

GFMD Preparatory Workshop

“Factoring Migration into Development Planning”

Mauritius, 12-13 June 2012

Summary report¹

A) Background

The workshop on “Factoring migration into development planning” was organized as part of a series of preparatory workshops for the 2012 Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) held between 11 and 15 June 2012 in Mauritius. The workshop was co-chaired by the Governments of Switzerland, represented by the Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency (SDC), and Mauritius, Chair of the 2012 GFMD. It was organized in collaboration with the Government of Sweden; the GFMD Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research; and the GMG Working Group on Migration Mainstreaming under the lead of UNDP and IOM. The workshop was meant to prepare the ground for GFMD Roundtable session 2.1 entitled *Supporting National Development through Migration Mainstreaming Processes, Extended Migration Profiles and Poverty Reduction Strategies*. It provided representatives of both, national and local governments, as well as stakeholders from civil society and international organizations with the opportunity to share their experiences and learn about mainstreaming migration into development planning, focusing on concrete challenges and solutions as they relate to the institutional, policy, and partnership dimensions of the mainstreaming process.

The main workshop goals were to:

- ✓ Facilitate an exchange on mainstreaming experiences among governments and with non-governmental stakeholders to support the identification of lessons learned and, potentially, good practices relating to institutional support mechanisms, policy development and programming, and partnerships for implementation to be shared with the 2012 GFMD.
- ✓ Increase understanding of the concept of mainstreaming migration in local development planning, including from a gender perspective, and examine different ways of translating it into practice at the local level and its subsequent effects at the national level;

¹ This report was prepared by UNDP in collaboration with SDC and IOM.

- ✓ Familiarize governments with some of the tools available to support migration mainstreaming, including the GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning and Extended Migration Profiles, as well as relevant sources of data, and collect first experiences on their effectiveness;
- ✓ Build and strengthen the international network of practitioners involved in migration mainstreaming, including its gender dimensions, for ongoing peer-to-peer support;
- ✓ Formulate recommendations to GMG and other stakeholders on how to better support government needs and strategies;
- ✓ Identify interested countries that would be willing to engage in the process of mainstreaming migration into their national development strategy or other planning tools;
- ✓ Identify opportunities for including the topic of migration mainstreaming in the preparations for the 2013 General Assembly High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development and influencing the discussion on a post-2015 development agenda from a migration and development perspective.

B) Summary of workshop discussions

1. Overarching considerations

A number of broader reflections on the relationship between migration and development underpinned the workshop's discussion on mainstreaming migration into development planning. These included considerations regarding the scope that the current debate on migration and development should adopt in order to stay attuned with present and future challenges.

1.1 Developing a joint vision: Conceptualizing the migration-development nexus

From the outset, it was observed that perspectives on the relation between migration and development have evolved over time and are not on a linear trajectory. The pessimism that largely prevailed a few decades ago may well return if the current global process is not seen as producing tangible added value for countries and migrants alike. While there can be no doubt that migration is an inherent part of development processes, it is also clear that it is no panacea for development. That is why integrating migration policies into development planning is important.

Some workshop participants expressed concern that there may be a tension between migration as an individual decision and the prospect of submitting migration decisions to development planning. Would this result in migration being planned for people rather than driven by their own aspirations? It was stressed that the objective of mainstreaming migration into development strategies cannot be limited to maximizing economic and social benefits, but must be to ensure the protection of the rights of migrants' and their families. Indeed, it should serve to, on the one hand, better facilitate migration so as to make it an informed, affordable and safe choice for the individual migrant and his or her family; and, on the other, to harness the positive and mitigate the negative effects of migration decisions for communities

and the country. It was recommended to use the human development concept to measure these effects as it captures various dimensions of human wellbeing, beyond income.

Experiences from local and national government representatives illustrated the challenge of taking a pro-active stance and integrating migration into development planning, when different attitudes as to its desirability and benefits prevail. The representative of Nigeria highlighted the difficulty of bringing together at least four schools of thought at the national level: Those who are optimistic about the benefits of migration and diaspora engagement for development; narrow optimists who see the benefits of migration but only if the latter is well regulated; skeptics who stress the selectivity of migration and thus the unevenness of its benefits; and narrow skeptics who see migrants as having abandoned the homeland and thus as being without legitimate stake in its development.

