EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This is the third in a series of four background papers drafted to support round tables organized to help prepare Permanent Missions at United Nations (UN) Headquarters for the 3-4 October 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (High Level Dialogue). Focusing on ‘strengthening partnerships and coherence on international migration, mechanisms to effectively integrate migration into development policies, and promote coherence at all levels’, this paper presents a concise review of recent research, thinking and policy, highlights challenges, and identifies concrete recommendations, in order to provide the basis for discussion and debate.

2. Terms such as ‘coherence’ and ‘partnerships’ are often used in the policy discourse on international migration and development with different meanings. To provide a common starting-point for discussion and debate at the round table, this paper distinguishes four concepts: Coherence is defined here as the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions. Consultation is the process of seeking input from relevant actors in order to achieve greater transparency and efficiency. Coordination refers to organizing different institutions towards the achievement of a common goal. Cooperation is the process of working together. Unified, coherence, consultation, coordination, and cooperation are essential for effective migration management, and for integrating migration and development meaningfully, especially against the backdrop of the changing character of contemporary international migration.

3. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and more recently National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) are often identified as key reference points for policy coherence on migration and development. A review of PRSPs concludes that relatively few refer directly
to migration; concrete policy responses to migration challenges are rarely identified; and there is little basis in PRSPs for implementing policy initiatives on migration and development. Three recommendations have been made to strengthen the integration of migration in PRSPs: to involve migrant and diaspora groups in their development; to ensure political commitment and funding for their implementation; and to review existing PRSPs to identify good practice. While the overall number of NAPAs (and NAPs) has increased significantly in recent years, still relatively few refer directly to migration, and where they do, they often do not provide the basis for subsequent policy implementation. Recommendations for achieving more systematic inclusion of migration in NAPAs include: wider acknowledgement that adaptation policies alone will not stop migration; a focus on urban planning; and taking account of the positive impacts of migration on adaptive capacity and resilience.

5. Consultation is important for more effective migration and development policies first because the range of stakeholders directly or indirectly involved in the process extends well beyond government; second because it is good practice to consult those who are likely to be impacted by policy; and third because consultation is one way to ensure ownership and legitimacy. In the migration-development context particular attention has been paid to consulting with the private sector and civil society. Challenges consulting with the private sector include a concern on the part of business leaders that they may experience a public backlash for supporting migration, that they may lack influence among policy-makers, and because policy-makers may be unwilling to accept their recommendations. Challenges of consulting civil society include: identifying legitimate representatives, achieving consensus between differing opinions, and developing appropriate forums for consultation. In addition civil society may lack the political skills and funding to enter into meaningful dialogue with governments, and their access is often limited. Effective consultation entails identifying key stakeholders; building trust between governments and relevant stakeholders; institutionalizing partnerships; devising incentives for stakeholders to participate in partnerships; encouraging ownership of partnerships; structuring capacity-building to include all relevant stakeholders; and enhancing information exchange among and between stakeholders.

6. International migration is a multi-sector issue. Ministries such as justice, home affairs, labour, employment, health, trade, development, social welfare, housing and education may include migration-and integration-related issues in their wider portfolios. At the same time coordination is required at all levels – national, regional, and local. At the national level, institutional arrangements for coordination between relevant ministries vary widely, and there is no clear evidence on whether one model is most effective. One way to support greater coordination on migration and development is to provide a better evidence-base and data, including through Migration Profiles. International organizations and initiatives also provide technical advice and expertise on cooperation on migration and development. Coordination is also important at the level of the UN and other international organizations, and the Global Migration Group (GMG) and annual coordination meeting on international migration are generally viewed as positive examples of coordination mechanisms.

