaica, Moldova, and more recently Tunisia. He also reminded delegates that these migration and development planning tools need to be considered in the various forthcoming international development discussions, in particular the Post-2015 development agenda and the upcoming 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

Ms Toni-Shae Freckleton presented Jamaica's process towards formulating a National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development under which migration and development mainstreaming has been integrated into several sector plans in 'Vision 2030 Jamaica'. This process is being monitored through the inter-agency National Working Group on International Migration and

---

<sup>22</sup> For more information, refer to the GFMD 2012 Roundtable 2.1 and 2.2 Background Papers at <http://gfmd.org/en/docs/mauritius-2012>.

Development (NWGIMD). The focus was on the use of the GMG Handbook as a critical guide, inter alia, to establish the Migration Policy Project Unit and frame the eight thematic areas of focus. Broad stakeholder participation has been key to the process through the involvement of representatives from all Ministries, Departments and Agencies of government; civil society, NGOs, migrant groups, academia and development partners to facilitate greater institutional and policy coherence in migration and development initiatives. Data, Gender and Human Rights have been identified as key cross-cutting issues that will be integrated throughout the Policy. Extensive consultations have been held at various levels including special population groups and sectors.

The process to complete Jamaica's first Migration Profile was outlined including the strengths and weaknesses. Ownership of the Migration Profile resides with the country's policy planning and statistical institutes. Several lessons from the overall process were shared emphasizing that mainstreaming migration is not an event but a process which requires strong political will and commitment; and partnerships with experts in the field to provide technical guidance and support. Mainstreaming migration can be effectively achieved if migration is integrated into national development frameworks with a dedicated institutional focal point.

Ms Daniela Morari presented Moldova's current migration policy. Some 25% of Moldova's labour force resided outside the country, which has a significant impact on Moldova's development, including high negative social costs on families, children and elderly left behind. Remittances represent some 30% of the GDP. She stated, inter alia, that under the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership, the government's migration priorities were defined in terms of funding, coordination, strengthened policy coherence, investment in human resources, more targeted initiatives for cooperation, etc. Extended Migration Profiles (EMPs) represent an integral part of Moldova's migration policy, implemented within the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership.

A national coordination team was set up in Moldova, including an Inter-agency Technical Working Group involving all relevant institutions and authorities, and the National Commission for Population and Development. An EMP Template with a list of indicators and a set of definitions was approved by the Government on 25 August 2012. The Bureau for Migration and Asylum (Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Moldova) was designated as the coordinating authority responsible for the future development and annual update of the Moldovan EMP. The first EMP Report for Moldova will be published in early 2013.

For the Philippines, Cabinet-level Secretary Imelda Nicolas explained how Philippine President Benigno S. Aquino III had articulated the transformational character of his Government's migration policy in his 16-point contract with the Filipino people, as follows: "From a government that treats its people as an export commodity and a means to earn foreign exchange, disregarding the social cost to Filipino families ... to a government that creates jobs at home, so that working abroad will be a choice rather than a necessity and where its clients choose to become Overseas Filipino Workers, their welfare and protection will still be the government's priority." She said the Government and other significant stakeholders need to get their act together, know the planning process, what stage of the development planning process the country or the local government unit is in, and harness the opportunities made available to influence the planning process, so that the strategy for mainstreaming can be adjusted.

She reaffirmed that the ingredients for a successful mainstreaming of migration and development are the political will of both national and local leaders, capacity building of the planning offices (both national and local), and evidence-based policy planning and need for migration and development data, both national and local. Development planning must thus lead to investment and funding plans and continuous monitoring of the implementation and mid-term review of any plan, including that of migration and development.

In the ensuing discussion, presided over by the Moroccan Co-chair, participants highlighted a number of lessons learned: M&D mainstreaming processes –including extended migration profiles- help identify gaps in national policy and legislative frameworks, and facilitate prioritization of migration-

related objectives and their linkage with national development planning. These processes should also cover internal and intra-regional migration, in particular in the context of South-South migration and its relevance for related development and economic strategies.

Delegates also stressed that mainstreaming processes must consider the social costs of migration (“migrants are not commodities, but human beings”), that such processes offer opportunities to enhance dialogue with destination countries, that destination countries should also develop such processes (including for successful integration), and that mainstreaming involves longer-term and continuous activity. In a few cases, M&D mainstreaming has resulted in integrating migration into key planning documents, including PRSPs.

Concerning institutional coherence and synergies between the different planning tools, participants remarked that political will and ‘buy-in’ at the political level is essential to ensure broad national ownership and sustainability, including by means of a dedicated national coordinating entity that can act across concerned ministries and departments. Consultations with civil society, diasporas, migrant organizations, employers and trade unions are important. Action by local government is also essential. The synergetic use of the different tools can be relevant, for example relying on extended migration profiles to launch a broader mainstreaming process. Ultimately, to be effective, migration needs to be mainstreamed into countries’ key long term development planning documents.

In terms of assistance required by governments, participants reaffirmed the need for sustained support to building capacity at the national level, sub-regional and regional levels, including in areas such as structural support, skills requirement mapping and skills recognition, inclusion of migration data in development surveys, and enhancing access to labour markets, e.g. through bilateral labour agreements or other enabling legal frameworks by countries of destination. Key development agencies and partners also need to factor the contribution of migration to development in their strategies. This includes the UN Country Teams (UNCTs) which may need to enhance their own capacity.

Integrating migration into the Post-2015 Development Agenda was recognized by all as a key priority action, stressing the unique opportunity offered by the 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, and the deliberations leading up to the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Expressing regret that the current Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) failed to include migration factors, delegates considered that action should be fast since the Post-2015 deliberations are already underway. Also, indicators to measure and monitor the concrete effects of migration on specific development outcomes need to be developed. Suggested entry points for inserting migration into the Post-2015 Development Agenda included the on-going Global Consultations on Population Dynamics, focusing on mainstreaming migration under the inclusive social and economic dimensions of development as well as into the follow-up to the current Global Partnerships found in MDG 8.

### **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. Promote continued planning and implementation of migration and development mainstreaming processes (including Extended Migration Profiles and appropriate monitoring) by governments in all regions and with the support of relevant international and national actors.
2. Develop effective and coherent institutional arrangements to implement such processes, within government and between government and non-state stakeholders.
3. Integrate migration into the post-2015 development agenda, recognizing the unique opportunity offered for such action by the 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, and the deliberations leading up to the Post-2015 Development Agenda.
4. Include migration data in development surveys.
5. Factor the contribution of migration to development outcomes into development strategies by development agencies, including multilateral organizations.
6. Enhance legal access to labour markets, e.g. through bilateral labour agreements or other enabling legal frameworks.

#### **4.3.2.2. Roundtable 2.2: Addressing South-South Migration and Development Policies**

**Co-chairs:** Bangladesh (Dr Md. Shahidul Haque)  
Ghana (Dr Prosper Asima)

**Session Rapporteur:** Argentina (Mr Paulo Cavaleri)

This first-ever GFMD Roundtable session focused specifically on migration and development issues and policies in the Global South built on a series of earlier regional workshops and conferences on migration and development in developing countries. The session sought to deepen the understanding of migration patterns in the Global South and examine the impacts of human mobility between developing countries on sustainable development. Key objectives were to provide latest available and comprehensive data on migration in the Global South, discuss possible policy options to harness the development potential of South-South labour mobility, offer an overview of latest developments in the context of climate change and environment-induced migration, and address capacity gaps with regard to the collection and analysis of data, migration and development mainstreaming processes and migration governance.

In his introductory remarks, the Ghanaian Co-chair recalled the absence of a universally accepted definition of the ‘Global South’ and that the estimated number of international migrants living in developing countries depends on the definition applied (i.e. by UN/DESA, World Bank and the UNDP Human Development Report). Much of South-South migration is across borders of neighbouring countries, is often irregular, involves primarily young and lower-skilled migrants, and is mainly intra-regional. While many countries lack effective migration policies or face difficulties in implementing existing policies, he stressed that migration and development realities in the South – including in terms of migration policy development- differ considerably between regions.

A major challenge was the social and legal protection of migrants’ rights, in particular youth and other vulnerable groups. In some regions, availability of reliable and comprehensive migration data is scarce, and building capacity to develop and analyze such data is a key challenge for many countries in the South. Also, in some developing countries remittances sent from other developing countries are as important as remittances sent from the North. Finally, the Co-chair stressed the high number of refugees and forcibly displaced persons living in the South.

Recalling the different definitions applied to determine migrant stock in the Global South, Mr Bela Hovy (UNDESA) mentioned that migrants residing in developing countries account for 40% (UN definition); 44% (UNDP Human Development definition); and 36% (WB definition) of international migrants. South-South migration has increased, but slightly less so than South-North migration. Most S/S migrants move within their region, i.e. Africa with 81%, Asia 75% and Latin America 60%, and most young migrants (under age 20) live in developing countries. Of the worldwide 33.3 million young international migrants, 20 million (60%) live in the less developed regions. Asia hosts the largest number of migrants under age 20, with 13.1 million or 39.3% of all young international migrants. Europe hosts the second largest number of international migrants under age 20 (7.5million, or 22.7%), and Africa follows with 5.5 million or 16.5%. Also, migration has little impact on population growth in most developing countries.

Stressing the importance of remittance flows between developing countries the Co-chair mentioned that costs of transferring remittances have been declining over recent years, but remain considerable. Finally, he proposed the following steps to strengthen data collection on international migration in the Global South: 1) Ask basic questions, and tabulate the answers; 2) exploit administrative data sources; 3) leverage existing surveys; 4) provide access to micro-data; and 5) build capacity for collection and dissemination.

Prof David Thomas (Foresight/UK), referring to the relationship between migration, development and environmental change, emphasized the need to better understand how environmental change influences decisions to move and the drivers of migration. Environmental change, which includes

climate change, interacts with a number of migration drivers that often underpin South-South migration, including economic drivers, such as employment opportunities and wages, and social drivers, such as access to education and family obligations. It is important that the GFMD grasps this debate, building on the discussions at the Mexico 2010 GFMD, to ensure it is informed by a nuanced understanding of the synergies between migration and development.<sup>23</sup>

## **Issues and observations**

### ***Enhancing capacities to collect better data***

In the ensuing discussion, delegates first addressed the *capacities needed to collect better data on South-South migration*, stressing again that definitions matter since the variations resulting from existing definitions are considerable. For example, Gulf Cooperation Council countries are difficult to categorize as ‘North’ or ‘South’. The UN definition of international migrants (1998) is not well known in many countries and often not applicable in the South-South migration context since short term cross-border movements, including informal labour migration and seasonal migration, are not captured under this definition. The definition may need to be reviewed.

It is also necessary to rely on censuses and sectoral surveys to collect better South-South migration data and ensure financial and procedural capacities for such data collection and analysis. The 2010 census round is slow in producing South-South data due to financial and procedural constraints. Data also need to be disaggregated by gender and age. Political will to conduct such local censuses and sectoral surveys is essential, and the ‘Migrants Count’ guide was mentioned as an effective tool for comprehensive data collection, including for data analysis and dissemination.

Some participants suggested a GFMD-led discussion on South-South migration data surveys, to be held at a future GFMD summit meeting. More reliable and comprehensive data are also essential in the context of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Data on transit and return migration in the Global South are of great significance (for example in the Libya crisis), and new emerging migration trends (such as Africans in China and South America, Chinese in Latin America and Africa, and Latin Americans in Africa) also need to be considered. Some delegates further mentioned existing knowledge gaps on environment-induced migration and displacement in the Global South.

### ***South-South labour mobility and its effects on development***

Participants first stressed the financial and economic crisis’ negative impact on labour migration that seriously affects a number of countries in the Global South. Delegates also recognized the growing labour market differences within and across regions of the South.

Main drivers of migration between developing countries are the search for employment and lack of economic and social prospects in source countries. Much of such migration is irregular, for example in Africa, and jobs are usually only available in the informal labour market, which exposes many migrants to abuse and violation of their basic rights. Restrictive immigration policies are in part responsible for why people choose to move in an irregular manner. Lower-skilled migrants account for the majority of South-South movements, primarily across borders of neighbouring countries as less distance makes mobility less costly, is more accessible and often includes short-term seasonal migration. However, a number of delegates mentioned the growing number of highly-skilled migrants moving between countries in the South and whose contribution to economic development can be significant.

Some participants considered that the contribution of both low and highly-skilled migration to development can be significant if it is managed effectively, takes account of actual labour market needs and offers appropriate legal and social protection. South-South migration could also bring larger poverty alleviation gains through increased remittances and lower transfer costs, but delegates

---

<sup>23</sup> For more information please refer to the GFMD 2012 Roundtable 2.2 Background Paper, prepared by Foresight/UK, and the 2011 Foresight report ‘Migration and Global Environmental Change’.

recognized that remittance flows to the South, from developing and developed countries, are often not registered and cannot be leveraged for such development gains.

In view of the high degree of labour market informality and lack of formal jobs, delegates agreed that many labour migrants in the South, in particular lower-skilled migrants, face major challenges in terms of human security and social protection. Governments should thus provide an enabling socio-economic, political and legal environment to leverage the human development impact of South-South migration.

### ***Influence of environmental change on migration in developing countries***

Participants recognized environmental change and its impact on migration and development as an issue of growing importance. They noted the need to focus not only on directly affected populations able to move away from environmental threats, but also on those who do not have the means to leave these areas or move towards other environmentally hazardous areas. Some delegates considered that governments, and the GFMD, should also address the issues of internal environment-induced migration and its impact on cities and the growing urbanization in many countries of the Global South, in particular in low-lying coastal areas in Asia and Africa affected by extreme weather events. Environmental migration will place additional burdens on cities that are already faced with major challenges of infrastructure and urban planning. Strategies to prevent displacements should also be encouraged, since adaptation to environmental change with populations remaining in affected areas and building resilience should also be considered an option in certain situations.

Some participants also referred to the need to build on the lessons learned from National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) which should more consistently include references to the impact of environmental change on population movements, and highlight the role of migration as an adaptive strategy, promote risk assessments and resilience building, enhance preparedness and response capacities, and integrate migration into the NAPAs as part of national development strategies.

Participants further recognized that the challenge goes beyond migration, and that development, environment and migration experts and policy-makers should gather to address environmental migration in an integrated approach. Practical tools and approaches reflected in the recent Foresight/UK report were considered useful guides in this regard, including for awareness raising and training. Such discussions should also take account of the Cancun Adaptation Framework of the UN Framework Convention for Climate Change, and the UN Conference on Sustainable Development Rio+20.

Finally, some delegates suggested to create an 'environmental observatory on migration', while others referred to the recent Nansen Initiative launched by Norway and Switzerland, which addresses key principles on protection of people affected by natural disasters, including those caused by climate change.

### ***The current and emerging challenges require greater policy attention and governance capacity.***

Recognizing the scale and complexity of South-South migration and its links with development, participants agreed that the current and emerging challenges require greater governance capacity and policy attention. Many governments in developing countries lack the necessary knowledge, skills and resources to manage South-South migration effectively and benefit from its development potential.

Concerning migration data, while some information on South-South migration exists, available data are limited, scattered between different sources and often not reliable. There are large inconsistencies among existing databases; and many governments lack the structural and technical capacity to gather and analyze data in any comprehensive manner. No comprehensive databases on migration and well-established statistical infrastructures generating in-depth migration information are in place in the global South, and participants agreed that reliable and up-to-date data are crucial to understand, and harness, the impact of South-South migration on development.

The ACP Observatory on Migration, focusing on South-South migration research and capacity building for migration data collection through migration data assessment tools, was recognized as a useful initiative to support governments in African, Caribbean and Pacific countries in their efforts to develop such reliable and up-to-date data. The support of other relevant international agencies was also recognized.

Addressing the lack of coherence between migration policies and development goals, some delegates referred to existing migration and development mainstreaming projects, such as those being implemented in Bangladesh, Moldova, Jamaica and Tunisia, supported by Switzerland and led by UNDP and IOM. Extending such mainstreaming activities to other countries in the Global South was considered important, as was the need to share information on national migration policy development among countries in the South. Furthermore, a number of participants stressed the need to include the South-South migration and development linkage in the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the 2013 High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

Ratification of principal international legal instruments protecting migrants and their families and ensuring their human security, in particular in Asia and Africa, was considered slow by some delegates. Also, discussions on South-South mobility should be linked to the specific needs of vulnerable people and linked to other development agendas, such as health, gender and youth.

Finally, in terms of building national and regional capacity for better migration governance, delegates stressed that such actions should preferably be approached from a regional perspective, since South-South migration is predominantly intra-regional, sub-regional and cross-border between neighbouring countries. Regional dialogues and consultative processes were considered useful mechanisms to promote capacity building, including for enhanced protection of migrants and the promotion of labour mobility and related development.

### **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. In view of the multiple aspects and implications of South-South migration and development issues, the GFMD should pursue discussions on this topic, but focus on more selected issues.
2. The issue of migration, environmental change and development needs to be followed up in future GFMD meetings.
3. The collection, analysis and sharing of timely and comprehensive data should be promoted further, including through support of relevant global and regional organizations.
4. Regional fora, processes and dialogues are considered key mechanisms to support capacity building for enhanced migration and development governance, including migration and development mainstreaming processes, and the protection of migrants and their families.
5. South-South migration and development issues should be integrated into the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the 2013 High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

### **4.3.3. Roundtable 3 - Managing Migration and Migrant Protection for Human Development Outcomes**

**Coordinators:** Mr Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie (RT 3.1)  
Ms Anja Klug ( RT 3.2)  
Ms Elizabeth Adjei (RT 3.3)

**General Rapporteur:** United States of America (Ms Catherine Wiesner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), Department of State)

This Roundtable explored different facets of migrant protection in three specific contexts: first, how to manage public perceptions of migrants and migration, especially as these may influence the protections and support given to migrants and consequently their capacity to contribute to human

development; second, how to ensure that migration management policies and programs adequately protect migrants and their families in vulnerable circumstances; third, how to protect migrant domestic workers and enhance their human development potential.

