

ATHENS GFMD 2009

Roundtable 3: Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships (Coordinator: Dr. R.K Jenny)

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

Background Paper ¹

Executive Summary

GFMD Athens Roundtable session 3.1 will offer the opportunity for governments to:

- discuss the supporting role of data and research findings for coherent and effective policies on migration and development, including those relating to Athens GFMD Roundtables (RTs) 1 and 2;
- report on and discuss concrete progress made by governments in promoting greater policy and institutional coherence on migration and development, including obstacles to achieving such coherence and assessment mechanisms;
- in the context of intra-governmental institutional arrangements, review the role and usefulness of the GFMD national focal points; and
- address some new developments in the context of policy coherence and related activities.

The working paper supports the preparation and discussion on these issues in RT 3.1 on Policy and Institutional Coherence – Latest Data and Research Findings. The paper includes input by governments, non-governmental experts and international agencies on recent progress made in the above areas, while at the same providing some new information and conceptual comments on issues of policy coherence and related research priorities and findings, including those that are relevant for the Athens GFMD overarching theme ‘Integrating migration policies into development strategies for the benefit of all’. The paper also benefited from discussion with governmental and non-governmental experts at a meeting in

¹ The 3.1 background paper has been drafted by Prof. Susan Martin, Georgetown University, Washington, in consultation with the GFMD Athens Roundtable 3 coordinator Dr. R.K. Jenny and the Roundtable session 3.1 co-chairs Morocco and Switzerland. It also draws on comments and input from the RT 3.1 team government members and other governments, as well as from input by international organizations and non-governmental experts. The aim of the paper is to inform and facilitate the discussion of Roundtable session 3.1 during the Athens GFMD meeting in November 2009. It is not exhaustive in its treatment of the RT 3.1 theme, and does not necessarily reflect the views of the GFMD organizers, or the governments or organizations involved in the GFMD process. Any reproduction, in part or whole, of this document, should cite the source.

Vienna on 15 and 16 June 2009, supported by the Government of Finland and chaired by the co-Chairs of RT 3.1. The paper also places emphasis on recent policies and practices by governments and other actors in these areas, *inter alia* based on the responses to the ‘Informal inquiry on policy and institutional coherence’ (3.1 informal inquiry) with a number of GFMD participating governments in the context of RT 3.1 (See Annex 1).

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1.1. Rationale

Data and research findings are essential for governments to develop and implement evidence-based, effective and coherent policies, programs and practices in the fields of migration and development. Informed decision-making by governments should be based on reliable evidence, and the inter-connection between data, research and coherent policy-making needs to be better apprehended. This is also relevant for Athens RT sessions 1.1 and 1.3 on ‘mainstreaming migration into development strategies’, and ‘addressing the root causes of migration through development, specifically in the light of the current global economic crisis.’

The 2008 GFMD Manila specifically emphasized the need to improve data and research on migration and development to support greater policy and institutional coherence, building *inter alia* on the Brussels GFMD and the recommendations of a data and research expert meeting in Helsinki held in October 2008.² Manila underlined the need for more raw data on the scale and nature of migration flows as well as better analysis of the policies, causes and impacts of migration and its linkages with development. Specific priorities mentioned were: clearer definitions of the terminology and concepts around migration; greater comparability of data across countries; and making existing and new data and research outcomes more accessible to governments to develop effective and coherent policies. Particular attention was given to the inclusion of appropriate migration questions in the 2010 round of national censuses.

In terms of policy, program and institutional coherence Manila underscored the need to move from rhetoric to implementing initiatives to increase such coherence within government and between government and non-state actors, and between the many different *fora* working on migration and development. Intra-governmental coordination and the role of the national GFMD focal points were discussed, and related capacity building and information sharing were highlighted. The need for timely and better assessment of the impact of policies, programs and institutional arrangements was also stressed.

In Manila, governments also recognized the *technical, political and financial obstacles to achieving greater policy and institutional coherence*, and that data and research are often not relied upon as governments do not prioritize data collection or cooperation on data exchange on issues related to migration and development.³ The resources dedicated to this area are generally inadequate to achieve

² The experts in Helsinki identified the following priorities: understanding the impacts of migration on development; understanding future migration trends, including the impact of economic crises, climate change, food insecurity and conflict; assessment of policy impacts; south-south migration; the role of diaspora communities; and the need to improve the coverage, comparability and timeliness of migration data, with particular focus on national censuses, administrative data related to migration flows, and labour force surveys.