7. There has been increasing cooperation between states on international migration and development at the bilateral and regional levels. At the bilateral level there is a plethora of labour mobility agreements, and clear guidelines on good practice exist. The European Union (EU) Global Approach to
Migration is an example of a set of partnerships between a region and individual non-EU states, with a number of concrete activities targeted on migration and development. Regional Consultative Processes on migration (RCPs) also increasingly include migration and development on their agendas, as do Regional Economic Communities. Common principles for effective cooperation on migration and development include: country ownership and leadership, an integrated approach; genuine partnership; result orientation; consideration of migration in relation to peace, security, development and human rights; equity; voice and representation; and a balanced role for the State and market considerations.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the third in a series of four background papers drafted to support preparatory round tables organized to help prepare Permanent Missions at United Nations (UN) Headquarters for the 3-4 October 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. Together these four papers reflect the topics agreed for the Round tables at the High level Dialogue.¹ All four papers present a concise review of recent research, thinking, and policy developments; identify concrete recommendations and priorities as appropriate; and are supported by a targeted list of key references to enable further information-gathering and analysis as required. They are intended to provide the basis for discussion and debate at the preparatory round tables, and thus identify key questions for discussion.

This paper focuses on ‘Strengthening partnerships and coherence in international migration, mechanisms to effectively integrate migration into development policies, and promote coherence at all levels’. It is structured in three main parts. First, the paper provides brief working definitions of the main terms used, distinguishing coherence, consultation, coordination and cooperation (‘partnerships’ are an example of cooperation). Second, the paper establishes why coherence, consultation, coordination and especially cooperation are increasingly important for effective migration management and in particular for achieving development outcomes. In the main part of the paper, recent examples of coherence, consultation, coordination, and cooperation on migration and development are reviewed, highlighting challenges and identifying lessons learned and specific recommendations.

2. DEFINITIONS

Terms such as ‘coherence’ and ‘partnerships’ are often used in the policy discourse on international migration and development with different meanings. This brief section provides working definitions of these and other relevant terms, drawing on existing proposals, in order to establish the basis for a common starting point for debate and discussion at the round table. It distinguishes the four ‘Cs’ of coherence, consultation, coordination, and cooperation (a fifth ‘C’ is capacity building but is not the focus for this paper). Even here there is no clear consensus on meanings, and the various terms are used differently in different policy contexts. Certainly there is overlap between the concepts in reality – for example consultation with relevant stakeholders is good practice in developing policy coherence, coordinating implementation, and in promoting national and international cooperation.

¹ General Assembly (2012) A7C.2/67/L.15
2.1 Coherence

Policy coherence is defined by the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD) as ‘...the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the agreed objectives.’\(^2\) In simpler terms, policy coherence means ensuring that policies in one do not contradict or jeopardize policy objectives in another. In the context of seeking to integrate migration into development policies, for example, policy coherence implies that, in pursuing migration policy objectives governments should, at a minimum, avoid negative consequences and spillovers which would adversely affect the development process. More positively, policy coherence for development implies that, in designing migration policies, governments should actively look for ways to exploit the potential for positive spillovers and consequences for development in the way it pursues these migration objectives. Clearly policy coherence is not just required at the national level, but also at the sub-national levels as well as international levels. At the same time according to the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), it is probably most important to establish coherence at the national level first, as incoherence here risks trickling downwards into the sub-national level and cascading upwards leading to ineffective regional and global approaches. Within national governments, policy coherence issues arise between different types of public policies (for example those relating to employment, health, security, development and so on), between different levels of government, and between different stakeholders.

2.2 Consultation

Consultation is the process of seeking input from relevant actors in order to achieve greater efficiency and transparency. Migration increasingly involves stakeholders other than governments alone. Effective migration policy therefore relies on the active engagement of the business community, civil society, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), migrant and refugee associations, trades unions, and others at the sub-national, national and international levels. Similarly, states increasingly see the need to engage on migration and development with intergovernmental and other international organizations, as well as a range of specialized mechanisms and processes providing knowledge, data, and expertise.

2.3 Coordination

Coordination is usually defined as the act of organizing – of making different people or institutions combine to achieve a common goal. According to the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), just as important as developing a coherent approach to migration is to coordinate its implementation. This is true for migration, which by definition is a multi-sector issue that is often divided between government ministries and agencies, and is even more important where direct synergies are being sought between the two sectors of migration and development. There have been occasional examples where the two issues have been combined within a single Ministerial portfolio, but more often inter-ministerial or agency mechanisms have been established to try to develop synergies.

