

REPORT OF THE MEETING

The Sixth United Nations Coordination Meeting on International Migration took place at United Nations Headquarters in New York, from 26 to 27 November 2007. 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: (a) discuss the outcomes of the 2007 Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), held in Brussels, Belgium; (b) consider preparations for the 2008 Global Forum, to be held in Manila, the Philippines; (c) exchange information on work programmes in the area of international migration and development, and (d) share best practices and future plans on the use of surveys in collecting migration information.

Some eighty participants representing 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 attended the meeting. Also present were invited experts and representatives of Member States of the United Nations.

I. OPENING

Ms. Hania Zlotnik, Director of the Population Division of UN/DESA, welcomed participants and opened the meeting. She recalled that the annual coordination meetings were convened in response to a request by the United Nations General Assembly. The Sixth Coordination Meeting on International Migration would be very useful in preparing the report of the Secretary-General on possible follow-up options to the High-level Dialogue on Migration and Development, to be considered by the General Assembly at its sixty-third session in 2008. By bringing together a large number of entities working on international migration, the coordination meetings also enhanced coherence between the United Nations system and the process of the Global Forum.

Ms. Zlotnik noted that the Government of Belgium had taken the initiative to organize the first meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development. The Global Forum meeting in Brussels in July 2007 was attended by 157 Member States reflecting a high level of interest by Member States. The atmosphere at the meeting was rather informal, which was conducive to a substantive discussion on the issues. Ms. Zlotnik informed participants that the Government of the Philippines had graciously suggested convening the second meeting of the Global Forum in Manila in October 2008 and had taken on the responsibility for its organization. She then described the agenda of the Sixth Coordination Meeting and introduced the keynote speakers of the first session, Ambassador Régine De Clercq, Executive Director of the first meeting of the Global Forum and Mr. Esteban B. Conejos, Jr., Under-Secretary for Migrant Workers Affairs, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, responsible for the second meeting of the Global Forum.

II. THE GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ambassador De Clercq noted that the 2007 Brussels Global Forum had been very successful. She explained that the Global Forum was a logical follow-up to the High-level Dialogue. The Global Forum was an informal and State-led process, which was open to all United Nations Member States, focusing on practical results. Ambassador De Clercq remarked that it

was crucial to move the migration discussion forward and to engage in interaction between different stakeholders. To that end, the Government of Belgium, in preparing for the Global Forum, had conducted a survey to learn about thematic priorities of Member States. It had also requested countries to nominate national Focal Points in order to achieve greater coherence towards migration and development at the national level. The Brussels Forum had identified 57 concrete suggestions for follow-up. In addition, the Marketplace on International Migration and Development Services, which was organized by UN/DESA, was a valuable instrument to enhance cooperation between Member States and international organizations. Although achieving concrete results was important, the main goal of the Global Forum was to allow for an informal exchange of views and not to produce project proposals. Ambassador De Clercq invited all participants of the Coordination Meeting to review the outcomes of the Brussels Forum, which had been summarized and distributed by UN/DESA, and to indicate how their organizations could assist in implementing them (see Annex II of this document for a compilation of the replies).

Under-Secretary for Migrant Workers Affairs Mr. Esteban B. Conejos briefed participants on the second meeting of the Global Forum, which would be held in Manila in October 2008. Preparations for the Manila Global Forum focused on two main issues, namely: (a) follow-up of outcomes from the 2007 Global Forum, and (b) selection of the themes to be discussed in Manila. Based on the results of the questionnaire among Member States in preparation for the Brussels Forum, the Government of the Philippines had proposed that the theme of the 2008 Global Forum would be “Protection and empowerment of migrants for development.” At a recent meeting of the Forum’s Steering Group, Governments had voiced widespread support for the proposed theme. The 2006 High-level Dialogue had also identified respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of all migrants as a key condition for reaping the full benefits of international migration. Under-Secretary Conejos underlined that the participation of international organizations was essential for a successful outcome of the Manila Global Forum.

During the discussion, participants thanked Ambassador De Clercq and Under-Secretary Conejos for their detailed presentations and expressed support for the theme of the Global Forum’s meeting in Manila. UNIFEM was working with the Government of the Philippines to organize a conference on the protection of women migrants prior to the Global Forum and expressed hope that some of the recommendations from this conference would feed into the Global Forum. The representative of the World Bank suggested to include the topic of economic empowerment of women migrants as a topic and offered the support of the World Bank in this respect. The representative of UNESCO informed participants that his organization would like to contribute to the Global Forum by addressing the issue of security and protection of migrants. The representative of UNODC welcomed the attention to human trafficking and smuggling of migrants at the Global Forum in Manila and said that UNODC was organizing the first meeting of the United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT) in February 2008. The results of this conference would be forwarded to Manila in order to inform the discussions at the Global Forum.

The representative of the European Union (EU) informed participants that, following an initiative of the Government of Mauritius, the EU was organizing a seminar on circular migration. The representative of UNAIDS emphasized that there were close ties between the movement of people and the spread of HIV/AIDS. In this respect, UNAIDS had prepared a draft of recommendations on HIV/AIDS and migrant populations. The representative of UNEP noticed that the topic of environmental deterioration had received little attention so far and was wondering whether it would be feasible to include environmental issues in the migration debate. UNEP had already prepared a report on how migration was linked to the environment. The representative of the Metropolis Project enquired about the extent to which the debate in Manila

would focus on development. While he was interested in the themes of protection of migrant rights and the protection against human trafficking and smuggling, he asked how those topics could be linked to economic development, and whether they should be linked at all.

In her response, Ambassador De Clercq emphasized that because the Global Forum was an informal process, any issue could be discussed as long as the topic reflected the priorities of the Member States. She emphasized that the informality of the process was very useful and should be preserved. If the Global Forum were to become formal, it would become political, losing its flexibility and creating stalemates. The Global Forum was a State-led process that had put Governments at the centre of the discussion on migration with the aim of developing a common understanding of the future directions of international migration policy. The Global Forum offered a comprehensive, inclusive and constructive platform to discuss migration issues. It was important that the United Nations and other organizations were supporting this process within their existing resources. The Global Forum was intended to benefit all stakeholders.

Under-Secretary Conejos pointed out that the organizers had asked countries to spearhead discussions at the roundtables using a question and answer format to engage participants. He noted further that it was important to consider during the discussions how development could be linked to migration and the protection of human rights. Under-Secretary Conejos agreed that economic empowerment was one of the topics that should be emphasized at the Global Forum. He also pointed out that the conclusions of the conferences organized by UNODC and UNIFEM would serve as very useful inputs for the discussions in Manila. He expressed hope that both organizations would also attend the Manila meeting. He agreed that cultural issues were very important and assured participants that the organizers would be addressing social and cultural rights in addition to economic and political issues in preparation for the Global Forum.

The representatives of IOM and UNESCO noted that there was ambivalence on how the Global Forum was working with the United Nations. They believed that the cooperation with the United Nations would be more effective if there was a more formal connection between the Global Forum, IOM and the United Nations. The representative of UNAIDS suggested to involve the United Nations country team in Manila in the preparations of the Global Forum. Participants pointed out the need for close cooperation and collaboration between organizations in order to determine how each entity could best contribute to the Global Forum.