³ The informal expert group in Vienna identified a number of the obstacles to coherent policymaking by governments: lack of data and related mechanisms needed for policy making; lack of coordination within governments between migration and development actors; lack of political will to tackle many of the controversial issues raised by migration and development, particularly given antipathy towards migration seen in public opinion polls and other manifestations of public concerns; conflicts –often legitimate– between policies based on the national interests of destination countries and the development interests of source countries, particularly those related to brain drain resulting from high skilled migration; and lack of effective lobbying groups to support innovative policies on migration and development. A High-Level Parliamentary Conference on Policy Coherence for Development and Migration, organised jointly by the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in November also concluded there are inherent tensions between migration and policy frameworks (for example, the tension between offering migrants a path to citizenship in host countries versus promoting circular migration – which limits the possibilities for integration. Another is the tension between reducing poverty in

coherence. Institutional structures for ensuring a ‘whole of government’ approach to migration and development are still in their infancy or non-existent. Questions still abound as to whether migration is an appropriate issue to be considered within the development domain, with even less agreement as to whether development of source countries should be considered at all in migration policy formulation in destination countries. Examples of *incoherence* between migration and development goals and objectives are easily identified; best practices in coherent policy making are fewer to be found.

Yet, both the Brussels and Manila GFMD emphasized that governments recognize the need for more coherent approaches, giving priority to these issues at each subsequent GFMD meeting.

This paper discusses progress in achieving the goals set out in previous GFMD meetings as well as limitations and obstacles faced by governments. After a brief discussion of definitions, assumptions and objectives, the paper discusses policies and practices adopted by source countries and destination countries of migrants. Section 2.1 focuses particularly on integration of migration into the planning processes underway to promote sustainable development and economic growth, and briefly comments on how development can affect migration patterns and on the challenge of integrating development objectives into the dialogue on migration. Progress and limitations in collecting and analyzing data to inform policy and practices follows in section 2.2. Available data and research are assessed to determine their utility in advancing policy and institutional coherence. Section 3 presents suggestions and proposals to policy makers, and Section 4 presents questions and possible outcomes for further discussion in Athens.

1.2. Definitions

This paper uses the same definition of policy and institutional coherence utilized in previous working papers for the GFMD. The 2007/2008 Swedish GFMD survey background paper described policy coherence “as the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions across government departments and agencies, as well as the promotion of synergies between migration and development policies.” Institutional coherence involves “the establishment of clear organizational responsibilities and focal points for promulgating and implementing migration and development policies and programs, manifesting itself in a ‘whole of government’ approach to these complex issues”.

In discussing migration, the paper focuses primarily on movements across international borders, but it recognizes that internal movements may be closely related to international movements, particularly when they are generated by the same factors or one (internal) leads to the other (international). In defining development, we use the 2005 World Summit concept of the “three components of sustainable development — economic development, social development and environmental protection — as interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars. Poverty eradication, changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development are overarching objectives of and essential requirements for sustainable development.” In this sense, development encompasses the *Millennium Development Goals* but goes beyond them. The paper assumes a two way relationship between migration and development: *development affects migration patterns and migration, in turn, affects development*.⁴

the poorest countries – from which, generally speaking, few people migrate to OECD countries – and reducing poverty in migrants’ regions of origin, which tend to be in middle-income countries).

⁴ The two way direction is an important point to keep in mind in the GFMD discussions. In its response to the 3.1 informal inquiry, one country stated that it does not “apply a ‘migration and development’ approach in the implementation of its policies and programmes,” but it went on to say that development is the best way to prevent economic migration by creating job opportunities in the origin communities and described programmes to combine and coordinate migrants’ resources with government funds to develop community and infrastructure projects. Both of these approaches (addressing the root causes of migration and working with migrants to develop communities) would fall within the paper’s concept of coherent migration and development policies. In discussing these inter-linkages, the paper further recognizes the complex interplay between development and migration. For example, although increasing economic opportunities at home may reduce emigration pressures in the longer-term, as the above quote indicates, such improvements may increase movements in the short to medium term as would-be migrants gain financial resources, knowledge and the human capital needed to migrate in search of even greater economic gains (the so-called migration hump theory).

The Accra Agenda for Action on aid effectiveness emphasized the importance of transparency and accountability. Achieving effective and coherent policies and programs requires credible data on migration and its inter-relationship with development as well as the research tools necessary to analyze trends and impacts. Data may be derived from national Censuses, specialized labour force and household surveys, administrative data, and qualitative tools that include in-depth interviews, focus groups and observations. Each has an important role to play in providing greater understanding of trends in migration (stock, out-flows, in-flows, return, etc.), trends in remittance flows and other contributions by migrants and diasporas, characteristics of migrants, impacts of migrants on development of countries of origin and countries of destination, impacts of migration policies on migration flows, stocks and experiences/impact of migrants; impacts of migration on development outcomes; and impact of development processes on migration trends. The quantitative data provide for trend and impact analyses whereas qualitative data often help identify the factors that explain these trends (going beyond economic, political and security factors to include anthropological considerations and identify other cultural and social motivations). Both are needed to ensure that policies take into account current realities while anticipating future factors that will affect migration and development. Of particular importance, as emphasized in Manila, is the collection and analysis of data that *will help governments “know what policies work, and don’t work, in promoting development, and how policy-relevant information and evidence can support this.”*

1.3. Assumptions

This paper is based on two major assumptions:

- a) Policy-makers in the field of development and migration require up-dated, relevant and easily accessible evidence that can support their policies and practices.
- b) For this purpose the interface between migration and development experts and governments is essential and needs strengthening.

