

REPORT OF THE MEETING

The Seventh United Nations Coordination Meeting on International Migration took place at United Nations Headquarters in New York, from 20 to 21 November 2008. The meeting was organized by the Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) of the United Nations Secretariat. The main objectives of the meeting were to discuss the follow-up to the 2006 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development; to assess the consequences of the financial and economic crisis on international migration and development, and to exchange information on current and planned activities in the area of international migration and development.

Some eighty participants attended the meeting, including representatives of agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations system, offices of the United Nations Secretariat, including the regional commissions, as well as other intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental institutions active in the field of international migration. Also present were invited experts and representatives of United Nations Member States.

I. OPENING

Ms. Hania Zlotnik, Director of the Population Division of UN/DESA, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants. She noted that more people lived outside their country of birth today than at any time in history, and that the numbers of people who moved across international borders was expected to continue to increase in the future. International migration had moved to the forefront of national and international agendas. The annual coordination meeting on international migration, convened by the Population Division, was the only system-wide forum where representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) could share information on international migration and discuss emerging issues. The 2008 Coordination Meeting provided an opportunity within the United Nations system to review specific implications of the economic and financial crisis for international migration. The meeting also enhanced coherence between the United Nations system and the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), an informal, State-led process.

Ms. Zlotnik informed participants that the General Assembly, at its sixty-third session, was expected to adopt a resolution on the follow-up to the High-level Dialogue¹. The report of the Secretary-General on international migration and development, prepared for the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, would be presented during the second half of the morning.

Ms. Zlotnik then outlined the meeting agenda and introduced the first speakers, Mr. Esteban Conejos Jr., Under-Secretary for Migrant Workers Affairs, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines and Chair of the Second Global Forum and Mr. Athanasios Nakos, Vice-Minister of the Interior of Greece and Chair of the Third Global Forum.

II. THE GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Conejos reported that the Second Global Forum on Migration and Development held in Manila, the Philippines, from 27 to 30 October 2008, had been very successful. The Forum's Civil Society meeting (27 to 28 October) was attended by over 220 people; the Government meeting (29 to 30 October) was attended by 1,130 delegates, representing some 163 Member States and observers of the United Nations. The conference also benefited from the participation of numerous high-ranking officials, such as

the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-Moon, and the President of the Philippines, Ms. Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. The meeting was the first global meeting on migration and development held in Asia.

In presenting the highlights of the Manila Forum, Mr. Conejos said that the Civil Society Days, organized by the Ayala Foundation, Inc., had been broader in scope and had achieved a greater degree of engagement than during the 2007 Global Forum. One such improvement was the expansion of the Civil Society meeting from a single day in Brussels to two days in Manila. He also mentioned the enhanced discussions between government delegates and civil society. Mr. Conejos recalled that during the Brussels Forum there was insufficient time allotted for discussion between government delegates and civil society. The outcomes of the Civil Society meeting had been presented during the governmental meeting offering little opportunity for debate. In Manila, Mr. Conejos led a delegation of governments to discuss the Civil Society meeting outcomes before the meetings among governments began. He also mentioned the three new workshops, entitled Voices from the Region, which highlighted regional perspectives. Mr. Conejos then listed the three key recommendations that emerged from the Civil Society meeting: (a) emphasis on the benefits of migration, and on resisting the temptation to reduce migration in the current economic circumstances; (b) recognition of the need for development of a global architecture to ensure a rights-based approach to migration; and (c) renewed commitment to development through realization of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), full employment and decent work. According to Mr. Conejos, civil society, for the first time, recognized the benefits that migration brought not only to migrants, but to countries of origin and destination.

Mr. Conejos explained that the Government meeting consisted of two plenary sessions and eight break-out round table discussions, including a special session on the Future of the Forum for heads of delegations. The round table discussions were organized according to the following topics: (a) migration, development and human rights; (b) securing development impacts through regular migration, and (c) policy and institutional coherence and partnerships. The ensuing discussions yielded 33 practical recommendations and possible follow-up actions. He said that the Manila Forum's most significant contribution to the overall GFMD process was to emphasize the rights of migrants and discuss the ways to empower migrants to contribute to development. This shifted the focus of the migration debate away from economic costs and benefits and more toward migrants and their families, highlighting the human face of migration and development. Mr. Conejos cautioned against the false notion that migrants went abroad to promote development. Rather, people migrated to create a better life for themselves and their families.

The Special Session on the Future of the Forum was chaired by the Special Representative to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on International Migration and Development, Mr. Peter Sutherland. Since Greece, Argentina, Spain and Morocco had already offered to host future Global Forums, the immediate future of the GFMD seemed secure. In 2008, a light support unit has been established within IOM in order to assist the Chair-in-Office with basic administrative matters. While the Forum was not directly responsible for monitoring the projects and follow-up actions that emanated from its meetings, a website administered by the support unit could help achieve this goal. Mr. Conejos said that the Forum enjoyed the full backing of the Secretary-General, demonstrated both by his presence in Brussels and Manila and by the important role played by his Special Representative on International Migration and Development. The Global Migration Group (GMG) was an obvious partner both for providing expertise during preparations for the GFMD meetings and for implementation of GFMD outcomes. There was also consensus that the fundamental purpose of the Forum was to provide a place for dialogue between governments, which in turn needed to be informed by civil society. The need for better communication between the Global Forum and regional consultative processes was emphasized. During the session, it was urged that the donor base should be broadened, both to fund the participation of more people and to dispel any perception that the GFMD was a donor-driven process. In addition, there

was general agreement that the Forum and the United Nations served different but complementary purposes. The Forum was a venue for informal discussion of practical solutions to particular problems, whereas the United Nations provided a venue in which to develop normative solutions.

In conclusion, Mr. Conejos expressed the need to ensure continuity in the Forum agenda. In particular, he noted that future meetings of the GFMD must deal with the central issues of protecting migrants and of the coherence of institutions and policy in setting international migration policies.

Mr. Nakos expressed his gratitude for the Secretary-General's support of the GFMD. He added his own thanks for Mr. Sutherland's contributions to the GFMD, in particular the valuable suggestions he had communicated to the Greek Chair. Mr. Nakos assured participants that Greece's presidency of the Forum would strive to maintain a close and strong link between the GFMD and the United Nations, while also setting high standards for the organization of GFMD III and future Forums. The Greek Chair was committed to transparency and open dialogue. He stressed the need to go beyond declarations and general conclusions, asserting that the success of the Forum depended on practical solutions to concrete problems. The GFMD intended to work toward the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs, and to ensure that migration became a matter of choice rather than necessity.

Mr. Nakos announced that the theme of the third GFMD, to be held in Athens, Greece, from 2 to 5 November 2009, would be Integrating Migration Policies in Development Strategies for the Benefit of All. He said that a Greek task force had already been established to prepare for the Forum and that the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation was organizing the Civil Society Days. While the basic purpose of the Forum was to support dialogue between governments, it was also intended to foster relationships with civil society. The third meeting of the Forum would maintain thematic continuity by delving deeper into the same issues addressed by the first two GFMD meetings. The Forum would also focus on current challenges in international migration and development, including the impact of the global economic and financial crisis on migration. Mr. Nakos said that GMG had become a valuable source of expertise and that its member organizations had provided useful support to the Global Forum. He suggested that the GMG and GMFD explore opportunities for further collaboration.

In closing, he said that Greece was an ideal host for the Global Forum considering its recent change from being a country of emigration to a country of immigration. He pointed out that migration was a global phenomenon requiring a holistic approach and emphasized the importance of increasing synergies between migration and development. International migration must be an integral part of the international development agenda as well as national and regional development strategies. He was looking forward to the meeting and requested the full support of all participants, which would be crucial to the success of continued international dialogue on international migration and development.

During the discussion, participants thanked Mr. Conejos and Mr. Nakos for their detailed presentations. The representative of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) asked about the follow-up process to the Global Forum. Mr. Conejos replied that the Forum was not an operational body and that governments themselves must plan, develop, finance and implement the practical outcomes in which they were interested. Governments also required expert assistance from the United Nations system and other international organizations to support those outcomes. Mr. Conejos informed the audience that the report of the Manila Global Forum would be available by the end of February 2009 and would subsequently be submitted to the Secretary-General.