\(^2\) [http://www.oecd.org/pcd/guidanceandtoolsforpolicymakers.htm](http://www.oecd.org/pcd/guidanceandtoolsforpolicymakers.htm)
2.4 Cooperation

Simply put cooperation is the process of working or acting together. It can be informal or formal, and involve two or more partners. In the migration context, cooperation usually refers to international cooperation, in particular between states, for example through bilateral agreements, Regional Consultative Processes on migration (RCPs), or Regional Economic Communities (RECs). Cooperation is equally important, but often overlooked, at the national level, for example between municipalities, provinces, and central government. In the context of migration and development, particular attention has also been paid in recent years to cooperation between UN and other international agencies.

3. CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND THE NEED FOR GREATER COHERENCE, CONSULTATION, COORDINATION, AND COOPERATION

While the need for more effective migration management has regularly been identified during the past few decades, starting with the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in 1994, the nature of contemporary international migration makes it more important than ever before.

One reason is the character of international migration. It has been estimated that there are at least 214 million international migrants, representing about three percent of the world’s population. Besides numbers alone, several other characteristics have made migration management more important – and demanding. International migration has a greater global reach than ever before, including significant South-South migration, and involves a wider diversity of ethnic and cultural groups, as well as a growing feminization with nearly 50 percent of all migrants female and more migrating independently and as heads of households than previously. Migrants are increasingly concentrated in urban areas. Clearly migration also affects far more people than those who actually migrate, including families and communities at home, as well as the societies where migrants settle.

A second challenge is that the forces that drive international migration are powerful, the ability to modify these forces is limited, and national migration policies alone are no longer effective. The ‘drivers’ for international migration include global disparities in development; demographic trends; the ‘global jobs crisis’; the segmentation of labour markets in high-income economies; ‘revolutions’ in communications and transportation; the momentum associated with transnational migration networks; and the role of intermediaries and agents including migrant smugglers and human traffickers.

A third dynamic relates to the need to fill ‘protection gaps’, covered in more detail in the background paper in this series prepared for Round table 2 at the High Level Dialogue, and particularly pertaining to women and children; irregular migrants; and the victims of migrant smuggling and human trafficking. These ‘gaps’ are likely to be exacerbated in the coming decades by new migration dynamics, including the growth in ‘mixed migratory flows’, the linkages between climate change and migration, and the growing incidence of migrants caught in crises.
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Growing economic integration is another significant feature of international migration. Multinational corporations, for example, want governments to facilitate the inter-country movements of executives, managers and other key personnel, highlighting the need for consultation with the business sector. Although the rules for admission of foreign workers are largely governed by national legislation, such regional and international trade regimes as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) now include provisions for admission of foreign executives, managers and professionals.

Another aspect is changing geo-political and security interests that view international mobility as problematic although necessary for commerce and economic growth. Balancing the competing interests of facilitation of mobility and security poses challenges to all governments and requires cooperation in information sharing to prevent the movement of those who pose security threats while maintaining opportunities for legitimate forms of transnational mobility. This is also one example of how migration has become an interest across a range of government departments or agencies, from those responsible for security, through labour, to development.

In various ways, all of these developments reinforce the need for developing coherent policies on migration; for consulting with stakeholders beyond government alone; for better coordination in policy implementation, and for greater cooperation at the national and especially international levels. The next section turns to examples of how to achieve these principles effectively.

4. ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE COHERENCE, CONSULTATION, COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

4.1 Coherence

According to the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), if states are to address international migration in a coherent manner, they must develop agreed national objectives for their migration policies, as well as agreed criteria for example on entry and residence. While the exact nature of these objectives and criteria will vary according to national traditions, requirements and circumstances, they must be consistent with international law and uphold migrants’ rights. Yet GCIM found that most states have not yet formulated explicit national objectives relating to migration policy. More states are turning to organizations like IOM to assist them in the development and implementation of national migration policies, particularly with a view to maximizing their development potential.