1.4 Objectives

- a) Create a better understanding among governments of the significance of policy-relevant research and evidence that can support good and coherent policy making in the areas of development and migration.
- b) Report and discuss selected outcomes of the Manila GFMD in the context of policy and institutional coherence, and data and research.
- c) Take stock of the current role and responsibility of the national GFMD focal points as an integral part of national coordination in the field of migration and development and discuss other government arrangements for such coordination
- d) Provide specific input to other Athens roundtables.

2. POLICIES AND PRACTICES

This section discusses:

- Recent developments, including progress and obstacles encountered, in working towards policy and programmatic coherence, such as continued progress in incorporating migration issues into poverty reduction strategies, national development plans and donor development policies and programs; as well as other recent initiatives;
- Recent practices concerning institutional coherence within government (‘whole-of-government’ approach), including the creation of coordination mechanisms and the role of the national GFMD focal points as an integral part of such intra-governmental consultation and coordination;

- Progress in improving data and analyses on the scale, nature, causes and impacts of migration, including progress in incorporating migration questions into the 2010 round of national censuses; latest research priorities and findings that are relevant to the causes and impacts of migration; and utility of Migration Profiles (cf. page 10 ff.) as a tool for policy development.

The 3.1 informal inquiry demonstrated that most of the surveyed governments have made recent efforts to develop new or refine existing policies and programmes that reflect a coherent approach to migration and development, as shown in Table 1. A majority of the respondents reported that the GFMD discussions had contributed to these actions, as follows:

	YES	NO	not applicable or no response
NEW POLICIES	10	9	1
REFINED POLICIES	15	4	1
GFMD CONTRIBUTED	12	6	2

2.1 Developments in policy and programmatic coherence

A number of key strategy documents provide a basis for integrating migration into development policy and practice, including 1) Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), 2) National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and other climate change planning documents, 3) donor policies and programmes, and 4) mid-term reviews of progress in achieving Millennium Development Goals.⁵ The section focuses primarily on progress in incorporating migration into the poverty reduction strategies and national adaptation programmes of action adopted by developing countries to address future development challenges. Government responses to the 3.1 informal enquiries are also taken into account.

2.1.1 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) - Incorporating migration into development strategies, policies and programs

Since the preparation of the GFMD Manila background paper in summer 2008, 15 countries have submitted new Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (6) or presented a review of their existing strategies (9). Annex II.1 offers detailed comments on those countries with new PRSPs, examining four countries with significant levels of labour emigration (Albania, Armenia, Laos and Tajikistan) and two experiencing post-conflict return and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons (Liberia and Cote d'Ivoire) as illustrations of how migration is treated in the PRSPs.⁶ The strategies focus on five principal issues: recognizing the importance of migration to development; ensuring legal avenues for migration; protecting the rights of migrants at home and abroad; enlisting the support of migrants and Diasporas in development planning and programming; and mobilizing the human resources of return migrants. The countries with principally labour-oriented emigration focused particularly on regulating flows of labour migrants to deter irregular migration and facilitate legal movements; attracting investment funds from Diasporas and return migrants; and establishing institutional capacity to address migration issues. Countries with sizeable refugee and displaced populations are also focused on their diasporas, particularly bringing back skilled migrants for government service and business investment, but these countries are equally concerned with reintegration of returnees in their home communities and in addressing the social and other service needs of those who remain displaced, particularly in large urban areas.

The 3.1 informal inquiry also identified a number of planning efforts now underway to integrate migration more fully into national development plans. For example, migration and development will be an integral

⁵ Further information about these documents can be found in Annex II.

⁶ Laos' PRSP has not been included in this analysis as its primary focus on migration is on internal movements. There is one reference to remittances in the document but not a sufficiently developed discussion to warrant inclusion in this analysis.

part of Jamaica's National Population Plan 2030 as well as its wider National Development Plan 2030. Similarly, Ghana intends to take a coherent approach to migration and development in its National Long Term Development Framework. Mauritius has integrated circular migration into its national development strategy. Colombia has developed a Comprehensive Migration Policy that takes into account services for Colombians abroad, the Return Positive Plan (to make better use of the skills that Colombians acquire abroad), data collection, and other activities.

