

## SECOND MEETING OF THE FRIENDS OF THE FORUM

*“Integrating Migration Policies into Development Strategies for the Benefit of All”*

Geneva 02 July 2009

### Report of the Proceedings

The second meeting of the Friends of the Forum (FoF) was held in Geneva on 02 July 2009. It was attended by 151 representatives from 89 Member States and 20 Observers.

Athens GFMD Chair-in-Office, Mr. Athanassios Nakos, Deputy Minister for Interior of the Hellenic Republic, was joined on the podium by Ambassador Anastase Scopelitis, Head of the Athens GFMD Task Force, Mr. Peter Sutherland, UN Secretary-General Special Representative of the for Migration and Development, and the other Troika members, former Chair Philippines (represented by Ambassador Erlinda Basilio) and future Chair Argentina (represented by Minister Pablo Tettamanti and Minister Paulo Cavaleri).

**I.** - *Welcome Address*  
- *Statement of the Chair*

Deputy Minister Nakos delivered a welcome address followed by a statement from Mr. Sutherland.

- A. Deputy Minister Nakos** reported that preparations for the Athens GFMD are firmly on track and big steps have been taken since the first FOF meeting in April. He expressed thanks to the UNOG for making available the excellent venue for the meeting. He also thanked the UN Secretary General for his full support to the Forum, as well as his Special Representative for Migration and Development, Mr. Peter Sutherland, for his tireless assistance to the GFMD process and to the Greek Chair.

He announced that the Steering Group now has 34 members, with the most recent admission of Germany and India. This demonstrates the increasing engagement and commitment of governments in the Forum process. He expressed gratitude to those governments that have pledged financial support to the Forum, and those that have helped in the preparations of the Roundtables.

Following are the achievements that have been made since the first Friends of the Forum meeting in April:

- **Revision and distribution of the final Themes Concept paper to all FOFs;**
- **Setting up of Roundtable session teams** with co-chairs and members, with as fair a geographic balance as possible across all seven sessions. Although

interested governments are still welcome to volunteer in the Roundtable preparations;

- **Completion of Concept Notes** of the seven Roundtable sessions, in cooperation with the Roundtable Coordinators and the Greek Chair. The Concept Notes form the basis for the Background Papers that will serve as a guide to the session discussions in November;
- **Commencement of work on the Background Papers**, formed either by the governments themselves or by subject experts. Team members and some key international organizations have been approached for their input into the Background Papers;
- **Follow-up of Manila GFMD**, whereby some activities are being pursued and funded (as required) by individual Member States, notably the Governments of The Netherlands and the United Arab Emirates, to help ensure the thematic and institutional continuity of the Forum and add value to the Athens Roundtable discussions;
- **Close coordination with the Civil Society Days conveners** in ensuring synergies between the government and Civil Society components of the Forum;
- **Restructuring of the Athens GFMD budget** with renewed appeal for financial contributions.

Deputy Minister Nakos stated that the Athens GFMD will try to bring some new and innovative angles to the international debate on migration and development. Its overarching theme touches upon both the inclusion of migration in development strategies of developing countries and mainstreaming a developmental philosophy in migration policies of receiving countries?. Another new theme is the inclusion, protection and acceptance of migrants in society. The impact of the global economic crisis is the subject of a separate session in Roundtable 1 in order to investigate in depth its consequences on the migration and development nexus.

He cautioned that themes and policies alone cannot secure the future of the Forum. As the process matures, there is a need to reflect on the structures and modalities that carry them it forward, in such a way as to preserve the informal, open and concrete nature of the Global Forum while remaining agile and relevant to today. The Steering Group, for example, is an essential advisory body for the Chair, but, as it continues to grow in size, Mr. Sutherland's suggestion at the first FoF meeting that some voluntary rotation of membership be considered, could be reflected upon.

The current Chair has started reflecting on the Future of the Forum, to which a special session will be devoted in the Athens meeting. The Chair believes that this reflection, which will have to take the form of a paper in due course, should benefit from the governments' experience of, and commitment to, the GFMD. Hence, the FoFs were requested to communicate their views to the Chair.

Recognizing that the continuing chairmanship is also key to the sustainability of the Forum, Deputy Minister Nakos reported the change of plan for GFMD 2010, with Argentina's announcement that its Government is no longer in a position to host the 4<sup>th</sup> GFMD. Mexico has offered to host in Argentina's stead, thus continuity of the process is assured for the next year. Mexico's offer was endorsed by the FOF and her representative (Ambassador de Alba) took on the podium, as the new member of the Troika, the place of Argentina.

- B. Mr. Peter Sutherland** stressed that we live in difficult times where challenges in the area of migration are going to be increasingly evident, particularly in countries with

growing unemployment. In regard, the Forum has been a catalyst for coherence, not merely between countries but also within countries.

He provided a brief reflection on the future of the forum. He welcomed the Mexican offer and recalled that the GFMD calendar now extends until 2012. The offers of Spain and Morocco should permit to complete a cycle. He expressed the hope that, by the end of 2012, the participant governments will have acknowledged the gradual development and growth of the Forum and will thus be able to evaluate what its contribution has been to the issue of migration and development. This will inform the High-Level Dialogue which will take place at the United Nations in 2013. In the meantime, some aspects of the Operating Modalities should be kept under review to facilitate and improve the GFMD process. He suggested that the Athens Forum could look in particular at funding to ensure sustained support to the successive chairs; at the Steering Group membership, notably by introducing some sort of rotation; and at languages used in the GFMD, keeping in mind the budgetary constraints.

Furthermore Mr. Sutherland recognized that the Troika system is entirely rational and provides the leadership to the Forum. He emphasized the Secretary-General's real and enduring commitment to the process, as evidenced by his participation during the Forum and the involvement of his Special Representative. The UN commitment is the legitimizing feature of the GFMD, without which it would simply be another conference on migration and development. He acknowledged the new momentum from the Global Migration Group's current leadership, which could enable the GMG members to provide together an improved support for the development of the GFMD as a whole.

**II. – Adoption of the Agenda**  
**- Update on the Roundtable Preparations**

Following the adoption by the FoFs of the proposed Agenda, **Ambassador Scopelitis** gave an update on the status of the Roundtable preparations. He explained that the final version of the Themes Concept sent by the Chair on 10 April accommodated, to the extent possible, the principal suggestions and comments made at the last Steering Group and FoF meetings, while respecting the results of the thematic survey conducted last January, as well as the letter and the spirit of the overarching theme endorsed for this year. Now that the Themes Concept Paper has been endorsed by the FoF, he stressed the need for the Background Papers and the discussions both leading to and in Athens to remain as faithful as possible to it.