Ambassador De Clercq responded that the Global Forum was not an international organization and that it could not encompass the work of all international organizations. If Member States wanted, they could involve the United Nations system in preparing papers, organizing roundtables, etc. Indeed, more than twenty international organizations had attended the Brussels Global Forum.

Under-Secretary Conejos thanked participants for their suggestions and offers of assistance. He said that although the Global Forum was not part of the United Nations, it was also not completely divorced from the United Nations. In terms of technical support, most working papers for the discussions in Brussels had been prepared with the assistance of United Nations agencies. In addition, the expertise and financial assistance of the United Nations would be sought in implementing the Global Forum outcomes. As to the future of the Global Forum, Under-Secretary Conejos noted that the Secretary-General had said that the Global Forum would remain a State-led process in the foreseeable future. Member States were being informed that if they thought that the United Nations could assist them, the organizers would contact the relevant agencies. For instance, the organizers of the Manila meeting were looking forward to the Handbook by IOM, UNDP, UNICEF and the World Bank on mainstreaming international migration in development plans.

The representative of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) thanked the organizers of the Global Forum meeting in Brussels for allowing civil society to actively participate. He said that ICMC was very appreciative of the interaction that took place in Brussels and asked how civil society would be involved in the next meeting of the Global Forum. The representative of the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) stressed the need for a better organization of the civil society day as it had proved impossible to have a meaningful dialogue among so many participants over the course of only eight hours.

Ambassador De Clercq responded that while the Brussels Forum had successfully brought together civil society, employers and NGOs there was a balance to be struck between the participation of civil society and the State-led nature of the Global Forum. For some, the ideal situation would be one in which civil society and Governments could simultaneously participate in the discussion, whereas for others, civil society had no role in an intergovernmental meeting.

Under-Secretary Conejos noted that the civil society part of the Manila Global Forum would be organized by the Ayala Foundation¹. The organizers had already been approached by many NGOs interested in participating in the Global Forum. In Brussels, the meeting with civil society took place one day before the intergovernmental discussions which provided too little time to prepare summaries and conclusions. Hence in the future, such a meeting could be organized a month or two before the Global Forum. Lastly, there was a need to have a broader participation of civil society, including labour unions and the private sector.

The representatives of ICMC and OECD noted that they were impressed with the potential of the Marketplace for sharing expertise and wondered whether the Marketplace could be expanded. Ms. Zlotnik responded that the Marketplace was set up like a shopping mall. People put up their shops and others could come and purchase services. Password-protected access was provided to those who wanted to offer or request services, expertise or financing. In Brussels, people actually met face-to-face and discussed concrete projects. It was expected that an improved version of the Marketplace would be organized during the Manila Global Forum.

In conclusion, Ms. Zlotnik advised participants to consult the website of the Global Forum in order to keep up with the latest developments.²

III. INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT: EMERGING ISSUES

The session on emerging issues was devoted to presentations of three recent studies and a new global migration survey.

The first presentation was made by Mr. Jean-Christophe Dumont, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), who provided the results of a recent study on the health workforce and migration published in International Migration Outlook (OECD, 2007a). The study had found shortages of health workers in several OECD countries. The report also documented the important contribution of foreign-born health professionals in many OECD countries. Most foreign-born nurses originated from OECD countries, while most foreign-born doctors originated from outside the OECD. Countries in Africa and the Caribbean were found to be disproportionately affected by the emigration of health professionals to OECD countries. At the same time, it was found that expatriate health workers in OECD countries generally constituted a small proportion of the total shortage in health workers in countries of origin.

The second presentation was made by Mr. Jeff Dayton-Johnson of the Development Centre of the OECD. He presented the report “Policy Coherence for Development 2007: Migration and Developing Countries” (OECD, 2007b). The report assessed both the impact of international migration to OECD countries on economic development in countries of origin and the impact of economic development on migration. The evidence suggested that while international migration could potentially contribute to poverty reduction, economic development or international aid were unlikely to slow down future migratory movements. Low-skilled mobility was found to have the greatest impact on combating poverty, not only because it reduced unemployment in countries of origin, but also because low-skilled migrants remitted larger sums of money. Moreover, the decreased labour supply in origin countries might have encouraged women to participate in the labour force. Also, changes in productivity that followed emigration contributed to advances in economic development.

Mr. Dayton-Johnson noted that discussions on highly-skilled migration tended to focus on the negative ramifications of the emigration of skilled workers from developing countries. He stressed that it was also important to consider important countervailing effects. Thus, it was possible that emigration opportunities provided incentives for potential migrants to acquire additional skills, a phenomenon referred to as “brain gain”. Moreover, the return migration of highly-skilled emigrants could contribute to development in the country of origin. He noted that while poor countries were found to have the highest emigration rates of skilled professionals, emigration of skilled workers alone was not enough to imperil economic development.

In conclusion, Mr. Dayton-Johnson advocated more coherent policies focusing on migration and development. Receiving countries were advised to develop circular migration schemes, to grant citizenship to long-term immigrants, to reduce remittance transfer costs and to engage expatriate communities through co-development projects. Policy recommendations for sending countries included creating sound macroeconomic policies, developing human capital, and investing in communications and transportation.

During the discussion, participants requested clarification on the relationship between remittances and poverty reduction in migrant-sending countries. The representative of UNICEF enquired whether the OECD had looked into the relationship between remittances and inequality. He also asked how the definition of poverty affected the role of remittances in reducing poverty. In his response, Mr. Dayton-Johnson agreed that the definition of poverty was important and that remittances affected wealth distribution in different ways. He also noted that evidence for the relationship between remittances and inequality was mixed, but that remittances were generally expected to be associated with reducing inequalities. He pointed to the study “Close to Home” (World Bank, 2007a), which addressed the issue of remittances and inequality in Latin America.

The representative of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) asked about the relationship between remittances and the wage rate at which a worker would be willing to accept a certain type of job, particularly in areas of high emigration. Mr. Dayton-Johnson explained that the question referred to the hypothesis that remittances might reduce labour force participation by increasing the minimum wage at which recipients were willing to enter the labour force. He did not believe that receiving remittances alone caused people to drop out of the labour market. Policies restricting access to land and other productive sectors were more likely to discourage remittance receiving families from entering into economic activities.

The representatives of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) enquired whether there were any countries that had fully achieved policy coherence in the area of international migration and development.

Mr. Dayton-Johnson remarked that in order to have coherent policies, there needed to be a mechanism to facilitate information sharing between the main policy actors at the national level. Coherent policies were sometimes triggered by external factors, such as a major immigration crisis affecting a country.

The third presentation was made by Mr. Andrew Morrison, Mr. Maurice Schiff and Ms. Mirja Sjöblom of the World Bank, who informed the meeting about a recent publication entitled “The International Migration of Women” (World Bank, 2007b). The study, using econometric analyses and household surveys, addressed the hypothesis that determinants and consequences of international migration differed between men and women. The presentation focused on gender differences in five main areas: (a) the determinants of migration; (b) the propensity to remit and the amounts involved; (c) the ways in which remittances were spent; (d) the patterns of labour force participation and performance, and (e) the impact of migration on families and businesses left behind. One salient conclusion was that, due to gender- and sector-specific networks, women were less likely than men to migrate abroad, except for the highly-skilled. Another finding was that household expenditure allocations were not only determined by the sex of the remitter, but also by that of the head of the household in remittance-receiving families. Thus, women’s expenditure patterns often resulted in better child development outcomes than those of men.