III. FOLLOW UP TO THE HIGH-LEVEL DIALOGUE ON INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Philip Guest, Assistant Director of the Population Division of UN/DESA introduced the 2008 Secretary-General's Report on international migration and development, prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 61/208, calling for appropriate follow-up options to the High-level Dialogue, and resolution 62/270, requesting an evaluation of existing cooperation mechanisms on international migration and development. The report surveyed the work of relevant bodies, agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations on this topic and found that the High-level Dialogue had stimulated work on international migration and development as well as sharpened the focus on the migration-development nexus. Mr. Guest thanked all participants for providing valuable input to the report.

In order to identify follow-up options to the High-level Dialogue, the Population Division had distributed a questionnaire to all permanent missions of United Nations Member States with a copy to the national focal points designated for the Global Forum. As of the 15 July 2008 submission deadline, 64 Member States had responded. Three main follow-up options emerged from the questionnaire responses: (a) to continue including an item on international migration and development on the agenda of the General Assembly; (b) to give special consideration to ideas and initiatives generated by the Global Forum on Migration and Development in the Assembly's deliberations on international migration and development; and (c) to periodically conduct a high-level dialogue in the Assembly taking stock of advances made by governments, the United Nations system and other international or intergovernmental organizations at the regional, interregional and global levels.

With regard to the evaluation of intergovernmental cooperation mechanisms, including regional consultative processes (RCPs), Mr. Guest stated that the report showed that intergovernmental cooperation in the area of international migration had markedly increased since the 2006 High-level Dialogue. The evaluation had shown that the success of RCPs depended in large part on their institutional support. He cautioned, however, that since the RCPs were fairly new it was still too early to determine their role in maximizing the positive contribution of international migration to development.

In the ensuing discussion participants asked how RCPs were evaluated for the purposes of the report. Mr. Guest replied that the criteria were informal and that conclusions were inferred from RCP outcomes over the previous two years as well as background papers on RCPs prepared for the Manila Forum. The representative of IOM said that the question of evaluating RCPs dated back to the time of the Global Commission on International Migration, and that governments were somewhat reticent regarding the question. RCPs themselves had not undertaken formal evaluations because governments felt they were an informal, non-binding process. IOM was planning to convene a meeting of the chairs and secretariats of major RCPs in early 2009 following an evaluation of RCPs that IOM had undertaken with financial support from the MacArthur Foundation.

Participants also remarked on the growing participation of civil society at the GFMD and similar events as well as its role in a future High-level Dialogue. The representative of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) expressed concern that the Secretary-General's report contained insufficient coverage of civil society activities. Civil society had become more involved in the debates, and had both participated in and led a number of regional consultations, including in Asia. Mr. Hovy recalled the important contribution of civil society to the 2006 High-level Dialogue. He added that the consultations mentioned by the representative of ICMC would be useful in preparing for the civil society hearings in advance of a second High-level Dialogue.

The representative of the NGO Committee on Migration said it was her understanding that GFMD II had achieved substantial progress in advancing the role of civil society by extending the Civil Society Days from one day to two, and by providing opportunities for civil society and governments to interact more closely during the meeting. Looking to the future, she asked for greater transparency regarding the selection process for members of the Steering Group of the Global Forum. She noted further that NGOs were at times overshadowed by academics who produced reports on behalf of NGOs but did not necessarily represent them or their views. She advocated a bottom-up approach to organizing civil society participation in these processes.

The representative of IUSSP said that the number of university-based researchers working on international migration was expanding rapidly which was evidenced by the number of papers on the topic submitted to professional meetings. While such work still seemed scattered and driven by the diverse interests of individual researchers, it could lead to a more solid evidence base for future high-level dialogues. The representative noted that many researchers who participated in the Manila Forum were members of IUSSP, contributing in their own capacity.

The representative of the World Bank suggested that in preparing for a future high-level dialogue, it would be helpful to publish well-researched and cohesive reports prior to the meeting. He suggested that a future World Development Report might focus on migration, and that a few powerful reports could move the agenda on international migration and development in a substantive way. The representative of the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University suggested that a research conference and subsequent publication of its proceedings should take place prior to the next High-level Dialogue. Supporting this argument, the representative of the Harvard Kennedy School of Government stated that the academic community had a role both in contributing research to governments and in enhancing the role of civil society.

The representative of Western Union supported the suggestion of publishing reports prior to a future high-level dialogue. She remarked that concerted use of and contribution by businesses had been missing from the discussions at the GFMD. The business community had an interest in supporting human rights of migrants and in implementing outcomes in conjunction with governments and civil society.

The representatives of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and IOM noted a lack of development practitioners in the GFMD process. ESCAP had organized a regional meeting prior to the GFMD so that delegates could familiarize themselves with the topic before attending the Forum. However, the GFMD was attended primarily by government representatives from ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice and Labour. Mr. Hovy noted that the theme of GFMD III might encourage greater attendance by development practitioners. He asked whether the preparatory consultations organized by ESCAP and ECLAC included a place for civil society. The representatives of both organizations replied that thus far the meetings had been limited to governments, but that this might change in the near future. The representative of the Regional Commissions Office in New York reported that the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) had indicated that regional preparatory meetings had mainly taken the form of expert group meetings which were less conducive than meetings of government officials in building the capacity of governments participating in the Global Forum.

The representative of the Human Development Report office stated that the 2009 Human Development Report would address migration. Her office was in the information-gathering stage and had conducted six regional consultations, including one following the GFMD in Manila, that had convened a range of experts on migration. Three more regional consultations were planned.

The representative of ICMC expressed appreciation for the collaboration between UNDP and the European Commission in funding a call for proposals on co-development projects, involving migrant communities in both countries of origin and destination. ICMC had seen a slow but steady increase in the participation of development agencies in discussing international migration and development. For example, several of the Caritas groups engaged in development activities now expressed interest in migration, as evident in their participation in the Manila Forum. ICMC was the only faith-based organization among the 16 NGOs which had worked with the Ayala Foundation, Inc. preparing the Civil Society Days in Manila. The representative expressed concern that his organization had been involved very late in the preparation process, by which time the structure of the Civil Society Days, including the designation of writers and presenters of papers, had already been decided. Seconding the comment by the NGO Committee on Migration made earlier, the ICMC representative noted that most of the presenters during the Civil Society Days were from academia, and he hoped that would change in the future. He welcomed the strong involvement of labour unions at GFMD II. In concluding, he stressed that the Forum had advanced the process of consultation and collaboration among governments and civil society begun in Brussels, and suggested that further progress could be made by creating an interface where common themes could be discussed with governments during the second Civil Society Day.

The representative of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) expressed concern that her organization was not mentioned in the 2008 Secretary-General's report on international migration and development. She said that UNIFEM had been working with women migrant workers in nine countries since 2001. Similarly, the representative of the World Trade Organization (WTO) expressed disappointment that the WTO was not mentioned in the 2008 Secretary-General's report, especially in light of its work on Mode 4 of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

In closing, Mr. Guest assured participants that inputs from both UNIFEM and WTO would be considered for future reports. He noted that the morning discussion had focused on the contribution of various actors prior to and during the 2006 High-level Dialogue and meetings of the Global Forum, and that a number of participants suggested that research reports be produced in time to inform the next GFMD and a future High-level Dialogue. In this regard he noted with interest that ESCAP and ECLAC had held regional preparatory meetings in advance of the Manila Forum.

IV. INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION, REMITTANCES AND THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

Mr. Dilip Ratha of the World Bank made a presentation on Remittances: Outlook for 2008-2010. He said that after several years of strong growth, the third quarter of 2008 had witnessed a slowdown in remittance flows to developing countries. The slowdown was expected to deepen in 2009 in response to the global economic and financial crisis, although the degree of moderation was uncertain. He predicted that total remittance flows would remain resilient because many countries had established immigrant populations which would not immediately return home as a result of the crisis.