Guidelines for the Roundtable sessions were sent to all FoFs. For each session, an outline has been developed as the foundation for the Background Papers and discussions in Athens. Given the fact that the Chair has considered the production of concrete outcomes a priority, as the outlines establish the basis for possible deliverables out of the Athens discussions.

There are now 7 Roundtable teams, each with two co-chairs and a balanced cross-section of the team members. At this stage, some 35 governments are participating in the Roundtable teams (in other words more than 20% of the total FoF governments), assisted by approximately ten international organizations and expert agencies. Both the papers and the approach to the Roundtables in Athens have been discussed with the Civil Society counterparts.

The Chair thanked all those governments that have stepped forward to help out in the Roundtable preparatory work. He expressed appreciation for the time and resources that these governments have devoted to this. Mr.Sutherland also announced the Co-Chairs of the Roundtable session teams, as follows:

Roundtable 1, coordinated by Mr. Romeo Matsas:

- RT 1.1 Greece and Moldova
- RT 1.2 Mexico and Netherlands
- RT 1.3 Bangladesh and UK

Roundtable 2, coordinated by Dr. Irena Omelaniuk:

- RT 2.1 Argentina and the United Arab Emirates
- RT 2.2 Brazil and Portugal

Roundtable 3, coordinated by Dr. Rolph Jenny:

- RT 3.1 Morocco and Switzerland
- RT 3.2 Australia and Thailand

Moreover, three projects are being undertaken by individual governments as preparatory activities for the Athens meeting:

- a) The Netherlands is funding a study in Bangladesh on *“Reducing the Cost-burden for Migrant Workers: A Market-based Approach,”* the conclusions of which hope to feed into RT session 2.1;
- b) The United Arab Emirates (UAE) have undertaken to fund a project on *“Preparing Contract Workers for Return and Reintegration” - Relevant for Development?”* to support the discussions of session 2.2;
- c) The UAE has also proposed to fund a project on *“Examining global best practices on the provision of services to protect and empower temporary contractual workers through Migrant Resources Centers”*, to support the discussions of Roundtable 2.

The Chair thanked the Government of Finland for having financed an experts’ seminar in Vienna on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, that has greatly contributed to the preparations of Athens Roundtable 3.1 while examining a number of key outcomes of the Manila Forum. He then handed the floor over to the Roundtable Coordinators and the government Co-Chairs of the sessions to update the FoFs on the progress of their preparations.

#### **Roundtable 1: (Coordinator: Mr. Romeo Matsas)**

**Mr. Matsas** first thanked all the governments and agencies that are helping in preparing the various sessions of Roundtable 1. He explained that Roundtable 1 on *“How to make the migration development nexus work for the achievement of the MDGs”* mirrors the priority of the Greek Chair to emphasize the integration of migration policy in developmental strategies. There are 3 sessions under this Roundtable, each of which addresses the main theme from a different angle.

***RT 1.1: Mainstreaming migration into development planning – key actors, key strategies, key actions***

The session is co-chaired by Greece and Moldova, and includes Ethiopia, France, Jamaica, Mauritius, Norway and Spain as members. It is also benefiting from inputs from the ILO and the European Commission. There are two main tracks in the session: (a) integrating migration consideration in development planning and (b) developmental role of international migration partnerships.

The session proposes a few outcomes, namely:

1. Coordination mechanisms for the integration of migration into development planning;
2. Specific tools which can support policy-making on migration and development, such as information platform, and the analysis of migration situation and future flows;
3. Joint projects along the migration track from countries of origin, transit and destination;
4. Criteria for having positive migration and development nexus.

**Co-Chair Moldova** added that the session team just held a meeting in Geneva, wherein they defined the objective to have a very practical discussion of the policies, practices and the projects that have been implemented in some countries, as well as possible outcomes which could serve as guidelines for governments in the future.

***RT 1.2: Engaging diasporas and migrants in development policies and programs – their roles? their constraints?***

The session is co-chaired by Mexico and the Netherlands and the members are Armenia, Bangladesh, Canada, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Ghana and Israel. The purpose of this session is to focus on the technique of engaging with diaspora for development activities, while building on what has been done on diaspora development activities in both Brussels and Manila. The session aims at producing a catalogue of good practices based on global experience which could be useful to both countries willing to start with diaspora, but also to countries which have already experienced and would like to see also what others are doing.

The **Netherlands** stated that the team has had some very active discussions. The team's Co-Chairs have very active communication. The document of the session will be ready in its first draft within one or two weeks. The Netherlands plans to hold in the coming week a broad consultation with their civil society, notably their diaspora organizations, while Co-Chair Mexico is organizing a seminar. The team is now looking at an innovative way to organize the session by doing away with a panel, to avoid the kind of static discussions that had been had in a number of sessions in the previous meetings.

**Mexico** confirmed that it is organizing an international meeting in cooperation with IOM on 31 August and 01 September on the contribution of the diaspora. Invitations will be sent to international organizations, experts, universities and governments. More information may be made available for those who want to participate in this international meeting.

***RT 1.3: Addressing the root causes of migration through development, especially in light of the current global economic crisis***

The third session is co-chaired by the UK and Bangladesh, and team members are Egypt, Germany and Greece. Inputs have also been received from the OECD and the UNDP.

Countries willing to join the session in preparing the background paper would be welcome.

The purpose of this session is to look at the impact of the crisis on the migration and development nexus, as well as on the drivers of migration. The session proposes the following outcomes: (1) good practices for tackling the impact of the crisis on the migration and development nexus, (2) improved data and improved data sharing, especially in the short term since this crisis is still developing, and (3) the role of the migration and development nexus in recovery efforts.

**Co-Chair United Kingdom** explained that the session topic is important and timely. There is a wide range of reasons why and how people migrate – the push and pull factors and the intermediary factors. The ongoing economic crisis is likely to affect these factors in different ways. The session will thus look at the root causes, the drivers of migration, how these are likely to be affected by the crisis, how the migration and development nexus is likely to be affected, and the capacity of countries to manage the migration-development nexus. The session will look at the history of previous crises and analyze the data that are emerging so far, in order to identify successful policy initiatives and interventions to tackle the negative effects of the downturn, and how these might be applied in other countries. It will likewise look at partnerships and data gathering efforts and the role that the migration and development nexus can play in global efforts for recovery.

#### **General Discussion on Roundtable 1**

2 Governments and 1 Observer gave their comments after the presentation on Roundtable 1. One Government encouraged the session teams to thoroughly address and mainstream the gender perspective when they develop the background papers. In reply, the **Chair** gave assurance that the gender perspective is present in the sessions as a horizontal and cross-cutting issue. The Chair is also thinking of having a General Rapporteur in November to make a brief report on the gender perspective during the closing session.