The experience of the City of Naga in the Philippines demonstrated that not all types of migration command the same kind of political attention and buy-in. While the city government managed successfully to integrate the concerns of Overseas Filipino Workers and their families into the local development strategy, the issue of internal migration into the city appeared more difficult to tackle. This may be due to the fact that the first group of migrants is predominantly perceived as a source of investment and financial inflows, while the latter is more often associated with a drain on local resources. Yet whether these perceptions are always an adequate reflection of the real economic and social contributions of each respective group remains questionable.

Another strand of the discussion focused on the need to extend the migration-development dyad into a triad that links migration, development and climate change adaptation. Having the ability to move was deemed a crucial option in the context of environmental change, offering those affected the possibility to diversify their income and enhance their resilience. Findings from the UK Government Office for Science's Foresight Project suggest that this is all the more true as environmental degradation may decrease people's ability to move by eroding their livelihood, leaving them with fewer resources to afford migration, and putting them at risk of being "trapped". Migration is recognized as an adaptation strategy in the UNFCCC Cancun Adaptation Framework and speakers called on the GFMD to connect with that debate and leverage the funding opportunities that are available for adaptation interventions.

1.2 Mainstreaming migration at the global level: Linking the GFMD to other global processes

Migration mainstreaming into national development planning cannot be undertaken in isolation of local, regional and global level development agendas. The workshop featured a first exploratory discussion regarding entry points for introducing migration concerns into those agendas. It recognized that there is more than one forum to discuss migration issues and called on GFMD stakeholders to establish links with other global processes.

The main focus of the discussion was on the post-2015 development agenda. Migration does not feature in the current Millennium Development Goals, but it has received attention in the context of the Rio+20 summit and the discussions on Sustainable Development Goals. Three factors would suggest that it could play a more prominent role post-2015: 1) the recognition that global population dynamics will be a key determinant of development processes and will spur future migration flows; 2) the continued pace of globalization and transnational interdependence since 2000; and 3) the increased political recognition

of the migration-development nexus brought about by the 2006 UN High Level Dialogue (HLD) and the GFMD process.

A global consultative process is underway for shaping a post-2015 development agenda, convened by the United Nations. The UN System Task Team on the post-2015 UN development agenda, in its report to the Secretary General entitled *Realising the Future We Want for All*, highlights migration as an important issue to be considered as part of shifting global demographics and population dynamics; and when addressing questions of global governance and regional mechanisms. It also recognizes migration as a key enabler for inclusive social and economic development, pending the adoption of a fair system of rules for managing migration.

While the explicit inclusion of migration in any post -2015 agenda was deemed a rather remote prospect, the discussion identified multiple opportunities for advocacy. One suggestion was to formulate a set of aspirational Migration & Development Goals that could be submitted to the UN Secretary General. Civil society could play a lead advocacy role in this regard, promoting a rights-based approach to migration, grounded in existing conventions. Some called on the Special Representative of the Secretary General for International Migration, Peter Sutherland, to become involved in the post-2015 process. Others emphasized the responsibility of governments to ensure coherence between the various fora and processes in which they participate.

The GFMD was seen as hamstrung by the fact that it is an informal process, not meant to be standard setting; but the 2013 High Level Dialogue could provide the opportunity to formulate a set of target outcomes in areas that are less controversial, e.g. regarding the high costs of remittances and of migrant recruitment, or the role of migration in climate change adaptation. A compact between governments, private sector, and relevant civil society stakeholders was identified as another potential outcome.

2. *The practice of mainstreaming migration into development planning*

The workshop's main focus was on countries' and cities' practical experiences to date with linking their migration-related policies to their development aspirations and goals. At the 2010 GFMD in Puerto Vallarta, states endorsed the GMG *Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning* as a useful tool, and a number of governments have since used the handbook to guide their efforts at integrating migration concerns into local and national development strategies. The handbook defines migration mainstreaming as "*the process of assessing the implications of migration for any action or goals planned in a development and poverty reduction strategy*".