Translating these general principles to the specific task of mainstreaming migration into development planning, the Global Migration Group (GMG) concurs that agreed objectives are essential for coherent policy. In its IOM-initiated *Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning*, it identifies a development planning cycle, starting with situation assessment and analysis, moving to identifying strategic goals and national priorities, followed by action and programmatic planning,

---

4 GCIM (2005)
5 GMG (2010)
capacity development financing mechanisms, implementation mechanisms, and monitoring and evaluation.

In the view of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data, and Research of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), these final steps of monitoring and evaluation are critical for policy coherence, but are often overlooked. Together, monitoring and evaluation allow for impact assessment. Impact assessment assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention, whether a project, programme, or policy. The impact can be in the short or long term, positive or negative, direct or indirect, and intended or unintended. Impact assessment helps answers key questions for evidence-based policy making: what works, what does not work, where, why, for whom, and at what cost?6

Two examples of policy coherence that are often cited in the migration-development context are national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) (and more recently National Adaptation Plans – NAPs). Both are key strategy documents that provide a basis for integrating migration into development policy and practice.

A 2009 review of PRSPs – which are nationally-elaborated poverty reduction frameworks - came to the following broad conclusions.7 First, relatively few PRSPs make any direct reference to migration (although it is likely that PRSPs published since have included migration references more systematically). Second, while some PRSPs identify problems and opportunities related with migration, few identify specific policy initiatives, and where they do the focus seems to be on regulation and control rather than, for example, remittances. Finally, there is very little evidence that policy initiatives that have been identified in PRSPs have actually been implemented. Very few PRSPs for example include specific indicators or monitoring and evaluation criteria on policies related to migration and development. The overall conclusion is that while there is evidence that migration is becoming gradually more integrated as an issue in PRSPs, its coverage is not systematic and there is a significant gap between identifying the issue and implementing policies. The review provides three specific recommendations: first, it may be worth involving migrant and diaspora groups more directly in the development of PRSPs; second PRSPs should be prepared systematically at a senior level of government to ensure that commitments are met and spending priorities adjusted; and third that, while difficult, a review of best practice for integrating migration in PRSPs would be useful.

A 2010 review by the GFMD Ad Hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research of NAPAs similarly provided broad conclusions and recommendations. First, the overall number of NAPAs submitted is increasing steadily. Second, many do not make any reference to migration, which is surprising in the case of certain countries where there are strong predictions that climate change will lead to migration. Third, where NAPAs do make reference to migration it is again country-specific. The overall conclusions were that there is a need for more systematic inclusion of migration in NAPAs; that NAPAs need a stronger focus on the design and implementation of policies relevant to the movement of
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6 Ad Hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data, and Research (2010)
7 Black and Sward (2009)
people; and that there is a need for the elaboration of specific monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in this context.

A more recent review of migration in NAPAs by the Migrating out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium (Migration RPC), added these recommendations: First, wider acknowledgement is required that while adaptation policies are required, they cannot be expected to stop migration. In other words NAPAs need to consider migration outcomes more systematically as a factor to be considered but not a variable to be controlled. Second, adaptation strategies in particular require a focus on urban planning, especially as rural-urban migration is expected to increase in the coming decades, in part as a result of the effects of climate change. Third, adaptation policies should take account of the positive impacts of migration on adaptive capacity and resilience - for example by relieving population pressure on already fragile ecosystems and by diversifying income for inhabitants and generating remittances that can be used to further facilitate adaptive measures - as well as its negative impacts.

4.2 Consultation

It is widely acknowledged that consultation is critical to formulating and implementing effective migration policies. As alluded to in the previous section, one reason is that an increasing range of stakeholders is directly involved in migration – whether the business sector or actors in migration networks; as well as indirectly involved – for example academics and the media through their analysis and coverage of the issue. A second reason is that it is widely understood to be good practice to consult those who are targeted, or likely to be impacted by, policies in any field. In the context of migration and development this includes migrants themselves, as well as families and communities affected by migration both in origin and destination countries. Overall, thirdly, consultation is important for ensuring a wide ownership of policy, and ultimately for promoting its legitimacy.