Another Government asked how the coordinators are organizing themselves so that there is no overlapping and rehashing of topics in the different Roundtables. He cited the issue of diaspora as an example. Mr. Matsas clarified that various questions will be touched upon in different Roundtables, but the Coordinators are in touch with each other to ensure that there is complementarity between the Roundtables and that restating or pointless overlapping of the same ideas are avoided.

One Observer, in reference to RT 1 preparations, mentioned that the IOM is now in the process of finalizing with several GMG partners, including UNDP, ILO, UNICEF and the World Bank, a handbook on integrating migration strategies in national development strategies and poverty reduction strategy programs. She expressed hope that this tool would be of use not only to the Co-Chairs and the Roundtable, but also to the other FoF governments.

#### **Roundtable 2: (Coordinator: Dr. Irena Omelaniuk)**

**Dr. Omelaniuk** explained that RT 2 picks up quite a number of issues and themes that have been dealt with for two years now, notably the issue of mobility and how migrants can be better supported and protected in an environment of much more circulation of people in the world. The migration landscape has changed in recent years and continues to change fast. People are moving not just once or twice, but many times in their lives. Migration has become much more diverse, and migrants have increased in number.

***RT 2.1: Inclusion, protection, and acceptance of migrants in society – linking human rights and migrant empowerment for development.***

Session 2.1, links human rights and migrant empowerment for development. There are more and more people in temporary situations abroad that are frequently in a vulnerable situation and do not have the same kind of access to services. We do not just have people who move to resettle permanently in other countries and where integration policies help both the migrants and the societies to adapt to this kind of diversity and increasing social diversity. **Inclusion** is thus defined in the context of migrants who do not aim for citizenship, but who do not know enough about their rights, do not have sufficient access to them, and may not be fully accepted within their host societies, because they are not long-term or permanent settlers.

The World Bank and other agencies cited the enormous benefits of temporary labour mobility for development both in the country of origin and in the host country. The session will probe into the actual links between integration – paraphrased as “inclusion, protection and acceptance of migrants in society” - and development. It will look at the impacts on migrants who are better protected and supported in their host countries.

RT 2.1 would like to address the following questions:

- 1) What are the evidence-based links between integration- paraphrased as “inclusion, protection and acceptance”- and development?
- 2) What are the policies of inclusion, protection and acceptance for the different forms of migration (e.g., temporary, permanent, circular, and those who are working in irregular circumstances) today? In what ways can these policies enhance the development impacts of the returns from these people, both virtual and physical, and measurable and immeasurable returns? How to adapt existing models of integration that traditionally have applied to permanent re-settlers? How to draw from those policies some of the elements that may be just as applicable to people who are temporarily in other countries?
- 3) What are the effects of policies of inclusion, protection and acceptance on circular migration - the term “circular migration” referring to people who move back and forth once or frequently, but who need certain policies that enable them to do so?

RT 2.1 team is comprised of a broad range of governments, from one end of the spectrum to the other, in terms of experiences and policy approaches. Both Co-Chairs Argentina and UAE, are very much engaged and bring different angles to the question of how to best protect and support migrants, whether permanent or temporary. The team membership has a nice geographic balance, which includes Australia, Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Israel, Mexico Philippines, Portugal and Spain. Many of these countries have a good and big story to tell.

There are two projects in support of RT 2.1. The first project, funded by the Netherlands and undertaken by Dr. Philip Martin, is on reducing the cost burden for migrant workers and looking at a market-based approach. It completes a project that was started in 2007 and continued last year – and, hopefully, will be completed this year. It tries to demonstrate that reducing pre-departure debts for poor migrants, particularly lower skilled migrants or lower income migrants is likely to help them to be better adjusted and productive in the host countries. The second support project, funded by the UAE and undertaken by the IOM, is on examining global best practices in the provision of services to protect and empower temporary and contractual workers through migrant resource centers - centers that provide information, re-skilling, retooling, a range of services to temporary

contractual workers who are seeking employment abroad or reintegration assistance when they come home again. This project can serve both sessions 2.1 and 2.2.

**Co-Chair Argentina** said she is pleased to be working with the UAE. The two countries have two different national experiences, but believe that they can complement each other in bringing different perspectives into the debate. The team is also assisted by some international organizations, including the World Bank and the UN Special Rapporteur for Human Rights. For Argentina, the link between human rights and empowering migrants for development is about making sure that human rights standards are respected in the host country. It is about including migrants in society, reducing irregular labour, guaranteeing universal access to health, education as well as transportability of their pensions and earnings. And, finally, it is about preventing violence and doing away with discrimination of all sorts.

### ***RT 2.2: Reintegration and circular migration – effective for development?***

Session 2.2 views at a new and, to date, quite neglected facet of migration, namely return and reintegration. It has always been implicit in the discussions of the last two years, but has acquired a new significance today, particularly in the context of the economic crisis. It looks at the return phase in any kind of migratory cycle. It recognizes the way that governments and countries prepare for the return of people and their reintegration into society, their social and economic readjustment to their home environment, as it is critical for the development efforts of the home country. It is critical for any country, but particularly so to developing countries. Conversely, the session looks at the issues of support, protection and empowerment in the home country - as incentives for people to return and be productively reintegrated. The circumstances that cause people to want to go back and remain to their home, invest in their country, set up new businesses and have a family at home are probably the same ones that would cause people not to want to move in the first place or, if they do move, to do so voluntarily.

This has continued and has expanded on the discussion of circular migration for the past two years. There are experimental programs in place now that had been partly stimulated by the discussion in the GFMD. The European Commission, for instance, is tremendously interested in these pilot projects. There is one example between Mauritius and France on circular migration. In 2007, Mauritius put a very coherent and cogent proposal for circular migration which is now in a program format and is actually being tested, and can be followed as it moves along. This is a continuing part and helps in making the GFMD a process, not just a string of disconnected meetings.

Reintegration is being discussed in the context of circular migration because reintegration is about return: The conditions that will attract people to come home and will give them opportunities to stay home are also the conditions that will attract them to go abroad and circulate among countries in a much more globalized and transnational environment today.

The Session 2.2 discussion in November will build around three questions:

- 1) How do we link reintegration strategies more closely to development in the context of circular mobility as a new reality in migration?
- 2) How do we adapt existing reintegration policies to the new, diverse forms of mobility?
- 3) How do governments evaluate their circular migration programs in the context of development?

At this stage, both sessions 2.1 and 2.2 have not yet crystallized into concrete outcomes or proposals as concrete outcomes.

Session 2.2 has a dynamic mixture of governments. The Co-Chairs are Brazil and Portugal, both very engaged in the process, with important lessons to bring to the discussions as both countries of origin and host countries. The big team, which has had productive discussions to date, includes Albania, Columbia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Philippines and Switzerland.