Mr. Ratha stressed that too little was known about the scale, scope and duration of the economic and financial crisis. It was evident, however, that the current crisis differed from previous ones in that it originated in the more developed countries. Previous crises due to financial downturns, natural disasters and political conflicts, which had originated in developing countries such as Haiti, Mexico, Somalia and Thailand, seemed to exert a countercyclical effect on remittances.

In November 2008, the World Bank estimated that remittances to developing countries in 2008 would total US\$283 billion, up from US\$229 billion for 2006. Mr. Ratha said that some countries, such as Egypt and Nigeria, had recently revised past remittance estimates, a common problem affecting World Bank figures. In the case of Egypt, remittances in 2008 were revised upward from US\$4 billion to US\$7.5

billion and in the case of Nigeria from US\$3 billion to US\$18 billion. The annual growth rate of remittance flows to developing countries had declined from 18 per cent in 2005-2006 to seven per cent in 2007-2008. India, China and Mexico were the top three remittance recipients, having received more than US\$20 billion each in 2008. In Tajikistan, Moldova and Tonga remittances accounted for more than 30 per cent of GDP in 2007.

Mr. Ratha confirmed that total remittances to Mexico had declined in recent months, due in part to the slowdown in the construction sector in the United States. However, the average amount per worker of remittances sent to Mexico had remained at some US\$340 to US\$350 per month. Mr. Ratha said that in times of crisis entrepreneurs did not generally lay off unskilled and low-paid workers first. Even during an economic downturn, migrants might determine that they were still better off in countries of destination, and thus better able to help families back home. Tighter border controls further reduced the propensity of migrants to repatriate. Mr. Ratha concluded by saying that the global economic and financial crisis would affect remittances, but that the depth and extent of the crisis remained uncertain and that its impact would likely vary by country, geographic region and employment sector.

The ensuing discussion focused on the effects of the crisis on migration. Mr. Ivo Havinga of the United Nations Statistics Division said that official remittance statistics tended to underestimate the actual size of remittance flows. Following a request from the G7 countries in June 2004, an international working group was created to improve the quality of remittance statistics. This working group, the “Luxembourg Group”, had recommended that three new categories — personal remittances, total remittances, and total remittances and transfers to nonprofit institutions serving households — be added to the Balance of Payments Manual. The United Nations Statistics Division shared the view of the Group that remittance statistics often underestimated the total flow of remittances. For example, not all migration-related transfers were included, especially those between non-profit organizations, which reached high levels following the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. In order to remedy this deficiency, Mr. Havinga suggested combining data collected by various organizations. As an example of regional data collection efforts, the presenter cited the Centre for Latin American Monetary Studies (CEMLA) in Mexico, the regional association of Latin American and Caribbean central banks. The Center had a multi-year remittance measurement programme and had published reports on how to compile such data from various sources.

Mr. Havinga agreed with Mr. Ratha that the impact of the financial crisis on remittances would vary significantly by employment sector and migration corridor. He urged that those discussing the impact of the financial crisis on developing countries also consider official development assistance (ODA) and foreign direct investments (FDI), both of which he expected to be affected. In response to Mr. Havinga’s remarks, Mr. Ratha agreed that combining remittance data from various sources could fill some data gaps.

The representative of the World Food Programme (WFP) asked how less developed countries would be affected once the financial crisis reached them. He also asked whether the frequency of sending remittances changed during periods of financial crisis. The representative of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) observed that, contrary to Mr. Ratha’s assertion, immigrants in the construction sector in OECD countries were normally the first to lose their jobs during economic downturns. The representative of UNDP doubted whether during economic crises immigrants tended to remain in countries of destination due to persistent expectations of higher earnings. Mr. Ratha responded that during times of economic crisis, immigrants without jobs could only remain in countries of destination for a limited time and then would return home. However, it was clear that during economic turmoil immigrants were still often better off remaining in countries of destination because they were still earning more money than they would be in their countries of origin. It was still too early, however, to observe the impact of the current crisis on remittance and migration patterns.

The representative of UNIFEM said that the number of migrant women was increasing, especially in the Middle East, and that remittance estimates disaggregated by sex were needed to help governments allocate budgetary resources for migrant women. Mr. Ratha replied that unfortunately global remittance data by sex were not yet available. However, citing survey-based research, he noted that men and women differed in their remittance behaviour. Whereas men used all available remittance channels, women tended to use only reliable and trusted sources, which were more expensive. This was one reason why the amounts of money remitted by women were generally lower than those remitted by men. However, more work needed to be done in this field. The representative of the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) said that survey work conducted in Jamaica by her organization showed that the total amounts of remittances sent by men and women were about the same, but women tended to send smaller amounts of money, but did so more frequently than men.

Mr. Hovy then introduced Ms. Barbara Span of Western Union, an organization providing money transfer services in about 200 countries and territories worldwide. Ms. Span presented the Global Migration Barometer, a study conducted by the Economist Intelligence Unit on behalf of Western Union to assess (a) attractiveness and accessibility of countries for migrants, and (b) countries' needs for migrants to sustain economic growth. Sixty-one mostly more developed countries were selected for the study, in which an international migrant was defined according to the United Nations definition of a long-term migrant. A country's attractiveness to migrants was measured in terms of its economic and social conditions. Accessibility to migrants was assessed in terms of ease of entry, integration and legal environment, including public attitudes to migration and governments' respect for migrants' rights. In total, twenty-two indicators were identified gauging both attractiveness and accessibility. Quantitative and qualitative data were then collected and weighted to reflect the relative importance of each indicator. From this a composite Global Migration Barometer score was derived and used to rank countries. The need for migrants to sustain economic growth was assessed by collecting qualitative and quantitative data describing countries' demographic situation, especially future labour needs, labour force participation at older ages, public pension, childcare and health-care provisions.

Overall, the study showed that politically stable and democratic countries with high living standards were the most attractive destinations for migrants, including former colonial powers and English-speaking former colonies of the developed world. Further, most countries attractive to migrants were not necessarily in need of migrants. With the exception of Japan, countries with high demand for migrants were in Western and Eastern Europe. This was closely linked to the fact that these countries had ageing populations resulting in high demand for immigrants to supplement their labour force. Australia, Canada, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China, New Zealand, Singapore and the United States ranked high in terms of accessibility for migrants. Ms. Span argued that youth-oriented cultures with liberal attitudes towards migrant families, legal environments protecting migrants and pro-immigration policies contributed to the high score for these countries.

Mr. Hovy thanked Ms. Span for her presentation, adding that he was particularly pleased to hear from a representative of a private sector enterprise. Some of the participants enquired whether the Barometer could track changes in the attractiveness of countries to migrants over time to which Ms. Span responded that the Barometer was not designed for this purpose. She also explained that the weights chosen for the different indicators were assigned by external experts to account for the relative importance of the indicators. She thanked the organizers for the opportunity to make the presentation and expressed hope for closer interaction between business, government and civil society in the area of international migration and development.

V. RESPONDING TO POLICY CHALLENGES: ESTIMATING INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION FLOWS

Mr. George Lemaitre of the OECD described his organization's recent international migration data initiative. In many OECD countries immigrant statistics were generated from population registers, with disaggregation by place of birth, citizenship, sex and age. However these statistics lacked comparability across countries. In general, internationally comparable flow statistics were required which provided the following detail on migrants: (a) country of origin; (b) sex; (c) age; (d) category of entry (labour, family, humanitarian, etc.); (e) duration of stay; (f) changes in immigration status, and (g) skill level. Due to problems with existing data, the OECD had decided to apply innovative estimation techniques to the available data in order to compare international migration flows in OECD countries.