Studies among immigrant women in the United States of America found that being married and having children decreased labour force participation among women migrants, while English language skills and education had the opposite effect. Most differences in wages disappeared after controlling for the migrants’ native language and level of education. In studying the psycho-social impact of migration on children, the authors found a greater negative impact when mothers were absent. The authors of the study recommended that families be informed about the potential negative consequences of migration and that children be assisted to cope with the absence of parents. More research was needed on gender and the economic impact of migration, including the impact on fertility. It was also important to improve understanding of how children fared in migrant families and how migration impacted girls and boys.

During the discussion, several participants suggested additional opportunities for future research. The representative of ICMC stated that return migration was too often omitted from discussions on international migration and development, even though it played an important role in the process. The presenters agreed that this was a critical area for future research. While not much was known about return migrants, at least one study had indicated that improved economic conditions in the home country lead to the return of emigrants. The effect was strongest in richer OECD countries and weakest in developing countries. The percentage of highly-educated people among return migrants increased with improved economic conditions in the country of origin.

The representative of UNIFEM expressed that she would have liked for the discussion to have moved beyond the economic aspects of migration and development to also have considered the socio-cultural and political process that shaped the experiences of male and female migrants, respectively. She enquired about policies aimed at reintegrating female return migrants into the country of origin. Mr. Morrison responded that they had attempted to consider socio-cultural dimensions of the migration and development nexus by analyzing differences in preferences for household expenditures according to the gender of the remitting migrant.

Professor Richard Bilborrow from the Carolina Population Centre, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, asked the presenters to comment on the gender differences in education as a determinant of migration and wondered whether they felt the results were surprising. Regarding the finding that increased education lead to increased migration propensities for

women but not for men, Mr. Morrison responded that his results were for rural Mexico only. In rural Mexico, most men worked in agriculture while women, when working outside the home, were employed in occupations with higher returns to education.

Participants expressed interest in the policy implications of the findings presented. Professor Bilborrow remarked that the low elasticity of migration associated with border control expenditures suggested that policies to enhance border control activities were fruitless. Ms. Sjöblom agreed that increasing the expenditures for border control was unlikely to have the desired effect. She believed that restrictive border policies ran the additional risk of discouraging circular migration, with potentially detrimental effects for both sending and receiving countries.

The representative of CMS remarked that the World Bank study failed to present findings differentiated by age and marital status, two important demographic indicators. He wondered whether migration flows dominated by women had different development implications than flows dominated by men. He also wanted to know if the authors had considered defining an optimal sex composition of migration flows for development. Mr. Morrison responded that the question of an optimal sex-specific migration policy was addressed in the chapter on policy implications. Due to occupational segregation of men and women, the sex composition of labour migrants was determined by labour market demands rather than by official government policy. Mr. Schiff responded that while the econometric analysis described in the volume controlled for age, the results presented were not disaggregated by migrants' age.

Mr. Gerver Torres of the Gallup Organization presented the Gallup World Poll, a global annual survey introduced in 2005, which measured subjective well-being and quality of life. The survey included some 140,000 respondents in 130 countries, covering 95 per cent of the world's adult population. Once fully developed and tested, the survey would be carried out four times a year. In response to a growing interest from Governments and the private sector, Gallup had recently developed a migration index, based on a series of 16 questions measuring migration intentions and experiences. A recent pilot study in Latin America had shown that more than half of the respondents in the Dominican Republic intended to move abroad, compared to only 13 per cent of respondents in Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Young people between the ages of 15 and 20 years had the greatest desire to move. Job dissatisfaction was found to have a greater impact on the desire to move than unemployment.

Mr. Torres also presented information on the desire to move in relation to the respondents' satisfaction with political freedom, confidence in the Government and the economy, possession of talent and political discrimination. Respondents believed that international migration was a positive experience for sending countries, receiving countries and migrant families alike. Mr. Torres introduced a tool called "The Monitor", which would allow users to access the World Poll data through a web-based interface. The goal in producing the monitor was to provide easy access to and visualization of the data. Using the monitor, one could produce maps on each of the survey indicators, generate scatter plots and calculate correlations between indicators. Mr. Torres informed participants that Gallup would process and analyse the 16 migration questions for all countries included in the most recent round of the World Poll in the near future.

In the discussion that followed, participants expressed interest in the World Poll and requested additional details about the sampling process, specifically the variation in sample sizes across countries, the ability of the sample to detect migrants, representation of urban and rural areas, and political barriers to gain access to respondents in some countries. Mr. Torres clarified that the smallest sample drawn in any one country was 1,000 people, but that the sample size

varied by country. He said that the samples drawn were representative of each country's adult population, including both urban and rural areas. He admitted that countries subject to conflict or natural disasters were less accessible and they were therefore less likely to be included in the poll.

Participants were also interested in learning more about the motivation of the Gallup Organization for conducting the World Poll and how the specific questions were developed. Mr. Torres clarified that the World Poll was a Gallup initiative and was not commissioned by any organization. The survey was designed to address issues of importance to Governments and non-governmental organizations as well as the private sector. Over the course of several months, representatives from academia, the media and other sources had been brought together to develop a set of questions. Mr. Torres stressed that Gallup remained open to feedback and suggestions on the poll items.

IV. THE USE OF SURVEYS IN COLLECTING DATA RELEVANT FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

a) Migration surveys: Tips and tricks

Professor Richard Bilsborrow from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill made a presentation on the use of surveys in collecting data relevant for the study of international migration. Surveys were a key source to collect information on the causes and consequences of international migration for development. Professor Bilsborrow described several challenges when conducting migration surveys. The first challenge was to construct an accurate sampling frame. A population census was the preferred sampling frame to study international migration as it allowed for the calculation of the proportion of migrants in each area. However, the census generally did not include information on emigrants, especially not on entire households that had moved away. A second challenge was that migration was a relatively rare phenomenon. Finding a sufficient number of international migrants made surveys an expensive undertaking. In order to overcome this problem, Professor Bilsborrow suggested using existing large-scale surveys to collect migration data, such as labour force surveys. Those surveys had the added advantage of focusing on employment, thus allowing the study of labour migration. Other advantages of using labour force surveys in the study of international migration included their routine nature in many countries, their administration by national statistical offices, their relatively large samples, their national coverage and representation and their collection of basic demographic and employment information. The third and main challenge was to select the correct comparison group. To properly assess the effects of migration, it was essential that those exposed to migration were compared to an appropriate control group of non-migrants.

Professor Bilsborrow pointed out that the ideal population for studying the determinants of emigration by individuals (households) were emigrants (emigrant households) interviewed directly in the country of destination and equivalent individuals in the country of origin who did not emigrate in the time period. This implied conducting a survey in each country—to interview those who emigrated in their country of destination (where they are viewed as immigrants) in a destination country survey, and those who did not emigrate in a survey at origin. Similarly, to study the consequences of migration, data should be collected on immigrants at destination and non-migrants at origin at the time the movement took place. In order to fully grasp the causes of international migration in one country of origin, surveys should be conducted in several other countries of origin. Similarly, studying the implications of international migration required surveys of immigrants from one country of origin in several destination countries. In practice,

most surveys in destination countries compared international migrants to non-migrants in the same country. While such research was useful to study integration of immigrants, it did not address the causes or consequences of the migration process itself.