The Roundtable sessions built on discussions begun in Puerto Vallarta in 2010 and taken further in the Swiss thematic meetings in 2011, particularly in the context of mixed and/or irregular migration flows, or forms of labour mobility inadequately protected by labour laws, which can severely hamper the human development capacities of migrants. The sessions aimed for concrete solutions that involve a shared responsibility of all key actors – countries of origin, transit, and destination; the media; private sector; civil society; and migrants and diaspora themselves.<sup>24</sup>

#### **4.3.3.1. Roundtable 3.1: Improving Public Perceptions of Migrants and Migration: Challenging preconceptions and shaping perceptions**

**Co-chairs:** Canada (Mr Mark Davidson)  
Mexico (Ambassador Ulises Canchola Gutiérrez)  
Russia (Mr Ilya Malenko)

**Session Rapporteur:** Turkey (Mr H Onur Ariner)

In their introduction to the Roundtable, the Co-chairs remarked on the significance of public perception for the realization of the full potential of the contribution that migrants can make to their country of origin as well as the country of destination, with a specific emphasis on the necessity for this need to be recognized by all players, including policy makers, the political leadership, civil society organizations, migrants themselves and the public at large. Recognizing that the issue of “perception” is inherently a subjective issue, the Co-chairs underlined the importance of an interactive discussion in as many platforms as possible, thereby pointing to the usefulness of not only traditional media outlets, but also social media and “ethnic media”, i.e. the mediums used by migrant communities, thereby doing all that is possible to empower migrants by giving them a voice in the public sphere.

#### **Issues and observations**

During the first theme of the discussions, the relationship between perceptions of migrants and government policy making, delegates pointed to a scenario in which well-meaning politicians and policy makers who face an engrained negative perception of migrants in the public opinion of host societies find it difficult to reverse this discourse during their tenure. It was noted that perceptions of the public and the policies of the government tended to fall into virtuous or vicious circles depending on the starting point and existing historical and contextual relationship of countries to migration.

Canada was cited as an example where what could arguably be considered a virtuous cycle plays out, with high support for migration among the public enabling the implementation of effective migration-friendly policies that reinforce and promote the positive outlook on migrants. An example of a vicious cycle, on the other hand, was given in the sense that “securitization” and “secretization” of the issue of migration are both the cause and effect of the negative perception of migration in society. The question of how to disrupt a vicious circle, in which public opinion that is already set against migration and migrants, informed the rest of the discussion, starting with the way in which the issue of migration “management” should be conceptualized, to a normative evaluation of the roles which different stakeholders can play and the relationship between these actors, and then finally to best practices from different experiences of countries.

Inquiring as to different methods of approaching the issue of public perception and looking at migration management in a different light, the importance of “thinking outside the box” was

---

<sup>24</sup> For more information, refer to the GFMD 2012 Roundtable 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 Background Papers at <http://gfmf.org/en/docs/mauritius-2012>.

emphasized, thereby pulling migration out of a “zero-sum” discussion whereby one area of migration such as security is opposed to another, such as the economic gains of migration. The suggestion with which to accomplish this task was to replace the discourse of “managing migration” with “migration governance”, whereby the latter implied a broader and more holistic understanding of migration, which necessarily incorporated not only data management but also sensitivity towards the “human experience” and the realization that we are dealing with real human beings.

Nevertheless, the necessity for a clearly defined migration management plan was underscored, based on the understanding that integration is a long-term process that can be envisaged as a continuum involving settlement, citizenship and multiculturalism programs, policies and services, and that countries who have proved to be successful in migration are those which have put in place managed migration systems consisting of a suite of immigration, integration and multiculturalism policies and programs. Such a migration management plan, it was argued, would enable a country to enter into a virtuous circle, which would be self-reproducing in its effectiveness.

The discussion focused heavily on the stakeholders’ role and areas of action, starting with the role of governments in the collection and utilization of empirical facts and data, the use and promotion of correct terminology concerning the field of migration, empowering migrants, informing the media and investing in the education of the public.

Underlining the fact that regularization experiences do not bring about a noticeable change in figures relating to criminality and unemployment, the importance of conveying such evidence to the general public to ensure that their perceptions are informed by healthy and correct information was stressed. The necessity to obtain and present hard empirical data based on well understandable statistical methodologies to break down stereotypes against migrants in general, and women migrants in particular was noted. Another point to take into consideration is the fact that women migrants invest heavily in human capital and are therefore of great importance to explaining the interlinkages between migration and development. The Swedish government regularly publishes empirical evidence on the internet to counter misinformation about migration. Swedish Universities have published a “diversity barometer” measuring the public perception towards migrants since 2005.

A recurring theme in the discussion was the necessity to promote the usage of correct terminology in the field of migration, as negative perceptions are frequently (mis)informed by deliberate or unintentional errors in this field. Tendencies include the labeling of persons who had already obtained citizenship as “migrants” for short-term political gain, while it was noted that host societies are not knowledgeable with regard to the different types of migration, leading to the view that migrants are impoverished and uneducated, and not noticing the fact that mixed migration flows include migration for the purposes of family reunification and asylum. Delegates emphasized the importance of discourse, and specifically noted the debilitating effects on society’s perception of migrants of the term “illegal”, as opposed to “irregular” migration.

Empowering migrants and enabling them to voice their stories and complaints in the public and legal spheres was also discussed. Approaches in this area include encouraging migrants to speak of their experiences on air, and therefore contributing to a better understanding among the host society. It was agreed that allowing outlets for migrants to voice their stories and concerns would be a practical way of dissolving negative perceptions. Moreover, migrants’ access to the justice system and the resulting ability of migrants to claim their rights against discriminatory practices was deemed to be paramount. The relationship of the government with the media, in all its forms, was stressed numerous times in the discussion, not least because it was noted that the media has a large role in influencing the public’s perception of migrants and the potential it has of carrying migrants’ voices to the public sphere.

Acknowledging the fact that a new and more “pragmatic” approach to the media was necessary, especially taking into consideration and accepting that the media cannot be manipulated and has a tendency to, and interest in, publishing human interest stories rather than focusing on dry empirical data, a general agreement was reached in trying to find ways to correctly inform the media and form a constructive relationship with it regarding the reporting of issues related to migrants and migration.

The UN Alliance for Civilizations mentioned two projects regarding media perceptions and prejudices towards migration in five European countries and a dialogue with media professionals in the framework of which 30 chief editors have been invited to a seminar in which they were provided information and knowledge on the issue. Australia also issues rapid rebuttals to migration misinformation via a Twitter account that has proven to be effective.

The education of the public, especially the youth, was also deemed to be of high importance, with special endeavors to target children of host societies and their values regarding diversity and inclusiveness, and creating platforms on which the youth of host societies and migrants can interact and understand one another. Sweden is considering proposals to widen the scope of the issues with which the Equality Ombudsman is dealing in order to encompass the rights of migrants, as well as efforts to train teachers to combat xenophobia and racism in schools.

Approaches to prevent migrant-host community isolation start prior to entry to the country and continue during migrants' stay. The Philippines shared their experience, pointing to their three-tier training program for emigrants, starting from a general seminar informing potential emigrants of the pluses and minuses of working overseas, to pre-departure training following the signing of a contract, whereby migrants are informed of the specifics of the country they are to travel to, and finally post-arrival seminars conducted by labour attaches in foreign missions or other embassy personnel. The characteristic of "integration" was portrayed as a "two-way street", whereby both the host societies and the migrants are responsible for a harmonized way of living. An emphasis was made, however, on the necessity to tailor such integration methods and apply them locally, thereby ensuring that local communities engage and learn how to best apply such policies for maximum effectiveness. Language training was put forward as necessary to prepare migrants for jobs, schooling and community life in general.

The important contribution of civil society to the perception of migrants in host societies was also discussed in the Roundtable, underlining that civil society's rightful advocacy for migrants' human rights should be coupled with an endeavor to understand the government's position vis-à-vis public opinion and other pragmatic issues (such as finance, infrastructural capacity, etc.) and thus take on a constructive approach based on the promotion of fresh ideas. The IFRC noted several projects that aim to inform young people regarding the life experiences of asylum seekers and migrants, providing the example of a computer game that is to be launched in Australia on the issue.

Last but not least, the role of the private sector was also considered in the framework of "pragmatic" thinking to influence both public opinion and policy change. Noting the "underwhelming involvement of the private sector for immigration reform," the necessity to pull in the private sector and encourage them to voice their views on the matter was underscored. Best practices included the Canadian banking sector which specifically catered for the needs of new citizens or permanent residents and marketed themselves in a very positive way.

### **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. The backdrop to consideration of perception of migrants and migration must recognize the human rights and human development dimension of the individuals involved.
2. Tackling the issue of perceptions of migration will often benefit from being informed by a vision of integration as a long-term process that can be envisaged as a continuum involving settlement, citizenship and multiculturalism programs, policies and services.
3. Some of the countries that have proved to be successful in migration are those that have put in place managed migration systems consisting of a suite of immigration, integration, and multiculturalism policies and programs. Notwithstanding the value of an effective approach to managed migration, this may usefully be set in a broader context of the governance of migration.
4. Such an approach can help countries avoid falling into a vicious cycle of negative public perceptions constraining public policy which further feed negative perceptions. Shifting

negative perceptions under these conditions is extremely difficult. The alternative is to aim for a virtuous cycle in which public understanding paves the way for more enlightened policymaking.

5. As a concrete action, it was considered that information, research and data are important to assist the public to understand better migrants and migration. The importance of gender-disaggregated data was emphasized to help counter discrimination and prejudice against women. The research agenda would include understanding the nature of migrant flows - which are often more varied and complex than the public appreciate - and how they contribute to the societies of destination and origin.
6. Effective engagement with and through the media was identified as key to building and sustaining the essential public support for effective migration policies. Strategies include working with editors, rapid rebuttals using new social media tools, such as Twitter (as was piloted through this roundtable in this year's GFMD).
7. In the areas where public perceptions need to be changed, the urgent need to look at root causes of some perceptions, combat racism and xenophobia was emphasized. Teachers and educators play a major role in this regard, especially in shaping young people's outlook.
8. The roundtable noted the need for a more amplified voice of the private sector, which to date has been muted, in public debates that could shape perceptions of migration.
9. While information and data play a relevant role, the human experience needs to be known and shared. It is important to give migrants a voice, including access to the justice system. Media could provide an additional channel, including ethnic media.

#### **4.3.3.2. Roundtable 3.2 – Migrant Protection as Integral to Migration Management**

**Co-chairs:** Australia (Ms Kate O'Malley)  
Ethiopia (Amb M. A. Getahun)

**Chairs of break-out sessions:** USA (Ms Catherine A. Wiesner) supported by Ms Pia Oberoi, OHCHR;  
Indonesia (Mr Dindin Wahyudin) supported by Ms Anja Klug, GFMD Task Force;  
Philippines (Mr Eduardo M.R. Meñez) supported by Mr Gervais Appave, IOM;  
Ethiopia (Amb M. A. Getahun) supported by Mr Ryszard Cholewinski, ILO

The Roundtable focused on the important challenge for states in designing migration management strategies which take into account the needs of migrants and at the same time meet migration control and law enforcement objectives. Using case studies in break-out sessions, participants explored ideas of how to best develop protection-sensitive responses for different migration situations which render people particularly vulnerable. The scenarios included unaccompanied and separated children on the move, migrants in distress at sea, migrants and their families in humanitarian crises and labour exploitation and human trafficking.

#### **Issues and observations**

Experience shows that integrating protection-sensitive approaches into migration management policies and processes is an effective approach for strengthening migration management. In his keynote address, Dr Khalid Koser outlined ten reasons why effective migration management depends on migrant protection. Among these are that rights based policies reduce incentives for irregularity and thus contribute to public security; they can win public confidence and the support of civil society, thereby setting the basis for an evidence-based debate; protecting the rights of migrants and enhancing their well-being empowers them to contribute to economic growth and development; and in the case of return, protection-sensitive approaches ensure they are sustainable.

The breakout sessions showed that the protection of migrants' rights is a key consideration for all groups of migrants throughout the migration cycle. Discussions drew attention to applicable international law and other tools that provide guidance on how to best protect people on the move

(these are all documented in the Background paper to this Roundtable). Examples of good practice at the national and regional level were shared. As international migration is by definition a transnational phenomenon, triggering protection responsibilities by more than one state, opportunities for greater coordination and cooperation, including through capacity building and sharing of best practice, were raised.

### **Border management and the protection of unaccompanied and/or separated children**

This session used the case of two boys apprehended at the border without documentation. Discussion focused on how best to identify children who migrate irregularly without their families and the specific protection and assistance measures required to address their needs. The session also discussed how to set in place differentiated approaches to address these needs, including refugee protection needs.

#### **Outcomes and recommendations:**

1. The protection of migrant children is best ensured if policies and practices are in place to ensure they are treated first and foremost as children. This includes access to child protection systems designed to respond to the specific needs of children.
2. Unaccompanied/separated children should be identified as soon as possible upon arrival. Identification can be challenging and immigration officials need specialized training. Immigration officials should refer children to specialized medical, psychological and social services where appropriate. One participant noted their government's policy to involve child experts in immigration interviews once it becomes apparent that the interviewee is a child.
3. Specialized training is necessary to enable immigration officials to identify child asylum seekers and refer them to the asylum authorities.
4. Detention of children should be avoided. Where restrictions on freedom of movement are necessary, alternatives to detention should be explored. Where children are detained, they should be held separately from adults.
5. Relevant processes and procedures to assist unaccompanied/separated children can include mechanisms to address the child's immediate needs; the appointment of a legal representative and/or guardian, family tracing; assessment of refugee protection needs and identification of solutions in the best interest of the child.
6. It was proposed that considerations of the best interests of the child should inform all policy and procedure for decision-making processes regarding children. In addition, strengthening of referral systems between these different processes ensures that the needs of children are comprehensively addressed.

### **Rescue at Sea – managing sea borders while ensuring the protection of migrants and refugees in distress at sea**

The session reviewed a complex rescue at sea scenario involving a mixed group of undocumented migrants and refugees implicating the responsibilities of different States. Participants found that this case study well represented the challenges with which they are struggling. These included the need for adequate search and rescue capacities, clarification of responsibilities for disembarkation and follow-up after rescue and the need to find solutions for a mixed group of rescuees. In addition to distress situations, attacks by pirates create additional risks for migrants at sea.

#### **Outcomes and recommendations**

1. The physical protection of people in distress at sea is key. All possible measures need to be taken to rescue people in distress at sea, irrespective of their status.
2. Better cooperation and burden sharing could help to address the gaps that exist in protecting migrants in distress at sea. Existing cooperative arrangements such as between Indonesia and Australia (including *inter alia* a joint Task Force, contact points and technical cooperation);

between the U.S. and Caribbean countries; and among EU Member States are useful starting points. Tools such as the *UNHCR Model Framework for Cooperation on Rescue at Sea Emergencies* could further support states in setting up more predictable cooperation. The *Model Framework* is based on the premises that different countries implicated in a rescue at sea emergency could make different contributions. Responsibility for search and rescue may be distinct from responsibility for disembarkation, and allowing for disembarkation may be distinct from longer-term responsibility for the provision of solutions.

3. Existing models and tools need to be translated into regional realities. The forthcoming Bali process workshop on irregular maritime movement, for example, could take forward discussions on cooperative approaches in the Asia and Pacific region.
4. Responses to distress and rescue at sea are most efficient if they are part of a comprehensive regional approach, which also tackles the root causes in countries of origin. This would also avoid well-functioning rescue at sea arrangements becoming a pull factor.

### **Migrant workers and their families in humanitarian crises**

Discussions revolved around a case study highlighting the predicament of a migrant worker caught up in an outbreak of violence in his country of destination, and the obstacles he has to overcome to reach safety. Migrant workers are frequently caught up in natural or man-made disasters, but until recently the international community had focused almost exclusively on their evacuation from danger, without addressing their particular needs. Recent humanitarian crises (for instance in Libya, in West Africa and in Japan) triggered greater awareness about the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants affected by these crises and, about the necessity of better planned responses from governments, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders.

#### **Outcomes and recommendations:**

1. Protection of the human rights of migrant workers is necessary before, during and after a humanitarian crisis.
2. The ability/resources of migrant worker populations to help themselves could be strengthened through better self-organization and the provision of orientation courses or training material on how to cope in crisis situations.
3. Preparedness/contingency plans should be developed by both countries of origin and countries of destination with significant migrant worker populations. Contingency plans of countries of origin should focus on consular protection mechanisms, the deployment of rapid response teams and communication outreach to migrant worker populations. The latter is also an important tool for countries of destination.
4. Work contracts should establish a responsibility of employers to contribute to assistance and return operations.
5. Reintegration programs can assist with the social and economic re-insertion of migrant workers within their communities of origin.

### **Combating labour exploitation and human trafficking while protecting victims**

This session explored, on the basis of a case study involving two young women victims of human trafficking and labour exploitation, measures states can employ to prevent these abuses and crimes without undermining migration management objectives. It drew attention to applicable international instruments, including international human rights law, international labour law and international criminal law as well as the many effective practices which countries of origin and destination have developed.

## Outcomes and recommendations:

1. Both countries of origin and destination have responsibilities for the protection of migrant workers. Bilateral agreements can help to clarify these responsibilities and establish mechanisms to ensure their implementation, such as joint committees of State party representatives with a regular meeting schedule. They also reduce irregular migration and the risks of abuses through the creation of legal migration channels.
2. A strong labour rights legislative framework in the country of destination is key for the prevention of abuses. This includes the possibility for migrant workers to change jobs; use of a standardized employment contract recognized in origin and destination countries; adequate labour protection for all migrant workers, including with regard to occupational safety and health, wages and working hours; and prevention of passport retention.
3. The following practices have been effectively employed by countries of origin to prevent abuses: pre-departure preparation, including language training and information on risks relating to migration; registration of job offers, expected wages and/or outgoing workers; prevention of unethical recruitment practices through regulation/licensing of private employment/recruitment agencies and the development of a system of incentives/disincentives; elimination of “middlemen”; establishment of complaints mechanisms in countries of origin and destination; the setting up of self-regulatory bodies; and the use of labour attachés in destination countries to verify employers and employment contracts.
4. More attention needs to be given to female migrants and the gender aspects of migration. Proposals included the elimination of outright bans or restrictions on emigration of women based on age, occupation and pregnancy; and information on “women-friendly” migration channels. Lower-skilled women migrant workers need special attention, especially domestic workers.
5. UNODC and other international organizations have developed practical tools for implementing the obligations states have under international law, including toolkits on best practices, a Framework for Action for the implementation of the trafficking protocol, standard operating procedures on identification of trafficked persons, and an interagency/multi-agency taskforce approach.
6. Measures to prevent abuse and exploitation and protect victims should be complemented by a comprehensive approach to address irregular migration.

