Roundtable 3: Policy and institutional coherence to address the relationship between migration and development

General Rapporteur's Report to Plenary
(Ambassador Maria Bassols, Spain)

Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished Delegates,

It is an honour to summarize for you the debates of Roundtable Sessions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 that have taken place in this IV Global Forum in Puerto Vallarta.

But before undertaking this task, which I do gladly, I would like to publicly extend my gratitude to some persons who have been instrumental in making this summary possible. I would first like to thank Dr. Rolph Jenny, the RT3 coordinator, for his help and support. I would also like to thank the RT rapporteurs for their cooperation:

- for RT 3.1, Ms Susan Martin
- for RT 3.2, Professor Ronald Skeldon
- for RT 3.3, Mr. David DiGiovanna

Since I have yet to learn the secret of being able to be in two places at the same time, you will understand that without their help my task would have been virtually impossible.

Roundtable 3 versed on "Policy and institutional coherence to the address the relationship between Migration and Development". In turn it divided its work in the three different sessions:

RT 3.1: "Assessing the impact of migration on economic and social development and addressing its cause-effect relationship" had a rich discussion that touched on both the connections between development and migration, and ways to improve policy coherence. The debate focused on three issues:

a) **Impact Assessment of migration on development**
   - The RT discussed ways to assess impacts at macro levels, as well as with regard to specific policies, programs and projects. Regarding the macro level participants noted the importance of examining the effects of migration on development of both source and destination country migrants. Participants also noted a wide range of indicators that included both economic and human development.
   - Participants reported on a variety of specific projects and programs that link migration and development and would benefit from rigorous assessment. To mention a few: programs to help migrants invest in their home country, reintegrate returning migrants, recruit qualified migrants to help fill gaps in the labour force, etc.
   - The RT discussed the benefits of developing a culture of evaluation that would help ensure policies, programs and projects are having the good benefits that they initially intended. As one participant stated it is important to do this initiatives right, not just to do them.

- Additionally, participants pointed out that good impact evaluations require rigorous methods and take time to accomplish. They also recognized the importance of engaging outside experts and the importance of collecting baseline data to allow the evaluation to determine what might have happened in the absence of the policies, programs and projects.

b) **Migration profiles**
- The RT showed considerable consensus that migration profiles are valuable, both as a process and for the information produced. They provide a logical framework for collecting and analysing information and they generally synthesise existing data which can be useful for the type of impact assessment described. The process through which profiles are carried out also builds capacity of the Governments to undertake this type of analysis.
- Challenges in developing migration profiles were identified, among others the paucity of good migration data and problems arising in updating the information.
- The importance of establishing bilateral and regional collaborations to collect information from both source and destination countries was emphasized.
- The RT underscored that countries undertaking migration profiles must take ownership of the process.

c) **Mainstreaming Migration into development**
- Participants reiterated the importance of mainstreaming discussions of the impacts of migration into a variety of development planning process.
- They also called on Governments to bring the evidence generated by impact assessments and migration profiles into de development planning process.

5 concrete **outcomes** were identified in **RT 3.1**:

1. The need to **develop and assess indicators of the impact of migration on development** using rigorous methods of evaluation.
2. The possibility of establishing **a clearinghouse** that would include information on indicators and methods of evaluation and copies of relevant impact assessments of policies, programs and projects linking migration and development.
3. The usefulness of continuing to **produce and update migration profiles** that use a **standardized template** but also provide flexibility that allows the information to be tailored to the priorities of the countries concerned.
4. Encouraging the **use of a handbook on mainstreaming migration into development planning.**
5. The usefulness of implementing the recommendations on **improving the collection of data on migrants in census, survey and administrative systems**.

RT 3.2 addressed the relevance and impact of climate change on migration and development.

Although initially there were some doubts as to the adequacy of including this topic in the IV. Global Forum discussions, the high number of well balanced interventions (43 total: 22 in the first part and 21 in the second part), as well as the high quality of information and best practices shared, demonstrate the importance of the exchanges.