2.1.2 National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs)

Migration issues are also discussed in National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), which are the principal frameworks adopted by least developed countries to manage environmentally-induced migration. As of October 2008, 38 countries had submitted plans⁷. Repeatedly, countries reference that loss of habitat and livelihoods could precipitate large scale migration, particularly from coastal areas that may be affected by rising sea levels and from areas susceptible to increased drought, flooding or other environmental hazards that will affect agriculture. A number of NAPAs link climate change to the intensification of natural disasters that displace large numbers, often in emergency circumstances. The majority of NAPAs see the adaptation strategies they describe as ways to reduce migration pressures and allow people to remain in their original settlements. In some cases, the NAPA identifies migration as an adaptation strategy in itself. This perspective appears in two contexts. First, some countries see migration as a way to reduce population pressures in places with fragile eco-systems. Second, countries recognize that resettlement of some populations may be inevitable, given the likely trends, but should be accomplished with planning. Most of the NAPAs reviewed for this paper do not set out a process of consultation with the populations that may need to relocate. An exception is the NAPA prepared by Solomon Islands. The Human Settlement project envisions that the communities themselves will be deeply involved in adaptation assessments. Interestingly, a review of the climate change strategies adopted by three of the largest mid-income source countries of migration—Mexico, India and China—found few references to migration as a consequence of or adaptation mechanism in addressing environmental hazards. This finding was surprising because there is a sizeable academic literature discussing environmentally-induced migration in each of these countries.

2.1.3 Mid-Term Reviews of the Millennium Development Goals

Migration received scant attention in the mid-term review of achievement of the Millennium Development Goals even though international movements of people affect the MDG outcomes. As Robert Lucas describes, "Perhaps the most obvious links between migration and the MDG are with goals of poverty eradication and partnerships for development, though education and gender issues certainly overlap substantially with the migration-remittance nexus, while aspects of health and the environment are also touched by the migration process."⁸

The 2008 and 2009 UN reports on progress in achieving the MDGs⁹ made mention of internal migration as a factor in explaining increasing urban poverty and addressed refugees and conflict-induced displacement in relationship to poverty, education, women's political participation and health care, but it did not discuss other areas in which migration might positively or negatively affect achievement of the goals (e.g., migration of health professionals, diaspora support for education and health care programs, or remittances). A review of recent country reports on the MDGs reveals the same problem, with only a few

⁷See Annex II.2 of the paper for a more detailed discussion of the NAPAs.

⁸Robert E.B. Lucas, Integrating Migration Issues into Development Planning, International Migration Papers #93, International Labor Organization available at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/imp/imp93.pdf>

⁹The 2008 report is available at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/The%20Millennium%20Development%20Goals%20Report%202008.pdf>
The 2009 report is available at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/MDG%20Report%202009%20ENG.pdf>

countries identifying issues related to migration as factors in achieving the goals.¹⁰ Lucas also notes that the countries he studied (Lesotho, Moldova, Nepal and Pakistan) paid greater attention to migration in PRSPs than in the MDG mid term reviews, even though both processes are essential tools for reducing poverty and improving lives.¹¹

2.1.4 Donor Policies

In keeping with the Athens overarching theme, this paper focuses upon the ways in which donor governments are integrating migration into the policies and programs that are most directly related to achieving sustainable development. A number of donors have adopted or refined migration and development policies. For example, the Netherlands issued a new policy memorandum in July 2008, which aims to focus more attention “on migration in the development dialogue and on development in the migration dialogue.” Norway adopted two white papers in 2009 on development cooperation and foreign affairs which reflect a coherent approach to migration and development. Also in 2009, Sweden identified a new goal for its migration policy, namely to acknowledge and foster the development effects of migration. The United Kingdom’s White Paper on “Making Governance Work for the Poor” committed to monitoring the effects of the UK’s migration policies on development. In the 3.1 informal inquiry responses, a number of governments (for example, Australia, Canada and South Africa) also indicated that they take into account the impact of in-migration on their own economic growth. Under the French Presidency, the European Union adopted the European Pact on Migration and Asylum, which includes a commitment to establishing partnerships with countries of origin to identify synergies between migration and development.

In addition, donors, individually and collectively, have implemented new programs, including pilots, to foster the development benefits of migration. For example, Australia adopted the “Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme” to test whether labour mobility can assist its Pacific neighbours achieve shared economic development objectives, signing Memorandum of Understanding with Vanuatu, Tonga and Kiribati in November 2008. Norway launched a pilot project for development cooperation between government authorities and Diasporas. The Swiss government is elaborating a *global program Migration* which aims at supporting projects and activities in several thematic areas, including protection, rights and primary health care for migrants; contribution to the bilateral Swiss migration dialogue; migration and conflict in fragile states and regions of conflict; synergies with the global programs food security, climate change and water initiatives; migration and development; and contribution to the multilateral migration dialogue. Other recent governmental initiatives include multi-donor funded programs to build the capacity of civil society groups and local governments to implement migration and development programs; facilitate remittance flows and diaspora investment; and improve the knowledge base on migration and development.¹²

The development implications of immigration into destination countries are also taken into account in policy formulation. For example, Australia points out that the contribution of migration to Australia’s development has not come about by chance; it is the result of coherent and comprehensive migration policies. Australia plans the levels and different types of migration, which is based on research about the impacts of different forms of migration and broad consultation with the community and specific stakeholders such as industry and education providers. South Africa’s Immigration Act notes that the economic prosperity of the Republic of South Africa (RSA) is inextricably linked to the contribution of foreigners and thus sets policy parameters to promote growth and investment by attracting foreign labour to the RSA.