The examples presented at the workshop underlined that mainstreaming requires high-level political commitment as it seeks to foster sustainable collaboration between different parts of government, and the involvement of a range of stakeholders in society, to devise a systematic and comprehensive approach to the inter-linkages between migration and development. Development planning processes, with their sequencing of successive stages – from an initial situation analysis; over the prioritization of objectives, and formulation of an action plan; to implementation planning and Monitoring & Evaluation – provide a structured and consultative framework for undertaking a migration mainstreaming exercise.

2.1 Entry points to migration mainstreaming

For most governments present at the event, the entry point to migration mainstreaming has been concern about specific migration-related policy challenges and their implications for development. Most prominently, these priority concerns include:

- ✓ Diaspora engagement for home country development, including the integration of the diaspora in development planning;
- ✓ Skills development and labour matching: how to strengthen the sharing of labour market information between sending and receiving countries, and link that information with human resource development strategies on both ends;
- ✓ Ensuring migrant workers' welfare, including through better regulation of the recruitment industry aimed at reducing the cost of labour migration and preventing fraud and abuses;
- ✓ Tackling the social costs of migration in countries of origin;
- ✓ Promoting the integration of migrants and social cohesion;
- ✓ Managing the infrastructure and service provision implications of internal migration.

Participants suggested that it may be time for the GFMD to pay more attention to internal migration and urbanization dynamics. The 2009 Human Development Report estimated that there are approximately 740 million internal migrants in the world, almost four times as many as international migrants. Half of the world population is living in cities today. In Asia and Africa, this mark is expected to be reached in 2020 and 2035, respectively. Globally, the United Nations expects cities to absorb all the population growth that is happening in the next four decades.² National and city governments alike highlighted rapid rural-urban migration as a prominent concern that presents challenges and opportunities at both ends of the migration process, at origin and destination, but is rarely addressed in a coordinated, cross-sectoral manner by existing governance structures.

The drivers of increased internal mobility largely overlap with those of international migration. They include, but are not limited to: rapid population growth, access to jobs, better infrastructure, transition to middle-income status, and environmental degradation and shocks and their effects on people's livelihood. Similarly, the management of internal migration raises some familiar policy questions related to the integration of migrants, and their access to social services and economic opportunity, including how to match migrants' skills with jobs or enable them to start businesses. Other challenges are more pronounced at the local level, including the provision of adequate local infrastructure for growing cities and the role of land rights, land use and secure tenure in rural-urban migration dynamics.

Governments recognized that tackling this range of challenges requires an integrated approach across sectors (horizontal coordination) and between local and national governments (vertical coordination).

² Between 2011 and 2050, the world population is expected to increase by 2.3 billion, passing from 7.0 billion to 9.3 billion (United Nations, 2011). At the same time, the population living in urban areas is projected to gain 2.6 billion, passing from 3.6 billion in 2011 to 6.3 billion 2050. (Source: UNDESA, Population Division, *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2011 Revision*, 2012)

Several participants pointed to the need for reciprocity between countries of origin, transit and destination that are connected by the same migration corridor. Such a joint approach to migration mainstreaming could enhance the effectiveness of national policies, reconciling the interests of both sides, ideally with broad national-level buy-in from various stakeholders. Reciprocity could also be envisioned to at the regional level.

2.2 The mainstreaming process

Vision, leadership, and participation

Most mainstreaming processes start with developing a joint vision. For some, like Jamaica and the City of Johannesburg, this has meant starting off with a long-term development strategy (“Vision 2030 Jamaica” and “2040 Growth and Development Strategy”) that serves as guidance for policy development. Other countries, such as the Philippines and Bangladesh, have developed sectoral policies on overseas employment and have, on that basis, lobbied for the integration of their migration-related concerns and objectives into their countries’ national development plans.