The OECD project used residence permit data and identified permanent and permanent-type migrants as defined by the receiving country. Permanent and permanent-type migrants included persons who had been: (a) granted the right of permanent residence upon entry; (b) admitted with a permit of limited duration that was renewable indefinitely; (c) granted entry under the free-movement regime of the European Union or between Australia and New Zealand; or (d) changed their migration status from short-term to permanent. The data were then disaggregated into work-related migration, family-related flows, and "free-movement regime" flows, such as those prevailing in the European Union or between Australia and New Zealand. Using these data, Mr. Lemaitre presented international immigrant flows by category of entry for 18 OECD countries for the period 2002-2006. He showed that there were relatively few labour migrants for these countries, and that for the most part people migrated freely within the European Union or for family-related reasons. For 2006, estimates of the total number of immigrants in OECD countries were in general 19 per cent higher than data published by national statistical offices. In the case of Japan, the Statistics Bureau had estimated 325,600 immigrants for 2006 versus 87,600 estimated by the OECD, a difference of 73 per cent. Germany had estimated the number of international immigrants at 558,500 people in 2006 versus 216,000 estimated by the OECD, a difference of 61 per cent. For Canada and the United States, however, official data and estimates produced by the OECD did not differ at all. In conclusion, Mr. Lemaitre asserted that certain types of migrants —such as temporary labour migrants, migrants adjusting their migration status and certain special cases, such as intra-corporate transfers of people, or high-skilled versus low-skilled migrants— were neglected both by national statistical offices and by researchers in general.

In the ensuing discussion Ms. Zlotnik praised the work done by the OECD on estimating migration flows. By collecting migration data according to national definitions, the spirit of the United Nations recommendations on international migration statistics was maintained. She remarked that permits by definition represented only the legal component of migration, while population registers could include people who were not necessarily regular. Ms. Zlotnik concurred with Mr. Lemaitre regarding the importance of studying temporary labour migration flows and migrants adjusting their status. Collecting permit data was very important and the OECD should make such data available to researchers. Mr. Lemaitre replied that such data were generally available on-line and that his office was planning to analyse it in more detail.

The representative of Cornell University remarked that some of the disparities between the OECD estimates and national data might be due to large numbers of student migrants in OECD countries who had adjusted their status and became permanent migrants. Mr. Lemaitre replied that student retention rates were not very high: the highest such rate was in Japan, while other countries had rates of only 15 to 20 per cent. The representative of the ICMC wondered if statistics on migrant workers should always include some reference to undocumented migrants, estimated in many industrialized countries at about five per cent of total migrants. Mr. Lemaitre, supported by Mr. Hovy, said that such data were scattered through various ministries and agencies in many European countries, and that only the United States published estimates regularly. Hence the ability to supply such references in migration statistics varied by country.

VI. KEEPING MIGRATION IN THE SPOTLIGHT: TRAINING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Ms. Colleen Thouez of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in New York presented an overview of the Institute and its work in the area of migration. UNITAR was the principal training body of the United Nations system targeting delegates from United Nations Member States and focusing on training for capacity-building and research in the areas of: (a) the United Nations system and its functioning; (b) international law and policy, including international migration, environmental governance, peace and justice issues; and (c) diplomatic skill-strengthening, including workshops on negotiation skills, public speaking and drafting of resolutions. UNITAR provided seminars, workshops and other training opportunities, including e-learning courses. The Office also cooperated with the United Nations Secretariat, programmes and funds, as well as academia, foundations and the private sector.

Ms. Thouez then provided a history of international migration dialogues at the global, regional and country levels, beginning with the Inter-Governmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugee and Migration Policies (IGC) in the mid-1980s. The first joint statement by United Nations Member States on the topic of international migration was issued at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). In the years that followed policy discussions in Geneva focused on international migration management and protection of migrants, whereas discussions of migration and development took place at the United Nations in New York. The Berne Initiative, which began in 2001 as a States-owned consultative process, resulted in the International Agenda for Migration Management (IAMM), a reference system and non-binding policy framework intended to facilitate cooperation between states in planning and managing the movement of people in a humane and orderly way. The 2002 Doyle Report, commissioned by the former Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, found that the field of migration within the United Nations system lacked direction. It recommended the creation of the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), which was founded in 2004 and concluded its work in 2005. In its final report in 2005 the Global Commission provided a comprehensive analysis of key global policy issues in the field of international migration. It proposed six 'Principles for Action' and thirty-three related recommendations, intended to guide formulation of migration policies at the national, regional and global levels. In 2006, the High-level Dialogue took place in New York, followed by the first Global Forum held in Brussels, Belgium, in 2007.

Ms. Thouez said that UNITAR supported the global dialogue on international migration and development through a number of initiatives, such as its collaborative work with ILO, IOM and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in the International Migration Policy Programme. This programme ran from 1998 to 2005 and provided capacity-building on migration and refugee issues to governments from developing countries around the world. From 2004 to 2005 UNITAR provided secretariat support for the Global Commission. The Migration and Development Seminar Series was established in 2005 to advance policy-thinking and dialogue on migration-related topics among New York's diplomatic community.

Mr. Jimmy Blas from the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations described his experience with the Seminar Series. He said it offered a unique opportunity to learn more about international migration, and to share expertise and best practices at a time when the topic was being debated at the United Nations. Looking to the future, Ms. Thouez informed the audience that UNITAR, with the support of the Government of Spain and the IOM, would extend seminars to other United Nations duty stations. UNITAR was also offering international migration law courses at United Nations Headquarters and in other United Nations locations. These courses provided diplomats and other

stakeholders with in-depth knowledge of relevant international legal instruments as well as with practical skills on how to implement them. UNITAR was planning to organize regional workshops on operationalizing GFMD recommendations. Lastly, UNITAR was considering offering certain migration-related seminars via e-learning.

Ms. Zlotnik thanked Ms. Thouez and UNITAR for their work, remarking that the entire United Nations community had benefited, not just diplomats. She was pleased to learn that the Seminar Series would be replicated in Geneva, where governments discussed international migration more often than in New York. Regarding the historical review of the debate on international migration, she observed that the topic of international migration had been addressed at the 1974 and 1984 population conferences, but came only to the forefront during the ICPD in 1994 when governments were dealing with large refugee inflows. Ms. Zlotnik said a meeting at the United Nations on international migration did not occur until 2006 because there was no consensus between governments regarding objectives and possible outcomes. The representative of IOM echoed Ms. Zlotnik's remarks regarding the 1994 ICPD, noting that an informal compromise was reached in Cairo regarding organization of a conference on international migration, but that there was no follow-up until the High-level Dialogue in 2006. He added that the numerous regional dialogues on international migration that followed the Cairo discussion were an unintended consequence of this. In response to Ms. Zlotnik's comments, Ms. Thouez concluded by saying that reports and presentations from the Seminar Series were posted on the UNITAR website and distributed to Member States.

VII. THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION DATA FOR DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Mr. Douglas Massey of Princeton University presented preliminary findings from the work of the Commission on International Migration Data for Development Research. The Commission, supported by the Center for Global Development and funded by the MacArthur Foundation, focused on the state of migration statistics, and the question as to what data were needed to give researchers and policy makers an adequate empirical basis from which to assess migration's impact on countries. Mr. Massey said that despite numerous efforts, migration statistics remained weak and that there were more reliable statistics on the movement of goods and services than on the movement of people. So far, the Commission had compiled five key recommendations. First, censuses should include basic migration questions on place of birth, country of citizenship and place of residence five years ago. Tabulations for the population by country of birth and country of citizenship disaggregated by sex, age, place of residence five years ago, skill level and education should be made available. Second, administrative data sources should be better exploited, including information from visa statistics, enforcement and population registers. Third, the three basic migration questions on place of birth, country of citizenship and place of residence five years ago should be included in existing surveys, such as those conducted by Macro International (Demographic and Health Surveys), OECD and the World Bank. Further, it was important to create a template for a harmonized labour force survey, including a migration module for use in different countries. Fourth, access to microdata should be provided, especially since in many countries such data had become a low-cost, routine by-product of operations undertaken by statistical offices. There were political and ethical barriers to the release of such data, but these could be overcome, as shown by the release of microdata files accompanying the publication of standard census files from the United States Census Bureau. Fifth, capacity-building for the collection and dissemination of data should be undertaken. A core migration module should be developed for household surveys, including key questions capturing information on international migrants. Whenever possible these modules should be used in census-based surveys, intercensal surveys, special surveys, such as fertility surveys, or ageing surveys leading up to a World Migration Survey. In addition, people should be trained in survey administration and analysis.