¹⁰In its 2008 review, Sri Lanka referenced remittances as a source of foreign exchange proceeds for meeting external debt service obligations and described conflict-induced displaced persons as an at risk population that poses challenges for poverty reduction.

¹¹Lucas, Integrating Migration Issues into Development Planning

¹² See Annex II.3 of the paper for a more detailed discussion of donor policies.

2.2 Institutional coherence on migration and development within government, including the role of national GFMD focal points

2.2.1 Inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration

GFMD Brussels and Manila recognized that a ‘whole of government’ approach to migration and development would help ensure the promulgation and implementation of coherent policies and programs. A broad range of stakeholders within and outside of government intersect with migration and development issues, including ministries responsible for foreign affairs, development cooperation, immigration and emigration, labour, trade, health, education and social services.

In the 3.1 informal inquiry, a large majority of governments indicated that there was a particular government unit or department responsible for facilitating and coordinating planning and work on migration and development. In most cases, the GFMD focal point was located in the responsible agency for intra-governmental facilitation and coordination. A majority of governments had not taken steps to reinforce the GFMD focal points:

	YES	NO	not applicable or no response
FOCAL POINT FOR COORDINATION	16	2	2
GFMD FOCAL POINT FOR NATIONAL COORDINATION	11	7	2
STRENGTHEN GFMD FOCAL POINT	6	12	2

The 3.1 informal inquiry revealed a number of initiatives aimed at ensuring national coordination and collaboration.¹³ The locus of responsibility differs but in each case, the focus is on ensuring that a broad base of stakeholders is consulted about new policies and programs. Australia, for example, has established an interdepartmental committee specifically related to its Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme. In Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Canadian International Development Agency and other government agencies initiate and coordinate government-wide consultations on specific issues. Costa Rica has given responsibility to the General Directorate of Migration Planning Unit to encourage coordination among Ministry of Interior, Foreign Affairs, International Organization for Migration and other relevant stakeholders. In Mauritius, the Prime Minister’s Office (Home Affairs Division) is the national focal point for coordination of migration policies, working with several ministries. Ghana has encouraged ministries and agencies (Interior, Foreign Affairs, Labour, etc.) to set up migration units/focal points¹⁴; the National Development Planning Commission, which has principal responsibility for preparing the 2010 medium term development plan, has responsibility for ensuring consultations with major stakeholders regarding the migration component of the plan. In the Netherlands, the International Migration Cluster in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for coordinating policies. In South Africa, the Directorate of Immigration Policy and Directives is charged with responsibility for developing policies on migration and development. In Sweden, the Minister for Development Cooperation is responsible for coordinating implementation of the entire policy within Government.¹⁵ In the United Kingdom, the Department for

¹³ See Annex 1 of the paper for more information.

¹⁴ According to the International Labour Organization, a number of other countries have established such focal points, including Nigeria, Jordan, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

¹⁵ While most of the responses focused on ministerial activities, the Swedish government described an innovative effort to gain Parliamentary support for more coherent migration and development policies. On July 2, 2009, the Swedish Government appointed a parliamentary committee that has been tasked with examining how increased mobility to and from Sweden can be facilitated, and how the positive development potential of this mobility can be promoted. The committee will: 1) map examples of circular migration to and from Sweden and point out if and where more research is needed; 2) analyze positive and potential negative effects of circular migration to and from Sweden; 3) analyze how migration policy, development policy and a number of other policy areas affect migrants opportunities/possibilities to engage in circular migration and/or voluntary return; 4) propose measures that are deemed necessary to facilitate circular migration to and from Sweden and to maximize its development potential. It is hoped that the committee’s work will further strengthen policy and institutional coherence in the field of migration and development.

International Development is the focal point on migration and development. In June 2009, the Swiss government appointed a special Ambassador for International Migration in the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) to facilitate the establishment of a common framework around coherence within all Federal Offices concerned with migration issues.

2.2.2 Collaboration with Migrants Abroad

Since the GFMD process began, a number of countries have established ministries or other bureaus responsible for relations with their diasporas. In February 2008, for example, Georgia established the State Ministry for Diaspora Issues. In October 2008, the Armenian government launched its Ministry of Diasporas, as one of 18 government ministries. The 3.1 informal inquiry indicated that a number of governments have taken steps to strengthen their relations with the diaspora. For example, the Colombia Nos Une (Colombia Unites Us) program, created within the framework of the National Development Plan for 2002-2006 was reinforced by the 2006-2010 National Development Plan and Vision Colombia 2019.