There are numerous examples of mechanisms or partnerships for consultation, in particular but not exclusively between governments and other stakeholders. Focusing on the private sector, in 2005 IOM for example established a Business Advisory Board, comprised of chief executives representing a broad cross-section of industries and interests to identify and exchange ideas on global issues relevant to migration and business. A roundtable to consult with the private sector was organized in 2013 as part of a wide range of consultations on the role of population dynamics in the post-2015 development framework (see also the background paper in this series prepared for the first round table at the High Level Dialogue). A roundtable with the private sector is currently planned as part of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) to be hosted by the Government of Sweden in 2014. The World Economic Forum’s Global Agenda Council on Migration is currently developing tools to engage the private sector in the international debate on migration and development.

Nevertheless, it has often proved difficult effectively to engage the private sector in the migration debate. A business roundtable discussion convened in preparation for the Global Forum on Migration and Development in Athens in 2009 identified a number of reasons why, including a concern on the part of business leaders that they may experience a public backlash in particular for supporting migration.
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that they may lack influence among policymakers, and because policymakers may be unwilling to countenance their recommendations especially where these concern lowering obstacles to migration.\(^9\) Another obstacle may be differing time horizons for decision-making, and different accountabilities, between policy-makers and business.

Consultation mechanisms for civil society are even more widespread, in part reflecting the diversity of the category ‘civil society’ (another term which is only loosely defined in most policy documents). Certainly the principle of consultation with civil society has been widely affirmed, for example in the Asuncion Declaration (2006), the Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Brussels Declaration on Asylum, Migration and Mobility (2006), the IOM’s Annual IOM-NGO consultations. The 2006 session of the International Dialogue on Migration (IDM) was devoted to the subject of engaging business and civil society in developing partnerships in migration; indeed IDM was conceived as a forum for governments and non-governmental actors to participate in migration-related discussions on equal terms. Since its inception, GFMD has included Civil Society Days in its programme and mechanisms for dialogue between civil society and government representatives. The civil society component of GFMD has evolved, with increasing interaction between governments and civil society, the consolidation of civil society engagement, and the dedicated role of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) in bringing together civil society actors. The organization of informal hearings of NGOs, civil society and the private sector in advance of the 2006 and forthcoming 2013 High-Level Dialogues are good examples of the significance of consultation in UN General Assembly activities.

*It is very hard to evaluate how effective such consultation mechanisms are. One reason is that it is not clear what should be evaluated – the fact that consultation took place, or the outcome of the consultation. Another is that often consultation takes place informally, and is not recorded. It also covers a wide arena, ranging from broader development planning consultations, to convening specific working groups for example to focus on monitoring and evaluation.*

*Specific challenges of consulting civil society include: identifying legitimate representatives, achieving consensus between differing opinions, and developing appropriate forums for consultation. One particular reason why it has been difficult for civil society to engage has been that migration policy covers such a broad scope and comprises extensive inter-linkages, for example with trade, development, the environment, security and conflict management. Civil society organizations tend to have narrow and specialized interests, for example in human rights advocacy, and may lack the breadth of expertise required to engage in migration policy. One possible response is for civil society organizations to establish coordinating mechanisms to provide a broader base for engagement. A related challenge for many civil society organizations is a lack of financial resources. While in certain circumstances states may fund civil society organizations, it is also incumbent upon such organizations to fund-raise, and a capacity-building requirement is for training on fund-raising within these organizations. Equally, access for civil society organizations to formal policy forums is often limited by states.*
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do not already exist governments might consider the potential benefits of establishing formal mechanisms for consultation with civil society.

According to the International Dialogue on Migration, critical to effective consultation is: ‘...identifying key stakeholders; building trust between governments and relevant stakeholders; institutionalizing partnerships; devising incentives for stakeholders to participate in partnerships; encouraging ownership of partnerships; structuring capacity-building to include all relevant stakeholders; and enhancing information exchange among and between stakeholders.’