Another supporting project which will help bring more evidence and information into the discussion will be funded by the UAE. It is about preparing contract workers for return and reintegration, and how this is relevant for development.

**Co-Chair Brazil** added that the background paper is being drafted by a representative from the Ministry of Labour of Brazil, and representatives from the Ministry of Labour of Portugal and the Portuguese Institute for Development Support. Their different backgrounds will hopefully add more diverse views into the paper. The drafting team will meet in July in Lisbon. Some international organizations, the World Bank, IOM, ILO, the European Commission and OSCE, are also expected to submit their inputs.

#### **General Discussions on Roundtable 2:**

During the discussion, one delegate inquired about the formulation of session teams – whether they include the focal points in Geneva or in the capital. The Chair responded to say that the GFMD Task Force has sent all messages to the Focal Points in capitals, like when it sent the final version of the themes concept paper with a request for volunteers to come forward and form the government teams. The same letter was transmitted through the Greek Permanent Mission in Geneva to the focal points in Geneva or New York, as the case may be. But, even at this stage, governments that would like to bring inputs into the Roundtable preparations are more than welcome.

#### **Roundtable 3: (Coordinator: Dr. Rolph K. Jenny)**

##### ***RT 3.1: Policy and Institutional Coherence – Latest Data and Research Findings***

**Dr. Jenny** explained that Session 3.1 deals specifically with policy and institutional coherence, data and research, while Session 3.2 deals with regional and inter-regional processes and fora. Governments have, both in Brussels and again very strongly in Manila, underlined the need for the GFMD to work towards policy coherence, recognizing the obvious difficulties that governments are facing in achieving a certain degree of policy coherence in the fields of migration and development, . Session 3.1 will revisit some of the progress made by governments. For this purpose, the session team sent out an informal inquiry to about 40 governments, including the Steering Group members, but not to all FoFs because the team did not wish to repeat the much more comprehensive survey that Sweden had undertaken in 2007 and in 2008 on the same topics. So far, the team has received close to 20 responses with extremely useful and thorough comments. Such a response shows that governments take this theme very seriously.

**Session 3.1** is co-chaired by Switzerland and Morocco, with Australia, Finland, France, Jamaica, Lithuania, Mauritius and UK as members. In relation to the session's preparation, an experts meeting was held in Vienna, which included representatives from both government and the non-governmental sector, academia and international agencies.

The meeting focused on the relation between data, research activity and evidenced based policy making. The principal focus of the 3.1 discussion will be precisely on how to build coherent policies on migration and development by taking account of reliable research and data from both all sources available.

In addition, the session will also review the current role of the national GFMD Focal Points as vehicle to increased levels of institutional coherence. The informal inquiry has yielded very interesting responses. The trend now seems to be that the GFMD national focal points, in an increasing number of countries, also assume some form of coordinating role within the government. They are not only communication channels for the GFMD process, but some of them, are being given increased responsibilities in what is normally called a “whole of government” approach on migration and development.

**Co-Chair Morocco** expressed its appreciation for the excellent cooperating mentality of both the Roundtable Coordinator, the other Co-Chair, Switzerland and members of the government team. This session will try to define ways and means to support policy coherence through data and research findings. One of its main concerns is how to strike a balance between research data and the real government needs in terms of migration policy and development. A first draft background paper has been circulated among team members since early June, and a second draft background paper will be discussed soon in order to include the findings of the Vienna’s meeting of experts. The final version of the background paper will be available around late August or early September.

### ***Roundtable 3.2: Regional and Inter-regional Processes and Fora***

Dr. Jenny called on Co-Chair Australia to give an update on Session 3.2 preparations.

**Australia** is very pleased to co-chair the session with Thailand because of their common interest in regional consultative processes (RCPs). Both countries believe that RCPs remain a key part of the international framework on migration, and recognize the value of their informal nature and their focus on practical outcomes in matters of interest to participating states. Joining the Co-Chairs as team members are Ecuador, France, Moldova, US and, most recently, Indonesia. The draft paper will be ready in a couple of weeks, thanks to IOM’s contribution, and to Michele Klein Solomon and Cynthia Bryant in particular, who are drafting the paper. The Co-Chairs were also very grateful to Dr. Jenny for his support. The team is as keen as the Chair to generate a lively and productive discussion during the Athens’ meeting. The session will also include a report on the Bangkok meeting of the heads of secretariats of regional consultative processes that took place in June.

**Dr. Jenny** added that some of the processes, such as the Bali process, have already asked the Greek Chair to be given the floor to report on recent activities. This session will seek to accommodate such requests as it is important for governments involved in such processes, both regional and interregional, to talk to each other about the progress they are making. For example, the Euro-African Conference, a follow-up to the Rabat Conference, has come up with an action plan drafted in Paris last year. Many governments, including those that are not part of that region, are interested in hearing more about the progress made in relation to the drafting of the Action Plan. Another issue that might come up, is how the RCPs can take forward the proposals and recommendations they produce. What could the Global Forum learn from regional processes in terms of following-up on certain recommendations? How do governments do that in the regional context? Finally, the Session will try to address the objectives of the RCPs, how they are different from interregional initiatives, and what the different agendas and regional priorities are. The

Global Forum deals with development, but many of the regional processes do not. They mainly focus on migration management and other issues, but not necessarily on development. Even so, the Session will look at how the regional achievements, the regional expertise and capacity that exists can in a way reinforce the capacity of the Global Forum and they can continue working together in a mutually reinforcing way.

Dr. Jenny acknowledged a number of non-governmental actions involved in the preparations in both Roundtable 3 sessions. In Session 3.1, a large number of expert agencies are involved, including UNDESA, the World Bank, OECD, IOM and ILO. Session 3.2 mainly relies on IOM, but is also assisted by ICMPD based in Vienna. The two background papers will be based on the collective inputs and expertise of all these actors.

### **General Discussions on Roundtable 3:**

During the open discussion on RT 3, the representative from **Sweden** announced that it had just taken over the EU Presidency and, in such capacity, intends to work very hard to link the work of the GFMD to the work of the EU and vice-versa. As a general comment, she expressed her belief that the issue of policy coherence and creating synergies between policies indeed forms the foundation for the discussion on migration and development. Regarding Session 3.1, in particular, in order for the survey on policy coherence and its results to be representative and useful to the discussions in Athens, she urged the Coordinator and the Co-Chairs to distribute the survey to all FoFs, citing the survey that Sweden conducted in Brussels and Manila as an example.