Four issues came out of the debate:
a) **Data and Analysis**
- Despite acknowledged conceptual difficulties, this is an area deemed too important to ignore. Consequently, participants agreed that the lack of data must

not hinder progress. Quite on the contrary, participants agreed that there is a need to be working on this issue as of now.
- Though considerable data exists, there is a demand for new data. A need exits to bring these data together on a continuous and systematic basis.

b) Geographical scale
- Regarding impact of climate change on migration and development it was recognized that geography and size *do* matter. Small island countries are different: for them internal migration is not an option. Thus a need to develop this topic at local, regional and global level was acknowledged. As one representative very eloquently put it: climate change does not stop at borders.

c) Migration and Climate Change is a multisectoral issue, crosscutting through different areas, not the least of which food and water security, the basic factors of life.

d) There is a need for **legal and institutional arrangements**, but it was recognized that binding agreements are the result of complex negotiations. One must deal with complex issues, such as development, migration, humanitarian issues, and climate change which are interconnected, while at the same time trying to achieve as well policy coherence in all of them. This is undoubtedly an important challenge.

Additionally the RT recognized that Civil Society and the private sector, with Governments, had a role to play.

The critical issue of political will was also put on the table.

RT 3.2 discussions had the following **outcomes:**
1. In order to **expedite data and analysis** exchange and sharing, first **experiences and best practices** are of the utmost importance. A **virtual library** may be a useful way of sharing this information.
2. A need exists to **strengthen the dialogue at local, regional and global level** on the interconnections on climate change and migration. RT participants welcomed and encouraged **future discussions on this issue in the context of the Global Forum.**
3. The need to **begin discussions as to the appropriate legal and institutional arrangements** to address these important issues was recognized.

RT 3.3 addressed the question of how Regional Consultative Processes and Inter-regional *Fora* can best include the migration-development nexus.

Participants welcomed the possibility offered by the Global Forum to exchange views on latest experiences and practices of RCPs and Inter-regional *Fora*. The Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs for Salvadorans abroad, Mr. Juan José Garcia, presented a special statement on the work of the **Ibero-American Forum on Migration and Development** in advancing the regional and global development agenda and global governance on migration.

The discussion focused on the key questions highlighted in the session background paper, with the following key conclusions and outcomes:

1. On the question of **how to incorporate a whole of government approach into RCP and IRF´s agendas:**

a) The importance of leadership at national level was highlighted, as was the need for intergovernmental coordination structures.
b) Whereas some delegates called for stronger binding agreements and approaches, other noted the value of the non-binding nature of the RCPs and IRFs.
c) One delegate called for a stronger voice of Civil Society in RCPs.
d) Some underscored that the creation of jobs is critical to enhancing the social dimension of development and migration and that participation in RCPs and a whole of Government approach are mutually reinforcing. Each promotes the other.

e) The need to ensure migration is prominent on the national agenda was noted.

2. On the question of **which are the necessary knowledge and tools to assist RCPs in incorporating development in their agendas:**

   a) Ensuring gender perspective in discussions.
   b) Several noted the importance of promoting good data collection, including sex disaggregated data.
   c) Some noted the value of migration profiles as supporting evidence based approach to migration.
   d) It was noted that the necessary data and tools will depend on the individual focus of each RCP.

3. On the question of **how to strengthen cooperation and cross-fertilization among RCPs and between IRFs:**

   a) Some called for tailored and targeted information campaigns.
   b) Frank discussion among regional groups was deemed to be very important.
   c) Given the brief history of RCPs it is premature to asses the impact of cross-fertilization but the 2009 Bangkok meeting confirmed great interest in greater cross-cooperation.
   d) It was noted that the role of the Chair in promoting closer cooperation and cross-fertilization is critical.

4. On the question of **feedback between RCPs /IRFs and the GMDF:**

   a) One delegate used the example of the South-American Conference on Migration, noting that civil society input is crucial and that as long as RCPs and IRFs are non-binding, their impact will be limited.
   b) Several delegates disagreed on the necessity of binding processes, noting that RCPs are independent, so the decision of how binding they should be is best left to each of them.
   c) Another delegate noted that RCPs' focus on specific regional issues and challenges, while GFMD takes a more global approach. It may be premature to institutionalize linkages between the two.
   d) It may not be timely to think of structured linkages, but the Common Space may be a model.

5. On the question of **how to support countries not currently RCP members and facilitate creation on new RCPs**:

   a) The role of IOM to fuel interest in creating RCPs in regions not covered was noted.
   b) Some noted that if there is an outside facilitator to create RCPs the process may become overly dependant on the outside facilitator.
   c) Also, there may be good reasons for not having an RCP in a particular region.
   d) There must be political will and ownership for an RCP to succeed.

11 November 2010