It has been suggested that often the most effective consultation takes place at the sub-national level, where different sectors are faced with different aspects of the same migration challenge and realize the importance of consulting one another and working together. For instance, the City of Johannesburg has started a Migrant Health Forum that meets regularly and is attended by representatives from different government sectors, international organizations, and NGOs, to address specific migration-related health challenges in the city. In this context it is worth noting that a number of member states have held national consultations with civil society in preparation for the 2013 High-Level Dialogue. Scaling these local consultation processes up to the national and international level is difficult.

4.3 Coordination

The need for coordination across governments to manage migration effectively is clear. *International migration is not only by definition a cross-border issue, it is also a cross- or multi-sector issue. At the very least ministries such as justice, home affairs, labour, employment, health, trade, development, social welfare, housing and education may include migration- and integration-related issues in their wider portfolios. At the same time coordination is required at all levels – national, regional, and local.* To give just one example in the specific context of migration and development, a coordinated approach would allow policies developed to fill labour market gaps by promoting temporary labour migration, also to incorporate skills acquisition for migrants and support for successful development-oriented return and reintegration, thus also helping meet objectives in the realm of foreign development assistance.

A review commissioned by the Global Commission on International Migration on national institutional arrangements for coordination on migration revealed the significant differences worldwide. In countries where there is already a well-established governance structure on international migration, *the ministerial setting for migration issues can range from a single ministry dealing with all or most of the issues involved, to a department within a broader ministry holding these portfolios, to the portfolios being spread across several ministries.* In other countries migration scarcely appears as a government policy issue at all. The review demonstrates first that ministerial responsibilities for migration change quite often; and second that they reflect in part migration priorities, but also cultural, political, economic, and historical interests. But it also concludes that there is no firm evidence that one institutional setting is necessarily more effective than another for managing migration effectively. *A systematic review of these different models of governance to establish whether one really is more effective...*
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effective than another would be an important first step before making capacity-building recommendations concerning re-aligning ministerial responsibilities.

Where – as is usually the case – the migration portfolio is divided across ministries and agencies – one response has been to develop *inter-ministerial or inter-agency coordination mechanisms*. An interesting insight is provided in Sri Lanka, where the government has recognized that migration health cuts across many different sectors and actors and that vertical and horizontal approaches are needed to ensure that migration does not negatively affect the development of migrants, their families at home, and origin and destination countries. The government first undertook a mapping of relevant ministries and of domestic legislation and health, legal and social protection services provided to different types of migrants. It then developed an inter-ministerial ‘whole of government’ approach involving twelve key ministries to advance a national health agenda. This coordination has in turn led to a greater engagement by the Sri Lankan government in the migration health agenda at the regional and global levels.\(^\text{12}\) Plainly there are lessons to learn here for developing coordination on migration and development, ranging from the significance of mapping, to the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee or taskforce, and its alignment towards a single national policy agenda. To this list might be added the importance of monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of such an approach.

*One concrete way to support greater coordination on migration and development is to provide better data and a stronger evidence-base.* Data on the number and profile of migrants in developing countries is improving, for example as a result of *Migration Profiles*, pioneered by the European Commission and carried out by IOM;\(^\text{13}\) the *UN Population Division Global Migration Database*; and the *International Labour Organization (ILO) International Labour Migration database*; and there is also extensive *World Bank data on remittances*. Implementation of the recommendations of the *Commission on International Migration Data for Development Research and Policy* of 2009 may enhance this evidence-base.\(^\text{14}\) It has also been recommended that the content of Migration Profiles should be extended to include a comprehensive range of issues relevant in the migration and development context, such as labour market conditions, income levels, human development indicators, migrants’ access to rights, ‘brain drain’, health, diaspora, education, trade and other factors related to the impact of migration on the development of concerned countries.\(^\text{15}\) The activities of the ACP Observatory on Migration are worth noting in this regard.\(^\text{16}\)

International organizations also provide technical advice on migration and development cooperation. One example is the *Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI)*\(^\text{17}\), the contributing agencies of which are IOM, ILO, UNHCR, UNFPA, and UN Women, and which is implemented by UNDP. In its first phase JMDI focused in particular on developing cooperation at local government levels. The *World Bank*

\(^\text{12}\) IOM Geneva and IOM Sri Lanka (2012)  
\(^\text{13}\) IOM (2012)  
\(^\text{14}\) Commission on International Migration Data for Development Research and Policy  
\(^\text{15}\) IOM (2010)  
\(^\text{16}\) http://www.acpmigration-obs.org/  
\(^\text{17}\) http://www.migration4development.org/content/about-jmdi
is also establishing the *Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD)*\(^\text{18}\) intended as a global hub of knowledge creation, knowledge sharing, and policy expertise on migration and development issues.