Mr. Buettner of the Population Division expressed some concern about the emphasis on surveys to collect migration statistics. He said that more than 50 per cent of the world population was currently not covered by vital registration, and that the proportion of unregistered migrants was probably even higher. Attempting to fill this data gap with survey data was only a partial solution, since migrants needed official documents to assert their rights. Mr. Massey agreed with Mr. Buettner on the importance of documenting migrants but said that the recommendations were intended to facilitate data collection rather than address human rights issues. The representative of the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) asked about the Commission's plans for future work. Mr. Massey replied that once the report was finalized and sent to governments, the Commission intended to promote the recommendations worldwide.

The representative of the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) said his organization supported the efforts of the Commission. He noted that the United Nations principles and recommendations for the 2010 census round had been prepared, and that the three key migration questions mentioned by Mr. Massey were all included in the recommendations. The most controversial aspect of these recommendations concerned the concept of usual residence, for which there was as yet no agreed definition. Further, since many countries based their censuses on population registers, the boundaries between administrative and census data had eroded over the years. He referred to the limitations of using administrative data that were not intended for statistical purposes. He then reported that 60 censuses of the 2010 census round (2005-2014) had already been conducted and that data from 47 censuses were already available. Data on country of birth were available from 35 censuses while data on country of citizenship were available from 32 censuses. UNSD was preparing a guide for the release of microdata, with a special focus on data confidentiality. He concluded by saying that migrant stock statistics from censuses by age, sex, country of citizenship and period of arrival were available on the UNSD website.

The representative of the OECD said that survey coverage was always problematic but had been improving, and that good estimation techniques were needed to fill data gaps. He said that there were better data on movement in trade and services than on movement of persons. Although there was consensus as to collection and dissemination of trade statistics, there was no consensus or international agreement regarding migration statistics. However, the European Union had recently attempted to harmonize migration statistics, and the representative expressed hope that more intergovernmental organizations would follow its example. In terms of resource allocation, the representative advised investment in labour force surveys and administrative sources, such as population registers and visa collection systems, which represented a solid data source in OECD countries.

The representative of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) asked if the Commission had studied internal migration patterns. Mr. Massey replied that the Commission had only focused on international migration. However, he added that the United States Census Bureau had created microdata files from various United States decennial census counts that allowed the analysis of internal migration patterns. The Mexican Migration Project and the Latin American Migration Project had collected complete retrospective migration histories of migrants permitting the reconstruction of migration patterns within as well as between countries. The representative of the World Bank asked how skills and educational levels were defined, and if working with the Latin American countries Mr. Massey had encountered any political problems collecting and disseminating migration data. He also asked if Mr. Massey would cite particular countries that produced reliable migration data on a regular basis. Mr. Massey replied that at present the recommendations did not specify skills or educational levels, and that he had not encountered any political problems working with countries in Latin America. Regarding reliable migration data he mentioned Mexico, and said that the Argentinean Centro de Estudios de Población produced good quality migration data and studies for Latin America. Mr. Heilig of the Population Division reported that his Section was working on the 2008 Revision of the World Population Prospects. He observed that collecting migration flow data for countries by age and sex was problematic

and that the presence of undocumented migrants rendered existing estimates unreliable for some countries. He said that in addition to asking questions designed to capture international migration, countries also had to disseminate the data to the public. Mr. Massey agreed as to the need for quick dissemination and said that the recommendations issued by the Commission would mention this point.

The representative of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa asked whether Mr. Massey could cite some relevant research on African migration. He also said that ECA was supporting countries in the collection of migration data, and asked if other institutions could offer help to African countries in implementing a data collection system. Mr. Massey replied that there were comparatively few Africans in the United States, and that the United States census probably provided the most complete coverage. He also mentioned research projects on migrant flows from Africa, such as the one led by the French Institute nationale d'études démographiques (INED) on Senegalese migration to Europe. He said that African statistical systems were currently underdeveloped, and that for the time being it was best to focus on African migration captured by OECD countries.

Ms. Zlotnik thanked Mr. Massey for his presentation and reiterated that the report of the Commission was not finalized. She noted that people studying migration had different data needs, and that there was interest in sustaining and strengthening existing surveys. She pointed out that ECLAC, through its database Investigación de la Migración Internacional en Latinoamérica (IMILA), had stored and analysed census data on international migration for over three decades. She also expressed hope that in the future ECA would play a similar role with respect to African countries. The representative of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa asked ECLAC to support capacity-building efforts by ECA on migration-related topics, especially with regard to data collection and dissemination.

VIII. COORDINATION OF CURRENT AND PLANNED ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

During the last session of the meeting, representatives of United Nations offices, funds, and programmes and other institutions exchanged information regarding their work in the area of international migration. In total, 26 speakers took the floor. A summary of the interventions is provided below.

The representative of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) said that his office continued to work with member States, migrants and civil society to defend human rights of migrants and secure ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. In November 2007, the Committee on Migrant Workers had considered the report of El Salvador, followed by the reports of Bolivia and Syria in 2008. In 2009, it would review the reports of Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia and the Philippines. The Convention had been ratified by 39, mostly developing, countries and ratification by more countries was expected in the foreseeable future. OHCHR also supported the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants. In addition to annual human rights reports, the most recent of which concerned the criminalization of migrants, the Special Rapporteur issued country reports, two of which had been published in 2008 following visits to Guatemala and Mexico. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women had recently adopted General Recommendation No. 26 on the protection of migrant women. In September 2008, OHCHR with the support of the Government of Mexico had organized a conference on the rights of migrant children in which 26 government delegations and partner agencies had participated. The conference adopted recommendations concerning migration and children, including experiences of children left behind, children crossing borders and migrant children in receiving countries.

The representative of the United Nations Population Division called participants' attention to the Global Migration Database which was recently made available on the Migration Section's website. The database had been created in response to a growing demand for data on international migration following the discussions at the 2006 High-level Dialogue. UNICEF and UNDP's Special Unit for South-South Cooperation had provided financial support for its development, while the United Nations Statistics Division, the World Bank, the University of Sussex and the Minnesota Population Center had contributed data. The database contained publicly available data on the number ("stock") of international migrants, reported by country of enumeration, country of birth, citizenship, sex and age. The data were taken from population censuses, population registers, nationally representative sample surveys and other official statistical sources. The Population Division would release *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision* in the spring of 2009. These estimates of the number of international migrants were provided for 230 countries and territories of the world covering five-year time intervals for the period 1960 to 2010. The aforementioned Global Migration Database was the basis for these estimates and had significantly improved in coverage over the years. Hence, the robustness of the estimates of the foreign-born stock had significantly improved. In 2009, the Population Division would also issue *International Migration Flows to and from Selected Countries: The 2008 Revision*. The Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development in Asia and the Pacific was jointly organized by the Population Division and ESCAP in Bangkok, Thailand, from 20 to 21 September 2008, bringing together some 30 experts to discuss the linkages between international migration and development in the region. Papers and presentations from this meeting as well as the Sixth Coordination Meeting on International Migration were available on the Division's migration website².

The representative of the United Nations Statistics Division said that the Division's principal mandate was development of statistical methods and standards, data collection and dissemination, capacity-building and coordination of international statistical programmes and activities. Two major outputs from the Statistics Division in the field of migration were the *Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1* published in 1998, presenting recommendations on international migration flows and stock data, and the *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, Revision 2*, published in 2008, which defined the core international standards for the 2010 round of population and housing censuses. The Statistics Division had published the *Manual on Statistics of International Trade in Services* in 2002, providing guidelines for the compilation and dissemination of statistics on international trade in services. The Division was currently working on a technical report on the use of censuses and surveys for statistics on international migration, which aimed to showcase best practices for using censuses and surveys to study international migration. The Division collected data on international migrant stocks primarily from census questionnaires sent to national statistical offices. The data were made available through its Demographic Yearbook database. In regard to capacity-building and coordination of statistical activities, the Division had held a series of workshops on core census topics. Specialized workshops were planned on the measurement of international migration using a forthcoming handbook.