All governments that have made progress with mainstreaming migration reported that an institutionalized, inter-sectoral platform for coordination, and high-level political buy-in were key ingredients. In Jamaica, for example, cabinet-level endorsement of the migration mainstreaming exercise was sought from the outset, and the process has already survived a change in administration. It is led by a newly established National Working Group on International Migration and Development, which combines political and technical level leadership by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade and the Planning Institute, respectively, and involves key ministries and departments as well as a range of non-governmental stakeholders and development partners.

The involvement of a central body in government, such as the Planning Commission or Prime Minister’s Office, was deemed helpful to convene and coordinate different ministries and agencies whose portfolios touch on migration and development issues. At the same time, the experience of the Philippines’ Commission on Filipinos Overseas showed that a mandated institution on migration issues with a dedicated budget can successfully champion migration concerns in the national planning process. Looking beyond government, the participation of relevant civil society and private sector stakeholders, including migrant and diaspora communities, in national or thematic working groups or consultative councils, was deemed a key success of the featured mainstreaming processes.

A further expected benefit of migration mainstreaming is enhanced outcome orientation. Morocco’s National Agency for Employment and Skills Promotion (ANAPEC) reported using the country’s human development strategy to determine the human resource needs that arise if certain goals are to be achieved. The need for such outcome orientation – and the role of development planning in providing for a vision and specific goals and targets – was underlined further with regards to diaspora engagement. Governments expressed the wish to move from an ad hoc approach and a focus on outputs to a more integrated, systematic effort where diaspora contributions are seen in the context of intended development outcomes, for example in the area of health. They noted that, better information is needed as to which sectors are experiencing shortages and who in the diaspora could contribute to addressing them.

Emphasis was also put on the need for Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E). The Nigerian Government reported that it is moving to conclude performance contracts with different ministers with the overall goal of increasing the country's GDP. Several other voices supported the idea of establishing key performance indicators for each sector, with each line ministry, and of using those to guide M&E efforts. However, participants also observed that M&E is only possible if strategies and policies are actually implemented and that large gaps persist in that regard.

Mainstreaming at the local level

Local authorities largely echoed the experiences of their national government counterparts. They stressed that migrants and their families can be an important political constituency, providing an incentive for local leaders to endorse the issue of migration as a political priority. In addition to the need for horizontal coordination among different parts of government, they also stressed the vital importance of working with non-governmental stakeholders, and the necessity for vertical coordination between different levels of government. Just as some of the national level mainstreaming examples, city experiences involved institutionalized systems for engaging different stakeholders and fruitful partnerships between government and civil society. The City of Johannesburg, for example, has established an Advisory Panel and a Migration Council – both multi-stakeholder platforms that have allowed the city to address migration issues in a way that advances its goal of enhancing social cohesion, giving a voice to marginalized and vulnerable groups.

Indeed, the main comparative advantage of the local level that seemed to emerge is the opportunity for direct participation by a range of stakeholders and the ability to provide for tailored and integrated service delivery, for example in the area of social protection and services, or as regards investment vehicles for overseas workers. In the IGAD context, the provision of mobile health and education services to pastoralist communities was highlighted as a way of supporting climate change adaptation. The City of Johannesburg has established a Migrant Help Desk to provide orientation for newcomers and connect them to services and opportunities in the city, a good practice that is being replicated in other South African cities. Participants underlined the importance of public communication and appropriate dissemination of information to ensure that the objectives of migration policy initiatives are understood and accepted by local citizens and avoid the impression that migrants' needs are prioritized.

Reflecting on the ingredients for successful multi-level governance, local government representatives recommended focusing on what can realistically be done at the local level; and lobbying national governments to transfer the competences and resources necessary for addressing local challenges. Decentralization and devolution, and good governance at the local level, were deemed key enabling factors for local migration mainstreaming. While acknowledging the importance of local conditions for the success of a mainstreaming initiative, local authorities also called for intensified collaboration among cities and the sharing of lessons at regional and international levels, e.g. under the umbrella of NEPAD in the African context. Participants suggested that Regional Consultative Processes and the GFMD should seek to establish links with existing city networks.