### 4.3.3.3. Roundtable 3.3: Protecting Migrant Domestic Workers - Enhancing their Development Potential

**Co-chairs:** Philippines (Ambassador Evan P. Garcia)  
Turkey (Ambassador Ercumend Enc)

**Session Rapporteur:** Belgium (Mr Philippe Bronchain)

The Roundtable session discussed the rights of migrants, with particular focus on the rights of migrant domestic workers. In his introduction, the Philippine Co-chair underscored the indispensable contribution of migrant domestic workers to economic growth and human development in the countries of origin and destination. He outlined the moral and economic case for the protection of the rights of migrants, arguing that migrant domestic workers’ contribution was critical to the development of the careers of women by providing care for family members and security of the household. Bringing domestic work under the coverage of labour laws with adequate rights and entitlements is the right thing to do and makes common sense. He urged participants to focus on policy and practice that are urgently needed to improve the lives of people on the move, particularly migrant domestic workers and how these changes can happen. The Turkish Co-chair urged the speakers and participants to address the guiding questions in the background paper and ensure the session concludes with some concrete outcomes.

The session was divided into three parts, moderated by the Co-chairs. The first segment of the discussions focused on the status of implementation of the ILO Convention 189 (ILOC 189), widely acknowledged as the premier international instrument dedicated to the promotion of the protection of domestic workers, both local and migrant, and the extent to which governments have committed to integrating its standards into domestic policies and laws. The second segment explored some good practice models and how they can be replicated and broadened to change the mindsets about migrant domestic workers. The concluding segment discussed the way forward in consolidating these protections.

### **Issues and observations**

Ratification of the ILOC 189 and other instruments was considered a crucial benchmark for achievement of the goals of increased protection of the rights of migrants. While only three governments have ratified the Convention to date, many governments expressed strong commitment and full support for the implementation of the standards, while others, South Africa, Indonesia, Ghana, were preparing the processes for ratification.

Mauritius and Philippines shared their experiences on the road to ratification. Philippines proposed to adopt an action plan for ratification and implementation. The plan involves the engagement of a broad-based coalition to publicize ILOC 189 to enhance understanding and commitment for the Convention, and address concerns and misconceptions by segments of the society. Widespread information campaigns will sensitize stakeholders, including law makers, private sector, employers and workers' unions, while the new legislation is being introduced to domesticate the standards and make implementation more effective. While national laws were considered to be in line with the Convention, Mauritius considered additional clauses to increase labour inspections, better access to training of domestic workers and other entitlements such as social security and medical insurance. Both countries engaged in extensive consultations and inclusive dialogue with governments and other stakeholders, including civil society to enhance understanding of key components of the Convention and their implications for the labour administration and development, while working to enact new protective national labour laws.

Philippines highlighted the benefits of ratification, noting that ratification sends an unequivocal message of the government's recognition of the value of the contributions of domestic work to national and global economies and its commitment to ensure their human rights. Stressing the importance of bilateral labour agreements (BLAs), it observed that the adoption of the standards of the Convention provides a common language and a set of rules with which to engage in dialogue, as well as a platform to promote bilateral agreements and regional efforts. Ratification has spurred the launching of further initiatives to promote decent work, including better information for domestic workers and employers and a campaign for labour inspectorates to improve compliance. Other governments were urged to adopt action plans to ratify and implement the global standards as a way of deepening bilateral and regional negotiations.

In the second segment, many governments showcased good practice models and promising initiatives to support and implement increased rights and protection. The initiatives covered labour reforms, awareness raising, labour coverage, minimum wage legislation, better enforcement and establishment of remedial and redress mechanisms. South Africa, Ecuador, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Jamaica, Ghana and many more have introduced very bold reforms and far reaching measures in preparation towards ratification of ILOC 189. South Africa and Indonesia have made progress in extending legal and social protections, including social security coverage and unemployment insurance to migrant domestic workers. Ghana and Zambia have extended labour law coverage to domestic workers, and are working to enact new protective legislations as well as reforms to other policy and legal regimes to make implementation holistic.

Ecuador has recently introduced social security and medical insurance for domestic workers. In addition to stricter enforcement of labour laws, the Government provides training and certification to

domestic workers, as well as labour attachés and inspectors, law enforcement agents and the judiciary to improve their knowledge of the new provisions and enable speedy resolution of violations. Trinidad and Tobago has recently established a special register for domestic workers, to assist in identifying them and providing support. Ghana has established a task force involving all partners, training institutions and civil society organizations to study the current laws and propose reforms and specific measures to deal with special cultural practices such as child fostering. These initiatives were expected to encourage support for ratification and implementation.

The European Union welcomes the Convention as a landmark international instrument and expressed full support for its implementation. The Convention reinforces the EU global approach to migration and mobility and represents a clear step in mainstreaming the fundamental rights of migrants. The EU was preparing a draft decision to encourage member states to ratify the Convention in line with processes and expressed optimism about ratification by member states in the near future.

### **Key considerations**

Information campaigns were recognized as essential and a key strategy in building strong partnerships and knowledge about ratification. Philippines, Indonesia, Jamaica and Ghana are all using information dissemination and consultations with various stakeholders as a way of publicizing and sensitizing important stakeholders about the Convention. Nepal and Bangladesh have developed innovative ways of providing relevant information on the rights of migrants through labour inspectors and other officials as a way of raising their awareness and empowering migrant domestic workers. Belgium and Austria provide crucial information to migrant domestic workers and employers within the diplomatic community on the requirements under their respective laws. The Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs provides an entry point for crucial information to domestic workers and connecting them to NGOs for assistance in case of need. There is a requirement for written contracts and a banking card to be provided by the employer to the MFA as a mechanism for monitoring this process. Belgium provides information in a flyer inserted in the passport of potential workers to make them aware of their rights and support systems available in case of distress.

Participants called for information on recruitment costs, labour standards and conditions, minimum wage, legal and social entitlements, new legislative initiatives as well as contracts to be packaged and published in a user and gender-friendly language, targeting migrants. One government suggested the development of an information kit, to include a basic handbook for migrants, with rights and obligations, phone numbers of critical institutions including shelters, consulates and non-governmental organizations. The International Domestic Workers' Network, DWN, citing experience with migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong, made a strong case to support the fact that providing the right information empowered migrants and enabled them to take care of themselves.

The importance of education and training was stressed as critical in promoting awareness of migrant domestic workers' rights and protections under international instruments. Pre-departure training was particularly crucial, and should include modules on human rights and other political and social rights. In the Philippines and Trinidad and Tobago, training of outgoing migrants is mandatory. Basic training in skills development, cooking and nutrition, care giving and security of the household is provided in addition to specific training that includes modules in human rights and other social and political rights.

Government's role in providing institutional leadership to promote training was highlighted.

In this regard, governments were urged to improve support and capacity to labour inspectors through specific training and tools to enforce regulations and monitor compliance. Governments were further urged to engage strategically with other partners at the bilateral level to monitor and verify compliance on both sides. The example of the well known Philippines comprehensive assistance program to migrant domestic workers was shared.

Registration and documentation of domestic workers by both origin and host countries was considered a useful way of identifying migrants and providing them with assistance. For the EU, registration was a necessary pre-condition for effective inspections. One government called for the registration of all domestic workers, irrespective of status, to encourage them to come forward and as a way of reducing abuses and exploitation.

Despite the vast array of good practice frameworks showcased by many governments to increase the rights of migrant domestic workers; effective enforcement remained a major challenge. Many governments consistently raised the lack of enforcement of existing laws and effective regulation of the recruitment industry in general as a threat to protection that requires urgent attention. Private recruiters charge excessively high fees, sometimes at both ends, which could be very costly for migrants and subject them to bondage; and has the potential to undermine the human rights of migrants. Regulation of recruitment practices in both origin and destination countries was acknowledged as fundamental to the promotion of the rights of domestic workers and the consistent application of a rights-based approach.

A number of models were advanced by participants to help countries improve confidence and trust in recruitment agencies and other intermediaries, including the following:

- Standardization and streamlining of recruitment practices at the bilateral and regional level could be a very important tool. Philippines, Bangladesh and Nepal have adopted robust recruitment practices, which include registration of contractors, strict licensing and sanctions to penalize rogue recruiters.
- Governments, particularly in sending countries ensure that migrant domestic workers are empowered with information and full support mechanisms to deal with vulnerable situations; and there is improved support and information to employers to facilitate compliance.
- Effective compliance and enforcement mechanisms that give effect to policies and laws protecting migrants. South Africa, Nepal and Bangladesh have achieved this through intense training for law enforcement officials and implementation of effective redress mechanisms with stiff penalties as well as greater legal access to migrants.
- Intense policy advocacy by civil society groups, and working with governments and private employment agencies, and workers' organizations to monitor compliance levels. Monitoring of sub-contractors at the village level was seen as crucial to this effort.
- Innovative ways to reduce or abolish the dual payment of recruitment fees in both countries of origin and destination. A recommendation was made by participants to find such innovative ways. It was further suggested that recruitment fees should be enshrined in bilateral agreements.

Strengthened and inclusive dialogue and cooperation between government and key social partners, including migrant associations, as well as bilateral discussions with major receiving countries were seen as paramount in achieving understanding among the major players. Cooperation at the bilateral and regional levels is essential to embed protection clauses in legislation to help prevent trafficking in persons and enhance access to social security and monitoring of employment agencies. In the Philippines, Indonesia and Ghana, ratification efforts have been greatly enhanced by the commitment and support from workers' unions and other stakeholders.

Finally, the need for reforms in other policy areas such as visa regimes and immigration laws were highlighted. The immigration sponsorship visa which ties the employee to first employer, child fostering systems and lack of regulation for domestic violence have the potential to undermine the prospects of ILO 189. Zambia's example of introducing anti-human trafficking and anti-domestic violence laws to supplement reforms in domestic work was deemed worthy of emulation. Further, efforts at integrating the standards of the ILO must be underpinned by effective civil remedy systems to address breaches, strong labour unions and greater access to legal services to migrants. Countries of origin were urged to ensure that criminal complaints are followed through and resolved.

## Outcomes and recommendations

1. Countries of origin and destination to adopt an action plan that prioritizes short, medium and long term programs to ratify and implement ILOC 189 as a way of increasing the momentum for ratification.
2. Governments to adopt an inclusive approach in the formulation of policies and regulations to reflect the standard in international instruments, and develop comprehensive mechanisms for monitoring and compliance
3. Gender-sensitive checklist trialled in 2011 and launched at the GFMD Summit to be posted on the GFMD website as a guide to governments. Good and effective practical models to be uploaded on the GFMD Platform for Partnerships (PfP) to be replicated and up-scaled by other governments.
4. Governments to seek support from international organizations for training and capacity building programs for officials and other stakeholders for the implementation of rights-based employment standards. Civil society to take an active role in the monitoring of progress towards implementation of agreed standards
5. Gender equality perspectives and women's empowerment issues to be addressed in the context of the UN HLD 2013. A substantive speaker on gender equality to be appointed to inform HLD outcomes.

### 4.4. Working session on the Platform for Partnerships<sup>25</sup>

The Working Session on the Platform for Partnership (PfP) was co-chaired by the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey, represented by **Mr Kristof Tamas**, **Mr Christoph Graf** and **Mr Kaan Baskurt**, respectively.

The session, aimed at highlighting the added value of the PfP as a vehicle for knowledge dissemination and brokering partnerships between governments and relevant stakeholders, was structured in three parts.<sup>26</sup>

In opening Part I - *PfP Adds Value to the GFMD Process*, Mr Graf, Executive Director of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, reminded the delegates that the PfP was established in 2010 in order to provide a space for governments and relevant stakeholders to feature migration and development (M&D) practices, foster calls for action (M&D Calls) and facilitate networking (M&D Networking). Recently, the PfP has also showcased products and policy tools that came out of GFMD discussions, such as the *Migration Profiles Repository*, the *Handbook on Engaging Diaspora for Development*, and the *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning* handbook. He likewise underscored the important administering role of the GFMD Support Unit in maintaining the online PfP<sup>27</sup> and in organizing PfP meetings.

Part II - *PfP Features M&D Practices and Calls for Action* was moderated by Mr Baskurt of the Turkish Department of Migration. Four M&D practices and calls for action were presented by different governments and their respective partners. Mauritius, represented by Mr Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie, with the assistance of Ms Anne Sofie Olsen of the African Development Bank (AfDB), introduced the GFMD 2012 banner project on labour mobility and skills development and called on interested governments to join as pilot. The initiative intends to provide migrant business grants, mobilize diaspora investment and improve human capital by examining issues of jobless growth, barriers to talent mobility and skills development deficiencies in Africa. Three elements are needed to move the process forward, namely, political commitment, intra-African foreign direct investments and public-private project implementation.

<sup>25</sup> The PfP working session was organized by the GFMD Support Unit, in coordination with the GFMD Chair's office.

<sup>26</sup> See <http://www.gfmd.org/en/docs/mauritius-2012> for the PfP working session program.

<sup>27</sup> The online PfP is integrated in the GFMD web portal. See <http://gfmd.org/en/pfp>.

As a private sector partner, the AfDB is providing seed funding to jumpstart the pilot project. The bank saw a way to address the mismatch between labour market needs and supply in Africa through its human capital development strategy, as well as complementary activities like the AfDB Migration and Development Trust Fund and the African Institute for Remittances (AIR). It also supports the three focus areas of the labour mobility project – i.e., skills for competitive employment, value for money and accountability in service delivery, and then building inclusive financial and social services.

A number of delegates representing governments, an international organization and regional economic communities commented on the presentation. Some delegates from Africa expressed interest in the project and asked about next steps, the definition of talent and skill, and the issue of recognition of certification of skills. Other delegates sought clarification about the link of the project with the PfP and suggested that the GFMD should devote more resources into enhancing the PfP as a knowledge dissemination and management vehicle. The presenters elaborated on the elements of the pilot project and invited the African delegates to have more bilateral discussions with the Mauritian Government and the AfDB in order to explore possible partnerships. Mr Chikezi also reaffirmed the PfP's potential in terms of brokering partnerships at different levels – between governments, government and private sector, and also with the civil society. Additionally, the PfP could build up a repository of experiences and progress in project implementation, thus, sustaining a momentum for change in Africa.

The second presentation on 'Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Planning' was made by Mr Shabarinath Nair of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The concept was first introduced in GFMD 2009, followed through by the production of the GMG handbook on mainstreaming migration in 2010, a series of focused thematic meetings under the Swiss and Mauritian GFMD, and a pilot project in four countries -- Bangladesh, Jamaica, Moldova and Tunisia – in 2011. In supporting these varied initiatives, Switzerland wanted to bring the practical applications offered in the field of mainstreaming migration into the development agenda into the Global Forum and other global discussions.

Supported jointly by IOM and UNDP, the mainstreaming pilot project aims to systematically increase national assessments of migration and development inter-linkages, promote national institutional coordinated structures and strengthen the UN capacity to deliver, particularly through the GMG agencies. Phase 1 of the pilot project, which was to end in December 2012, resulted, inter alia, in the implementation of the process beside long-term development strategies for Jamaica (2030) and Moldova (2020), as well as an enhanced inter-agency and UN field agent collaboration within the 4 pilot countries.

Switzerland launched Phase 2 of the pilot project through the PfP in September 2012. Five new countries have since responded and expressed their interest to mainstream migration into their own development strategies. In this second phase, Switzerland would like to see a more dynamic participation of bilateral partners and other relevant actors in national mainstreaming processes. A strong government ownership, transparent and inclusive consultations, and a space for such consultations will also be a key to ensuring its success. The principles of reciprocity and co-development will also be promoted in Phase 2. There is also a need to relate the mainstreaming initiative with the various international dialogues, including the 2013 High Level Dialogue (HLD) and ongoing global efforts to mainstream migration into the Post 2015 Development Agenda.

The ensuing open discussion clarified that existing pilot countries may still participate in Phase 2, provided there is a continuing need to do so, e.g., if there is a need to improve the vision, framework or implementation of the exercise. Also, pilot country Jamaica shared that it has already submitted its request to join Phase 2, which will focus on implementation of specific aspects of the international policy on migration and development developed under Phase 1.

Mr Kristof Tamas then moderated the rest of the session.

A third M&D call for action to respond to the Informal Inquiry<sup>28</sup> on Migration Profiles (MPs)/Extended Migration Profiles (EMPs) was launched by the Government of Morocco, represented by Mr Mohammed Benjaber, with the assistance of Dr Frank Laczko, Head of Research of IOM. Mr Benjaber explained that the MPs were first conceived as a concise statistical report prepared for both countries of origin and destination that drew together data from a wide range of sources. Over time, it has evolved into a more elaborate process involving consultation with many different actors, in an effort to help identify and develop strategies to address data gaps, produce the evidence required to manage migration effectively, and promote a coherent and coordinated discussion and policy-making between ministries and other stakeholders.

To date, over 100 existing MPs/EMPs can be found in the GFMD PfP Migration Profiles Repository.<sup>29</sup> The importance of developing MPs/EMPs has been repeatedly discussed in previous GFMD meetings, but some challenges remain, such as the lack of standardization and government endorsement. Nonetheless, MPs/EMPs enjoy broad and sustained interest from governments, international organizations and relevant stakeholders. Thus, the Governments of Switzerland and Morocco, co-chairs of the GFMD ad hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, have endorsed to the GFMD the informal survey developed by IOM and the ICMPD which aims to evaluate the impact of MPs/EMPs.