The representative of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) said that the Asia-Pacific High-level Meeting on International Migration and Development was the highlight of last year's activities. The meeting, jointly organized with the United Nations Population Division and IOM and hosted by the Government of Thailand, took place in Bangkok, Thailand, in September 2008 and brought together 22 ESCAP member States. The meeting served to build the capacity of Member States planning to attend the Manila Global Forum. It included round tables on remittances for development, the social aspects of migration, data and research, and the situation of migrants in least developed countries, landlocked countries and small island developing States. A chairman's summary was distributed at the end of the meeting and submitted to GFMD II. ESCAP had collaborated with the Population Division in organizing the expert group meeting on International Migration and Development in Asia and the Pacific held in Bangkok prior to the Asia-Pacific High-level

Meeting. Many of the experts who attended the expert group meeting served as resource persons for the High-level Meeting. ESCAP had published *Looking into Pandora's Box: The Social Implications of International Migration in Asia*, addressing the social dimensions of migration in the region, including gender issues, the impact of migration on family members left as well as marriage migration. Since 2005, ESCAP and IOM had co-chaired the Regional Thematic Working Group on International Migration including Human Trafficking, consisting of 15 United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations active in the field of migration. The group had produced the *Situation Report on International Migration in East and South-East Asia*, which provided country-specific analyses and an assessment of thematic issues relevant to the region. In 2009, ESCAP was planning to organize an expert group meeting to review the ICPD Programme of Action as well as that of the Asia-Pacific Population Conference. ESCAP would participate in a Development Account project aimed at strengthening national capacities to deal with international migration. Lastly, ESCAP was planning to study the impact of the global financial crisis on migration and remittances, and to develop a database on migration flows from selected countries.

The representative of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) reported that the number of international migrants in Latin American and the Caribbean had increased from 21 million migrants in 2000 to almost 26 million in 2005, some 13 per cent of the almost 200 million international migrants in the world. CELADE, the Population Division of ECLAC, was working on the following migration-related topics: (a) follow-up to the meeting of the ECLAC Ad Hoc Committee on Population and Development in Montevideo, Uruguay, in 2006; (b) follow-up to the high-level Ibero-American meetings such as those held in Spain (2005), Uruguay (2006) and Chile (2007); and (c) leading a Development Account project on migration and development, in which the other regional commissions and the Population Division of UN/DESA were collaborating. The project aimed at strengthening national capacities by improving the quality and availability of data on international migration; enhancing capacities to design and implement migration policy, and promoting cooperation through an effective intra- and inter-regional network for the exchange of information, studies, experiences and best practices among countries of destination and origin.

The representative of the New York Office of the United Nations Regional Commissions highlighted the migration activities of ECA and ESCWA. In general, there was a lack of reliable data on migration in Africa, which contributed to a research vacuum regarding linkages between migration and development. In 2006, ECA had issued the report *International Migration and Development: Implications for Africa*. Since then, international migration had emerged as an important activity for the Commission and had been included in the ECA business plan for 2007-2009. Numerous conferences, meetings and workshops had dealt with the impact of international migration for development. In the fall of 2008, the Sub-Regional Office for Southern Africa (SRO-SA) had undertaken a study on the role of population and migration in enhancing regional integration in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) regions. Future ECA work would focus on the role of international migration in regional integration and development cooperation. Three areas were of particular importance, namely the role of remittances in development and its links to the financial crisis; capacity-building for management of international migration flows, and regional integration and cooperation. As in the case of ECA, work done by ESCWA on international migration and development was spurred by the 2006 High-level Dialogue. Since 2006, ESCWA had published a series of publications and policy papers. Currently, ESCWA and IOM were preparing a paper on *International Mobility of Arab Youth in a Globalized World: Trends, Challenges and Potentials*, analyzing the demographic, economic and social factors impacting youth migration in the Arab region. ESCWA and the IOM were planning to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) pledging closer collaboration in the area of international migration and development.

The representative of the Office of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) said that his organization had articulated a 10-point plan on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration, calling for action to address situations where refugees were at risk of refoulement, human rights violations and hazardous onward movements³. The plan strongly recommended cooperation amongst key actors concerned, including governmental organizations, relevant regional and international organizations as well as local and international NGOs. In January 2006, the High Commissioner had drawn attention to the lack of follow-through in passing from the relief phase into development efforts, one of the most enduring problems in implementing durable solutions in conflict zones. In December 2008, the High Commissioner would convene a forum on protracted refugee situations. The current economic and financial crisis was likely to directly affect refugees and other beneficiaries of UNHCR as a result of cuts in donor funding.

The representative of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) stressed the importance of understanding the impact of migration on children, adolescents and women in the context of globalization and human rights. UNICEF was working on both humanitarian and development aspects of migration. One important area of work centered on collection of migration statistics at the country, regional and global levels to support evidence-based research. Through survey work, UNICEF was conducting research on remittances and social impacts of migration on children, adolescents and women left behind in countries of origin as well as the migration of unaccompanied children. The UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre in Florence, Italy was conducting research on independent child migration between and within developing countries and engaged in statistical work within OECD countries.

The representative of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) reported that the number of female migrants was increasing and that women and men were affected differently by the migration experience. Women faced vulnerabilities and discrimination throughout the migration process in both countries of origin and destination. Working on the operational side of migration, UNIFEM was implementing a multi-year programme to empower female migrant workers in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China, Indonesia, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, the Philippines and Thailand. At the global level, UNIFEM had advocated for the adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and other mechanisms addressing women migrants' rights. In particular, UNIFEM ensured that concern for migrant women was part of the CEDAW review process. At the regional level, UNIFEM provided technical assistance to the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to ensure gender was mainstreamed in the recently adopted Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers⁴. UNIFEM was working with recruitment agencies in Asia to develop a Covenant of Ethical Conduct and Good Practices of Overseas Employment Service Providers⁵ that set standards for the recruitment of migrant workers. At the country level, UNIFEM had worked with the Governments of Indonesia and Nepal to implement policies on women migrant workers. UNIFEM supported women migrant workers' groups to lobby governments to protect their rights. A high-level forum on women migrant workers, organized with UNIFEM and with participants from Bahrain, Kuwait, Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates in March 2007, had agreed to introduce a unified working contract for migrant domestic workers.

The representative of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) reported that her organization provided policy advocacy and technical support to ensure that international migration was recognized as an important factor in development. As chair of the GMG from January to June 2008, UNFPA had initiated collaboration between all 14 GMG member agencies to analyze human rights of migrants. The final report from this project, *International Migration and Human Rights*, emphasized that respect for human rights was essential for realizing the full benefits of migration. As to the 2010 round of censuses, UNFPA country offices, regional offices and headquarters would provide direct financial support, mobilization of other donor resources and technical assistance.

The representative of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) said that her organization was promoting sustainable towns and cities with adequate shelter for all. The focus of the organization's work was on Africa, which was still mostly rural but expected to urbanize more rapidly than any other major area between 2025 and 2050. Research on migration showed that people were increasingly moving to urban areas in search of work, especially in informal sectors of the economy. In most countries, municipalities were responsible for provision of basic services, but lacked the financial support from central governments. Inadequate housing and basic services were among the most important problems faced by migrants in countries of destination. Efforts to manage migration depended on the cooperation of international, national and local governing bodies. There was a need for in-depth research of the urban dimension of international migration that could be translated into practical strategies as well as for urban migration observatories that could collect information on urban migrants and publicize best practices. The representative concluded by inviting all participants to attend the Global Urban Forum, to be held in Brazil in 2010.

The representative of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) reminded participants that there were an estimated 33 million people living with HIV in 2007. The epidemic was growing at a rate of 7,000 new infections per day, with many international migrants among those infected. At the 2006 High-level Meeting on AIDS, United Nations Member States made a commitment to secure universal access to HIV/AIDS prevention, care, treatment and support. Migrants were often at increased risk of exposure to HIV due to loss of social networks when migrating. Language barriers, sub-standard living conditions and sexual exploitation placed undocumented migrants in particular at a higher risk of infection. Female migrant workers were often vulnerable to exploitation and sexual violence. Over 50 countries had restricted foreign citizens infected with HIV from entering or residing in their country. In July 2008, however, the United States had repealed the ineligibility of foreigners living with HIV to receive visas and be admitted to the United States, a decision welcomed by the representative of UNAIDS. UNAIDS, in collaboration with ILO And IOM, had issued a policy brief on international labour migration (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, 2008). In closing, the representative noted that the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) was developing a safe mobility tool kit for migrant populations.