A lack of effective coordination has also been a criticism regularly levelled at the international community. One response has been the establishment of the *Global Migration Group (GMG)*, an inter-agency group that meets at Heads of Agency and working levels and aims to promote the wider application of all relevant international and regional instruments relating to migration, and the provision of more coherent and stronger leadership to improve the overall effectiveness of the United Nations (UN) and the international community’s policy and operational response to international migration. Current members of the GMG are: the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)\(^\text{18}\), the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)\(^\text{18}\), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN Population Fund (UNFPA), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the World Bank, and UN Regional Commissions. *In its Position Paper for the 2013 High-Level Dialogue, IOM expresses support for the ongoing review process of the GMG and the intention to create a multi-annual work plan for the Group.*\(^\text{19}\)

Another example of coordination among UN agencies is the *annual coordination meeting on international migration* hosted for the eleventh time in 2013 by the UNDESA. This meeting had four main objectives: to review preparations for the 2013 High-Level Dialogue; to discuss the achievements of the Global Forum on Migration and Development; to review recent contributions to the migration evidence-base; and to provide a venue for international organizations to exchange information on current migration activities and present new initiatives.

### 4.4 Cooperation

In acknowledgement of the broadening geographical scope of international migration, referred to in Section 2 above, *there has been increasing cooperation between states on international migration and development, at a bilateral, regional, and occasionally global level.*

At the bilateral level, *labour mobility agreements* have been identified as a promising mechanism for ensuring that the potential benefits of migration accrue both to origin and destination countries, as well as to migrants themselves. While some countries recruit labour on the basis of Memoranda of Understandings (MoUs), the majority now rely on bilateral agreements. The main difference between the two is that bilateral agreements are legally binding.\(^\text{20}\) There has been a significant increase in bilateral agreements in recent years. The reason that increasing numbers of countries are signing bilateral labour agreements is that they offer an effective method for regulating the recruitment and
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employment of foreign workers; they allow for greater state involvement in the migration process; they can be tailored to the specific supply and demand characteristics of the origin and destination countries; and they can provide effective mechanisms for protecting migrants.

Destination countries normally select a bilateral partner origin country for four main reasons.\textsuperscript{21} Some countries use bilateral agreements to manage migration by asking origin countries to sign in exchange readmission agreements for migrants in an irregular situation. Some countries may wish to promote specific economic ties or wider regional economic integration. Another objective is to strengthen cultural ties between partner countries. Finally, some countries may sign bilateral agreements to prevent indiscriminate international recruitment in specific sectors, especially health. This range of goals makes the effectiveness of bilateral agreements difficult to gauge, because at times these goals can conflict, and the effectiveness of agreements will depend on the weight assigned to each goal.\textsuperscript{22} An additional challenge lies in the effective implementation of these agreements.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) has identified 24 basic elements that need to be addressed in bilateral labour agreements,\textsuperscript{23} while IOM and OSCE have developed a matrix of good practice.\textsuperscript{24}

Moving up the scale to the regional level, the European Union (EU) has developed a \textit{Global Approach to Migration} including dialogue and partnerships with non-EU countries, and intended to address migration and asylum issues in a comprehensive manner.\textsuperscript{25} The main priorities of the approach are to facilitate legal migration and mobility; prevent and reduce irregular migration; and strengthen synergies between migration and development. In the case of the latter concrete actions have included: enhancing the impact of remittances and diaspora investments in non-EU countries; addressing the so-called ‘brain drain’ and ‘brain waste’ phenomena; increasing the portability of pension rights; and promoting circular migration. The EU has developed a number of specific tools to promote migration and development, including migration profiles, migration missions, cooperation platforms, and mobility partnerships. The African Union (AU) has also developed an African Common Position on Migration and Development.