Dr Laczko explained that IOM and ICMPD will jointly administer the survey which will be emailed by the PfP to all GFMD focal points. Responses will be collected by end March 2013. Follow-up efforts will be made, including the conduct of key informant interviews. He underlined the fact that this survey is the first significant attempt to try to conduct an assessment of the impact of migration profiles since they were first discussed in 2005. Its findings could potentially provide the international community, in the lead-up to the HLD next year, with a useful reflection on the way forward. In terms of structure, the survey has two parts -- Part 1, which is fairly descriptive, asks for information about how the MP/EMP was carried out, the process involved, who its partners were, etc. Part 2 deals with questions of impact and tries to determine whether or not migration profiles have been used as a tool or for evaluation, capacity-building or monitoring purposes.

Co-chair Mr Tamas held the view that the MPs capture to a significant extent the essence of the Global Forum discussions as they increase the evidence-base while also promoting coherence between migration and development policies. In the same vein, Dr Laczko would like to also learn through this initiative how GFMD governments have been using the MP Repository which was created in the framework of the PfP. Through the survey, the PfP could help break new ground by identifying the elements of a potentially more sophisticated MP tool in the future.

A joint presentation on the Migration European Union Expertise (MIEUX) was then made by Ms Helene Bourgade, Director General for the Development Corporation, European Commission, and Ms Marcela Chacon, Vice Minister for Public Security of the Republic of Costa Rica.

EU-funded and ICMPD-implemented, MIEUX is a peer-to-peer knowledge exchange approach supporting migration-related policy development through short-term technical assistance, training, and deployment of experts. Ms Bourgade elaborated on the project's aim to improve the migration governance and policies of its partner country by strengthening national systems and sharing knowledge and best practices. It started with a focus on human trafficking, but has now included regular and irregular migration, protection, asylum and migration for development. Government services at national and regional levels, as well as regional organizations may submit a request for MIEUX assistance through the EU delegation in the country or the ICMPD office in Vienna.

---

<sup>28</sup> The MP/EMP informal survey questionnaire may be downloaded from <http://www.gfmd.org/en/pfp/policy-tools/migration-profiles/repository>.

<sup>29</sup> See the PfP Policy Tool section at <http://gfmd.org/en/pfp/policy-tools/migration-profiles> for more information about the MPs/EMPs. Additional MPs from the Prague Process Member States are also expected to be uploaded soon.

Lauding the impact of MIEUX, Vice Minister Chacon explained that Costa Rica's migration challenges as both a transit and a destination country compelled it to seek MIEUX assistance. Since February 2012, MIEUX has organized a trainer's workshop and developed a training manual on human trafficking and alien smuggling; it also held another workshop on integration policy which brought together the public sector, the private sector, NGOs and the academics; finally, it supported the development of Costa Rica's National Integration Plan.

A delegate from COMESA affirmed the project's effectiveness in the context of regional organizations, citing MIEUX's assistance to COMESA in organizing two workshops and a ministerial meeting.

The working session's Part III – "*PfP Goes Forward*" - focused on the future of the PfP. Co-Chair Mr Tamas asked a provocative question to delegates about how the PfP is being utilized and how to improve its role to better serve the GFMD process. He drew attention to some recommendations contained in the GFMD Assessment report – 1) Governments should provide regular updates and feedback to the Friends of the Forum on lessons learned in the implementation of the GFMD outcomes for improved policy development; in this regard, the PfP could record and showcase GFMD outcomes and lessons learned; 2) GFMD member states could agree on what knowledge the Forum should deliver and disseminate and by which means, and the PfP is mentioned as a vehicle for such information dissemination.

He acknowledged the need to enhance some of its technical aspects, as well as its communication system by utilizing newsletters, PfP alerts and social networking tools. He believed that one key issue is how to link the work of the PfP to that of government Roundtable teams as they prepare the RT sessions and develop background papers for the summit meeting. In the course of their preparatory work, these government teams identify lots of examples and good practices but very few of them reach the GFMD website. In looking to the future, he asked delegates to be mindful of this gap so that emerging practices from GFMD 2012 could be captured and featured through the online PfP.

#### **4.5. Special session on the Future of the Forum**

The Session was chaired by Ambassador Shree Servansing, on behalf of the 2012 Mauritian Chair-in-Office. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the 2012 Consolidated Assessment Paper, reach final agreement on this document prepared during phase 2 of the assessment and, by endorsing the paper, conclude the 2011/2012 overall assessment process.<sup>30</sup>

In his introductory remarks, the chair announced that, with the endorsement of the 2012 Consolidated Assessment Paper at the Special Session, the GFMD membership will have successfully concluded the two-year GFMD assessment process. The findings and action-oriented recommendations of this intensive and forward-looking process should henceforth constitute a common vision of the Forum's future and goals, and also concretely guide its functioning in the years to come. Looking back, he recalled the agreement reached at the 2010 Puerto Vallarta summit to conduct such an assessment, consisting of a survey with all GFMD participating States in 2011 (phase 1), and a strategic and political analysis, in 2012, of possible options for the future of the Forum (phase 2). Both assessment phases were spearheaded by an Assessment Team, under the lead of the 2011 and 2012 GFMD Chairs.<sup>31</sup>

Turning to the phase 2 Consolidated Assessment Paper, the chair first referred to the political and strategic vision on the Forum's future, reflected in the paper. This overarching common vision, building on the Forum's achievements since 2007 and shared by all GFMD members, should support

---

<sup>30</sup> The 2011 Assessment Survey Report, conducted under the 2011 Swiss Chair under phase 1 of the assessment, had already been endorsed at the GFMD 2011 Concluding Debate in December 2011.

<sup>31</sup> The Assessment Team was comprised of: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Kenya, Mexico, Mauritius (Chair), Morocco, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Arab Emirates.

a process that is consolidated, coherent and cohesive; impacts positively on migrants' lives and on policies of countries of origin, transit and destination; and sustains itself into the future as an informal, non-binding, voluntary and government-led process. Three commonly agreed objectives underlie this vision, i.e. consolidation of the Forum; enhancing the Forum's impact on the global Migration and Development agenda; and ensuring the Forum's sustainability.

These three objectives also support the sixteen action areas and concrete recommendations set out in the paper, which propose how the Forum should function in the years to come and concretely shape its future. Highlighting some of the recommendations, he made particular reference to strengthening the development focus of GFMD discussion and the role of the national focal points in this regard; sharing more systematically the Forum's thematic knowledge with the broader international community; pursuing cooperation with international organizations, including the Global Migration Group, and regional bodies to ensure thematic input; continued interaction with the United Nations; further enhancing the involvement of civil society through a more interactive Common Space; reviewing the roles of the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum; the need for efficient support structures; and, in particular, the need for more predictable GFMD funding.

These action proposals and recommendations will also require appropriate follow-up. Referring to section C of the Consolidated Assessment Paper, called *The Way Forward*, he said that the follow-up on how to implement the recommendations could be spearheaded by the Extended Troika (all past, present and future GFMD Chairs), in consultation with the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum.

Concerning the 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, he confirmed that the final Assessment Report (comprised of the 2012 Consolidated Assessment Paper, the 2011 Assessment Survey Report, and the summary report of this Special Session) would be presented to the HLD for information. Also, a comprehensive thematic recollection reflecting GFMD achievements, practices and outcomes covering the period 2007 to end 2012 would be prepared in 2013 and presented to the HLD in support of the HLD discussions.

He then passed the floor to the 2011 Swiss Chair-in-Office (Ambassador Gnesa) who offered some explanations on the 2011 GFMD Survey Report. Among other points, Ambassador Gnesa mentioned that the 2011 Assessment Team, supported by an independent external expert, had conducted a comprehensive survey with all GFMD members and observers, and then reflected its findings in a 73-page Survey Report. 66 member states and 10 GFMD observers had completed the questionnaire designed for this purpose. A key finding was that some 80% of responding governments expressed great or general satisfaction with the GFMD process. An overwhelming majority of governments considered that the GFMD offered added value compared to other fora, institutions or processes that deal with the same issues, essentially because the Forum was considered as the only global platform for dialogue on migration and development. Areas where improvements were needed had also been identified and served as a basis for the analysis in the second Phase of the assessment in 2012. Ambassador Gnesa thanked the Assessment Team and the Mauritian Chair for their successful work in 2011 and 2012.

The Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General on International Migration and Development, Sir Peter Sutherland, stressed the remarkable achievements and progress the Global Forum has attained since its inception in 2007. From a rather ill-defined context in 2006/2007, the Forum had developed into a unique and effective inter-state dialogue, built trust among governments, increasingly involved non-state stakeholders in its deliberations, and created a wealth of in-depth knowledge on policies and practices in the field of migration and development.

Highlighting in particular the now well-established involvement and partnership with civil society - including the Common government/civil society Space- and the Forum's sustained focus on the human rights of migrants - Mr Sutherland underlined the need for continued dialogue and cooperation among all concerned actors on the multiple and growing challenges, and opportunities, resulting from migration and its impact on development. Migration and development policies today represent a

critical part of the global agenda. However, as the assessment has shown, the Forum also needs to improve further its way of operating. Predictable funding, a more solid support structure, increased involvement of national focal points in the context of intra-governmental coordination and coherence, and a more concrete and stronger focus on development are required. Concerning the current link with the United Nations, he stressed the UN Secretary-General's sustained interest in the Forum's activities, and mentioned his own ongoing consultations with various UN bodies and the continued strong support the Forum receives from the Global Migration Group.

In the ensuing discussion, a large majority of delegates expressed their agreement to the 2012 Consolidated Assessment Paper. The paper offered a comprehensive analysis of the Forum's role, goals and government-led status, provided a series of concrete action recommendations to enhance its way of operating, and set out a forward-looking and common perspective and vision for its future. Many delegates referred to the critical need to develop a mechanism to ensure longer-term and predictable funding, the need to strengthen the Support Unit and also stressed the need to strengthen the development focus of GFMD discussion –including through increased involvement of development officials- which constitutes a key priority in view of the Post-2015 Development Agenda and its preparatory process.

A number of delegates also commented positively on the stronger and more constructive involvement of civil society, recognizing their value in policy discussions on migration and development, at the national, regional and global levels. Consultation with civil society at the national level was encouraged. Concerning the Roundtables, some delegates pointed to the need to focus on concrete issues and have smaller breakout groups to ensure more in-depth discussion.

Some delegates stressed the need to pursue GFMD discussions that put the migrant at the centre of all policy considerations, welcomed the ongoing focus on migration and development mainstreaming tools and capacity building processes, but also called for more concrete action as a result of such discussions. Furthermore, knowledge on practices and policies acquired in GFMD debates should be shared more consistently with the international community, and the Forum should also develop links with other global fora, such as those dealing with climate change. One delegate suggested that this Special Session Report should also be shared with Permanent Missions in New York.

Concerning the frequency of GFMD summits, some welcomed the possibility to space out these meetings and to organize smaller thematic workshops in between. A few delegates suggested that working groups should be limited to no more than one, and limited in time to coincide with one Chairmanship. A few delegates suggested that GFMD outcomes should be of a binding nature, and one said that there should be sanctions against governments that do not respect the rights of migrants. Another proposed negotiated GFMD outcomes, questioned the real benefits the Forum can bring to migrants and said the Forum should be part of the United Nations, referring to a specific declaration made by the South American Conference on Migration. Other delegates welcomed the Forum's focus on South-South Migration, suggesting continued and more in-depth debate on migration's impact on development in this context. Parliamentarians should also be invited.

Concerning follow-up to the assessment, delegates agreed with the need to ensure such follow-up, including the proposal to develop a comprehensive thematic recollection of GFMD substantive achievements since 2007, for presentation to and in support of the 2013 High Level Dialogue. Some delegates questioned the need for the Extended Troika to spearhead the follow-up to the various recommendations listed in the assessment paper, arguing that this may overlap with the role of the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum. One delegate suggested that there should be an action-oriented follow-up road map, but that the Extended Troika should include other interested governments to reflect a greater representation of governments that had actively supported the GFMD process.

The incoming Chair (2013/2014), Sweden (Ambassador Eva Åkerman Börje), opened by welcoming the Consolidated Assessment paper and supporting its adoption. Ambassador Åkerman Börje explained that she is keen to hear other states' views and ambitions as Sweden will make its utmost to

accommodate these wishes during its Chairmanship. In Sweden's view, the greatest value added by the Forum is the constructive dialogue on migration and development, made possible thanks to the state-led, informal and non-binding nature of the GFMD. This nature of the forum should be cherished and nurtured. As highlighted in the Assessment Paper, the forum also needs to be *consolidated, made more sustainable and increase its impact.*

Sweden believes that the impact on the global migration and development agenda can be enhanced by strengthening the development dimension of the GFMD and by better engaging development actors in the Forum. Making progress on integrating migration into the Post-2015 Development Agenda was highlighted as a key priority for sustained attention to migration and development including on the UN agenda. The impact of the Forum could also be enhanced by using the Platform for Partnerships more systematically to showcase and share lessons learned in the Forum. As the Government Team consultations that take place between Summit Meetings lie at the heart of the GFMD process, strengthened government engagement in, and ownership of, these consultations is key to consolidation of the forum. Sweden suggested that this could be done by drawing on a wider network of national and other experts. Other aspects that could further consolidate the forum include establishing a multi-year agenda, revitalising the Friends of the Forum, improving the dialogue with civil society through the common space and engaging the private sector as a distinct stakeholder group. More predictable funding was highlighted as a prerequisite for further consolidation and sustainability of the GFMD. Ways of implementing the proposal by the Swiss Chair and SRSG, based on early funding pledges and a broader donor base, should be explored. A better resourced Support Unit was also highlighted as crucial for an efficient GFMD.

On the way forward, Sweden, as the incoming Chair, will prepare a concept paper in close cooperation with the Troika, Steering Group and Friends of the Forum. This may offer guidance on how to deliver on some of the more straightforward issues arising from the Assessment Report. For more complex issues, Sweden will have dedicated consultations with the relevant bodies of the Forum before presenting proposed actions.

Finally, Sweden welcomed the proposed "synthesis recollection" paper of the achievements, practices and thematic outcomes of the GFMD for presentation to the HLD, and clarified that it would call a meeting with the past, present and future Chairs of the GFMD, to discuss how such a paper could be prepared.

Ambassador Servansing briefly summed up the 3-hour debate by welcoming the overwhelming support delegates had expressed for the 2012 Consolidated Assessment Paper. He also noted the large consensus among delegates on some of the specific action recommendations reflected in the paper. Concerning the proposed follow-up to the assessment, and the possible role of the Extended Troika, he noted that this needed more reflection and therefore called upon the incoming chair to continue consultations. Sir Peter Sutherland congratulated delegates for the good discussion, recalling again the significant progress the Forum had made since its inception. Ambassador Gnesa, in the context of civil society, stressed the importance of the increased involvement of the private sector as a key non-state stakeholder in all matters pertaining to migration and development.

UNDESA'S Assistant Secretary-General then provided comments on the preparations of the 2013 High Level Dialogue, stating that the modalities for this meeting were currently being discussed and negotiated in New York. Possible agenda items could include diasporas and migration and development mainstreaming, et alia. Of key interest in the present negotiations of the HLD modalities resolution was the question whether the HLD outcomes should be reflected in a Chair's summary, as in 2006, or whether there should be a negotiated outcome report. He also underlined the complementary and mutually reinforcing role of the HLD and the Global Forum.

Ambassador Servansing then closed the Special Session.

#### 4.6. Closing plenary session

The GFMD 2012 closing plenary started with the General Rapporteurs' reports<sup>32</sup> from the three Roundtable sessions, followed by comments from the World Bank Managing Director, **Mr Mahmoud Mohieldin**, the report on the special session of the Future of the Forum by **Ambassador Shree Servansing**, Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the UN in Geneva, and comments by UNSG Special Representative **Sir Peter Sutherland**. **GFMD 2012 Chair Ali Mansoor** then shared his conclusions on the GFMD 2012 Summit before formally handing over the Chairmanship to **Ambassador Eva Åkerman Börje**, representing incoming GFMD Chair Sweden. Concluding remarks were offered by **Mr S. Ragen**, Permanent Secretary of the Mauritius Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment.

The report on Roundtable 1, *Circulating Labour for Inclusive Development*, was presented by **Mrs Marcela Chacon**, Vice Minister of Public Security, Republic of Costa Rica. Roundtable 2, *Factoring Migration into Development Planning*, was presented by **Amb. Abdulaziz Musa Dankano**, Director in Charge of Migration and Consular Matters, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nigeria, and Roundtable 3, *Managing Migration and Perceptions of Migration for Development Outcomes*, was presented by **Ms Catherine Wiesner**, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, US Department of State.

In his comments, **Mr Mahmoud Mohieldin**, praised the GFMD's rich discussions and increased focus on the potential of migration to spur development. He believed that progress will only be possible through sustained partnership with governments from countries of origin, destination and transit, migrants, multilateral organizations, development partners, civil society and other stakeholders. To this end, he reaffirmed the World Bank's commitment to strengthen partnerships by introducing the Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD) initiative to be launched in December 2012. The World Bank is focused on the following work areas: 1) improving data collection and dissemination around migration flows, remittances and diaspora profiles; 2) mobilizing diaspora resources through technical assistance; and linking migration into the MDGs and Post-2015 Development Agenda.

**Ambassador Shree Servansing** reported on the highlights of the Special Session on the Future of the Forum, which examined the "Consolidated Assessment Paper: Phase 2 of the GFMD Assessment Process." The document was a result of a two-phase assessment exercise that was decided at GFMD 2010 Mexico, and carried out over a two-year period under the Swiss and Mauritian GFMD Chairmanships. Phase 1 provided a detailed report on the structure, impact and relevance of the Forum, while the Phase 2 Consolidated Assessment Paper set out a common vision of the future of the GFMD and outlined some 16 action areas around three framing objectives: consolidation of the Forum, enhancing the Forum's impact on the migration and development agenda, and ensuring the Forum's sustainability.