The representative of the United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (UN-INSTRAW) said that her organization focused on gender dimensions of migration and remittances. Topics of research included the feminization of migration in the Dominican Republic, the impact of development on gender relations in Colombia and the impact of migration on food security in the Philippines. The new project Gender and Remittances: Building Gender-Sensitive Local Development would be carried out in collaboration with UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM in Albania, the Dominican Republic, Lesotho, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal and South Africa.

The representative of the United Nations University (UNU) said that the role of his organization was to contribute, through research and capacity-building, to efforts to resolve pressing global problems of concern to the United Nations, its Member States and peoples. The UNU framework in migration involved building a scientific base, increasing awareness, strengthening migration policies, and stimulating interest in international migration in the media. UNU maintained a programme on migration and environmental change, and was planning to conduct research on the impacts of the financial crisis on migration. In late November 2008, UNU would launch the publication *Protracted Refugee Situations: Political, Human Rights and Security Implications*, to be followed by a panel discussion on the same topic. Since 2007, the UNU Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS) in Bonn, Germany had conducted research on environmental change and forced migration, providing European policy-makers, researchers, educators and civil society with a better understanding of the role of

environmental degradation and change in causing forced migration and related societal consequences. The project would analyse the effects of climate change on livelihoods, environmental degradation and migration patterns at the sub-regional or country level.

The representative of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) said that the organization carried out technical projects and published both reports and policy guidelines on migration related to agriculture, agricultural policy and rural development. FAO was particularly concerned with the role of remittances on rural livelihoods and access to land; sustainable management of natural resources in order to improve food security in rural communities; strengthening rural enterprises; protecting human rights of migrants, including the right to food and the prevention of abuse and exploitation in agricultural labour; productive use of remittances; and coherence in rural development and migration policies.

The representative of the International Labour Organization (ILO) said his organization worked to advance opportunities for women and men to obtain decent, productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity. Its chief aims were to promote rights at work, encourage decent employment opportunities, enhance social protection and strengthen dialogue in handling work-related issues. The ILO had developed a migration module for labour force surveys in Armenia, Ecuador and Egypt. The ILO was also working on institutional capacity-building for migration management in Western Africa and on the extension of social security to migrants in sub-Saharan Africa. These projects were funded by the European Union and the Government of Spain. Further, the ILO governing body had adopted a strategic policy framework for 2010-2015, in which labour migration was adopted as an important topic. The framework stressed a rights-based approach to migration and the protection of labour migrants. The presenter acknowledged that greater coherence was needed both within the organization and in working with other international organizations. While the development linkages needed to be addressed, the ILO was not a development agency. The ILO would expand its operations with tripartite partners, assist ILO member States in developing policies to make more productive use of remittances, and analyze the interaction between respect for migrant workers and the development benefits of migration.

The representative of the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) reported that his organization focused increasingly on the relationship between migration and tourism. UNWTO had initiated country studies in China, France, Germany, India, Japan, the Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States as well as regional studies in Central America focusing on three key questions. First, what was the economic impact of migration on tourism in origin countries? Second, what contribution was made by migrant workers to the tourism economy in destination countries? And third, what investments were made in tourism in countries of origin as a result of migration? The findings would be shared with the public on completion of the studies.

The representative of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) briefed the meeting on two new regional consultative processes (RCPs), focusing on migration and development. The Abu Dhabi Dialogue which took place in the United Arab Emirates in January 2008 brought together 11 Asian labour exporting countries and nine labour importing countries from the Gulf region and elsewhere in Asia. The ministerial-level gathering resulted in the Abu Dhabi Declaration in which participating countries agreed to collaborate to manage temporary labour migration and to maximize its benefits for development. A regional consultative process for the Horn of Africa was established during an intergovernmental meeting, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in May 2008. The purpose of the meeting was to promote a common position of member States of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) in Eastern Africa and the African Union (AU) on international migration and to facilitate regional dialogue and cooperation on migration policy issues. Most regions in the world were now covered by regional consultative processes. In 2008, IOM published a number of studies and reports, including the flagship publication *World Migration Report*, which focused on managing labour mobility as well as *Migration and Development: Achieving Policy Coherence*, a report which promoted development-friendly migration

policies. The *Compendium of International Migration Law Instruments* provided a comprehensive compilation of universal instruments focusing on the rights and obligations of states as well as the rights and duties of migrants. *Human Rights of Migrant Children* provided an overview of the international legal framework for protection of child migrants. IOM also published the report *Migration and Climate Change* which laid out possible future scenarios for climate change, natural disasters and migration. IOM was working with the Government of Mauritius and the European Commission to establish a circular migration programme between France and Mauritius. In 2009, IOM expected to undertake research on forced migration and humanitarian concerns and the effects of the economic and financial crisis on migration.

The representative of the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) reported that countries in the region experienced migration as countries of origin, destination and transit. CARICOM was committed to freedom of movement, particular labour mobility. Migrants within CARICOM were protected by a charter of civil rights covering the entire region. A common set of standards was needed for evaluating work-related qualifications and to coordinate access to social security payments. Although each member State still had its own migration policies regarding countries outside of CARICOM, the community was moving toward a common policy. Remittances to the region were at twice the level of foreign direct investment and much larger than official development assistance. The representative said that the region was experiencing an outflow of nurses and teachers. Despite the loss of these and other skilled people, transnational communities often continued to provide assistance to the Caribbean community. However, the children left behind continued to pose policy challenges to many countries in the region. He added that the financial crisis would reduce remittances, and that recurring environmental disasters such as hurricanes and floods would increase emigration from CARICOM member States. Another policy challenge was posed by the involuntary return of migrants who had committed crimes in countries of destination, especially the United States, since such returnees often had little or no connection to the islands to which they were returned.

The representative of the League of Arab States (LAS) noted that migration was a subject of great importance to the region. Member States of LAS included countries of origin, destination and transit of migrants, and therefore faced different challenges and opportunities. The Population Policies and Migration Department (PPMD) of the LAS had established an Arab Observatory for international migration in order to collect migration data and provide capacity-building in Arab countries. In 2008, LAS and IOM had convened the Arab Regional Governmental Experts Meeting on International Migration in preparation for GFMD II. The LAS also organized the Arab Ministerial Meeting for Migration and Expatriates in 2008 to coordinate labour mobility between Arab countries, and held an annual capacity-building workshop targeting Arab government officials working on migration.

The representative of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa noted that migration had become an important policy issue for Africa, especially since reports of African migrants seeking to enter Europe surfaced in the media. The speaker thanked the representative of CARICOM for his statement, which outlined many issues that were relevant to the African agenda. He underscored the importance of dialogue on migration across regions, adding that a dialogue between Northern Africa and sub-Saharan Africa was underway. He noted that the dialogue between the European Union and the African Union seemed to be a “dialogue of the deaf”. What began as a relatively small flow of Africans migrating to Europe had become a large stream, especially of health-care professionals leaving Africa for OECD countries. With more female Africans and undocumented migrants in current migration flows, gender- and human rights-related policy questions had surfaced. The representative stressed that help from other countries and organizations was needed to support collection of relevant and timely data, to conduct research on migration and to build capacity among researchers addressing migration-related issues.

The representative of the World Trade Organization (WTO) said that the organization was concerned with migration through Mode 4 of GATS. Mode 4 encompassed movement of two types of persons: service suppliers and employees of service suppliers. It did not address migrants seeking access to the employment market, or measures affecting citizenship, residence or permanent employment. In relation to Mode 4, to date, 153 WTO members States had taken up the Most Favored Nation (MFN) obligation, the principle of not discriminating between trading partners. The Doha Development Agenda was launched in 2001 with the intention of progressively liberalizing the movement of service suppliers. In September 2008, the WTO organized a symposium on Mode 4 of GATS in Geneva, Switzerland. Regarding the financial crisis, the scope of WTO research thus far had been confined to trade financing, but could be broadened if the organization received a mandate to study the impact of the financial crisis on the movement of persons.