Challenges: Data, analysis & capacity development

Throughout all sessions, governments cited data gaps concerning migration and its development implications as a major challenge, in particular as regards information on diaspora populations. They also saw problems relating to the quality and comparability of migration related data. The experiences of Ghana and Jamaica highlighted how the elaboration of an Extended Migration Profile can provide an evidence base for policy development on migration and development and also help identify where data gaps are. The next step – and a challenge for most governments – is to develop an integrated data management system at national level, which prompts different parts of the government to harmonize and pool their migration related data. The Philippines and Ghana are currently undertaking efforts to establish such systems.

Local government representatives highlighted the difficulty of obtaining migration data at the decentralized level. Both, increased collaboration with national authorities and support for local research centres were deemed important to improve the availability of disaggregated data on in- and out-migration and its local development impacts, including on remittance flows from urban to rural areas. City governments mentioned that one challenge for local planning is that migrants do not necessarily cooperate on the census. The City of Johannesburg aims to address existing data gaps by establishing a central database that registers everyone who lives in the city.

Beyond the lack of migration data, and challenges relating to data sharing and harmonization across government agencies, a third concern that emerged was to improve evidence on the positive and negative human development impacts of migration, and of migration-related policies. So far, governments do not seem to use existing development indicators, such as the MDGs, to seek to assess the role of migration. The ACP Observatory on Migration has developed a set of 48 tailor-made indicators to measure the impacts of migration on eight different development dimensions, including: economic growth and assets; education; health; gender; social change; governance and human rights; environment; and transnational transfers and engagement. These indicators will be tested by the ACP Observatory in twelve pilot countries to evaluate the impacts of South-South migration flows. They are freely available for use by other countries and their partners as well.

In addition to capacity gaps related to migration data collection and analysis, the workshop identified a number of other areas and entities that are affected by capacity constraints. Both regional bodies (such as the African Union and Regional Economic Communities) and UN Country Teams were seen as key partners for migration mainstreaming. Yet, their capacities are often limited and require targeted support. Practical tool kits; networks for information exchange and peer-to-peer learning; thematic consultations; the establishment of a global pool of migration and development experts; and enhanced South-South cooperation were among the measures proposed. Both national and local government representatives confirmed the usefulness of the GMG handbook in providing guidance for a mainstreaming exercise, especially regarding the establishment of an institutional support structure and the crafting of a multi-sectoral approach.

Particular attention was given to the concerns of Small Island States, which are often particularly vulnerable to disasters. Participants called for a dedicated session at the 2013 HLD on this subject and for focused attention on building resilience among vulnerable groups; and protecting the rights of migrants, including access to social security and social services, especially in the context of migration-based adaptation schemes. Synergies with the UNFCCC Cancun Adaptation Framework should be explored, i.e. by developing projects that are eligible for funding under that Framework.

C) Key findings

1. While there was a strong recognition of the intrinsic links between migration and development, the current global process set in place to support the positive interplay between the two has a window to demonstrate that it is producing tangible added value for countries and migrants alike.
2. Developing a shared understanding of migration and development linkages among various stakeholders, and aligning migration related policies with development goals, are the cornerstones of migration mainstreaming. Goals and policies should be grounded in international legal norms protecting the rights of migrants' and their families and be designed so as to harness the positive and mitigate the negative effects of migration for human development. Development outcomes should be measured across various dimensions of human wellbeing, beyond income.
3. National Development Plans and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers are key instruments to target for migration mainstreaming as they reflect a country's development priorities and translate international development goals, such as the Millennium Development Goals, into national objectives. They also guide the support of external actors, including bilateral and multilateral development partners, to be aligned with national priorities such as through the UN Development Assistance Framework in the case of UN country teams.
4. At the policy level, migration mainstreaming can foster greater alignment of sectoral strategies with overarching development objectives and thus promote outcome orientation. Specific targets and indicators should be agreed upon with all relevant line ministries, departments, or agencies and a multi-stakeholder mechanism should be set up to monitor progress against those targets. Targets and strategies should remain flexible and adaptable to changing migration and development trends and realities.
5. At the institutional level, the mainstreaming process will ideally bring about lasting changes and a new culture of cooperation, horizontally between different ministries and vertically between different levels of government and with external stakeholders. This can be facilitated through the establishment of institutionalized cooperation platforms, combining political level leadership with clear responsibility for follow-up at the technical level.
6. At the partnership level, a participatory mainstreaming process is a vehicle for promoting inclusion and creating institutionalized fora for regular interaction between all relevant stakeholders concerned with migration and its human development implications. The establishment of regular relations with non-governmental and international stakeholders, among them civil society, private sector, donors, and international agencies, will support the anchorage and sustainability of the process, secure support for policy implementation, and thus ensure more effective and tangible results.
7. As a result of a mainstreaming process being undertaken in one or more countries that share a migration corridor, governments may be inclined to review their relations. Regular exchanges between the national government and the representations of these partner countries, with the