According to Ambassador Servansing, Heads of Delegation from GFMD member states unanimously recognized the value and importance of the GFMD as an inter-governmental process that offers a space for governments and relevant stakeholders to exchange ideas and good practices and discuss policies on migration in a non-binding but responsible manner. After six summit meetings, the GFMD has built up cumulative knowledge in terms of data, policy options and good practices. To foster the heritage of the GFMD process, the Special Session identified some areas for improvement, including: a) communication and outreach system to increase knowledge distribution to all concerned actors; b) mainstreaming development into the migration agenda and policies; c) establishing a coherent and predictable funding structure; d) rationalizing and streamlining the work of the ad hoc working groups; and e) reinforcing the GFMD's administrative structures, including the Support Unit and the Chair's Taskforce.

---

<sup>32</sup> Copies of the General Rapporteurs' reports are posted on the GFMD website; and the summary of Roundtable Outcomes and Recommendations is available at Annex E.)

The session also explored ways to take the recommendations forward. Some items were for governments to take forward, others for the GFMD process itself, some needed to be addressed in the short term, others in the medium or long term. A number of options had been put on the table, and the incoming chair would need to consult, discuss and see how best to find the most optimal option. The options included: either to use the collective of past, present and future GFMD Chairs, or even add other interested governments to this group; or utilize the existing GFMD structures of the Steering Group or the Friends of the Forum. Lastly, the session discussed how the GFMD will interface with the second UN HLD in September 2013. It was agreed that the GFMD will submit 1) an information paper comprising the assessment reports of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the report on the Special Session as well as 2) a thematic recollection of all the achievements of the GFMD Summits from 2007 to date. The Chair, Mr Ali Mansoor, looked forward to Sweden taking over and distilling all this, and pledged collective support as they did that.

The UN Secretary General Special Representative for Migration and Development, **Sir Peter Sutherland** commented that the Chair, Mr Mansoor, and Ambassador Servansing had both been instrumental in making the Forum a success. The Forum had been a remarkable achievement since its conception at the High Level Dialogue in 2006, a testament to the flexibility of a state-led, inter-governmental process. Delegates were invited to celebrate what in the history of the UN will go down as a “unique, sui generis experiment that has really worked”. Fractious debates had given way to constructive dialogue, that has bridged divides and generated operational ideas and partnerships. He challenged the Forum to continue on its path of flexibility and partnership, and avoid politicization of the migration and development debate, especially in the lead-up to the 2013 HLD. He believed the HLD could offer an opportunity to begin forging a longer term agenda on the governance of international migration. The HLD could also generate a consensus around the issue of migrants in acute crises by promoting a sense of collective responsibility among countries of origin and destination, as well as international organizations and migrant employers. He expressed support for efforts to mainstream migration into the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The GFMD 2012 Chair, **Mr Ali Mansoor**, shared his conclusions on the Summit Meeting. The GFMD has successfully worked toward altering perceptions of migrants, advancing the GFMD from a platform for dialogue to one of experience-sharing, innovative approaches and rights-based frameworks. He highlighted the Chair’s two priority goals of seeking practical outcomes that improve migrants’ conditions and focusing on African concerns, while promoting increased African engagement in the Forum. In accounting for progress made on both 2012 goals, Mr Mansoor noted the participation of the highest number of African co-chairs and roundtable participants of any GFMD to date, as well as the launching of a joint African labour mobility initiative that enjoys support from various regional and international organizations, private sector and civil society actors.

Mr Mansoor observed that chairing the GFMD had also been transformative for his Government. Most significantly, Mauritius has become one of 3 countries to ratify the ILO Convention on domestic workers. Also, the Mauritian budget under debate at the time proposed to relax the visa requirements for a large number of countries; and Mauritius has put in place legislation to improve the living conditions and welfare of migrants, in consultation with the civil society. Conversely, the GFMD had gained from the Mauritian Government’s strong track record and conviction about the importance of cooperation and collaboration with the private sector and the civil society. Governments cannot act alone. They can only make progress if they put the right frameworks in place, and work with the private sector, civil society, and development partners to collectively implement these frameworks.

### **Handover from Mauritius to Sweden**

Before formally handing over the GFMD Chairmanship to the incoming GFMD 2014 Chair Sweden, Mr Ali Mansoor recognized and thanked the various individuals, organizations, advisers, service providers, suppliers and Mauritian Government colleagues who had worked tirelessly to ensure the success of the GFMD 2012 Summit.

In her first statement as incoming GFMD Chair, **Ambassador Eva Åkerman Börje** acknowledged that the GFMD had contributed greatly to the global policy debate on migration and development, while helping to build trust among states and other stakeholders. The two-year assessment exercise affirmed the states' general satisfaction with the Forum's activities. Nonetheless, there are areas for improvement, as well as the challenge to translate the common vision of the future of the GFMD into a reality. In this regard, Sweden would like to launch a new, upgraded phase of the GFMD, with three mutually reinforcing key objectives: 1) on substance, efforts to strengthen the development perspective will be doubled; 2) on process, the involvement and ownership by states will be re-energized, while improving outreach to other stakeholders; and 3) on the Forum's sustainable impact on the global debate, more stable and predictable funding will be promoted, and the accumulated knowledge and good practice will be shared and implemented more broadly.

Sweden would like the GFMD to focus more on identifying concrete synergies between development and migration and unlocking the potential of migration for inclusive development, through coherent economic and social development policies that maximize the benefits and minimize the downsides of migration. The GFMD should seize the opportunity to contribute to the ongoing global debate on how to integrate migration into the Post-2015 Development Agenda. To strengthen the development focus, the GFMD can set an agenda to encourage more development practitioners to become engaged in the discussions.

Sweden will aim at an open-ended, transparent and inclusive dialogue with all stakeholders throughout its 18-month chairmanship. This will include building a multi-year agenda together with the 2015 Turkish Chair for increased continuity, working closely with all GFMD stakeholders, enhancing civil society engagement especially through the common space, engaging the private sector as a distinct stakeholder, amplifying the GFMD focal points as a crucial link between the Forum and policymakers in capitals, and establishing a GFMD Experts Network comprised of experts from governments, international organizations and other actors. Coordinating initiatives with the GMG and other international organizations is also needed for improved evidence-base and follow up on GFMD recommendations.

Finally, Ambassador Åkerman-Börje believed that the GFMD can only continue as a consolidated and sustainable process if progress towards more stable and predictable funding is achieved. A stronger Support Unit and Platform for Partnerships can ensure that the GFMD evidence base and outcomes can be showcased and shared more systematically with the international community. The GFMD must also find new avenues for enhancing the impact of the GFMD on the global migration and development agenda. She cited the possibility of feeding the Forum's substantive outcomes into the HLD 2013, the 2014 follow-up of the Cairo International Conference on Population and Development, and the debate that has started regarding the millennium development goals and the UN development agenda beyond 2015.

### **Closing remarks**

Closing the GFMD 2012 Summit Meeting was **Mr S. Ragen**, the Permanent Secretary of the Mauritius Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment, speaking on behalf of the Hon Shakeel Mohamed, Minister of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment. He reiterated that Mauritius' rich history in migration, continuing support for migrants' rights and active participation in the GFMD since 2007 had led to its acceptance of the GFMD Chairmanship. The Government of Mauritius took advantage of the GFMD to revitalize the migration and development dialogue with its African neighbours and strengthen the continent's voice in GFMD discussions. To promote the development agenda, Mauritius also appointed the Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation as GFMD Chair.

Mr Ragen reported that GFMD 2012 had increased the GFMD momentum by addressing issues needing global attention and stronger governance, notably skills and jobs among global mobile workers as drivers of job-based growth, diaspora as agents of socio-economic change, integration of migration into development planning, managing the perceptions of migration and migrants, designing

comprehensive and protection-sensitive migration strategies; addressing the needs of migrants of distress, ensuring that mainstream migration programs protect and empower migrants, and protecting vulnerable mobile workers such as domestic workers.

Mauritius also takes pride in launching the multi-annual labour mobility and skills development program for Africa which aims to improve employment opportunities within the region. The program will be implemented through bilateral negotiations between governments, with support from the private sector and civil society. On the margins of the Forum, GFMD 2012 also advanced some possible labour mobility options for refugees, thus contributing to shifting the mindset about refugees being purely a humanitarian problem and possibly paving the way for some pilot programs among willing partners.

Finally, Mr Ragen expressed his appreciation to all delegates for sharing ideas and learning from each other during the four-day GFMD. He expressed the hope that the cooperation and consultation model and policy messages emanating from GFMD 2012 Mauritius have given further direction to the preparations for the next High Level Dialogue. On behalf of the Government of Mauritius, he wished the incoming Chair Sweden and the team of governments taking the Forum forward all success in the search for outcomes that will benefit migrants and their families and communities in real social and economic terms.

## **5. Conclusion**

Every year, the GFMD poses some old and some new challenges for the incoming Chair. Among these are: how to make the links between migration and development; how to balance old themes with new ones; how to be concrete and outcomes-oriented without making the GFMD “operational”; how to engage civil society, international organizations, private sector and diaspora more closely while preserving the state-led nature of the process; and how to remain informal, open, non-binding and affordable within an increasingly structured process (Troika, extended Troika, Steering Group, Friends of the Forum, working groups, Chair’s Taskforce, GFMD Focal Points, Support Unit, Platform for Partnerships).

The Mauritius GFMD 2012 was no exception to this. Indeed, the Forum this year faced the additional challenge of navigating Phase 2 of the GFMD assessment to an agreed conclusion, and towards some coherent GFMD input into the UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013.

### ***How has GFMD 2012 met its challenges?***

Development was a central focus for the Mauritian Chair, as demonstrated by the fact that the Forum was chaired for the first time by a national development agency (Ministry of Finance and Economic Development). There was also a high turnout of other Ministries and agencies dedicated to development, diaspora, labour and other public policy agencies, beyond just migration. In recognition of the linkage between human development and migrant rights, the protection of migrants featured directly in two Roundtables, in regard to mixed flows and persons in distress, and to international domestic workers.

Concrete development-related objectives were set for the Forum, and at least in Mauritius some real policy changes occurred during the term of the GFMD 2012. As reported in the closing plenary, Mauritius became one of the first three states to ratify Convention 189 on domestic workers and introduced policies to improve the well-being of migrant workers in the country. Countries like Jamaica were able to report on concrete progress with their new, coherent national Migration and Development policy and plan of action, directly attributable to their engagement with the GFMD.

Regarding old and new themes, GFMD 2012 was able to roll out a thematic agenda for 2012 that reflected Friends of the Forum preferences for a mix of both ongoing central GFMD concerns, like

labour mobility, mainstreaming migration into development planning or protection of domestic workers, and new concerns such as south-south migration and migrant protection in mixed flows, including and particularly migrants in vulnerable or distress situations.

Mauritius also challenged participants in 2012 to go beyond dialogue to find some workable models or plans to improve the situation of migrants, their families and communities. Mauritius initiated some new discussions with interested African governments, the African Union, African Development Bank, regional commissions, private sector and the EU on facilitating trans-border labour mobility and skills development in Africa to stimulate jobs-based growth across the continent. This gave a practical application to the labour mobility themes under discussion in the Roundtables and Common Space. These kinds of initiatives can be operationalized by interested stakeholders outside and beyond the life of an annual GFMD process, and offer important lessons for future Forum discussions.

Mauritius engaged with civil society in the earliest stages of preparation, benefiting from the joint brainstorming at various preparatory events and close interaction in the Common Space. There were strong efforts to coordinate local civil society engagement with the GFMD and with the issues under discussion, such as labour mobility and skills, diaspora, social protection of migrant workers, and public-private partnerships. Gratifyingly, other Forum member states had also undertaken such domestic coordination with their civil society partners. GFMD 2012 enhanced the Common Space through breakout panels, and broadened the participation of civil society, private sector and diaspora. One of the Common Space panels was open to online twittering, which globalized access to the debate. Twitter was also used in the preparation, and for the discussion, of Roundtable 3.1. Perhaps this use of social media could be taken further by future chairs.

The African participation in preparatory events, the Roundtables and the common space was exceptional this year, a tribute to the dedication of the GFMD Support Unit, the Mauritian Chair's team in Port Louis and the Mauritian Missions in Geneva, Brussels and other African countries, in engaging African partners from governments, private sector, diaspora and regional processes. This also took the GFMD forward to a new level of partnership with non-state actors; and to brokering partnerships that could grow beyond the life of the annual GFMD, with the potential for feeding lessons learned back into future Forum discussions. Mauritius also worked closely with GMG agencies in following up on earlier GFMD outcomes and to support new flanking initiatives such as the World Bank's KNOMAD (Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development).

Following a tradition set in 2007 by the first Belgian Chair, and observed by all ensuing chairs, the Mauritian team rigorously pursued a transparent and inclusive process in preparing the Summit meeting and to guide Phase 2 of the GFMD Assessment. A thematic survey shared with all Friends of the Forum and a range of non-state experts formed the basis of the broadly agreed thematic agenda for GFMD 2012. Many colleagues from government, civil society, private sector and diaspora participated in the brainstorming in Mauritius about the Roundtable themes for 2012 and in later focal meetings to take some of these issues forward in broader migration and development contexts.

Mauritius is very grateful to the 2011 Swiss Chair for expanding the participation and network of expertise by holding preparatory meetings in various global locations throughout 2011. In 2012, Mauritius adopted a less ambitious version of this approach. The Chair's Taskforce worked with African government partners, the Philippines, Switzerland, Sweden, ADB, UNECA, African Union, European Union, IOM, UNDP, UN Women and the World Bank to hold such preparatory workshops and seminars in Africa, Asia and Europe in support of the Roundtables.

The preoccupation in 2012 with the assessment and a way forward to the UN High Level Dialogue in 2013 also expanded the locus of the Forum's activities from the hosting country capital, and Geneva as the venue for the governing body meetings, to include New York with its HLD preparations and ongoing UN discussions about migration and development. This may well be a natural evolution in the life of a global process of this kind; but can also pose increasingly demanding challenges and costs for its member states, particularly developing countries with limited resources, to be equally present and participative in all of these locations.

Thus as the Forum has become more complex as a process, for example by expanding the preparatory consultations and workshops between Summit meetings, it has placed greater resource and time demands on member states. How to ensure equal representation and engagement among developed and developing countries in all Forum events may well be the biggest challenge for future chairs.

GFMD 2012 has pushed the boundaries a little further, and opened up the Forum to be more inclusive, transparent, development-focused and outcomes-oriented. We were happy to hear from both member states and non-state participants that the Summit meeting more than met their expectations in regard to the depth of the debates and exchange of good practices, and the broad inclusiveness and interactivity of the Forum sessions.

While in many ways we are still grappling with some of the fundamental questions posed at the outset of the GFMD process in Brussels in 2007, we have also narrowed down some concrete strategies at the interface of migration and development that can make a difference to migrants and their families, such as skills development and assessment for productive job-skills matching, and the joint responsibilities of countries of origin and destination in this effort. The outcomes and recommendations of the Roundtables offer elements of good practice which when consolidated could serve as principles of good governance.

As discussed by the GFMD Assessment Team and the Friends of the Forum, the Mauritian Chair will submit the final Assessment Report to the UN Secretary-General and the 2013 HLD, for information. This final report includes the Phase 2 Consolidated Assessment Paper, the 2011 Assessment Survey and the outcomes of the 2012 Special Session.

Furthermore, in line with the adopted Phase 2 Assessment Paper, the GFMD is to prepare a “thematic recollection” in support of the High Level Dialogue, reflecting all achievements of the GFMD summits from 2007 until 2012. Mauritius agrees with the suggestion by the incoming Swedish Chair in the Special Session to convene a meeting of past, current and future Chairs early in 2013 to agree on the modus of preparation of such a report. This meeting should also reflect the general understanding reached under which Sweden would serve as Chair in 2013 and 2014 (over an 18-month period), but that substantive GFMD communications to the 2013 HLD would be done collectively by the past, current and future GFMD Chairs. This understanding was also the basis of the GFMD assessment conducted during the Mauritian chairmanship in 2012.

Looking forward to 2013 and 2015, we begin to see more clearly now than when we first embarked on this ambitious journey in 2007 where and how the GFMD can contribute to the broader global debates on migration and development. The 2015 review of MDGs and plotting of a Post-2015 Development Agenda can set important markers for our work in the GFMD. As Mr Sutherland said in the Special Session on the Future of the Forum, the MDGs provide a unique opportunity to make the case for the migration and development nexus. The Government of Mauritius supports the incoming Swedish Chair’s proposal to pursue the integration of migration into a Post-2015 Development Agenda. We trust and encourage our future chairing partners to move the GFMD closer to forging a longer term agenda for governance of migration that is beneficial for development, and development policies that take account of migration.