During the discussion, the representative of UNHCR questioned the speaker's view that there was a deficit of data and research on international migration. He pointed out that UNHCR continuously collected data and had undertaken many studies in this area. Professor Bilborrow responded that UNHCR was working with refugees and therefore the data collected would refer to refugees seeking assistance. For example, UNHCR was not collecting data on non-migrants in countries of origin. Also, there were very few data on undocumented migrants, on social and economic conditions in the countries of origin and on the characteristics of migrants in general.

Ms. Zlotnik confirmed that some countries were carrying out very large surveys based on large samples. It was important to exchange information on surveys between countries. Also, labour force surveys could collect more information to study the determinants and consequences of migration. By adding some questions, countries could obtain migration information in a more systematic way.

The representative of CMS stressed that from his perspective, good policies were needed to obtain good data. He urged that data on citizens and the native-born population should also be collected in surveys in order to compare the characteristics and views of migrants with those of non-migrants. The representative of Cornell University strongly supported the point raised by the representative of CMS that one should also focus on non-migrants in destination countries in comparative research of immigrant groups in order to study integration and assimilation over time. Professor Bilborrow replied that it depended on the research questions whether non-migrants at destination should be included or not.

The representative of the Metropolis Project raised the point that data from surveys could be very rich. He referred to surveys on international migration between China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) and Canada from which Metropolis had obtained an in-depth understanding of the return migration flows from Canada to China, Hong Kong SAR. He emphasized that in general, surveys enabled the creation of sophisticated policies. Following up on this point, the representative of Cornell University stressed that more attention should be given to return and circular migration. She noted that in the United States of America in 2000, one third of all international migrants had arrived in the last two years.

The representative of UNESCO suggested creating a comprehensive electronic repository of data sets on international migration. He drew attention to differences between data-rich countries, primarily developed countries, and data-poor countries, primarily developing countries. Professor Bilborrow agreed that an electronic warehouse of data sets on international migration would be extremely useful.

The representative of the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) asked about the experience of other countries to obtain data and information for undocumented migrants. He said that it was very difficult for the United States Census Bureau to obtain data on such migrants. Professor Bilborrow replied that it was indeed difficult to collect data on undocumented migrants, but that some studies in this area had been successful. He mentioned that valuable data had been obtained on these population groups by employing well-trained interviewers and by using indirect techniques, such as interviewing neighbours.

The representative of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation asked about the status of the latest United Nations census guidelines on international migration. Mr. Hovy explained that there were three sets of relevant guidelines, namely: (a) the 1998 United Nations Recommendations on Statistics on International Migration; (b) census recommendations issued by the United Nations every 10 years, including those for the 2010 round of censuses, and (c) a handbook on migration statistics that was being produced by the United Nations Statistics Division. He remarked that few countries had fully implemented these guidelines.

The representative of the OECD stressed that one should pay special attention to the determinants of migration. Hence, studying the employment situation and the living conditions in the origin countries was important. He also noted that in general, there was more information on migrants in receiving countries, but less in origin countries. The representative of ICMC said that standards should be established for defining an international migrant and that the analysis of the determinants of migration was crucial. In response, Professor Bilborrow underlined that the analysis of the determinants of migration was indeed important. Knowing why people move would help formulating policies and if the analysis showed that there were positive consequences to immigration, one might want to set policies to increase immigration.

Mr. Hovy reiterated the usefulness of a clearing house of survey data on international migration. He also suggested that one might want to think of standard questionnaires that could be used in multiple surveys. He pointed out that the United Nations Statistics Division was expanding its tabulations for the Demographic Yearbook by expanding the number of questionnaires on foreign citizens.

(b) Review of surveys that collect data relevant for the study of international migration

Via telephone, the representative of the World Bank informed the audience about the ongoing survey work related to migration at his institution. This work included support to country teams in designing surveys (e.g. living standard measurement surveys) and census questionnaires. He particularly referred to efforts to collect better data in Peru, Tajikistan, Thailand, Ukraine and Viet Nam. In addition, pilot activities were under way that focused on new survey designs. The World Bank had tested three different methods to survey the population of Japanese descent in Brazil, namely: (a) census-based approach to identify areas with a concentration of migrants; (b) snowball sampling to survey Japanese communities, and (c) intercept survey method to survey migrants in specific localities, such as shops or markets. The World Bank was also implementing surveys on migration and remittances.

Mr. Hovy enquired about the status of the recent World Bank project on international migration and remittances in Africa. He also asked about migration questions that were part of the living standard survey. The representative of the World Bank said that his institution was planning to conduct surveys on migration, remittances and expatriate communities for a number of African countries. He noted that the type of migration questions included in surveys depended on the country under consideration. In Armenia, for example, a complete migration module was added. In Tajikistan, it was decided to include the migration module in the household survey.

The representative of the ILO reminded participants that at the Fifth Coordination Meeting on International Migration, he had mentioned that there were not enough data on migration to formulate migration policies. At the same time, he agreed with the representative of CMS that appropriate policies were needed to design surveys generating more data on international migration. He pointed out that the ILO had designed a migration module to supplement the

Labour Force Survey which would be tested in three countries: Armenia, Ecuador and Egypt. The survey module had been developed as a comprehensive instrument including questions on individual and household characteristics, work histories, migration status, reasons for leaving, duration of stay, naturalization, conditions of work at destination and remittances. The ILO also worked on a survey focusing on working conditions in destination countries, such as job security in the work place, whether migrants worked in areas for which they had no training or for which their occupational health was at risk. An income security component was part of that survey. The ILO intended to conduct the survey in countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) with a sample of 3,000 workers in each country. The representative of ICMC asked whether the survey gathered any information on unpaid wages. He noted that especially workers in GCC countries experienced the problem of not being paid on time.

The representative of UNICEF informed participants about a project on children left behind by migrating parents. The survey focused on education, health, quality of life, family roles and remittances. The pilot was carried out in Albania and Ecuador and the survey was cross-national and cross-cultural and closely linked to the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) also implemented by UNICEF. The survey contained a sample of 300 households per country, 150 migrant households and 150 non-migrant households. In order to carry out the survey successfully, UNICEF had established close institutional partnerships with non-governmental organizations, national census offices and academic institutions. Intense interviewer training was also undertaken. In the next steps, UNICEF planned to analyse the data from the pilot studies, to hold expert consultations regarding the results and to consult with MICS teams on the experiences gained from the pilot surveys.

The representative of the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) introduced a joint project with the Global Development Network (GDN) entitled “Development on the Move” which would run from September 2006 until May 2010. The project had five key objectives: (a) developing better methodologies for assessing the economic and social impacts of migration; (b) improving the evidence base on migration; (c) analyzing policy impacts and options; (d) building research capacities, and (e) promoting multidisciplinary research. The project consisted of a methodological component, a survey component, country reports, a policy audit and project workshops. The methodological component was designed to help develop new methodologies for assessing the impacts of migration on development. The household surveys were intended to generate new data on the impacts of migration on development carried out in a pilot survey in Jamaica and six other countries which had not yet been chosen. In the household surveys, the focus would be on three types of migrants: (a) immigrants; (b) return migrants, and (c) absentee emigrants, that is migrants who had left the household within the last 10 years and went to live in another country for more than three months but had not yet returned. The household surveys would be designed as nationally representative probabilistic samples. The results from these surveys would be summarized in country reports. Project workshops would be conducted over the course of the project to help promote information exchange, capacity building and quality assurance.