eventual support of international development organizations, may help to engage in in-depth intergovernmental dialogue and lead to the adaptation of existing policies and regulations in both countries on issues impacting their joint M&D reality.

8. The ability of local authorities to intervene in policy-making and implementation – and thus their effectiveness in migration mainstreaming – is directly impacted by the level of administrative decentralization in place in various countries, as well as the devolution of corresponding financial resources to implement local policies.
9. Large gaps persist as regards the collection, quality and sharing of migration data; and regarding the analysis of development impacts. Extended Migration Profiles provide a good starting point for a migration mainstreaming exercise. Yet, they must not remain a one-off exercise but will, ideally, lead to the establishment of national migration information management systems; and the integration of migration-related indicators in the monitoring of progress on development goals.
10. Capacity constraints are an issue at all levels of governance – local, national and regional – and among all stakeholders, including governments, civil society and UN country teams. More detailed assessments of existing capacities and capacity development needs should be part of all migration mainstreaming processes to enable the development of tailored tools and interventions.

D) Workshop recommendations

1. Outcomes and recommendations of the GFMD and its Civil Society Days should be linked up more formally with other global development processes to facilitate synergies and ensure more effectiveness in their implementation. Advocating for inclusion of certain development agenda discussion points (issues tackled in the Rio+20 follow-up, ICPD Beyond 2014, the UNFCCC, the UN Conference on LDCs, the WTO, and the post-2015) into M&D discussion and vice versa may be the way forward.
2. At the programmatic level, the GFMD could explore linking up the migration and development portfolio with the adaptation portfolio and developing projects that are eligible for funding under the UNFCCC Cancun Adaptation Framework. Similarly, the GFMD could explore developing joint “Voluntary Contributions” for the implementation of the Rio+20 agenda, as per paragraph 283 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document.
3. Governments should consider giving greater consideration to internal migration and urbanization dynamics in migration mainstreaming processes, including the need for coordination between national and local level governments on migration and development. They may also wish to consider establishing a dialogue between the GFMD and city networks.
4. Discussion on civil society participation in mainstreaming processes and related results should be encouraged further, for example by taking advantage of the Common Space. The aim should be to discuss and assess results and added value, if any, of participatory partnerships between governments, civil society actors, and/or private sector stakeholders that have been established as part of mainstreaming processes.

5. Continuous dissemination of the lessons learned and results of migration mainstreaming processes, and the sharing of concrete experiences and examples of migration mainstreaming practices, should be encouraged at the GFMD summit meeting in November 2012; through the GFMD Platform for Partnerships; and via the GFMD Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research.
6. Continuous support to governments on migration data should be pursued by sharing information on good practices within the GFMD mechanisms as regards:
 - a. The implementation of Extended Migration Profiles and their linkage with migration mainstreaming exercises;
 - b. The establishment of central data management systems at national level;
 - c. The development and testing of indicators to measure the multi-dimensional development impacts of migration;
 - d. The development and testing of indicators for evaluating M&D policies.
7. Strengthening government capacity to undertake mainstreaming is a crucial recommendation and can be done through complementary initiatives such as:
 - a. The establishment of a pool of M&D experts that can advise governments and their partners;
 - b. The facilitation of reciprocal mainstreaming exercises along migration corridors, involving countries of origin, transit and destination;
 - c. The facilitation of South-South exchanges and technical assistance missions to support migration mainstreaming processes.

17 August 2012