**Dr. Jenny** explained that they were hesitant to send the three-page informal inquiry to all governments because, in Manila, the group involved with the Swedish survey concluded not to undertake such a broad survey every year. But he affirmed that the present inquiry would now be sent to all focal points. He invited those who are interested to comment on it, and the team will seek to include these comments as much as possible into the draft of the background paper.

The **IOM** representative then recalled that, at the previous meetings of the Global Forum on the role of RCPs, several governments asked in particular what are the outputs and impacts of the various RCPs. To address precisely this question, the MacArthur foundation has now funded a study, carried out by Professor Randall Hansen from the University of Toronto. Many governments will be contacted to discuss the impacts and outputs of the various regional consultative processes. The results of the study will feed into the Athens discussions.

The **Chair** then thanked all the Co-Chairs and Coordinators for their updates on what is really the heart of the GFMD - the discussions and exchanges on policies and practices. He reminded everyone to respect the deadlines of the preparatory process. Contributions to the Background Papers should have been sent by the end of June to the coordinators and the authors of the Background Papers to enable them to complete their first drafts by 15 July. The Background Papers will be reviewed by the team members and the Chair during July and August. By the end of August, the final Background Papers must be ready for translation.

#### IV. *Follow-up to Manila GFMD*

The Chair declared that the Manila meeting gave a new impulse to the GFMD by expanding on some key debates that begun in Brussels, while also adding a new dimension on human rights and development, and the delivering of some concrete outcomes. He recalled that during the first FoF meeting, he had asked all FoFs to submit to the Chair their evaluation of the Manila meeting - the format, the themes and how it worked, also in terms of outcomes. The Chair had received no responses so far.

Turning to the concrete outcomes from the Manila meeting, the Chair announced that some follow up projects are being implemented as part of the preparatory process in support of the Athens Roundtable sessions. In the spirit of continuity, policy and institutional coherence stays firmly on the agenda and the GFMD continues as a venue for informal exchanges on inter-national fora and initiatives, and regional integration processes. The Manila GFMD also underscored the need to strengthen the GFMD national focal points in order to enhance institutional coherence. This is an ongoing effort, the first step being an up-to-date focal point list. In this regard, he appealed once again to all FoFs to provide the Chair and the Support Unit with updated information on their national focal points in the capitals.

Regarding follow-up projects, some of these are being pursued by individual governments, and linked concretely to the thematic Roundtables in Athens. For example, The Netherlands is funding a study in Bangladesh on ***“Reducing the Cost-burden for Migrant Workers: A Market-based Approach”***, the conclusions of which, if reached on time, will feed into Session 2.1. Similarly, the United Arab Emirates proposed to fund a study on ***“Examining global best practices on the provision of services to protect and empower temporary contractual workers through Migrant Resources Centers”***, to support the discussion of Roundtable 2. The Governments of Australia and Thailand also recently organized a meeting for Heads of Regional Consultative Processes in Bangkok, to share information on migration and development-related activities and achievements. The outcomes of that meeting are expected to add value to Session 3.2 in Athens.

There were two further recommendations in Manila, which the Chair referred to during the first FoF meeting, namely, to set up ad hoc working groups on:

1. Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development; and
2. Data, Research and Policy and Institutional Coherence

According to the GFMD Operating Modalities established in Brussels in 2007, the Steering Group is the only GFMD body with the mandate to create thematic follow-up working groups. The two proposed ad hoc working groups were to be pursued by a number of interested governments and reported on to the Chair. At the meeting held the day before by the Steering Group, it was decided that things have been clarified and the ad hoc working groups could be created. So there are now two ad hoc working groups. The Chair reminded the FoFs how it viewed these working groups: (a) task-oriented, (b) ad-hoc and, as such, limited in time. It should be up to the next Chair to evaluate or assess the usefulness of the ad hoc working groups and see whether their mandate should be renewed. The Chair expects that the individual countries, who will be the “force motrice” of these working groups, will start the work and bring it to a close.

Two government representatives made their comments on the establishment of the ad hoc working groups. One representative expressed sadness that it has taken so long for these groups to be established. He pointed out that the groups should have been

established much earlier, if only we did not look for operating modalities in an informal global dialogue like the GFMD. If a number of countries want to work together, for which no approval is needed, the Chair should just let them work and welcome any inputs which could feed into the Athens GFMD sessions.

Another government asked if the ad hoc working groups were to monitor the implementation of non-binding outcomes that states have volunteered to pursue. The Chair called on the representative of the Philippines to address this concern.

**Ambassador Basilio** first reported that the Philippines is working closely with Argentina, Ecuador, Ghana, Mexico, the Netherlands and the UAE on the ad hoc working group on protecting and empowering migrants. She invited other interested governments to join this ad hoc working group to lend their support in terms of expertise, views and commentaries, which can be exchanged electronically to further the process forward insofar as the outcomes of the Manila GFMD is concerned. The participation in this ad hoc working group is voluntary. She gave assurances that the ad hoc working group will not monitor the implementation in a way that will question, for instance, the prerogatives of governments. Instead, the ad hoc working group would like to encourage partnerships with like-minded states in implementing many of the recommendations of the Manila GFMD.

A delegate asked if the two ad hoc working groups will be responsible for the follow-up to the Manila forum and if they were to be animated by the Philippines. The Chair explained that, in the case of the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering migrants for Development, the driving force is very much the Philippines together with the United Arab Emirates. He thus called on Dr. Jenny to explain the ad hoc Working Group on data coherence.

**Dr. Jenny** confirmed that the Steering Group had endorsed the two ad hoc working groups. Unlike ad hoc Working Group 1, however, the ad hoc Working Group 2 on policy coherence, data and research, linking research with policy coherence, does not yet have any governments that have expressed interest in forming such a group. In terms of responsibility for the group on the protection of migrants, this essentially falls to the co-Chairs, United Arab Emirates and the Philippines. On the other hand, the responsibility will also be with those governments who may, in the coming weeks, show an interest in co-Chairing or participating in group 2 on coherence and data. It would be a separate issue if these groups are going to report in Athens; it will depend on what the groups themselves want to do.

The delegate thought that some sort of assessment should be done on the accomplishment of the Working Group, which can be reported on in Athens, even if merely on a temporary or provisional basis. The Chair concurred in principle with this, but cautioned that he could not commit the next Presidency to the existence of these working groups.

At this point, **future Chair Mexico** recalled that, during the last meeting, the FoFs did not find appropriate to have a working group to do a follow-up on Manila GFMD in general. There was no agreement on an umbrella working group for follow-up of the outcomes. But FoFs supported the idea of allowing the development of a certain number of working groups. These groups might not even necessarily need approval by the Forum inasmuch as interested countries could get together on their own and develop ideas or projects out of the meetings. The Philippines, for example, has proposed an agenda for the working group on protection that could serve as inputs for the Roundtable discussions in Athens. It is not the follow-up on the decisions or the issues that have been raised during the Forum, but rather a development of some ideas, projects and elements that will facilitate further discussions in future meetings. On this understanding, Mexico has supported the revised

proposal presented by the Philippines.