The representative of the European Union (EU) reported that in 2008, the Statistical Office of the European Community (Eurostat) was adding a migration module to its Labour Force Survey in all EU Member States. The Labour Force Survey had two aims: (a) to provide comparable statistics on the levels and trends of employment and unemployment in the EU Member States and regions, and (b) to analyse the structure of labour market participation of individuals and households.

The objectives of the migration module would be to: (a) identify the migrant population and their immediate descendants; (b) provide comparable data on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants, especially to allow for a comparison of labour market outcomes with other groups, and (c) analyse the factors affecting labour market integration and adaptation. Social, economic and demographic information would be collected for each respondent. In the migration module, questions would be added focusing on citizenship, including the year of acquisition, country of birth of the father, country of birth of the mother, total number of years of residence in the host country, main reason for migration (last migration), whether duration of the current residence was limited due to a permit, visa or certificate, whether legal access to the labour market was restricted, the need to improve language skills in order to obtain an appropriate job, what help was received in order to find the current job or set up one's own business, and whether services for labour market integration in the two years following the last arrival were used.

The data collected through these surveys would help promote policy initiatives for more effective migration management in Europe. Further, the results would provide necessary information for policy initiatives in order to monitor progress towards the common objectives of the Community's employment strategy. The deadline for data transmission by Member States to Eurostat was March 2009. Provisional data, after validation by Member States, would likely be available in the second half of 2009.

The representative of UNFPA reported that the Fund had recently embarked on a two-year project with IOM to study transit migration from sub-Saharan African countries to the Maghreb and beyond. The project aimed at collecting information on the characteristics of transit migrants and intended to document micro and macro implications and challenges of transit migration from sub-Saharan Africa. At the conclusion of the project, policy recommendations to address the challenges of transit migration would be formulated. The study would focus on the following seven countries: Algeria, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Senegal and Tunisia. A situation analysis of transit migration in each country was being prepared using both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Each situation analysis would describe the magnitude of the transit migration and the laws and policies on international migration affecting the country under consideration, and identify the existing knowledge base and institutional capacity in the country. A review of the existing literature and a compilation of all available information on the scope and characteristics of transit migration in the region was currently being conducted.

Three countries, Mauritania, Morocco and Niger, were identified for further study, including in-depth interviews. A questionnaire was being developed to obtain information on the socio-economic characteristics of transit migrants, a description of the situation in the country of origin, the decision to migrate and the migration journey, the situation in the country of destination, including labour market participation, sending of remittances, the social situation and living conditions, health status and access to health and social services, and attitudes towards and treatment of migrants in the host country.

Country case studies and a final report would document the trends and determinants of transit migration in the countries and the entire region; describe the situation of the migrants; analyse the economic responses to transit migration; and provide policy recommendations to address the challenges posed by the increasing number of transit migrants in the region. A handbook was planned that would summarize the methodologies used in the country studies.

The representative of IDB informed the participants that the Bank was conducting surveys as part of its work programme on statistics and research. The survey work of IDB took place in four areas. First, IDB provided direct financial support for conducting national censuses with

special focus on improving race and ethnicity questions. Second, the IDB programme for the improvement of surveys and the measurement of living conditions in Latin America and the Caribbean (MECOVI) provided support for both national censuses and labour force and household surveys. Third, IDB provided support for specialized surveys, particularly, surveys focusing on remittances and migrant communities. Fourth, IDB maintained the Information System on Equity and Social Indicators (EQxIS) and Sociómetro databases that presented population and employment data across countries in the region and could be accessed on the IDB website. Together with UNICEF and the Organization of American States (OAS), IDB helped countries improve their civil and birth registration systems by providing loans and grants to the authorities. IDB had also collaborated with IFAD to produce a worldwide map of remittances which could be accessed on the websites of IDB and IFAD. Working together with the private sector, IDB was also seeking to reduce transfer costs associated with remittances and providing potential recipients of remittances access to financial institutions.

The representative of OECD reported that different departments within his institution were involved in survey research and data collection, including the Education Department, which was responsible for the Programme for international student assessment (PISA) survey. The latest round of that survey would be made public by the end of 2007 and included information on students' performance by place of birth of the students and their parents. OECD was also involved in collaborative survey activities with UNESCO. The representative informed the participants that OECD would release a new database on the characteristics of migrants in OECD countries by 2008. The data would be based on population censuses and registers and would include information on migrants' age, gender, duration of stay, labour market participation, occupational group, field of education and place of birth. Mr. Hovy pointed out that the PISA study was important to all OECD countries which were often anxiously awaiting the results.

The representative of IOM informed the meeting that it had collected migration data since 1992, including data on return migrants, both stranded migrants and qualified migrants. Because control groups were not included in the data, the dataset on return migrants was considered of poor quality. Through specialized surveys, the IOM had also collected information on migration and HIV/AIDS and human trafficking. Lastly, IOM was involved in the United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT), a joint initiative to coordinate the global fight on human trafficking on the basis of international agreements reached at the United Nations. UN.GIFT provided a framework for all stakeholders—Governments, business, academia, civil society and the media—to work in partnership and create effective tools to fight human trafficking. The initiative included a research programme involving 20 experts who were tasked to develop new approaches to study human trafficking, including through the use of surveys.

In response, Mr. Hovy noted that he had been involved with recent UNHCR surveys which had moved beyond direct programme beneficiaries when collecting data. He suggested that IOM would also move beyond collecting data on beneficiaries only.

The representative of the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) remarked that GAO was not a statistical agency and did not conduct surveys. However, GAO was responsible for overseeing activities of the United States Census Bureau and the United States Department of Homeland Security. GAO was encouraging United States agencies to improve their statistics on the foreign-born and had prepared a paper addressing the long-standing problem of failure to obtain such data by United States federal agencies. GAO advocated a new method to collect migration data on the foreign-born population with different migration statuses, including the undocumented, without compromising the confidentiality of those migrants. GAO was asking the United States Census Bureau to incorporate this methodology into their survey instrument,

although the Census Bureau was reluctant to ask additional questions on place of birth. The representative argued that without enumerating people with different migration statuses, including the undocumented, it was not possible to obtain data relevant for evaluating policies, including social service delivery. He referred to a background paper by the GAO for the Sixth Coordination Meeting as well as CD-ROMs that contained additional information on the proposed methodology.

The representative of UNESCO reported that UNESCO was engaged in three areas of survey development. First, UNESCO was in the process of introducing a new concept of “international mobile students” to their worldwide education statistics survey. According to the new concept, international mobile students would be defined as students who studied in a country where they were not permanent residents. This approach was different from the previous approach which was based on the citizenship of the students. The goal of the new approach was to better distinguish students from other migrants. Second, UNESCO was developing a tool to study the careers of foreign-born doctorate holders. The tool contained seven modules, one of which concerned international mobility and included reasons for departure and return. It allowed distinguishing between temporary and permanent migrants. One question addressed the links between doctorate holders and the country of origin. Argentina had completed the first study using this tool set and plans were in place to use it in 20 European countries. India, Japan and the Republic of Korea were also considering to apply this tool set. These studies would address the emigration of highly-skilled professionals as well as short-term visits of highly-skilled expatriates. Third, UNESCO was also engaged in regional surveys in Montevideo, Uruguay, in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, and in Dakar, Senegal.