## Final Agenda

Port Louis, Mauritius 21-22 November 2012

Swami Vivekananda International Convention Center (SVICC)

### Wednesday, November 21

SCHEDULE	ACTIVITY	VENUE
8:15 - 9:15	Arrival of Delegates (Doors will close at 9:00 am)	
<b>Opening Ceremony</b>		
9:30 - 9:35	Welcome Address / Call to Order	Mr Ali Mansoor, GFMD 2012 Chair
9:35 - 9:55	Opening Speeches	H.E. Dr Mohamed Ibn Chambas, Secretary General, African, Caribbean, and Pacific Group of States
		Sir Peter Sutherland, UNSG Special Representative for Migration and Development
9:55 - 10:05	Key Note Speech	Dr The Hon Arvind Boolell, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration & International Trade, Republic of Mauritius
10:10-10:20	Report of the Civil Society Days	Chairperson of the Civil Society Days
10:20 - 10:30	Report of the Global Migration Group	Mr Yury Fedotov, Global Migration Group Chair and Director General, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
<b>Common Space (CS)</b>		
10:30 – 10:55	Opening Plenary Session of the Common Space – Moderator: Dr Khalid Koser, Deputy Director, Geneva Centre for Security Policy	
	Introduction to the Common Space	Amb William Lacy Swing, Director General, International Organization for Migration
	Statement by the European Union	Mr Stefano Manservigi, Director General for Home Affairs, European Commission
	Statement by the African Union	Dr. Mustapha Sidiki Kaloko, Commissioner for Social Affairs
10:55 - 11:00	Delegates proceed to the Common Space breakout sessions – Coffee will be served near the breakout rooms	
11:00 – 12:30	<b>CS Breakout session 1 - Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development</b> Moderator: Dr Kathleen Newland, Director, Migration Policy Institute	Paille-en-queue
	<b>CS Breakout session 2 - Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress</b> Moderator: Sir Peter Sutherland, UNSG Special Representative on International Migration and Development	Pink Pigeon
	<b>CS Breakout session 3 - Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs</b> Moderator: H.E. Constantjin van Orange Nassau, Deputy Head of Cabinet Vice President Kroes, European Commission	Kestrel
12:30 – 12:40	Delegates proceed to the Plenary Hall	
12:40 – 14:00	Closing Plenary Session of the Common Space – Moderator: Dr Khalid Koser, Deputy Director, Geneva Centre for Security Policy	
	Reports on CS Breakout Sessions	Ms Carmelita S Dimzon, Administrator of OWWA, Philippines Mr Francois Crépeau, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants Ms Audrey d'Hotman de Villiers, Manager, Corporate Social Responsibility, Rogers & Company Limited
14:00 – 15:30	Lunch; End of Civil Society participation in the Government Meeting	Atrium

## Final Agenda

Port Louis, Mauritius 21-22 November 2012

Swami Vivekananda International Convention Center (SVICC)

### Roundtable Sessions (RT)

Roundtable Sessions (RT)		
15:30 - 18:30	<b>RT Session 1.1 - Beyond-the-Border Skills and Jobs for Human Development</b> Co-chairs: Mr Ali Mansoor (Mauritius); Mr Alex Zalami (UAE) Rapporteur: Dr Md Shahidul Haque (Bangladesh)	Paille-en-queue
	<b>RT Session 2.1 - Supporting National Development through Migration Mainstreaming Processes, Extended Migration Profiles and Poverty Reduction Strategies</b> Co-chairs: Amb Omar Hilale (Morocco); Amb Eduard Gnesa (Switzerland) Rapporteur: Mr Justin McDermott (Sweden)	Pink Pigeon
	<b>RT Session 3.1 - Improving Public Perceptions of Migrants and Migration: Challenging Preconceptions and Shaping Perceptions</b> Co-chairs: Mr Mark Davidson (Canada); Amb Ulises Canchola Gutiérrez (Mexico); Mr. Ilya Malenko (Russia)	Kestrel
19:00 - 20:30	Welcome Reception hosted by The Hon Xavier-Luc Duval, Vice Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development, Republic of Mauritius	Domaine les Pailles

### Thursday, November 22

SCHEDULE	ACTIVITY	VENUE
Roundtable Sessions (RT)		
9:00 - 12:00	<b>RT Session 1.2 - Supporting Migrants and Diaspora as Agents of Socioeconomic Change</b> Co-chairs: Amb Francis Hurtut (France); Mr Zaddock Madiri Syong'oh (Kenya); Mr Mohammed Bernoussi (Morocco)	Paille-en-queue
	<b>RT Session 2.2 - Addressing South-South Migration and Development Policies</b> Co-chairs: Dr Md Shahidul Haque (Bangladesh); Dr Prosper Asima (Ghana) Rapporteur: Mr Paulo Cavaleri (Argentina)	Pink Pigeon
	<b>RT Session 3.2 - Migrant Protection as Integral to Migration Management</b> Co-chairs: Amb M.A. Getahun (Ethiopia); Ms Kate O' Malley (Australia) Rapporteur: Amb M.A. Getahun (Ethiopia)	Kestrel
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch	Atrium
13:30 - 16:30	<b>RT Session 3.3 - Protecting Migrant Domestic Workers-Enhancing their Development Potential</b> Co-chairs: Amb Evan Garcia (Philippines); Amb Ercumend Ahmet Enc (Turkey) Rapporteur: Mr Philippe Bronchain (Belgium)	Kestrel
	<b>Special Session on the Future of the Forum (Heads of delegations only)</b> Chair: Amb Shree Servansing, Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva and GFMD 2012 Assessment Chair	Paille-en-queue
	<b>Working Session on the Platform for Partnerships</b> Co-chairs: Mr Kristof Tamas (Sweden), Mr Christoph Graf (Switzerland), and Mr Kaan Baskurt (Turkey)	Utilizing the PfP for Sharing Knowledge and Promoting Partnerships in Migration and Development
16:30 - 17:00	Coffee Break	Atrium

## Final Agenda

**Port Louis, Mauritius 21-22 November 2012**

Swami Vivekananda International Convention Center (SVICC)

### Closing Plenary Session


Closing Plenary Session			
17:00 - 18:00	Reports on the Roundtables and Special Session on the Future of the Forum		Plenary Hall
	Report on RT 1 outcomes	General Rapporteur: Mrs Marcela Chacon, Vice Minister of Public Security, Republic of Costa Rica	
	Report on RT 2 outcomes	General Rapporteur: Amb Abdulaziz Musa Dankano, Director in Charge of Migration and Consular Matters, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nigeria	
	Report on RT 3 outcomes	General Rapporteur: Ms Catherine Wiesner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), Department of State, United States of America	
	Comments by the World Bank	Mr Mahmoud Mohieldin, Managing Director, World Bank	
	Report on the Special Session on the Future of the Forum	Amb Shree Servansing, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Mauritius In Geneva	
	Comments by UNSG Special Representative for Migration and Development	Sir Peter Sutherland	
18:00 - 18:10	Conclusions by the GFMD 2012 Chair	Mr Ali Mansoor	
18:10 - 18:20	Hand-over / Statement by the Incoming Chair Sweden	Amb Eva Åkerman-Börje, Government Offices, Sweden	
18:20 - 18:30	Closing Remarks	Mr. S. Ragen, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment of the Republic of Mauritius	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Republic of Mauritius extends its gratitude to the following governments and non-governmental partners that have lent financial and in-kind support to the Mauritian GFMD Chair for the organization of the GFMD 2012 work program.

## A. Financial Contributions to the GFMD 2012 Budget

Commonwealth of Australia, Kingdom of Belgium, Canada, Kingdom of Denmark, Republic of Ecuador, Republic of Finland, French Republic, Republic of Ghana, Hungary, Republic of India, State of Israel, Principality of Liechtenstein, United Mexican States, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kingdom of Norway, Kingdom of Spain, Kingdom of Sweden, Swiss Confederation, Republic of Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, International Organization for Migration, The World Bank and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.



## B. In-Kind Contributions



## OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAURITIUS GFMD 2012

### A. Financial

<b>Donors</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Australia	USD 75,000	Advisory Fees
Australia	USD 75,000	Non-earmarked
Belgium	EUR 50,000	GFMD Support Unit
Canada	USD 40,443	Organizational costs
Denmark	DKK 750,000	Travel of Participants from Developing countries
Ecuador	USD 1,000	Organizational costs
Finland	EUR 100,000	Travel of Participants from Developing countries
France, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (MAEE)	EUR 15,000	Organizational costs
France, Ministry of Interior	EUR 75,000	Non-earmarked
Ghana	USD 10,000	Non-earmarked
Hungary	USD 10,000	Travel of Participants from Developing countries
India	USD 50,000	Non-earmarked
International Organization for Migration <sup>1</sup>	USD 75,000	Advisory Fees
Israel	USD 5,000	Non-earmarked
Liechtenstein	CHF 23,700	Non-earmarked
Liechtenstein	CHF 6,300	GFMD Support Unit
MacArthur Foundation	USD 220,000	Advisory Fees
Mauritius <sup>2</sup>	USD 340,700	Organizational costs
Mexico	USD 50,000	Non-earmarked
Netherlands	EUR 50,000	GFMD Support Unit
Netherlands	EUR 50,000	Organizational costs
Norway	NOK 800,000	Non-earmarked
Spain	USD 79,102	Non-earmarked
Sweden - Ministry of Foreign Affairs	SEK 1,000,000	Travel of Participants from Developing countries
Sweden – Ministry of Justice	SEK 700,000	GFMD Support Unit
Switzerland - Federal Office of Migration	CHF 100,000	GFMD Support Unit
Switzerland - Human Security Division	USD 61,866	Non-earmarked
Switzerland - Human Security Division	USD 61,866	GFMD Support Unit
Switzerland - Human Security Division	CHF 145,000	Advisory Fees
Switzerland - Swiss Development Cooperation Agency	USD 181,958	Contribution to GFMD 2012 Civil Society Process
Turkey	USD 150,000	Non-earmarked
United Arab Emirates	USD 150,000	Non-earmarked
United States of America	USD 75,000	Travel of Participants from Developing countries
United States of America	USD 65,000	GFMD Support Unit
<b>Total financial contributions received through the Support Unit</b>	<b>USD 2,611,030</b>	

<sup>1</sup> This amount did not form part of the funds received and managed by the GFMD Support Unit.

<sup>2</sup> This amount was managed directly by the Office of the Mauritian GFMD Chair.

**B. In Kind**

**Donors**

Georgetown University  
Global Migration Group (GMG)  
International Labour Organization (ILO)  
International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)  
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN)  
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)  
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)  
World Bank (WB)

**Purpose**

Technical assistance  
Technical assistance  
Provision of conference rooms  
Technical assistance  
Technical assistance  
Technical assistance  
Secondment of an expert  
Chairmanship of the GMG  
Organization of thematic meeting

<b>Programme GFMD Civil Society Days 2012</b>	
Swami Vivekananda International Convention Centre (SVICC, in <i>Pailles</i> ) Mauritius, 19 - 21 November, 2012	
<b>Co-chairs:</b>	<b>Clariste Soh Moube, Centre Amadou Hampâté Bâ (CAHBA)</b> <b>George Joseph, Caritas Sweden</b>
<b>Sunday 18 November</b>	
<b>19.00 - 21.00</b>	<b>Welcome get-together in Port Louis</b> <i>Sunset Café, Le Caudan Waterfront</i>
<b>Monday 19 November</b>	
<b>7.30 - 8.30</b>	<b>Arrival and registration</b> <i>Atrium</i>
<b>8.30 - 9.30</b>	<b><u>Opening Ceremony</u></b> <i>Main Hall A</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Ali Mansoor</b>, GFMD Chair-in-Office 2012, Financial Secretary, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Government of Mauritius</li> <li>- <b>Shakeel Mohamed</b>, Minister of Labour Industrial Relations and Employment, Government of Mauritius</li> <li>- <b>Patricia Adèle Félicité</b>, Secretary-General Caritas Mauritius</li> </ul>
<b>9.30 - 10.00</b>	<b><u>Theme and Methodology GFMD Civil Society Days 2012</u></b> <i>Main Hall A</i> <b>Operationalizing Protection and Human Development in International Migration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Introduction</b> by GFMD Civil Society Coordinating Office, ICMC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>John K. Bingham</b>, Head of Policy</li> <li>o <b>Wies M. Maas</b>, Senior Programme Officer</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Impressions from the African Civil Society Forum on Migration, Development and Human Rights</b>, <b>Milka Isinta</b>, Pan African Network in Defense of Migrants Rights</li> </ul>
<b>10.00 - 10.20</b>	<b>Coffee break</b> <i>Atrium</i>
<b>10.20 - 11.30</b>	<b><u>Inspiration Session</u></b> <i>Main Hall A</i> <b>"Migration &amp; Development Goals" – setting targets and benchmarks to achieve goals in migration and human development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Manuela Tomei</b>, Director, Labour Protection Department, International Labour Organization (ILO)</li> <li>- <b>Nunu Kidane</b>, Director, Priority African Network (PAN)</li> <li>- <b>Clariste Soh Moube</b>, Researcher, Centre Amadou Hampâté Bâ (CAHBA)</li> <li>- <b>George Joseph</b>, Director Migration Department, Caritas Sweden</li> </ul> <i>Inspiration from the floor</i>
<b>11.30 - 12.45</b>	<b><u>Future Session</u></b> <i>Main Hall A</i> <b>Towards the UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development 2013 (HLD) and the Future of the Forum</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Independent assessment</b> of Civil Society in the GFMD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>John Slocum</b>, Director Migration Program, the MacArthur Foundation</li> <li>o <b>Danielle Garcia</b>, Performance Management Specialist, Social Impact</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>GFMD States' Assessment - Amb. Shree Servansing</b>, Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations and Other International Organizations</li> <li>- <b>The HLD - Thomas Stelzer</b>, UN Assistant Secretary General, Department of Economic and Social Affairs United Nations (UN DESA)</li> <li>- <b>The HLD and Civil Society</b>, <b>William Gois</b>, Migrant Forum Asia, representative Civil Society Working Group on the HLD &amp; the global governance of migration</li> </ul> <i>Reflections from the floor</i>

12.45 - 14.30	Lunch and open space (see also side-event programme)	Atrium
14.30 - 16.00	[Theme 1] Operationalizing a Rights-based Approach to Labour Mobility, Markets and Matching	Main Hall B
	<b>Working Session 1.A - Regulating and Monitoring Recruitment, Placement and Employment Practices</b>	
	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Ellene Sana, Center for Migrant Advocacy Phillipines Art DeFehr, Palliser Furniture
	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Binod Khadria, Jawaharal Nehru University Shannon Lederer, American Federation of Teachers
	<b>Speakers</b>	Philip Hunter, Verité Neil Wilkins, Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB) Karl Flecker, Canadian Labour Congress Christiane Kuptsch, International Labour Organization
	[Theme 2] Operationalizing Human Development in International Migration	Kestrel
	<b>Working Session 2.A - Engaging Diaspora as Entrepreneurs, Social Investors and Policy Advocates</b>	
	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Gibril Faal, AFFORD UK Leila Rispens-Noel, International Network of Alternative Financial Institutions (INAFI)
	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Bob van Dillen, Cordaid Jeremaiah Opiniano, Institute for Migration and Development Issues
	<b>Speakers</b>	Efrain Jiménez, Federación Zacatecana A.C. Millicent Odongo, FOR Foundation / Diaspora Business Centre Mayan Villalba, Unlad Kabayan Migrant Services Foundation Nunu Kidane, Priority African Network (PAN) Kathleen Newland, Migration Policy Institute (MPI)
16.00 - 16.20	[Theme 3] Operationalizing the Protection of Migrants and their Families	Pink Pigeon
	<b>Working Session 3.A - Protecting Vulnerable Migrant Workers</b>	
	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Donald Kerwin, Center for Migration Studies of New York (CMS) Martina Liebsch, Caritas Internationalis
	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Jérôme Elie, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva Mary Jo Toll, Sisters of Notre Dame
<b>Speakers</b>	Michele LeVoy, Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants(PICUM) Shange-Buthane Sichel'mpilo, Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa Linda Al-Kalash, Tamkeen Center for Legal Aid and Human Rights Monami Maulik, Desis Rising Up and Moving (DRUM) Helen Schwenken, Kassel University Luc Demaret, International Labour Organization	
16.00 - 16.20	Coffee break	(outside Working Session rooms)
16.20 - 18.00	(continue Working Sessions 1.A, 2.A, 3.A – towards benchmarks and actions)	
18.00 - 19.00	Open space	Atrium
19:00 - 21.00	Cultural Evening	Atrium / Plenary Hall A