Establishing the means to reach out to the diaspora has been of particular concern to countries recovering from conflict. After the 2007 Sierra Leone elections, the newly elected President held consultations with the diaspora, leading to the establishment of the Office of the Diaspora in the Office of the President. The main focus is to address critical capacity gaps in the government by bringing Diaspora professionals and other experts from the South to deliver results in specific areas. The Transitional Government of Somalia established a Ministry for Diaspora and Community Affairs in 2009. The ministry is engaging in consultations with members of the diaspora, having already organized meetings in the United States and Canada. The ministry envisages departments responsible for promoting language and cultural heritage as well as financial and human resource support for Somalia. Reversing the brain drain is a major priority of the new ministry.

2.3 Data and Analysis of Migration Trend, Impacts and Policies

During the past decade, much progress has been made in the collection and dissemination of data on international migration and its relevance for development. Among the most noteworthy developments are the UN Population Division’s Global Migration Database and Trends in Total Migration Stock database, the World Bank’s data on remittances and tabulations on high skilled migration, south-south migration and migrant origin database; the International Labour Organization’s International Labour Migration database; and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s “International Migration Data” with standardized flow statistics into OECD countries.

	YES	NO	not applicable or no response
MAKE USE OF RESEARCH AND DATA IN POLICY FORMULATION	13	4	3
ACCESS TO RELEVANT DATA AND RESEARCH	12	5	3

The 3.1 informal inquiry indicated that most of the governments have access to and make use of policy-relevant research and data to formulate coherent policies on migration and development. The respondents reported on a number of innovative ways to gain access to the needed information. The United Kingdom appointed a senior academic with a migration and development specialization to serve as Senior Research Fellow, working part-time in DFID. Australia undertakes longitudinal surveys to measure the impact of migration and has funded the Global Development Network’s “Development on the Move: Measuring and Optimising the Economic and Social Impacts of Migration” project. The Colombia Unites Us project has worked with universities, international organizations, the national administrative department of statistics, and an inter-departmental committee to design and analyze surveys on remittances and migrants abroad. Jamaica’s has benefited from collaboration between the Population Unit of the Planning Institute of Jamaica and the Social Policy and Planning Division to undertake studies on such issues as brain drain,

policies and legislation on migration, and remittances that will be used in developing the National Population Plan 2030.

Yet, many questions regarding international migration still cannot be answered with existing data and research, including some of those with greatest policy impact, such as reasons for migration, rates of return migration, numbers and characteristics of unauthorized migrants, etc. Moreover, further progress is needed in ensuring access to comparable data in a timely manner.

The Vienna expert meeting reviewed several initiatives aimed at redressing some of the gaps in international migration data and analysis, including the development of migration profiles, the recommendations of the Commission on Migration Data for Development Research, efforts to incorporate migration related questions into the round of 2010 Censuses, and efforts to incorporate migration questions into other household surveys.

2.3.1 Meeting of the Informal Expert Group in Vienna

The 15-16 June 2009 meeting in Vienna gathered both government and non-governmental experts.¹⁶ The meeting placed particular focus on the need to *improve the coverage, comparability and timeliness of migration data*. The experts also reiterated that the *2010 round of Censuses* provide an opportunity to significantly improve migration-related data and urged the further and better use and *sharing of administrative data* (migration-specific as well as other demographic and economic data, such as birth registrations and tax records) and the incorporation of migration modules into existing *labour force surveys, demographic and health surveys*, and Living Standards Measurement Study Surveys and Household Surveys, citing some progress in these regards.¹⁷ The experts stressed the need for *data sharing at the national, bilateral, regional and global levels*, referencing the Suitland Working Group Meeting on Using Household Surveys to Measure Migration and the Size, Distribution, and Characteristics of Migrant Populations as an important mechanism for improving migration data (see below). The group also discussed the need to establish metrics and criteria for judging the effectiveness of migration and development policies and programs, citing the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The group endorsed the recommendations of the Center for Global Development's Commission on Migration Data for Development Research (see below) as an appropriate framework for improving data that is needed to achieve policy coherence.

2.3.2 Migration Profiles to identify data gaps and as tools to promote greater policy coherence

Conceived and promoted by the European Commission, the migration profiles provide a series of statistical information, including numbers of immigrants, presence of refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons; numbers of emigrants and levels of remittances. They also discuss the quality of these data. The migration profiles are implemented by the concerned countries as a national policy exercise. The international community supports the governmental process in the initial stages. With regard to policy and institutional coherence, the profiles provide information about the ministries responsible for migration policy (including border management); contacts with expatriate community; migration policies in place (including those related to labour mobility and legal migration, return policies and diaspora issues); the international legal frameworks in place, including signature of key international treaties on migration, bilateral and multi-lateral agreements relevant to migration (labour agreements, readmission agreements etc); illegal migration routes (including smuggling of human beings), policies to

¹⁶ The meeting reiterated the importance of the recommendations made by the 2008 Helsinki expert meeting and the date and research discussion outcomes of GFMD Manila 2008.