The representative of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) informed participants that his Commission was conducting survey work in 130 countries. At the global level, ICMC was primarily concerned with human trafficking while at the regional level it was focusing on mapping migratory flows, particularly in Africa. ICMC was collaborating with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to address the health and well-being of international migrants fleeing across dangerous borders. ICMC was also working on the topic of international migration and development and was planning to be actively involved in the civil society event organized in the context of the 2008 Global Forum. Funding had been secured to develop a new ICMC website.

Professor Bilsborrow thanked participants for their contributions, and stressed that participants had shown innovative approaches to conducting surveys. While some were linked to censuses, others were not. While some were looking at particular population groups, others were looking at representative general populations. He pointed out that his presentation had focused on the ideal way to conduct a survey, and he reiterated that it was important to study the determinants and consequences of migration flows. He urged participants to think carefully about comparison groups in the surveys keeping in mind that one should always recognize the strengths and limitations of the data used.

Professor Bilsborrow noted that one could build upon existing surveys, for example labour force surveys, to study migration in order to save resources, but cautioned to look carefully at sample size and other methodological issues. In the case of Thailand, for instance, a large labour force survey had only included 50 households with migrants, mostly from Cambodia and Myanmar. In the end, the migration module from that survey provided little information due to the small sample of migrants. Professor Bilsborrow urged participants to consider country-specific factors while conducting surveys, such as whether immigration or emigration was more important.

Professor Bilsborrow noted that conducting a survey based on snowball sampling proved difficult because the sample often did not contain enough migrants. When this method was used to identify a sample of Colombian migrants in Ecuador, either the migrants did not know other migrants or they did not want to identify other migrants. In this example, the snowball sample was not successful. Professor Bilsborrow also cited a World Bank study of migrants of Japanese descent in São Paulo, Brazil. The research found that data from the snowball sample yielded different results than data obtained through other methods. Professor Bilsborrow informed participants that the 2007 census in Peru would identify migrants, allowing a follow-up survey of migrant households, focusing especially on remittances, to be conducted. He also noted that most new methods to collect data on migrants were tested in developed countries, managed by scholars, research centres and international organizations based in the North. He stressed the need to continue to work on different approaches to conduct migration surveys in developing countries and to increase the capacity of the countries to conduct surveys themselves. Continued collaboration between developed and developing countries was necessary in the field of migrant surveys.

The country representative of UNICEF in Ecuador stressed the need to understand the purpose of collecting certain information through surveys while building capacity of national institutions at the same time. She pointed out that organizations should also consider the sustainability of survey programmes by collaborating with different entities and by enabling countries to use data at the local level.

In conclusion, Mr. Hovy thanked all presenters and the audience for their active participation. He emphasized the importance of capacity-building aspects of some of the described projects. In particular, he referred to the creation of country teams for the IPPR-led surveys and to the development of a handbook on migration data by the United Nations Statistics Division.

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

During the final session of the meeting, representatives of United Nations offices, funds, programmes, as well as other institutions, exchanged information regarding their work programme in the area of international migration.

The representative of the New York Office of the Regional Commissions stressed the importance of considering the regional dimension in the analysis of migration and development. She said that the regional commissions provided region-specific information on international migration. For example, ECLAC provided web-based access to a database on the foreign-born population in Latin America and the Caribbean based on national censuses, ESCAP had conducted a study on the impact of international migration on families, and ESCWA had published a report on regional labour migration and a wall chart on international migration and development. In addition, ESCAP had received a mandate from its governing body to compile and analyse information on international migration and to convene a high-level meeting on international migration in 2008. The regional commissions planned studies on the disruption of families due to migration, on transnational communities and on international migration in the context of ageing populations. Some regional commissions had established interagency task forces on migrants, for example, ECLAC with IDB and ESCAP with IOM. The regional commissions were also working to integrate international migration in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and to assess reforms needed in countries in order to achieve the MDGs. Reports addressing these issues were available on their websites.

The representative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) presented the current activities of his organization, both at headquarters and at the field level. He informed participants that UNDP together with IOM, UNICEF and the World Bank was working on a handbook for Governments that focused on mainstreaming migration issues in national development and poverty reduction strategies. The goal was to complete the handbook before the second meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Manila in 2008. UNDP was also working with UN/DESA on a book that focused on ways in which transnational communities could help reduce poverty and enhance entrepreneurship in countries of origin. Together with ILO, IOM and UNFPA, UNDP was managing the Joint Initiative on Migration and Development with a budget of 15 million euros, intended to gather and make accessible knowledge on experiences and best practices in the domain of international migration and development. UNDP was also managing the MDG Achievement Fund with a budget of 528 million euros provided by the Government of Spain over four years. Projects on youth employment and migration networks were receiving some portion of the funds. UNDP was planning to issue shortly a study entitled “Low-skilled workers and bilateral, regional and unilateral circular migration initiatives: Lessons for the GATS mode 4 negotiations and other agreements?”. The activities of UNDP in the field of remittances were in two areas. First it was coordinating regional activities on remittances. For example in 2007, UNDP had organized regional consultations on migration in Accra, Ghana that brought together private sector stakeholders and representatives of transnational communities. Second, together with INSTRAW, UNDP was working on a project on gender and remittances. Together with the United Kingdom Department for International Development, UNDP was also involved in a project titled “Mapping the global partnership for development: Country-level mappings of global issues, external policies and country contexts”. This project took the perspective of developing countries and studied, among other issues, how policies affected migration. The goal was to define new tools and methodologies that could be used to measure the effect of policies on migration.

The representative of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) reported that its work programme supported the mechanisms established by the General Assembly with respect to the protection of migrant rights. The meetings of the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families had recently considered the country reports of Egypt, Mali and Mexico. At the forthcoming meetings, the reports of Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ecuador, El Salvador and the Syrian Arab Republic would be discussed. The reports addressed the legal status of migrants and the management of migration in the respective countries. In 2006, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants had visited Indonesia, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America, focusing on specific topics relevant to each country. For example, in the Republic of Korea, the focus was on the conditions of migrant workers, while in the United States, the focus was on border control. The Special Rapporteur also visited and reported on the human rights situation of international migrants in Guatemala and Mexico. OHCHR had designed a questionnaire sent to all Member States regarding legal changes and policies relevant to migration. Although only 30 out of 192 countries responded, the reports from those that responded proved very useful. As a member of the GMG and the convener of the International Steering Committee of the Global Campaign for Ratification of the Convention on Rights of Migrants, OHCHR was active in providing information on and advocating ratification of that convention. OHCHR had entered into an agreement with the International Organization of Francophonie to coordinate activities in Western Africa with respect to human trafficking. OHCHR had also published papers on topics such as administrative detention, family reunification and migrant children.

The representative of the International Labour Organization (ILO) noted three main areas on international migration and development that were carried out by different ILO departments: (a) developing schemes for the migration of temporary workers, particularly in the Euro-Mediterranean region; (b) providing support to the global employment agenda of ILO, particularly with regard to youth migration and employment as well as skills development and recognition, and (c) enhancing the institutional capacity of ministries of labour. The main purpose of these activities was to build a multilateral and international legal framework on labour migration.

The representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) highlighted the “Migration without borders” approach to their work on migration policy. UNESCO promoted regional agreements on freedom of movement such as those adopted by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR). He noted that these agreements were inspired, in part, by the success of the free movement policies in the European Union. UNESCO had established an observatory in Dakar, Senegal to study the emigration of highly-skilled people and was planning to create a network of experts to evaluate policies and best practices with respect to emigration of highly-skilled people, “brain gain” and short-term visits by highly-skilled expatriates. The representative highlighted the need to study the education systems in both sending and receiving countries. Among forthcoming UNESCO publications on human rights, he pointed out a monograph on the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. UNESCO supported the commemoration of the International Migrants’ Day on 18 December with radio programmes. In Asia, UNESCO addressed human trafficking through a radio soap programme that aimed at providing information on human trafficking to potential victims. The UNESCO representative asked whether other organizations were interested in collaborating with UNESCO on the topic of climate change perhaps by studying “environmental refugees”. Mr. Hovy noted that there was no recognized definition of the term “environmental refugee” in the United Nations.

The representative of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) informed participants that UNITAR, supported by IOM, the MacArthur Foundation and UNFPA had launched the Migration and Development seminar series for the biennium 2007-2008. The objective of the series was to facilitate exchange of information and knowledge on migration issues for delegates working at the permanent missions to the United Nations in New York. The series continued the work of the “Key migration issues” series which was organized in collaboration with IOM and UNFPA in 2005-2006. Since 2005, UNITAR had sent 11 reports from their seminar series to the permanent missions in New York in order to develop and maintain interest in international migration issues. Delegates had been regularly updated by the Government of Belgium on the preparations for the first meeting of GFMD. UNITAR also consulted with the Government of the Philippines, the host of the 2008 meeting of the Global Forum, to identify migration-related priorities on which to train the international community over the coming year. In 2007 and 2008, UNITAR was also offering an international migration law course, focusing on the protection of migrant rights.

The representative of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) noted that the link between international migration and development had significant implications for the policy and programmatic work of UNFPA. The Fund had organized several expert group meetings to discuss how properly managed migration could contribute to the achievement of the MDGs and to address the particular challenges of female migration. The 2006 publication of UNFPA, entitled “State of the world population” had focused on women and migration. UNFPA was encouraging country offices to address the relation between human trafficking, migration and the spread of

diseases (especially HIV/AIDS), social services for migrants, the role of migration in social and economic development, and the protection of rights. Together with other agencies, UNFPA was engaged in capacity-building in countries, by, for example, conducting regional seminars preparing countries for the 2010 round of censuses, improving reproductive health services for female migrants and sponsoring “safe houses”. In addition, UNFPA had recently embarked on a two-year project with IOM to study transit migration from sub-Saharan African countries to the Maghreb and beyond.

The representative of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) informed participants that its Asia-Pacific and Arab States Regional Programme, which had started in 2001, addressed issues of women migrant workers, particularly domestic workers, in nine countries. One goal of the programme was to assist women migrants in claiming their rights and entitlements. On a global level, UNIFEM worked with the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) to address the rights of women migrant workers, highlighted issues on gender and migration in the context of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and built the capacity of Governments and civil society groups using the CEDAW process. On a regional level, UNIFEM promoted multi-stakeholder dialogue and consensus building. UNIFEM was working with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to promote the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers. In Thailand, the Government had recently amended contracts for migrant workers offering greater protection of their rights. UNIFEM had organized a meeting of Arab States in Amman, Jordan in March 2007 at which ministries of labour had adopted a standard contract for migrant workers. At the national level, UNIFEM was promoting the rights of female migrant workers in Indonesia and Nepal. UNIFEM had participated in a panel in Jakarta, Indonesia in preparation for the 2006 High-level Dialogue to discuss issues of women migrants. In Nepal, a ban on the emigration of female migrant workers was partially lifted by permitting women to work in the formal sector abroad. In Jordan, the Ministry of Labour had implemented a contract for migrant workers that recognized their rights. UNIFEM was also working with national recruitment agencies to develop a code of conduct. So far, the work of UNIFEM was focusing primarily on protecting women who wanted to emigrate. The representative expressed the intention of UNIFEM to work on the macro-level effects of the emigration of women.

The representative of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) reported that UNICEF worked on the following key issues related to migration: migrant rights and development; poverty reduction, with a focus on children; gender issues, especially with respect to the girl child, and adolescents and children left behind. UNICEF was encouraging dialogue in these areas in various countries, including Ecuador and Morocco. The organization was contributing to capacity building on statistics and had produced a paper on child protection and human trafficking which would be posted on the website of the Fund. The Innocenti Research Centre of UNICEF, based in Florence, Italy, carried out research on children in migrant families and children migrating alone. Mr. Hovy noted that two resolutions on the human rights of migrants, including children, were debated in the third committee of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly.

The representative of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) noted that many of the activities of UNODC related to migration were connected to the United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking (UN.GIFT). She emphasized that human trafficking was closely related to migration. UNODC, in partnership with ILO, IOM and OHCHR, was engaged in developing assessment and capacity-building tools to provide knowledge and expertise in this regard to Member States. UNODC was involved in data collection and had conducted a study on human trafficking based on questionnaires sent to 192 Member States. The study provided data on the number of investigations, prosecutions and convictions, described

support services provided to victims of human trafficking and provided information on legislation and action plans in countries. UNODC had hired 10 consultants to quantify the level of human trafficking. A conference on human trafficking was scheduled to take place in Vienna from 13 to 18 February 2008. International organizations, the private sector and media were invited to attend. With few organizations dealing with smuggling of migrants, it was even more difficult to collect data on smuggling than on human trafficking. UNODC was starting a project on migrant smuggling from Northern and Western Africa to Europe and was developing technical cooperation activities to support Member States. Mr. Hovy saluted the efforts of UNODC to improve data, given the difficulties with officially reported crime statistics.

The representative of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) remarked that IOM was engaged in research projects across all continents. She pointed out two programmes, namely the Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA) Programme and the Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) Programme. IOM was pleased with the themes for the agenda for the second meeting of the Global Forum that had been proposed by the Government of the Philippines. In preparation for the upcoming Global Forum, IOM was planning to organize consultations among the Secretariats and chairs of major regional consultative processes (RCPs) in order to facilitate a two-way flow of information between RCPs and the Global Forum. Reference was also made to the International Partnership on Migration and Development (IPMD), a GMG initiative to implement activities of the GFMD.