#### **V. *Third GFMD Government Meeting (Athens/ 04-05 November 2009) 1068***

The **Chair** announced that the Athens GFMD Meeting will take place in November, on Wednesday the 4<sup>th</sup> and Thursday the 5<sup>th</sup>. It will be preceded by the Civil Society Days on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> of November. The Government meeting venue will be the “Megaron Moussikis” in central Athens, which has all the necessary facilities for an international meeting of this scale. Registration forms will be available on the website.

At the Athens Meeting, there will be interpretation, both in the Plenary and the Roundtable sessions, from and to English, French and Spanish, as well as Greek as the host country’s language. As far as translation is concerned, documents are being translated into English, French and Greek and are available on the website. The final background papers, the practical information and the agenda, and the Final Report of Athens GFMD will be available in English, French, Greek and Spanish.

The Chair raised the issue of how to promote an interactive dialogue during the discussions in Athens. Citing similar views shared by a number of participating countries, the Chair asked whether there would not be merit in limiting the number of, or even doing away with, the panelists. This proposal should be combined with a balanced and strict co-chairing in order to enhance the interactivity of the dialogue and the fact that interventions will be focused on the topic of the discussion, as well as oriented to the possible deliverables.

A number of views were expressed during the discussion:

1. The Roundtable Co-Chairs, with the assistance of the Coordinators, should be given the flexibility to decide on the panel composition to make the session as interactive and creative as possible. Some topics are better suited to have a small panel presentation before opening the floor for discussion. Other topics are already well-known and the discussion could be opened by asking two or three leading questions.
2. However, while the Forum is intended for practitioners, it is attended by diverse government representatives, which includes not just experts but also politicians and diplomats. In some cases, delegations would like to make a statement. Hence, some combination of interactivity and allowance for statements may seem appropriate. Formal statements could be made at the end, not in the beginning, to avoid any kind of general debate in the beginning of the session. Or, formal statements could be posted on the GFMD website.
3. The Global Forum is not in the UN because we do not have interactive debates in the UN. The idea of the Forum is to do away with all the formal statements that characterize the UN, which impede the possibilities of an interactive debate. We try to bring together the practitioners, policy and decision makers, who are actually dealing with the matters at hand.
4. The Roundtable sessions need to be organized based on a set of criteria to help the Co-Chairs and the Coordinators in putting together the panels.
5. It is also important to look at practicalities such as the set-up of the rooms. Having actual roundtables, for example, may be more helpful by gathering everybody around the table rather than having a panel that speaks to an audience.

6. Coordination is very important. Speakers must keep their interventions to the topic of the session. Also, a conclusion or summary of points raised should be made by a panel member.
7. The background papers are extremely useful tools in order to guide the discussions in Athens. Government teams should look at how to present those papers to be able to kick off the discussions.
8. The Forum should be able to continue its important work at the expert level to enhance the substance in the field of migration and development. As much as possible, participation of politicians should be limited.

The **Chair** thanked the governments that intervened, and expressed agreement on the suggestion to draw up some criteria for the conduct of the Roundtables. He invited the FoFs to submit their ideas as soon as possible before he sends the guidelines.

The morning session ended at 12:45. The Chair announced that there is a lunch reception hosted by the Greek Permanent Mission at the Escargot Bar, and encouraged all to return to the meeting venue at 15.00 hrs.

#### **V. *Civil Society Days***

The **Chair** reconvened the meeting at 15.15 hrs. He reported, in light of interventions by various government representatives during the first FoF meeting, that the Greek Government has initiated a national consultation process, involving governmental and non governmental actors, including the private sector, in order to inform them on the GFMD process and the Greek themes. These actors have been invited to contribute to the preparation of the Greek participation.

Regarding some ideas put forward on how to enhance the interface between governments and Civil Society, non-state agencies – international organizations and other experts – are already an integral part of the government preparations of the Roundtables. They are helping to prepare Background Papers and implement supporting projects, and are providing expert input into the papers and discussions. The outcomes of the Civil Society Days will be reported on at the Athens plenary as happened in the past. In addition, the Chair would propose that the session co-chairs, as well as other interested governments, participate in an interface meeting with the Civil Society.

He reminded the FoFs to send their views on how to organize the interface between governments and Civil Society. He said that the Onassis Foundation has not yet received any input to date.

He then called on Mrs. Marianna Moschou, representative of the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, to update the FoFs on the status of their preparations.

Mrs. Moschou reported on the developments that took place since the first FoF meeting:

- 1) The International Advisory Committee has been constituted, with 21 members that are adequately diversified in gender, geography and sectors. They met in Athens on 22 April and decided both on the applications for the participation process and

criteria for selection, and on the RT themes (which are the same as the government RT themes) and the process for paper writer's selection.

- 2) So far, the Foundation has received about 1,000 applications from 120 countries. The selection process ended on 01 July and the scorings have been submitted to the Foundation. Hopefully, conclusions would be reached by the middle of next week.
- 3) There are adequate applications from development and diaspora organizations, two sectors previously identified as a target in terms of increasing the participation in the Civil Society Days. Special thanks were made to UNITAR and UNDP for their help in this regard.
- 4) The private sector application process has not yet closed. There are two events on 9 July and at the end of August to prepare the private sector for its participation in the GFMD:
  - (a) During the 2nd Euro Med Annual Conference to be hosted in Athens by the Hellenic Federation of Entreprises, there will be a 2-hour session on the theme 'The Development Perspective of Migration in Southern Mediterranean Countries.' The panelists will include Dimitri Papadimitriou from the Migration Policy Institute, Washington, the Vice-President of the Hellenic Federation of Enterprises, a representative from Business Europe and also from the academia.
  - (b) A special workshop on "The Private Sector and International Migration Policy: A Business Roundtable in Preparation for the 3rd GFMD", to be held on August 30-31 in Athens again, is being organized by the Hellenic Migration Policy Institute and the MPI in Washington, and funded by Mac Arthur Foundation. It aims to start the dialogue between policy makers and the private sector in order to promote a greater involvement of business leaders in the global migration debate. It will be attended by a small group of business leaders from industries heavily involved in international migration, together with a limited number of migration policy makers and experts.
- 5) On the agenda themes, 14 paper writers have been selected and are expected to submit their first draft paper by mid July. For each session, there is one academic and one practitioner. There is continuous communication and cooperation between the Civil Society Days (CSD) coordinators and the government meeting coordinators.
- 6) Regarding the interface, the following proposals were proffered to the governments:
  - (a) The Chairs of the CSD Roundtables to be present, as observers and resources, at the Roundtables of the government meeting;
  - (b) A limited number of CSD representatives to be invited to participate in the intergovernmental meetings;
  - (c) The chairs of the government Roundtables to be invited as observers in the CSD Roundtables so that they fully understand what has been discussed and analyzed;
  - (d) A working interface session in the afternoon of the 2nd day, with a limited number of participants from governments, split into three, to discuss the recommendations from the CSD per Roundtable in greater depth; and
  - (e) Civil society delegates to be included in the national consultations initiated by the governments for the preparation of the GFMD.