¹⁷ Such as the incorporation of migration modules in Ghana's labour force survey, and Mexico's household survey which has a rotating panel that permits the collection of useful data on migration patterns (in the second to fifth interview, data are collected for new residents, by birth or immigration; for immigrants, data are collected on state or country of origin also; for lost residents, by death or emigration; for emigrants, state or country of destination, for both types of migrants, cause of migration).

address illegal migration, the existence of human trafficking networks, and policies to address trafficking with an emphasis on trafficking of women and children; But most prominently, the profiles provide information relevant to the migration and development discussions, focusing on labour market analysis, giving information on skill shortages by sector, profession and region, discussing the impact of e.g. trade, economic or education policies on migration, presenting policies to address brain drain or brain waste; and informing about projects and programmes on migration and development and information on who funds and implements them.

The profiles provide a useful source of information for policy purposes. The main problem with the data presented is the timeliness of the information, reflecting the difficulty of obtaining current data on immigration and emigration. The profiles generally use stock data of immigrants compiled by the UN Population Division (from the 2005 estimates). Emigrant stock data are drawn from national censuses of major destination countries, when such data are available and the 2007 Bilateral Database on Migrant Stocks produced by Ratha and Shaw (2007) from the Development Prospects Group of the World Bank. The profiles also use administrative data on immigration, when available, and specialized surveys. Remittance data generally comes from two sources: international remittance information gathered from the World Bank and national remittance data from the national central banks of the countries analyzed. The work to date on migration profiles makes a cogent argument for improvements in data collection on the major issues covered in the profiles. It would also be necessary to increase sustainability of the profiles as a relevant policy tool by ensuring regular updates.

2.3.2 Recommendations of the Commission on Migration Data for Development Research

As discussed above, the Vienna Experts Meeting endorsed the recommendations of the Center for Global Development's Commission on Migration Data for Development Research. The Commission recommended five immediate steps to improve data. These include: incorporating migration questions into censuses, better use of administrative data, consolidating labour force survey data from OECD countries, provide access to micro-data, and adding migration modules to existing household surveys. Of particular importance is the Commission's recommendation for longer term progress in improving data and research—the need to build institutional capacity in developing countries for the collection of data through Censuses, administrative data and household surveys.

2.3.3 Incorporating Migration into 2010 Censuses

Incorporating a fuller set of questions on migration into the 2010 round of Censuses was recommended in the Manila GFMD and the need has since been re-stated by the CGD Commission and by the Vienna Expert Group. In 2007, the United Nations recommended that the 2010 round of Censuses include questions on country of birth, country of citizenship, and year of arrival as well as place of previous residence (generally one and/or five years ago).¹⁸ The UN also recommends that countries with significant levels of international migration ask questions about parents' country of birth in order to obtain information about the second generation, persons born of immigrant parents.

While the 2010 round of Censuses are already underway, efforts have been taken to provide training and technical assistance to national statistical agencies regarding the incorporation of migration questions into the Censuses. For examples, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Statistical Division, held a Regional Training Workshop on Population and Housing Censuses for South Eastern European Countries and presented on migration topics to include in censuses. IOM has had a project in Thailand to help incorporate migrant populations into the Census. [other examples would be welcome]

As of November 2008, of the 48 censuses with questionnaires available for examination, 38 asked detailed questions about country of birth (that is, ones that allowed for designation of a specific other country), 10 had detailed questions about previous residence one year ago, 28 about previous residence 5 years ago,

¹⁸ <http://www.unescap.org/stat/disability/census-ws/UN-Global-Recommendations-Census.pdf>

and 7 about both 1 and 5 years ago. An additional 4 countries asked for partial information about country of birth (that is, yes or no or aggregations of regions).¹⁹

2.3.4 Incorporating Migration into Household Surveys

As discussed above, the Suitland Working Group has convened to discuss ways to improve the use of household surveys to measure migration. At a meeting in March 2009, the Working Group set out its objective to produce a series of products that provide various agencies (e.g., national statistical agencies, international organizations, NGOs, universities, etc.) in both developed and developing countries with practical guidance on how to best use household surveys – possibly combined with other sources – to measure levels and outcomes of international migration and the characteristics of migrant populations. The Working Group will focus its efforts on: facilitating international collaboration and the consolidation of existing knowledge, through forums such as conferences and the coordination and monitoring of research projects; developing a research agenda focusing on methodological issues where no clear guidance exists; and creating products (e.g., handbooks on best practices, questionnaire modules, white papers, technical reports, literature reviews, guidelines/standards, web sites, etc.) accessible to the widest audience possible. The Suitland Group includes representatives from the U.S. Census Bureau, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), Eurostat, the United Nations Population Division, Office for National Statistics (United Kingdom), representatives from such source countries as Morocco, Mexico, and Lebanon, and demographers from academia and think tanks.