The representative of the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) said that his organization continued to publish the *International Migration Review*, an interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal created to encourage and facilitate the study of all aspects of international population movement, such as international migration, ethnic relations and refugee movements. The journal's readership included academics, international and non-governmental organizations. Over the past few years the number of articles submitted to the journal had increased. It had a subscription base of more than 1,000 persons and organizations, an increasing number of which coming from developing countries. There was also a trend toward more institutional subscriptions, which were considerably more expensive than individual subscriptions, broadening the journal's reach. CMS had also convened various symposia and meetings on migration issues. A report on *International Migration and Development—Continuing the Dialogue: Legal and Policy Perspectives* was published with IOM following a two-day conference held in New York in January 2008.

The intervention by Mr. Alexander Betts, University of Oxford, focused on the Global Migration Governance Project, a three-year research project funded by the MacArthur Foundation. Mr. Betts identified two gaps that the study would attempt to address. First, on a policy level, global migration governance was fragmented and incoherent. Second, on an academic level, there had been a lack of political science and international relations scholarship on migration. This project would address the role and relevance of international institutions in migration, focusing on the question of institutional choice. How did States decide to work within different frameworks? Did this choice depend on the level of development of the country or whether the country was a major sender or receiver of migrants? The project would also explore the governance of migration in a comparative perspective. How did the governance of migration differ from environmental, trade, and climate change regimes? How did the institutional framework vary by type of migration (e.g., high-skilled or low skilled)? The project aimed to inform the debate on the governance of migration and to identify institutional arrangements which were respectful of human rights, politically acceptable and, beneficial to all concerned. The project had three stages. Mapping—what formal and informal mechanisms existed and how did they relate to each other and to wider governance? Consultations—how do States use different institutions and what are their main strengths and weaknesses? Dissemination—how can the results of the projects be best distributed? Working papers, reports and a final book would summarize the findings from this project and be presented at various policy briefings and workshops⁶. Mr. Betts cited two working papers already published: *Towards a 'Soft Law' Framework for the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants* (Betts, 2008a) and *International Cooperation in the Global Refugee Regime* (Betts, 2008b).

The representative of the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) said its work focused on different policy-relevant issues in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, with a special focus on migration. The Institute was currently working with the Global Development Network (GDN) on a project called *Development on the Move: Measuring and Optimizing the Economic and Social Impacts of Migrations*. The project had three objectives. The first was to develop new methodologies for assessing the economic and social impacts of migration, taking account of immigration, emigration and return migration. It took a

broad conceptual approach to development, including economic and social factors such as gender, education and health systems, as well as governance and values. It studied impacts on migrants, households, communities and countries, using a multi-level methodology developed for that purpose. The second project objective was improvement of the evidence base on migration. Country case studies had been conducted over a period of 18 months in Colombia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Jamaica, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Vietnam. In collaboration with national statistical offices, new data on households with and without migrants were collected through household surveys. In addition to the surveys, each country report included a review of the existing literature. The third project objective concerned policy impacts and options. Each country report included policy reviews and recommendations. In 2010, a report would be published summarizing the project findings. Regarding the effects of the financial crisis, there was a relevant module in the household questionnaire that assessed household shocks. The data collected with this module could help in assessing the impact of the financial crisis on migration and household remittances.

The representative of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) reported that the organization was planning an international population conference in collaboration with the Moroccan Government to take place in Marrakech, Morocco, from 27 September to 2 October 2009. The meeting was held once every four years, and there was increasing attention paid to the topic of migration. The organizers were expecting between 2,000 and 2,500 attendants from 150 to 160 countries. The Moroccan Government was organizing sessions that would focus on migration flows, including migration between Arab States and migration flows from sub-Saharan Africa. Data and measurement issues had always been a major concern for IUSSP. In December 2007, IUSSP had convened a seminar on indicators of integration in social statistics in Montreal, Canada. The aim of this workshop was to provide a critical overview of scientific research on migrant integration using quantitative data, to assess the significance and limitations of different indicators of integration, such as intermarriage rates and integration indices, and to demonstrate to which extent they could be used for policy-making⁷. A second workshop on the policy use of quantitative and qualitative indicators of integration would take place in Paris, France, in May 2009. It would discuss the different approaches to integration in the scientific literature and public policies, as well as the design of quantitative studies to analyse migrant integration. The representative invited participants to access additional information on the forthcoming international population conference and other relevant information on the IUSSP website⁸.

IX. CLOSING OF THE MEETING

In her concluding remarks, Ms. Zlotnik thanked all participants for their presentations and contributions during the discussions. She noted with gratitude the wealth of information presented, and requested that participants identify key messages that could be easily conveyed to governments. Ms. Zlotnik expressed concern that there was a tendency to suggest that the economic benefits of migration were somehow antithetical to human rights. But migration did not occur in a vacuum: it was a result of societies that aimed to create jobs, wealth and better living conditions, including respect for human rights, for all. She added that international migration presented challenges and opportunities for development and that there was no single solution to the challenges countries faced. Ms. Zlotnik then proceeded to close the meeting.

NOTES

¹ On 19 December 2008, the General Assembly adopted Resolution A/63/225 on International Migration and Development specifying that a High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development would be held in 2013 and a one-day informal thematic debate on international migration and development would be convened in 2011. For a copy of the Resolution, see Annex I to this document.

² For the website of the Migration Section, see <http://unmigration.org>.

³ For the plan, see <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/4742a30b4.pdf> (accessed 20 April 2009).

⁴ For the Declaration, see <http://www.aseansec.org/19264.htm> (accessed 20 May 2009).

⁵ For the Covenant, see <http://unifem-eseasia.org/projects/migrant/Docs/Covenant%20of%20Ethical%20Conduct.pdf> (accessed 23 May 2009).

⁶ For the website of the Global Migration Governance Project, see <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/project-migration> (accessed 12 May 2009).

⁷ For more information on the conference, see <http://www.iussp.org/Activities/integrmigr/reportmontreal07.pdf> (accessed 23 May 2009).

⁸ For the website of IUSSP, see <http://www.iussp.org>.

REFERENCES

- Betts, Alexander (2008a). Towards a 'Soft Law' Framework for the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants. *New Issues in Refugee Research, Research Paper 162*. Geneva: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- Betts, Alexander (2008b). International Cooperation in the Global Refugee Regime. *Global Economic Governance Programme, Working Paper 2008/44*. Oxford: The Global Economic Governance Programme, University College, Oxford.
- Center for Migration Studies and International Organization for Migration (2008). *International Migration and Development - Continuing the Dialogue: Legal and Policy Perspectives*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Global Migration Group (2008). *International Migration and Human Rights. Challenges and Opportunities on the Threshold of the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations Population Fund.
- International Organization for Migration (2007). *Compendium of International Migration Law Instruments*. The Hague: Asser Press.
- International Organization for Migration (2008a). Migration and Development: Achieving Policy Coherence. *IOM Migration Research Series*, No. 34. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- International Organization for Migration (2008b). *World Migration 2008: Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.

- International Organization for Migration (2008c). Human Rights of Migrant Children. *International Migration Law*, No. 15. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- International Organization for Migration (2008d). Migration and Climate Change. *IOM Migration Research Series*, No. 31. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (2008). *HIV and International Labour Migration*. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS.
- Regional Thematic Working Group on International Migration including Human Trafficking (2008). *Situation Report on International Migration in East and South-East Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: International Organization for Migration, Regional Office for Southeast Asia.
- United Nations (2008). *International Migration and Development*. Report of the Secretary-General. A/63/265.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division (1998). Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1. *Statistical papers*, Series M. No. 58, Rev. 1. (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.98.XVII.14).
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division (2002). *Manual on Statistics of International Trade in Services*. (United Nations publication, Sales No. 02.XVII.11).
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division (2008). *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, Revision 2*. (United Nations publication, Sales No. 07.XVII.8).
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2009). *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision*. POP/DB/MIG/Rev.08.
- United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2006). *International Migration and Development: Implications for Africa*. Addis Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2008). Looking into Pandora's Box: The Social Implications of International Migration in Asia. *Asia-Pacific Population and Social Studies Series*, No. 164. Bangkok, Thailand: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
- United Nations University (2008). *Protracted Refugee Situations: Political, Human Rights and Security Implications*. New York: United Nations University.