## Tuesday 20 November

<b>8.00 - 8.40</b>	<b>Open space</b> (reports from Working Sessions day 1 distributed)	<i>Atrium</i>						
<b>8.40 - 10.10</b>	<p><i>[Theme 1] Operationalizing a Rights-based Approach to Labour Mobility, Markets and Matching</i></p> <p><b>Working Session 1.B - Improving Jobs, Skills and Education Matching</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"><b>Co-moderators</b></td> <td>Ellene Sana, <i>Center for Migrant Advocacy Phillipines</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Co-rapporteurs</b></td> <td>Binod Khadria, <i>Jawaharal Nehru University</i> Shannon Lederer, <i>American Federation of Teachers</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Speakers</b></td> <td>Jilian Roque, <i>Public Services Labour Independent Confederation</i> Dennis Sinyolo, <i>Education International (EI)</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i> George Joseph, <i>Caritas Sweden</i></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Ellene Sana, <i>Center for Migrant Advocacy Phillipines</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i>	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Binod Khadria, <i>Jawaharal Nehru University</i> Shannon Lederer, <i>American Federation of Teachers</i>	<b>Speakers</b>	Jilian Roque, <i>Public Services Labour Independent Confederation</i> Dennis Sinyolo, <i>Education International (EI)</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i> George Joseph, <i>Caritas Sweden</i>	<i>Main Hall B</i>
<b>Co-moderators</b>	Ellene Sana, <i>Center for Migrant Advocacy Phillipines</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i>							
<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Binod Khadria, <i>Jawaharal Nehru University</i> Shannon Lederer, <i>American Federation of Teachers</i>							
<b>Speakers</b>	Jilian Roque, <i>Public Services Labour Independent Confederation</i> Dennis Sinyolo, <i>Education International (EI)</i> Art DeFehr, <i>Palliser Furniture</i> George Joseph, <i>Caritas Sweden</i>							
	<p><i>[Theme 2] Operationalizing Human Development in International Migration</i></p> <p><b>Working Session 2.B - Rights-based Development Solutions and Migration</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"><b>Co-moderators</b></td> <td>Gibril Faal, <i>AFFORD UK</i> Leila Rispens-Noel, <i>International Network of Alternative Financial Institutions (INAFI)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Co-rapporteurs</b></td> <td>Bob van Dillen, <i>Cordaid</i> Jeremaiah Opiniano, <i>Institute for Migration and Development Issues</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Speakers</b></td> <td>S. Irudaya Rajan, <i>Centre for Development Studies</i> Ruben Puentes, <i>International Network on Migration and Development</i> Estrella Dizon-Anonuevo, <i>Atikha Overseas Workers and Communities Initiatives, Inc.</i> Sarah Rosengaertner, <i>United Nations Development Programme</i> Clariste Soh Moube, <i>Centre Amadou Hampâté Bâ (CAHBA)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Gibril Faal, <i>AFFORD UK</i> Leila Rispens-Noel, <i>International Network of Alternative Financial Institutions (INAFI)</i>	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Bob van Dillen, <i>Cordaid</i> Jeremaiah Opiniano, <i>Institute for Migration and Development Issues</i>	<b>Speakers</b>	S. Irudaya Rajan, <i>Centre for Development Studies</i> Ruben Puentes, <i>International Network on Migration and Development</i> Estrella Dizon-Anonuevo, <i>Atikha Overseas Workers and Communities Initiatives, Inc.</i> Sarah Rosengaertner, <i>United Nations Development Programme</i> Clariste Soh Moube, <i>Centre Amadou Hampâté Bâ (CAHBA)</i>	<i>Kestrel</i>
<b>Co-moderators</b>	Gibril Faal, <i>AFFORD UK</i> Leila Rispens-Noel, <i>International Network of Alternative Financial Institutions (INAFI)</i>							
<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Bob van Dillen, <i>Cordaid</i> Jeremaiah Opiniano, <i>Institute for Migration and Development Issues</i>							
<b>Speakers</b>	S. Irudaya Rajan, <i>Centre for Development Studies</i> Ruben Puentes, <i>International Network on Migration and Development</i> Estrella Dizon-Anonuevo, <i>Atikha Overseas Workers and Communities Initiatives, Inc.</i> Sarah Rosengaertner, <i>United Nations Development Programme</i> Clariste Soh Moube, <i>Centre Amadou Hampâté Bâ (CAHBA)</i>							
	<p><i>[Theme 3] Operationalizing the Protection of Migrants and their Families</i></p> <p><b>Working Session 3.B - Protecting Migrants in Dire Humanitarian Situations</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"><b>Co-moderators</b></td> <td>Donald Kerwin, <i>Center for Migration Studies of New York (CMS)</i> Martina Liebsch, <i>Caritas Internationalis</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Co-rapporteurs</b></td> <td>Jérôme Elie, <i>Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</i> Mary Jo Toll, <i>Sisters of Notre Dame</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Speakers</b></td> <td>Khalid Koser, <i>Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Brookings Institute</i> Ignacio Packer, <i>Terre des Hommes International Federation</i> Sue LeMesurier, <i>International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC)</i> Father Hagos Hayish, <i>Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat</i> Najla Chahda, <i>Caritas Lebanon Migrant Center</i> Martin Fowke, <i>UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)</i></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Co-moderators</b>	Donald Kerwin, <i>Center for Migration Studies of New York (CMS)</i> Martina Liebsch, <i>Caritas Internationalis</i>	<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Jérôme Elie, <i>Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</i> Mary Jo Toll, <i>Sisters of Notre Dame</i>	<b>Speakers</b>	Khalid Koser, <i>Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Brookings Institute</i> Ignacio Packer, <i>Terre des Hommes International Federation</i> Sue LeMesurier, <i>International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC)</i> Father Hagos Hayish, <i>Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat</i> Najla Chahda, <i>Caritas Lebanon Migrant Center</i> Martin Fowke, <i>UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)</i>	<i>Pink Pigeon</i>
<b>Co-moderators</b>	Donald Kerwin, <i>Center for Migration Studies of New York (CMS)</i> Martina Liebsch, <i>Caritas Internationalis</i>							
<b>Co-rapporteurs</b>	Jérôme Elie, <i>Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</i> Mary Jo Toll, <i>Sisters of Notre Dame</i>							
<b>Speakers</b>	Khalid Koser, <i>Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Brookings Institute</i> Ignacio Packer, <i>Terre des Hommes International Federation</i> Sue LeMesurier, <i>International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC)</i> Father Hagos Hayish, <i>Ethiopian Catholic Secretariat</i> Najla Chahda, <i>Caritas Lebanon Migrant Center</i> Martin Fowke, <i>UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)</i>							
<b>10.10 - 10.30</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	<i>(outside Working Session rooms)</i>						
<b>10.30 - 12.00</b>	<i>(continue Working Sessions 1.B, 2.B, 3.B – towards benchmarks and actions)</i>							
<b>12.00 - 14.00</b>	<b>Lunch and open space</b> (reports from Working Sessions day 2 distributed)	<i>(see also side-event programme)</i> <i>Atrium</i>						

14.00 - 16.00	<b><u>Plenary Session</u></b> <i>Review of recommendations from the GFMD Civil Society Days 2012, including on the HLD and the global governance of migration</i>	Main Hall A
16.00 - 16.20	Coffee break	Atrium
16.20 - 18.00	<b><u>Concluding Debate</u></b> <b>Operationalizing the Future of Migration &amp; Development Governance: towards the UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013 and the post-2015 Development Agenda</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sir Peter Sutherland, UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Migration</li> <li>- Amb. Eva Åkerman Börje, Government Offices of Sweden, incoming GFMD Chair</li> <li>- <i>Key elements of Civil Society vision on the HLD and the Global Governance of Migration</i>, by William Gois (Migrant Forum Asia), representative Civil Society Working Group on the HLD &amp; the global governance of migration</li> </ul> Debate with the floor	Main Hall A
18.00 - 18.30	<b><u>Closing Ceremony</u></b>	Main Hall A
18.30 - 19.30	Closing drinks	Atrium
<b>Wednesday 21 November</b> <i>Opening States' GFMD Summit and Common Space</i> <i>- All civil society delegates invited to Common Space -</i>		
9.00 - 10.30	<b><u>Opening Session</u></b> (including Report of the GFMD Civil Society Days)	Main Hall A
10.30 - 14.00	<b><u>Common Space</u></b>  <i>"Migration and Development: Common Ground and Partnerships in Action"</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Break-out session 1: Diaspora alliances and partnerships for development</li> <li>- Break-out session 2: Common ground and partnerships to protect migrants in distress</li> <li>- Break-out session 3: Labour mobility and skills development for inclusive growth and jobs</li> </ul>	Main Hall A



## Statement of Civil Society to Governments

---

Presented by Clariste Soh-Moube and George Joseph,  
Civil Society Co-Chairs, GFMD 2012  
21 November 2012, Mauritius

[final; check against delivery]

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, fellow migrants and colleagues:

We find ourselves here in Mauritius, civil society and governments, holding together, not separately, the hope of a young Afghan woman: a migrant, like many, prevailing with dignity and power after years of sacrifice and suffering in a range of forced migration journeys and exploited employment.

“What would we do at the Global Forum?”, she asked. “We come here for change,” we replied: change that matters to migrant women and men and children and their families, to communities and countries everywhere. “Do you think we can do it?”, we asked her. “Yes,” she said. “If you want to.”

We are here today—governments and civil society—not for ourselves. We are here for change.

140 representatives of civil society organizations from around the world gathered in Mauritius this week to work on change that matters in the areas of labour migration, protection of migrants, promotion of their rights and development. Like many of you, a majority of us are migrants; many more have at least one family member who is a migrant. We were inspired by increasing reminders—in so many lives and countries and movements—of an important truth: together we are major players and we know it.

We were invigorated by the awareness that this is the first time that the Global Forum has been held in Africa, and we welcomed the largest number and voices of African civil society delegates and diaspora in the six years of the Forum to date.

We opened our Civil Society Days part of this Global Forum to your full participation, and appreciate that 60 representatives of governments and intergovernmental organizations joined us, as well as another 30 special guests and media. And we welcome once again this moment to work with you this morning. We are co-responsible in these matters; we commit to looking not only at what governments need to do, but at ourselves and what we need to do, as well as what we can do together.

Our starting point here were the recommendations from prior GFMD meetings—of governments as well as civil society, and in particular those from last year. We noted and built upon considerable convergence that has already been established.

But beyond advancing a set of recommendations, civil society’s specific effort this year was to identify concrete benchmarks and mechanisms for action, and to frame civil society priorities for the High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development at the UN General Assembly next year.

### 1.a. We looked at the conspicuous need to regulate and monitor recruitment, placement and employment practices.

For change, we affirm the responsibility of national policies to promote decent work at home, but note also the sine qua non of legal channels of migration, and pathways to permanence, to mitigate conditions that foment abuse by unscrupulous private recruitment agencies. Significant upgrades are needed in public management of recruitment activity, including strong licensing and regulating of recruitment that is effectively enforced, ensures accountability and clearly identifies the rights of workers and responsibilities of all parties.

We commend a growing range of existing tools and mechanisms, but first and foremost, the rights and practice of freedom of association, worker organizing and collective bargaining. Ratification and full implementation of the international human rights and labour conventions of the UN and ILO are essential. Civil society notes the coming into force of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention since our last gathering at the GFMD, and applauds the five ratifications to date, notably including Mauritius as well as two recent ratifications approved by parliaments but not yet formally filed. We continue to advocate vigorously for universal ratification and implementation of this important convention.

Multi-stakeholder codes of conduct and frameworks can also have value, including the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration. Conventions or frameworks however, need national legislation with teeth: e.g., with effective monitoring, incentives for compliance and sanctions otherwise. It is time to develop systems that collect and compile data about recruitment violators. Labour attaches have a responsibility to their citizens abroad to share data both on recruiters and on country practices.

Benchmarks can measure success, among them:

- a reduction of the number of brokers and intermediaries and instances of illegal recruitment.
- creation of a system to promote good practices and expose bad practices
- increased ratification of UN and ILO conventions, including the 1990 UN migrant workers convention, and the ILO conventions 181 regarding recruitment processes and 189 on domestic workers.
- decreasing costs of migration.

### 1.b. We looked at improving jobs, skills and education matching.

For change we affirm that there is a need for harmonizing and recognizing qualifications. Countries should invest more in training in order to meet routine staffing needs and reduce international recruitment. We ask for minimum training standards across countries within industries. Employers should invest in training for migrants that is directly relevant to the labor market.

We need to create bilateral and multilateral agreements based on international standards and instruments, as well as domestic policies, using a tri-partite approach.

The impact of emigration on particular service providers in countries of origin should be recognized, e.g. on the health sector. Among the tools and mechanisms we commend are international codes for ethical recruitment such as the WHO Code of Nurse Recruitment and the Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol. National immigration policies should allow options for permanent settlement and family unification. Collective bargaining agreements, apprenticeship programs and job training should be encouraged. Migrants should be compensated at prevailing wages, and health and safety norms enforced.

We recommend improvements in qualitative and quantitative data collection on migration and analysis to ensure the production of relevant information for stakeholders, with particular emphasis on South-South migration.

Migrants should have the possibility of applying to a job directly, without intermediaries. We believe that a reduction in visa barriers (e.g. fees) and simplification of visa types would enhance development. However, labour migration should not be used to promote false notions of development.

We propose the following benchmarks:

- increase investment in migrant workforce and in skills training by both governments and employers
- ensure that migrants can work in the jobs they have been trained for (e.g. avoid de-skilling).
- increase the size of the formal sector relative to the informal sector
- increase the possibilities of migrants' affiliation to unions
- creation of public employment agencies to assist in placement of domestic and migrant workers.

## 2.a. We looked at the ever-expanding dynamism of diasporas in development.

For change, there must be a clear mandate for migrant participation in policy-making in countries of origin and destination on the full range of development planning, with meaningful attention to diaspora priorities, investments and other engagement, including entrepreneurial endeavours, investment guarantees, social remittances and knowledge exchange, capacity building, business networking and legal protection.

We are encouraged by the growing number of tools and mechanisms that are helping to bring about this change, but benchmarks for achievement in the near-term should be:

- 20 countries having consultative mechanisms that explicitly include migrants and diaspora communities in policy-making that concerns them
- 20 countries with programmes, services and funding mechanisms that support a range of migrant and diaspora investment
- 10 more countries with dual nationality laws
- 5 countries with new laws on recognition of skills of migrants/diasporas

In the wider context of development, the issue of migration should be incorporated in its own name into the post-2015 development agenda.

## 2.b. For the first time ever in our work at the Global Forum, we looked beyond diaspora dynamics at broader interactions of development with migration, and specifically at rights-based development solutions and migration.

For change, it is necessary to formulate national-level, bilateral policies on migration and development, promoting human and migrant rights and enabling migrants to meet their potential.

Forming and institutionalizing multi-stakeholder partnerships on migration and development covering efforts to share practices is important. These should address the social costs of migration and aim at harnessing the development potentials of remittances and migrants' knowledge.

Origin and destination countries should generate and disseminate migration and development data to inform migration and development policies.

We recommend multi-stakeholder mechanisms convening government, civil society, diasporas and other stakeholders to look at migration's impact on development as well as development's impact on migration. Regional consultative processes (RCPs) could be an adequate venue for these mechanisms.

There should be more policy studies on the impact of remittances on development.

Benchmarks might include, in the near-term:

At least 20 origin countries formulate migration and development policies and strategies

At least 20 countries set up multi-stakeholder processes / consultative mechanisms on migration and development.

At least 10 origin and destination countries create relevant databases, studies and analyses on migration and development.

At least 10 origin countries develop national-level indicators on migration and development for monitoring purposes.

By 2013, civil society develops reflections on migration and the post-2015 development agenda.

### 3.a. We looked at protection of vulnerable migrant workers.

Civil society calls for the full recognition of the mandate of the ILO as regards labour migration.

For change, it is high time to challenge the security framework for migration, in particular by overhauling systemic defaults to detention and deportation. Universal human rights include access to services for irregular migrants. Migrant-related policies of all kinds must be tested against the best interests of children, and should mainstream gender issues.

Many tools and mechanisms of protection exist, and some need further to be developed. Indisputably, the first requisite for protection is binding national and international law. Such laws must then be translated into action; and finally, enforced fairly.

Specifically to respect the human rights of irregular migrants and to ensure access to rights and services, government officials and service providers should not be required to report on immigration status, and migrants should not be discriminated against in accessing services and protection. Residency permits must be provided to survivors of human trafficking.

Regardless of immigration status, data-collection systems regarding migrants, including in consulates, must be both rights-centered and protection-sensitive. Migrant workers must be able to open bank accounts and register the account to the central bank to ensure timely payment. Circular migration is often marketed as a best practice, but should critically be reviewed.

It is time for us to be as clear and accountable as we are ambitious for this change, setting achievable benchmarks of at least:

the inclusion of migrant concerns like portability of pensions in bilateral agreements and negotiations.

a new flexibility of work choice: migrant workers should not be bound to one employer.

mapping of countries' domestic compliance with international standards and their progress towards the harmonization of domestic law with international law.

mapping of best practices on the protection of vulnerable migrants and progress towards countries' adoption and implementation of them.

making official development aid more available to diaspora-led programs.

increasing the number of development agencies that contribute and participate in the GFMD.

### 3.b. We looked at Protecting migrants in dire humanitarian situations

For change, we need to look more at the migration consequences of all types of crisis and distress, together with the underlying vulnerabilities. Migrants' sufferings have to be incorporated in humanitarian processes and protection systems. One important issue is to realize that there needs to be protection at every stage of the migration process, including in situations of returns.

In order to provide protection impartially, there should be no divisive humanitarianism. Indeed, we need to go beyond a categorical approach in providing protection, which has to be driven by principles and needs-first. One principle is clear: all distressed persons need access to international organizations and all international organizations should be able to help them.

But beyond ratification of international instruments, the issue is low implementation. Therefore, we need to create political will to implement the instruments. We also have to provide governments with the necessary tools to enforce instruments.

There are a fair number of tools and mechanisms already existing. Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action should be used to improve the quality of child protection. These standards should be part of programming of an intervention and guide humanitarian preparedness.

Existing mechanisms providing tools and benchmarks should be further promoted, e.g., UNHCR's 10-Point Plan of Action for Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration; UNODC International Framework for Action to Implement the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol). IOM is currently in the process of developing a Crisis Migration Framework.

Capacities of various stakeholders differ and can be complementary. Therefore, broad collaboration and effective coordination among all actors should be developed: it is only through close collaboration that protection can be achieved, from technical aspects to legal follow up. This means improving interaction between NGOs and international organizations but also with governments. It is important to have efficient information sharing and contingency planning. Such efforts should also include civil society partnerships and networking between sending and receiving countries to monitor situations and protect migrants. Employers also have a responsibility for their workers and can play a role in crisis situations, e.g., help people to go home.

We need to create awareness among potential migrants about crisis situations and the risk they may face and at the same time create attractive economic opportunities for people in countries of origin, especially rural areas (so that they do not need to leave).

Countries of origin, transit and destination have a responsibility to protect and respect the rights of migrants and should be held accountable. States should strengthen protection of migrants in difficult situations; consular protection should be enhanced and extended to people in distress.

Civil society organizations should build on their strengths and networks and be proactive in suggesting actions and solutions, for example, opening shelters and information center for migrants in distress and providing legal services.

Governments should introduce a human rights dimension in border management: tools and mechanisms at border controls are needed to safeguard the human rights of migrants, which imply raising awareness and capacity building for government officials. Civil society can help in this regard (good practice: example of Lebanon).

## Benchmarks

pilot and widen implementation of multi-stakeholder projects, i.e., with governments, international organizations and NGOs, building on the “Lampedusa model” and other initiatives and develop and replicate best practices.

make migrants in crisis a priority for the yearly agendas of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) and include all stakeholders in those processes.

call on the UN Special Rapporteur on Migrants to conceptualize a coordinated protection framework for migrants in dire humanitarian situations, including guiding principles.

## 4. The UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2013

Finally, as critical stakeholders and partners in both global policy-making arenas and programs on the ground, civil society expects to have a central role in the UN High Level Dialogue in 2013, beyond the limited format of the 2006 High Level Dialogue. We call for:

1. Substantive preparatory activities at the regional and international level;
2. Full and active participation of civil society in the High Level Dialogue itself;
3. Resources, including a trust fund, to enable an international steering committee to coordinate civil society engagement in the High Level Dialogue;
4. The 2013 UNHLD to focus on:
  - a. Measures to promote and protect the human rights of all migrants, including migrants in distress; irregular migrants; and the rights of children in the context of migration
  - b. Labor migration and decent work, including immediate possibilities to address abuses within the recruitment field
  - c. Gender and migration
  - d. Migration and development, including the post-2015 development agenda;
5. A succinct, negotiated outcome document that can address critical issues of global migration governance and concrete actions for strong HLD outcomes.