3. SUGGESTIONS AND PROPOSALS TO POLICY MAKERS

3.1 Remaining/emerging challenges and issues

This brief review of developments related to policy coherence, institutional coordination and data and research indicates that there are a range of issues and challenges raised in Brussels and Manila that remain of concern.

A first challenge is how to fill knowledge gaps concerning the migration-development nexus, including how to address these gaps on the basis of up-dated and easily accessible data and relevant research findings and what mechanism are required for governments to have ongoing and easy access to such priority data and research findings.

In terms of policy and institutional coherence, how to move ‘from rhetoric to implementation’ remains a key challenge. Many governments have stepped up their efforts to work towards more coherence in policy and institutional cooperation within and amongst governments, and with non-governmental partners. But they are also faced with often legitimate conflicting interests between national and international priority areas, and with institutional barriers at the national level, a situation which requires continued analysis and political will to enhance the degree of national and international coherence on migration and development

Furthermore, the development and implementation of evidence-based, effective and coherent policies and practices need to be based on a better apprehension of the importance of priority data and research findings.

Yet another critical aspect is how to assess effectively institutional coherence and related intra-governmental arrangements, including efficiency/effectiveness indicators; how to engage non-governmental experts, practitioners and migrants themselves in national policy development; and how to strengthen intra-governmental coordination and the role of the GFMD focal points.

¹⁹ Data provided by UN Population Division to the Commission on Migration Data for Development Research, p. 13.

At the same time, new issues are emerging, most notably how to address the impact on migration and development of such ‘shocks’ as the global economic crisis, climate change and environmental hazards, natural disasters, the food crisis, and post-conflict return and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons.

4. QUESTIONS TO GUIDE THE ROUNDTABLE 3.1 SESSION DISCUSSIONS – POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

4.1 Questions

- How to continuously build the political will and technical capacity within government to recognise the complex interconnections between migration and development and to work towards increased policy and institutional coherence?
- How to address conflicting and competing interests and perspectives between concerned government entities, including donor policies related to migration, development, trade and other areas? How to strengthen institutional coherence and the role of national GFMD focal points; and how to institutionalise effective consultation mechanism between governments, non-governmental experts and other concerned actors and stakeholders (private sector, NGOs, diasporas from both developing and developed countries, etc.)?
- What data and priority research are needed to ensure that migration and development strategies meet the highest standards of policy and programmatic coherence? Does the present abundance of data and research constitute and obstacle to coherent policy-making; are current government mechanisms sufficient to have access to the priority data they really need; and is there sufficient interface and cooperation with non-governmental experts to inform governments?
- Do the Migration Profiles conceived by the European Commission, and as described in the RT 1.1 background paper and in the section 2.3.2 of this paper, constitute an innovative and useful tool to develop comprehensive data and information on the migration situation in source, transit and destination countries, including aspects related to development? Which elements and data requirements would need to be strengthened in the Migration Profiles approach and implementation?

4.2 Possible outcomes

The “possible outcomes” are offered for consideration and discussion. Building on the challenges reflected in chapter 3 of this paper and the questions posed above they are offered with a view towards facilitating the work of delegates participating in Session 3.1 to identify practical and action-oriented outcomes. They are not intended to preclude different or additional outcomes.

4.2.1 Continue working towards policy and institutional coherence on migration and development

- Continuously raise awareness of the migration and development nexus, build political will to pursue coherent and effective migration and development policies and create and improve related policy and institutional arrangements.
- Provide technical assistance and training for governments on best practices in policy coherence, institutional coherence and data collection and analysis, including for the purpose of creating the necessary national mechanisms.
- Undertake systematic evaluations of projects that have been implemented to enhance the development payoffs of migration to assess their effectiveness and impact.

- Pursue the assessment of institutional arrangements and the related role of the GFMD focal points to determine how a whole-of-government approach to migration and development can be improved.

4.2.2 Linking data and research with policy and institutional coherence

- Promote sustained cooperation between governments, academia and non-governmental experts to determine which data and priority research are needed to ensure that migration and development strategies meet the highest standards of policy and programmatic coherence.
- For this purpose create and/or pursue consultation mechanisms between governments and non-governmental experts to assess the present abundance of data and research, and define priority requirements for policy-relevant data on migration and development. This may include the GFMD ad-hoc working group on policy coherence, data and research and the provision of continued support for informal meetings of experts, such as those held in Helsinki and Vienna, to help inform the work of the GFMD discussion on policy coherence, data and research.
- Develop bilateral and regional partnerships to engage in research on scale, characteristics and impacts of migration on source and destination countries, including the further development of Migration Profiles as described in this paper.