\textit{Evaluating the impact of cooperative partnerships and developing effective practice is difficult. In the specific context of migration and development, some general principles adopted in the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011-20 may be relevant.\textsuperscript{26} These are listed as: country ownership and leadership, an integrated approach; genuine partnership; result orientation; consideration of migration in relation to peace, security, development and human rights; equity; voice and representation; and a balanced role for the State and market considerations.}
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\end{footnotesize}
Linkages between migration and development can also be facilitated through *Regional Economic Communities (RECs)*. Intra-EU migrants, for example, enjoy a high standard of portability of healthcare and pensions, and similar multilateral schemes have been introduced by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR). IOM is also cooperating directly with a number of African sub-regional bodies, including the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the East African Community (EAC), the Maghreb Arab Union (UMA) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in developing partnerships to reinforce the links between migration and development, for example by promoting the Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA) programme. The final paper in this series will focus on international regional labour mobility and its impact on development. *Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs)* on migration represent a different form of international cooperation. These processes are state-led, dedicated migration fora, are not usually officially associated with formal regional or other institutions, and provide states the opportunity for dialogue centered on regionally- or thematically-relevant migration issues in an informal and non-binding setting. Although experiences vary widely across RCPs, a comparative analysis of some of the main processes has concluded that they have been effective in building trust between states, increasing understanding of migration issues, helping states better understand their capacity requirements, fostering the exchange of information and experiences, breaking down divides between states and within states between departments, creating networks, and harmonizing regional positions.\(^\text{27}\)

Building the capacity of RCPs is a way to increase cooperation between states at the regional level, often in conjunction with other partners. A review commissioned by IOM collated a series of lessons learned on the circumstances in which RCPs are most effective.\(^\text{28}\) Networking is identified as critical, in particular between and after meetings. This effect can be supported through the designation in participating states of RCP focal points, and facilitated for example through the tabulation, distribution, and maintenance of e-mail and telephone lists. The Bali Process, for example, has established a liaison network. An associated point is that *networking is easier where RCPs are relatively small*. Where large numbers of participating states are involved, one way to promote networking and continue to build trust and consensus is to devolve responsibility to working groups and taskforces that bring together a smaller number of the states involved. The *level and type of participation is also important*, preferably combining political and technical officials, from the full range of government ministries involved in migration issues, and with consistency of representation. Another recommendation is for a *two-level structure*, allowing for technical-level workshops and seminars, and a political-level meeting to establish consensus and if necessary coordinate a regional position.

Another proposal is to promote *greater cooperation between and among RCPs; and between RCPs and Regional Economic Communities (RECs)*. Sometimes this will not be appropriate because the migration priorities of concern to RCPs may be so different, although sharing experiences on administrative and technical issues may still be appropriate. Sometimes it is in effect already taking place, for example where a single state participates in more than one RCP. One option for greater cooperation is to provide opportunities for non-members to attend RCP meetings in an observer capacity. Another is to convene

---

\(^{27}\) Hansen (2010)

\(^{28}\) Hansen (2010)
on a regular basis meetings that bring together representatives of the various RCPs,\(^{29}\) as is being done by IOM with its biannual global meetings of the chairs and secretariats of all the RCPs, with the fourth such meeting scheduled for May 2013 in Lima, Peru.\(^{30}\)

5. CONCLUSION

This paper is intended to provide the basis for a round table discussion to assist Permanent Missions at UN Headquarters prepare their contributions and participation at the 3-4 October 2013 UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, where one of the four agreed Round tables will focus on strengthening partnerships and coherence on international migration, focusing on integrating migration into development policies. The paper has distinguished coherence, consultation, coordination and cooperation. It has provided a concise review of a substantial literature on these concepts as they apply to migration and development, identifying concrete examples, highlighting challenges, and listing where appropriate concrete recommendations.
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