Before entertaining questions from the floor, Mrs. Moschou asked for some clear indication from the governments on how the above proposals could be implemented.

During the discussion that followed, three governments supported fully the proposal outlined by the Onassis Foundation. They welcomed the active involvement of Civil Society because many of them are working on the ground and, thus, can provide the perspective of those working closely with migrant workers.

However, six governments objected to the idea of inviting civil society delegates into the government meeting to enhance the interface between governments and the Civil Society. They stressed that, while the inputs of the Civil Society are welcome, the Forum was born as an intergovernmental dialogue and it should be kept that way in order to ensure that governments are able to dialogue in a very open and transparent way. Other venues in order to improve the interaction between governments and Civil Society can be explored, such as becoming more active at the national level to involve Civil Society in the preparation of the GFMD. One delegate welcomed the suggestion of Mrs. Moschou to improve the interface by splitting it up into three roundtables. Another delegate expressed the view that inviting experts to take part in the elaboration of the roundtables is already an opportunity to enhance the interaction between governments and Civil Society.

Future Chair **Mexico** observed that the opposition to the participation of the NGOs came mostly from Western colleagues. He urged the Chair to leave this issue open and to explore further the proposal of the Foundation. He thought there was a huge misinterpretation of what a UN meeting was supposed to be, and that there would be no gain in debating further on this issue. We are all members of the UN, and we are trying to build a process that will allow us to build confidence and to identify ways and means to improve our understanding and our support to meet the challenges and the opportunities of migration. The Civil Society, which includes the private sector, is a major actor in this process.

### ***VII. Budget and Fund-raising***

The indicative preliminary budget was restructured following comments by delegations during the first FoF meeting. The **Chair** reassured the FoFs that every possible effort is, and will continue to be, made to keep costs at a minimum. He also reiterated the appeal made by the Chair-in-Office for voluntary contributions to the budget, either earmarked or non-earmarked. Such contributions, financial or in kind, by developed and developing states, not only will confirm their commitment to the GFMD, but will also further foster the independence and co-ownership of the dialogue.

At this stage, the Chair expressed gratitude to all those who have officially made available their financial contributions. He called on those governments that have pledged to contribute to translate it into real funding, as the time to actually commit money for essential expenses such as the travel and participation of developing country delegates is now fast approaching.

Following is the list of countries that have expressed financial support:

1. UK has contributed £25,000, earmarked for assistance with the travelling costs of delegates from developing countries:
2. Spain is willing to contribute 100,000 Euros for assistance with the travelling costs of delegates from developing countries. An exchange of letters is anticipated within the coming weeks:
3. The Secretariat of the ACP Group of States is considering a contribution of \$200,000 for assistance with the travelling costs of delegates from ACP member states:
4. Australia has contributed \$25,000 earmarked towards the fee of an international adviser.

5. The Netherlands and Switzerland have both made in kind contributions in the form of the services of an international adviser each.
6. IOM is also contributing towards the fees of the international adviser supported by Australia.
7. The MacArthur Foundation is in the process of considering an application for a grant of \$100,000 both for the GMFD budget and part of the fee of a GFMD International Taskforce member.

#### **VIII. Any other business**

##### ***Future of the Forum***

The **Chair** explained that, as in the previous meetings, there will be a special session in Athens devoted to the Future of the Forum. The GFMD Operating Modalities were adopted in 2007. The Chair has started reflecting on whether or not developments that have happened since the Brussels GFMD and new perspectives that seem to have emerged warrant a renewed reflection on the future of the process. This reflection, which will have to take the form of a paper in due time, should benefit from both the experience of, and commitment to, the GFMD. He, therefore, appealed to the FoFs to communicate their views to the Chair in writing by the end of July. These inputs can set the framework for a discussion during the next FoF meeting in September, but also constitute an invaluable contribution to the paper on the basis of which the discussions in Athens will take place.

The Chair likewise noted that chairmanship is a key to the sustainability of the Forum. There has been a change of plan for 2010: following Argentina's announcement that it is no longer in a position to host the 4<sup>th</sup> GFMD, Mexico has officially confirmed its readiness to host the fourth GFMD meeting. The Chair welcomed Mexico's offer, as it is in line with the need to ensure respect of geographical balance and rotation between developed and developing countries in the succession of chairmanships.

At this point, a delegate suggested organizing a light evaluation, or a "quick scan" or "take stock" or "point de situation", of the experiences of two and a half or three meetings of the Forum. It was suggested that a simple questionnaire be sent out which would cover different elements of the process as well as its outcomes, and also ask the member-states what policy changes have been done since the inception of the Global Forum. It can be done before or after the Athens GFMD. The result of this "quick scan" could also serve as inputs into the upcoming two or three GFMD meetings before the high level dialogue in 2013.

Seven (7) delegates seconded this proposal to conduct some form of assessment, to define the vision for the overall cycle of GFMD until 2013. Another delegate presented a two-pronged proposal: (1) to structure the three years between Athens and the HLD in 2013 in a way that will allow stronger interaction among GFMD actors, including the RCPs, better preparations, and consultations at the national and regional levels for more substantive inputs into the Forum.; and (2) to have a multi-year program of work for the three coming meetings of the Global Forum starting with Mexico net year. Another delegate followed up this suggestion and pointed out that we need to address the labour market issues in the next three years following the Athens GFMD. Some delegates, however, suggested that such an evaluation take place after the Athens GFMD.

One Observer supported also the proposal for a mid-term review of the Forum, and further suggested to use it as an opportunity to ensure greater participation of the African, Caribbean and Pacific states in the organization and the development of the Forum.

On the other hand, 2 delegates expressed their view that the idea of an interim evaluation might be a little premature because the Forum is still evolving. While one of them was not entirely against the idea, he suggested that the questions to be raised must not compromise the more thorough evaluation process mentioned by Mr. Sutherland, which should take place at the end of the first cycle of the Forum in 2012.