The representative of the European Commission (EC) pointed out that the European Union was shifting its focus on international migration away from mainly control and security issues toward development and employment issues. A global approach was needed to formulate comprehensive and coherent policies and to increase dialogue and cooperation on migration between the EU and all regions of the world, especially with Africa. At a conference in Tripoli in November 2006, a roadmap for cooperation between the African Union and the European Union had been agreed. This roadmap would be taken to a higher level at the EU-Africa Summit in December 2007. Ministers from EU Member States had also met with their counterparts from Northern, Central and Western Africa at an EU-Africa conference on migration and development, held in Rabat, Morocco in July 2006. This conference had brought together countries of origin, transit and destination in order to discuss migration issues of common interest for the first time. A follow-up ministerial conference would take place in Paris, France in October 2008. In March 2008, the EC was organizing a seminar of experts on migration in Latin America and the Caribbean in Brussels, Belgium, in preparation for the Latin America and Caribbean-European Union Summit, which would be held in Lima, Peru on 16 May 2008. The European Commission had recently put forward a legislative proposal to create a level playing field for highly-skilled migrants in the EU by issuing an "EU Blue Card" allowing highly skilled migrants to work in EU countries. In addition, the European Commission had developed "mobility partnership schemes" extending residence permits of limited duration, labour market access and circular migration opportunities to countries in return for cooperation in fighting irregular migration and returning migrants. The EC had entered into discussions of circular migration with Mauritius and would hold a seminar on this issue in February 2008. A Migration Information and Management Centre would be established in Mali to improve the management of supply and demand for migrant labour and to provide pre-departure training for migrants. Possibly, a second centre of this type would be established in Senegal. "Migration profiles" were being prepared for several countries in Africa, the Caribbean and Oceania to help pool information and inform policymakers in the field of migration and development. A network of regional observatories on migration in the Mediterranean region and sub-Saharan Africa would be created to promote the collection, processing and dissemination of information on migration flows. In the area of human resources, the EC was working on a code of conduct to promote ethical recruitment policies for health

workers from outside the EU. Jointly with UNDP and other partners, the EC would launch a 15 million euro initiative on migration and development in 2008, aimed at connecting local actors in countries of origin, transit and destination focusing on joint projects.

The representative of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) highlighted the four main activities of the OECD on international migration. First, the organization was working on improving migration statistics. Since 2006, the International Migration Outlook included statistics on long-term immigration flows that had been standardized across countries, in addition to stocks of international migrants. The OECD intended to obtain a comprehensive overview of international migration flows, including both short- and long-term movements. Second, the OECD was involved in activities aimed at integrating immigrants into the labour market by facilitating the recognition of foreign qualifications. The OECD had conducted a series of case studies on the experience of immigrants in the labour market and had published a first volume “Jobs for immigrants: Labour market integration in Australia, Denmark, Germany and Sweden” in 2007. Future volumes would cover Belgium, France, Portugal, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Third, the OECD was conducting case studies on education management and immigration policy. In particular, the OECD was concerned with the creation of a sustainable health workforce and was collaborating with the WHO in this regard. Fourth, the largest part of OECD migration activities focused on managing labour migration to support economic growth. The 2008 edition of the International Migration Outlook would contain a chapter on low-skilled migration. A seminar would take place in the Netherlands in June 2008 to consider managing labour migration of the highly-skilled and would devote particular attention to the recognition of foreign qualifications. The OECD was also working on developing statistics of return migration and would hold a conference on this issue in Italy in early 2008. A chapter on return migration would be part of the 2008 edition of the International Migration Outlook.

The representative of Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) informed participants that the IDB was working on the quantification of the level of remittances in the Latin American and Caribbean region. As a first step, IDB had mapped regional remittance flows which amounted to US\$70 million. IDB had partnered with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to create a worldwide map of remittance flows, which was available on the IDB and IFAD websites. IDB also had a programme aimed at reducing the cost of remittance transfers. While transfer costs had decreased by half in recent years, the IDB was collaborating with the private sector in order to reduce the costs by another half by 2010. The IDB also supported programmes linking remittances to development, such as the “Tres por Uno” programme in Mexico. Grants were made to help promote access to financial institutions for local communities receiving remittances. IDB worked on labour market development to link human capital development systems to migrant communities. A paper on this subject was available on the website of IDB.

The representative of the Metropolis Project informed participants that the secretariat of the project was located in Ottawa and that it had opened a branch at the University of Amsterdam. Recently, the project had received five additional years of funding. Research focused on the integration of migrants into Canadian society, using a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches. The Metropolis Project, in collaboration with the Foundation for Migration, Population and Environment (PME), Zurich, Switzerland, had put out a call for proposals for a study on the “Impact of skilled worker migration and return migration” to stimulate cross-national comparative research. The annual Metropolis conferences dealt with a series of migration issues, among them social cohesion, open borders, etc. The thirteenth International Metropolis Conference, to be held in Bonn, Germany, in October 2008, would focus on migration, immigrant integration and development. Major themes of the conference included the integration

of immigrants, environmentally motivated migration, gender and migration and the impacts of labour migration on countries of destination and origin. The Metropolis Project published the peer-reviewed Journal of International Migration and Integration. Information about Metropolis conferences, the topics covered as well as papers and reports were available on the Metropolis website³.

The representative of the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) noted that there had been a considerable increase in the number of articles submitted to its journal International Migration Review (IMR) over the past year. Most submissions were by authors based in developed countries, while there were few articles from authors based in Africa, South America, South Asia and Western Asia. Reviewers of the International Migration Review were overburdened by the increase in submissions making it increasingly difficult to carefully evaluate the submitted articles. The Center, together with IOM, would convene a conference in January 2008 to review the implications of the latest General Assembly resolution on international migration and development (A/RES/61/208) and the outcomes of GFMD, among other issues. The goal was to produce a report before the start of the deliberations of the sixty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly on the follow-up to the 2006 High-level Dialogue.

The representative of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) said that the Commission was working hard to increase civil society participation in the area of international migration and development. In preparation for the Global Forum in Manila, the organization would first conduct regional civil society consultations in Asia in July 2008. Second, since there was currently no website in place to mobilize civil society in migration and development, ICMC planned to develop a new website with funding provided from a development agency. Third, ICMC had organized one of the four civil society parallel events run by NGOs in Brussels in 2007. This event had attracted more than 200 NGOs and labour groups. ICMC intended to continue these efforts for the forthcoming Manila meeting of the Global Forum.

VI. CLOSING OF THE MEETING

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Hovy expressed the hope that the Sixth Coordination Meeting on International Migration had allowed participants to familiarize themselves with the GFMD process and the preparations for the Manila meeting. He thanked participants for their presentations and active engagement in the discussions on data collection and survey activities. He said that the description of planned activities of agencies was very helpful and urged participants to review the report of last year's meeting to obtain a comprehensive picture of past activities. Mr. Hovy thanked the participants for their active participation. Mr. Hovy asked participants to complete a questionnaire on GFMD follow-up activities. In addition, those agencies involved in activities of the GFMD Marketplace were asked to post their progress reports on the Marketplace website. The papers prepared for the meeting would be used in preparation of the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly on the implementation of Resolution 61/208 on international migration and development for its sixty-third session in 2008. Mr. Hovy then proceeded to close the meeting.

NOTES

- ¹ See: <http://www.ayalafoundation.org>.
- ² See: <http://www.gfmd2008.org/welcome.html>.
- ³ See: <http://www.canada.metropolis.net/>.

REFERENCES

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2007a). *International Migration Outlook 2007*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

_____ (2007b). *Policy Coherence for Development 2007: Migration and Developing Countries*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

United Nations Population Fund (2006). *State of the World Population 2006. A Passage to Hope. Women and International Migration*. New York: United Nations Population Fund.

World Bank (2007a). *Close to Home: The Development Impact of Remittances in Latin America*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

_____ (2007b). *The International Migration of Women*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.