Ladies and gentlemen, partners in action, six years on in the Global Forum process:

/ even as governments and civil society echo one another that migration should be a choice and not a necessity, millions of men women and children being forced to migrate and forced to return;

/ even as there is wide convergence among us all that the positives of international migration far outweigh the negatives, outbreaks of xenophobia, racism and discrimination are filling not only newspapers but law books;

/ even as migrants by the hundreds of million play a foundational role in the economies and societies of nations throughout the world, they continue to suffer discrimination in labour rights, access to basic health services and justice, and portability of benefits;

/ even as widely ratified international treaties of all kinds talk of the unequivocal right to family unity and the protection of the best interest of the child, millions of families are broken across borders.

As we together explore the intersections and collisions of migration and development in this Global Forum and upcoming High Level Dialogue, we tell ourselves and may we all remember: we are here today not for ourselves. We are here for change.

/Thank you.

## Annex to the Civil Society Statement: Affirmation of Civil Society Convergence on recommendations from prior GFMD's (2007 – 2011)

On the theme of “Regulating and Monitoring Recruitment, Placement and Employment Practices”, civil society re-affirmed the following recommendations from prior GFMD Civil Society Days:

1. Calls for governments to better regulate and monitor recruitment and employment practices, by creating sound and transparent licensing and monitoring systems, codes for ethical recruitment, simplified procedures, instituting sanctions, cap permissible recruitment fees, establishing whistleblower protections, portable justice, and reporting mechanisms for abuses, and ending visa-systems that tie migrants to specific employers.
2. Urges governments to work with employers, labour unions and other social actors to create more regular and safe migration channels that address labour market and protection needs, and ensure family (re)unification.

---

On the theme of “Improving Jobs, Skills and Education Matching”, civil society re-affirmed the following recommendations from prior GFMD Civil Society Days:

3. Urges governments to invest together with businesses, academia and other civil society actors in labour market analysis in order to develop mechanisms for the matching of education and training programs with labour market needs in both origin and destination countries and to organize skills and credential recognition in a just and more effective way so as to address present and future mismatches between labour supply and demand and prevent de-skilling and brain waste.
4. Insist that matching schemes that are circular or temporary in nature, do not replace permanent employment, and should ensure the same rights and entitlements to all workers, including equal payment, access to social security and freedom of association, and should include the portability of pension and other security benefits related to employment, as well as pathways to permanent residence status and citizenship.

---

On the theme of “Engaging Diaspora as Entrepreneurs, Social Investors and Policy Advocates”, civil society re-affirmed the following recommendations from prior GFMD Civil Society Days:

5. Urges governments both in countries of origin and destination, foundations and other donors to include diaspora and migrant voice and organizations in development policy formulation and implementation and to each create a national platform for dialogue with migrant/diaspora representatives, and to increase the resources available for capacity building of diaspora and migrant organizations, focusing on such areas as financial literacy, development of organizational skills, advocacy and education.
6. Calls upon local, state and national governments to create conducive legal and financial frameworks to promote migrants as entrepreneurs, provide access to credit, property rights and skill development, and promote Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) which can play a critical role in job creation (e.g. by governments of countries of origin providing low interest loans to migrants abroad towards income generating investments back home)
7. Recommends to migrant/diaspora organizations create trust relationships and partnerships among themselves and other partners including the private sector, local authorities and “mainstream” development organizations; to share experiences and knowledge, to replicate and scale up projects and build a common vision on specific themes that enable advocacy with one cohesive voice

On the theme of “Rights-based Development Solutions and Migration”, civil society re-affirmed the following recommendations from prior GFMD Civil Society Days:

8. Insists to governments to regard their primary responsibility for sustainable and human development thus adopting a rights-based approach to development which ensures economic and social rights – including access to decent work and essential public services (chiefly education, vocational and technical training programmes, and health care, that are necessary to make the “right to remain” possible; and to abandon aid conditionality and to detach development programmes and assistance from the repatriation of irregular migrants and (ex)asylum-seekers).
9. Calls for effective coordination (a) between ministries and departments - including ministries of health, education, labor, social security and development/foreign assistance (b) “vertically” across levels of government—national, state/provincial, and municipal; and (c) between government and representative bodies of civil society organizations, including diaspora and migrant organizations.

---

On the theme of “Protecting Vulnerable Migrant Workers”, civil society re-affirmed the following recommendations from prior GFMD Civil Society Days:

10. Continues to strongly urge governments to ratify, implement and enforce conventions providing for equal treatment and the protection of migrants, first and foremost the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, as well as the other core human rights conventions; and key ILO conventions, chiefly Conventions 97, 143 and the Domestic Workers Convention (189); and strongly encourages civil society to continue their ongoing advocacy on the ratification and enforcement of the conventions and to collect, share and showcase successful relevant advocacy campaigns.
11. Calls for the observance of all workers’ human rights and labour rights regardless of the workers’ migration status, including non-discrimination (i.e., the same treatment, working conditions, and wages as comparable native workers), freedom of association and access to social security benefits, health care, education, and legal remedies, including sanctions and prosecution of those violating the rights of migrant workers.
12. Urges governments to provide for regular and safe migration channels, including regularization mechanisms, for migrant workers, including migrant domestic workers, and to end the “kafala” and similar sponsorship systems; and to stop the criminalization of migrants with irregular status, making them further prone to discrimination, exploitation and de-humanization and to pursue alternatives to detention while never placing in detention pregnant or lactating women, children, survivors of torture, abuse and trauma, elderly, disabled or persons with serious health conditions, or other vulnerable groups.
13. Calls on governments to ensure that migrant children are treated as minors and are able to enjoy the full range of rights, irrespective to their migratory status; to reaffirm and reinforce family rights, in particular the right to family unity and reunification; and to acknowledge that the different needs and experiences of women and men while migrating and thus to adopt elaborate gender-sensitive protection and migration policies.

---

On the theme of “Protecting Migrants in Dire Humanitarian Situations”, civil society affirmed the following recommendation:

14. Urges states and international agencies to join us in urgently putting in place consistent responses of assistance and protection to victims in transit, in particular women and children. Improved mechanisms are needed to ensure that migrants are rescued at sea when such rescue is needed, and differentiated upon arrival for the specific protection to which they are entitled under international, regional and national law. UNHCR’s 10 Point Plan of Action for Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration is a useful framework in this direction.



## SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Roundtable 1: Circulating Labour for Inclusive Development

#### *Roundtable 1.1: Beyond-the-Border Skills and Jobs for Human Development*

1. Models to support effective skills recognition and job matching in the context of labour mobility include:
  - a) National Qualifications Authorities (e.g. in the UAE) – these are longer term, resource-intensive, and need to adjust for a myriad of other certification systems and standards.
  - b) Legal frameworks and demand-driven systems that facilitate employers' hiring of the skills they need, adapted to both short term and structural labour market needs.
  - c) Bilateral or circular labour agreements; including MRAs, in specific sectors (e.g. Filipino seafarers, nurses or domestic workers, or the Mauritius-France/Canada circular migration agreements) – these are expedient, more targeted, mutually agreeable, and cost effective.
  - d) Skills training cost-shared by country of origin and destination (e.g. employer-subsidized).
  - e) Information, websites or web portals for potential overseas workers about jobs, skills requirements, work conditions and remuneration.
  - f) One-stop shops in the country of origin (e.g. Philippines) and country of destination (e.g. Migrant Resource Centres, such as in Tajikistan).
  - g) Language skills training - often overlooked, its absence can be an obstacle to skills portability.
2. Bilateral circular labour agreements should include a country of origin responsibility for skills recognition of workers when they return.
3. The GFMD should further develop the theme of closing the gap between skills assessment and recognition in the country of origin for returning migrants.

#### *Roundtable 1.2: Supporting Migrants and Diaspora as Agents of Socio-Economic Change*

1. Key elements of a comprehensive diaspora support strategy:
  - a) Comprehensive diaspora surveys and mapping – beyond demographic data to include information on, e.g., investment profiles and history, savings profiles and history, age and risk tolerance, terms under which diaspora would invest, etc. These will assist in the creation of targeted marketing strategies. (Note that Malaysia, Jamaica and Kenya may be mapping diaspora profiles and organizations as well as existing obstacles to investment.)

- b) Support mechanisms for the diaspora to build bridges, networks and partnerships across borders (e.g. MITOS); and appropriate training and capacity building.
  - c) Create the conditions and incentives to stimulate investments back home, including accessible financial instruments through banks, micro-finance institutions and others.
  - d) Migration mainstreaming at the national and local levels to ensure that policy makers understand how migration supports initiatives at all levels. Capacity building of local authorities.
  - e) Improve communication and coordination among all stakeholders, including central and local governments, businesses and financial institutions, chambers of commerce and diaspora organizations.
  - f) Improve diaspora outreach: train Embassies and foreign services in diaspora engagement and services.
  - g) Local diaspora-focused grant matching competitions such as the African Diaspora Marketplace.
2. Complete and showcase on the GFMD website (PfP) the compendium of good practices in the Annex of the RT 1.2 Background Paper (held by governments and partners to be a useful reference on diaspora).

## **Roundtable 2 - Factoring Migration into Development Planning**

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

1. Promote continued planning and implementation of migration and development mainstreaming processes (including Extended Migration Profiles and appropriate monitoring) by governments in all regions and with the support of relevant international and national actors.
2. Develop effective and coherent institutional arrangements to implement such processes, within government and between government and non-state stakeholders.
3. Integrate migration into the post-2015 development agenda, recognizing the unique opportunity offered for such action by the 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, and the deliberations leading up to the post-2015 development agenda.
4. Include migration data in development surveys.
5. Factor the contribution of migration to development outcomes into development strategies by development agencies, including multilateral organizations.
6. Enhance legal access to labour markets, e.g. through bilateral labour agreements or other enabling legal frameworks.

### ***Roundtable 2.2: Addressing South-South Migration and Development Policies***

1. In view of the multiple aspects and implications of South-South migration and development issues, the GFMD should pursue discussions on this topic, but focus on more selected issues.
2. The issue of migration, environmental change and development needs to be followed up in future GFMD meetings.
3. The collection, analysis and sharing of timely and comprehensive data should be promoted further, including through support of relevant global and regional organizations.
4. Regional fora, processes and dialogues are considered key mechanisms to support capacity building for enhanced migration and development governance, including migration and development mainstreaming processes, and the protection of migrants and their families.
5. South-South migration and development issues should be integrated into the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the 2013 High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

### **Roundtable 3: Managing Migration and Migrant Protection for Human Development Outcomes**

#### ***Roundtable 3.1: Improving Public Perceptions of Migrants and Migration: Challenging preconceptions and shaping perceptions***

1. The backdrop to consideration of perception of migrants and migration must recognize the human rights and human development dimension of the individuals involved.
2. Tackling the issue of perceptions of migration will often benefit from being informed by a vision of integration as a long-term process that can be envisaged as a continuum involving settlement, citizenship and multiculturalism programs, policies and services.
3. Some of the countries that have proved to be successful in migration are those that have put in place managed migration systems consisting of a suite of immigration, integration, and multiculturalism policies and programs. Notwithstanding the value of an effective approach to managed migration, this may usefully be set in a broader context of the governance of migration.
4. Such an approach can help countries avoid falling into a vicious cycle of negative public perceptions constraining public policy which further feed negative perceptions. Shifting negative perceptions under these conditions is extremely difficult. The alternative is to aim for a virtuous cycle in which public understanding paves the way for more enlightened policymaking.
5. As a concrete action, it was considered that information, research and data are important to assist the public to understand better migrants and migration. The importance of gender-disaggregated data was emphasized to help counter discrimination and prejudice against women. The research agenda would include understanding the nature of migrant flows - which are often more varied and complex than the public appreciate - and how they contribute to the societies of destination and origin.

6. Effective engagement with and through the media was identified as key to building and sustaining the essential public support for effective migration policies. Strategies include working with editors, rapid rebuttals using new social media tools, such as Twitter (as was piloted through this roundtable in this year's GFMD).
7. In the areas where public perceptions need to be changed, the urgent need to look at root causes of some perceptions, combat racism and xenophobia was emphasized. Teachers and educators play a major role in this regard, especially in shaping young people's outlook.
8. The roundtable noted the need for a more amplified voice of the private sector, which to date has been muted, in public debates that could shape perceptions of migration.
9. While information and data play a relevant role, the human experience needs to be known and shared. It is important to give migrants a voice, including access to the justice system. Media could provide an additional channel, including ethnic media.

### ***Roundtable 3.2: Migrant Protection as Integral to Migration Management***

#### ***Border management and the protection of unaccompanied and/or separated children***

1. The protection of migrant children is best ensured if policies and practices are in place to ensure they are treated first and foremost as children. This includes access to child protection systems designed to respond to the specific needs of children.
2. Unaccompanied/separated children should be identified as soon as possible upon arrival. Identification can be challenging and immigration officials need specialized training. Immigration officials should refer children to specialized medical, psychological and social services where appropriate. One participant noted their government's policy to involve child experts in immigration interviews once it becomes apparent that the interviewee is a child.
3. Specialized training is necessary to enable immigration officials to identify child asylum seekers and refer them to the asylum authorities.
4. Detention of children should be avoided. Where restrictions on freedom of movement are necessary, alternatives to detention should be explored. Where children are detained, they should be held separately from adults.
5. Relevant processes and procedures to assist unaccompanied/separated children can include mechanisms to address the child's immediate needs; the appointment of a legal representative and/or guardian, family tracing; assessment of refugee protection needs and identification of solutions in the best interest of the child.
6. It was proposed that considerations of the best interests of the child should inform all policy and procedure for decision-making processes regarding children. In addition, strengthening of referral systems between these different processes ensures that the needs of children are comprehensively addressed.

#### ***Rescue at Sea – managing sea borders while ensuring the protection of migrants and refugees in distress at sea***

1. The physical protection of people in distress at sea is key. All possible measures need to be taken to rescue people in distress at sea, irrespective of their status.
2. Better cooperation and burden sharing could help to address the gaps that exist in protecting migrants in distress at sea. Existing cooperative arrangements such as

between Indonesia and Australia (including inter alia a joint Task Force, contact points and technical cooperation); between the U.S. and Caribbean countries; and among EU Member States are useful starting points. Tools such as the UNHCR Model Framework for Cooperation on Rescue at Sea Emergencies could further support states in setting up more predictable cooperation. The Model Framework is based on the premises that different countries implicated in a rescue at sea emergency could make different contributions. Responsibility for search and rescue may be distinct from responsibility for disembarkation, and allowing for disembarkation may be distinct from longer-term responsibility for the provision of solutions.

3. Existing models and tools need to be translated into regional realities. The forthcoming Bali process workshop on irregular maritime movement, for example, could take forward discussions on cooperative approaches in the Asia and Pacific region.
4. Responses to distress and rescue at sea are most efficient if they are part of a comprehensive regional approach, which also tackles the root causes in countries of origin. This would also avoid well-functioning rescue at sea arrangements becoming a pull factor.

### ***Migrant workers and their families in humanitarian crises***

1. Protection of the human rights of migrant workers is necessary before, during and after a humanitarian crisis.
2. The ability/resources of migrant worker populations to help themselves could be strengthened through better self-organization and the provision of orientation courses or training material on how to cope in crisis situations.
3. Preparedness/contingency plans should be developed by both countries of origin and countries of destination with significant migrant worker populations. Contingency plans of countries of origin should focus on consular protection mechanisms, the deployment of rapid response teams and communication outreach to migrant worker populations. The latter is also an important tool for countries of destination.
4. Work contracts should establish a responsibility of employers to contribute to assistance and return operations.
5. Reintegration programs can assist with the social and economic re-insertion of migrant workers within their communities of origin.

### ***Combating labour exploitation and human trafficking while protecting victims***

1. Both countries of origin and destination have responsibilities for the protection of migrant workers. Bilateral agreements can help to clarify these responsibilities and establish mechanisms to ensure their implementation, such as joint committees of State party representatives with a regular meeting schedule. They also reduce irregular migration and the risks of abuses through the creation of legal migration channels.
2. A strong labour rights legislative framework in the country of destination is key for the prevention of abuses. This includes the possibility for migrant workers to change jobs; use of a standardized employment contract recognized in origin and destination countries; adequate labour protection for all migrant workers, including with regard to

occupational safety and health, wages and working hours; and prevention of passport retention.

3. The following practices have been effectively employed by countries of origin to prevent abuses: pre-departure preparation, including language training and information on risks relating to migration; registration of job offers, expected wages and/or outgoing workers; prevention of unethical recruitment practices through regulation/licensing of private employment/recruitment agencies and the development of a system of incentives/disincentives; elimination of “middlemen”; establishment of complaints mechanisms in countries of origin and destination; the setting up of self-regulatory bodies; and the use of labour attachés in destination countries to verify employers and employment contracts.
4. More attention needs to be given to female migrants and the gender aspects of migration. Proposals included the elimination of outright bans or restrictions on emigration of women based on age, occupation and pregnancy; and information on “women-friendly” migration channels. Lower-skilled women migrant workers need special attention, especially domestic workers.
5. UNODC and other international organizations have developed practical tools for implementing the obligations states have under international law, including toolkits on best practices, a Framework for Action for the implementation of the trafficking protocol, standard operating procedures on identification of trafficked persons, and an interagency/multi-agency taskforce approach.
6. Measures to prevent abuse and exploitation and protect victims should be complemented by a comprehensive approach to address irregular migration.

***Roundtable 3.3: Protecting Migrant Domestic Workers - Enhancing their Development Potential***

1. Countries of origin and destination to adopt an action plan that prioritizes short, medium and long term programs to ratify and implement ILOC 189 as a way of increasing the momentum for ratification.
2. Governments to adopt an inclusive approach in the formulation of policies and regulations to reflect the standard in international instruments, and develop comprehensive mechanisms for monitoring and compliance
3. Gender-sensitive checklist trialled in 2011 and launched at the GFMD Summit to be posted on the GFMD website as a guide to governments. Good and effective practical models to be uploaded on the GFMD Platform for Partnerships (PfP) to be replicated and up-scaled by other governments.
4. Governments to seek support from international organizations for training and capacity building programs for officials and other stakeholders for the implementation of rights-based employment standards. Civil society to take an active role in the monitoring of progress towards implementation of agreed standards
5. Gender equality perspectives and women’s empowerment issues to be addressed in the context of the UN HLD 2013. A substantive speaker on gender equality to be appointed to inform HLD outcomes.