Echoing the comment on whether or not the time is ripe for an evaluation, the **Chair** asked the proponent delegate to submit a proposal prior to the next FoF meeting, which the Chair could consider circulating to all Friends of the Forum. The proposal could include some draft questions that the Friends could discuss and improve on at their next meeting in September.

The Chair then asked for comments on the proposal of Mr. Sutherland to have some rotation mechanism concerning the Steering group composition. A delegate supported this suggestion to ensure that the Steering Group will remain manageable and effective.

### **Support Unit**

The Chair gave an update on the Support Unit. The Support Unit was conceived, among other things, as a potentially valuable tool for the GFMD Chair. As it became operational only on 6 February 2009, the Greek Chair felt that it is at this stage too early to assess either its operation or its usefulness. There was unfortunately no coincidence between the birth of the Support Unit and the start of the Greek Chairmanship. The Chair had already made necessary arrangements. At the moment, the Chair is trying to accommodate the Support Unit's structure, and there is a closer cooperation between the Chair and the Support Unit now compared with what was happening at the beginning. The Chair has consistently tried to have the Support Unit limiting itself to, and operating strictly within, the ambit of its agreed mandate and the consensus that it should be performing administrative tasks only.

The Chair enumerated the salient developments concerning the Support Unit:

- a) **Administrative / Financial Assistant** - The Support Unit is now in the process of recruiting the second person who will act as Assistant to the Head of the Unit. A Notice of Vacancy was posted by the host entity (IOM) from 28 May to 15 June, attracting a total of 71 applications. The next step will be to conduct interviews with the shortlisted candidates. It is planned to have the Assistant in place in August.
- b) **Support Unit budget** – For its first year of operation, the Support Unit budget of \$355,000 has been covered through:
  - (i) a realignment of a CHF 30,000 left-over contribution by Switzerland to the Philippine GFMD;
  - (ii) a realignment of a Euros 100,000 contribution by Greece to the Philippine GFMD;
  - (iii) a realignment of a Euros 40,000 left-over contribution by Denmark to the Philippine GFMD;
  - (iv) a realignment of a Euros 100,000 contribution by Spain to the Philippine GFMD; and
  - (v) a fresh contribution of CHF 30,000 by Switzerland.

To date, the only amount yet to be received is the Spanish contribution which was never actually transferred to the Support Unit bank account handled by IOM due to

bureaucratic reasons. This matter is being dealt with.

The initial/original Support Unit budget that was attached to the MOU was revised in March to reflect more realistically its needs. The total amount has not changed, only sub-parts of it. The budget estimate for the GFMD main portal development is \$20,000. Some additional expense items will be shared by IOM, such as the Administrator cost and purchase of the URL (GFMD portal domain address). However, this amount does not include the costs for translation of the portal into French and Spanish. The Head of the Unit has assured the Chair that she will make an effort to find sources for covering these costs.

- c) **Facilitating financial contributions for GFMD Follow up projects** - The Chair agreed to the request by the Governments of The Netherlands and the United Arab Emirates to use the Support Unit in facilitating the funding for three GFMD follow-up projects in support of the Roundtable 2 preparations.
- d) **GFMD web portal** – The main GFMD website which will be managed and operated by the Support Unit is now being developed, to be launched at the November meeting. In the meantime the Greek website, [www.gfmdathens2009.org](http://www.gfmdathens2009.org), is fully operational and being updated on a regular basis.

Ms. Lajom-Roman, Head of GFMD Support Unit, made a presentation of the proposed sitemap and screenshots of the GFMD web portal.

The Chair called for interventions after the presentation. A number of delegates took the floor and gave their views as follows:

1. One delegate expressed his government's concern that the Support Unit may not have been used in the manner envisaged by the states. The Support Unit could assist in ensuring continuity in the GFMD process. It provides useful support in a situation with rotating Chair arrangements both to the Chair-in-office and to the future Chairs. He encouraged the Chair to consider carefully the assistance that the GFMD Support Unit is able to provide, particularly for administrative matters. The Chair replied that it has already done so.
2. Another delegate agreed with the Chair's observation that it would be difficult to evaluate the work of the Support Unit after less than one year. In that light, he suggested that the Friends of the Forum agree to extend the period of the Support Unit for up to a 2-year period in total. This will allow a decent evaluation of the Support Unit, and also the carry-over efforts that it can give from the Greek presidency to the Mexican one. He also commented that the GFMD web portal should include another objective, which is to support the Chair in its communication and information-dissemination. He also suggested that the next Chair should not start its own website, but rather use the GFMD web portal. This way, the FoFs will have to remember only one mail address and one internet address in working with the GFMD.
3. Two other delegates supported the proposal for an extension of the mandate of the Support Unit up to two years. But a question was made on whose responsibility it would be under - the Greek or the Mexican Chair. Also, it was suggested that the next Chair include the budget for the light Support Unit in the budget for the conference itself.

4. Another delegate saw some contradiction between the proposal for an extension of the Support Unit and the informal nature of the GFMD. He urged the FoFs to be open and to look at how the interaction is going to be between the Support Unit and the Global Migration Group. The Support Unit should not become an institution in itself, and the Forum should not duplicate the institutions, but rely on the existing ones to implement and to follow up the GFMD projects. There is a need first to clarify what has to be the Support Unit's role and actions in support of the Chair and the preparations of the meetings. The Unit still does not even have the full composition that it is supposed to have, so making an evaluation to decide on renewing the unit seems premature. But he did not want to send the message that the Unit might end in February only because of the overlap of presidencies.

The **Chair** clarified that the evaluation was decided upon in Manila at the end of the Special Session on the Future of the Forum. There was reference to the fact that, in one year's time, there would be an evaluation. This did not necessarily mean an institutionalization. While somewhat concerned about the idea of extending its existence, the Chair was open to having an interim evaluation of the Support Unit's operation and usefulness in November. Recognizing the need for a consensus on the matter, he invited the FoFs to submit their views, and include these in the Future of the Forum paper that they were asked to submit to the Chair by the end of July. He understood that there is already some confusion because the presidency started in mid-December and will probably end mid-December, but the Support Unit started early February.

5. One delegate, however, pointed out that there is no link between the GMG and the work of the Support Unit. During the discussions in the setting up of the Support Unit, it was decided that it would not be a good idea to link the Support Unit to the GMG. The hosting of the Support Unit by IOM is one thing, which is completely separate from the GMG. The GMG is doing its best to come up with good participation in the Global Forum by offering the works of its member agencies on migration issues, but the GMG should not be involved in the discussion of the administrative support of the Global Forum process.

The Chair closed the meeting at 1715 hrs. He thanked the FoFs for their active participation and looked forward to the next FoF meeting on 18 September 2009.