

MEASURING THE SDG INDICATOR ON COUNTRIES WITH WELL-MANAGED MIGRATION POLICIES

United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), Santiago, Chile
29 August 2017

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

Organized by:

Population Division

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)

Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre (CELADE)

United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

I. Overview

The workshop “Measuring SDG indicator on countries with well-managed migration policies” took place at the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) headquarters in Santiago, Chile, on the morning of 29 August 2017. The workshop was co-organized by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and ECLAC. The activity was held within the framework of a collaborative effort by DESA and IOM, to develop the methodology for the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 10.7.2, *Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies*, to inform the global evaluation of the 2030 Agenda.

This activity was part of a technical cooperation project, funded by DESA’s Regular Program of Technical Cooperation (RPTC) to improve national capacity to produce and analyze data on well-managed migration policies, implemented by the Population Division of DESA during 2017. The goal of the workshop was to analyze and discuss the methodology for measuring SDG indicator 10.7.2 with national representatives and experts from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

Participants included five representatives from DESA, ECLAC, IOM, five government officials from Chile, El Salvador and Mexico and five representatives from academia and civil society from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Dominican Republic. During the workshop, participants received information on the institutional and substantive basis of the methodology for the measurement of indicator 10.7.2, engaged in an interactive discussion, and exchanged specific ideas on IOM and DESA’s proposed measures for SDG indicator 10.7.2. This report highlights issues discussed and key recommendations provided.

II. Opening

Mr. Paulo Saad, Director of ECLAC’s Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre (CELADE) opened the workshop by welcoming participants. He drew attention to a key instrument in the region, the Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development¹, approved at the first Regional Conference on Population and Development in 2013. Mr. Saad explained that the Montevideo Consensus had a dedicated chapter on international migration, which included concrete commitments by countries and indicators for monitoring implementation. Mr. Saad concluded by reiterating that the results of the workshop would be also useful for the regional process regarding the Montevideo Consensus.

Mr. Bravo, Chief of the Demographic Analysis Branch, Population Division, UN DESA, provided an overview of the workshop’s objectives. He outlined the role of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) in determining the development and follow up of SDG indicators and their custodians. As co-custodians of SDG indicator 10.7.2, IOM and UN DESA would have an active role in the development of the methodology and measurement of the indicator. The goal of the workshop was part of such endeavor. Mr. Bravo highlighted Latin America and ECLAC had a well-known leadership role on international discussions of development issues, and stated that the workshop was the first step in a broader international consultation process. Mr. Bravo invited the participants to engage actively in the exchange of information, ideas and experiences, and to contribute concretely to the development of the methodology and measurement of SDG indicator 10.7.2.

Mr. Diego Beltrand, IOM Regional Director for South America, welcomed participants and pointed out that the opportunities for debate on international migration policy had changed markedly over the course of the previous years. He cited the absence of migration goals or targets in the

¹LC/L.3697 Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and noted that since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, migration had gained importance in the global debate and in international negotiations. At the High-level plenary meeting on addressing large movements of refugees and migrants held in New York on 19 September 2016, Heads of State and Government had adopted the New York Declaration, setting in motion the process for the Global Compact on Migration. He stressed that the New York Declaration represented an important opportunity at different levels, enabling a new kind of dialogue and language on migration. While for the Latin American region this people-centered language might not have been entirely new, the New York Declaration and the 2030 Agenda, including SDG target 10.7 and the other targets related to migration, represented a major step forward. Mr. Beltrand concluded his statement highlighting that, in such context, the monitoring and follow up to the SDG Agenda was of utmost importance.

III. Joint introduction of the methodology and measurement of SDG indicator 10.7.2

Mr. Bravo and Mr. Beltrand introduced the proposed methodology for the SDG indicator on well-managed migration policies.

Mr. Bravo recalled that migration was reflected in various SDG goals and targets and outlined the different steps in the ongoing collaborative process between IOM and UN DESA aimed at developing, validating and testing the methodology for SDG indicator 10.7.2. He recognized the challenges of reaching consensus on the methodology for the indicator, and the need for a practical data collection instrument. In the proposed methodology, IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF) served as the conceptual framework, while the UN Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development (the Inquiry) was the main data source. Mr. Bravo also briefly introduced the key features of the Inquiry, focusing in particular on the module related to international migration.

Mr. Beltrand stressed that the aim of the proposed methodology was to allow for a general stocktaking, while considering the different circumstances and realities of countries and regions. He pointed out the main components of the Migration Governance Framework, notably its three principles (adherence to international standards and fulfillment of migrants' rights; an evidence and "whole-of-government" approach for policy formulation; and engaging with partners to address migration related issues) and its three objectives (advance the socioeconomic well-being of migrants and society; effectively address the mobility dimensions of crises, and ensure that migration takes place in a safe, orderly and dignified manner). This led to the introduction of the six proposed domains for the methodology and measurement of indicator 10.7.2 (see table 1). Mr. Beltrand encouraged participants to exchange ideas, and share insights on the proposed methodology for SDG indicator 10.7.2.

Table 1. The six proposed domains and measures for SDG indicator 10.7.2

	Domain	Measure / Question
1.	Institutional capacity and policy	Is there at least one dedicated government entity responsible for designing and implementing overall migration policy?
2.	Migrant rights	Does the Government promote the integration of immigrants through language skills training, access to public services, and protection against discrimination?
3.	Safe and orderly migration	Does the Government address irregular migration through pre-arrival authorization controls, integrated border management or other measures to ensure safe and orderly migration?
4.	Labour migration and recruitment costs	Does the Government take steps to reduce recruitment costs, born by the employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination?
5.	International partnerships	Has the country signed bilateral labour agreements concerning the movement of workers? (if yes, how many?)
6.	Humanitarian crises and migration policy	Does the Government’s humanitarian policy include measures in relation to forced displacement of persons?

IV. Interactive discussion

Participants welcomed the opportunity to participate in the workshop and gain information about the proposed methodology, including IOM’s MiGOF, and United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development. During the interactive discussion, participants engaged in a rich exchange about the opportunities and challenges inherent in the development of SDG indicator 10.7.2, posed questions and made a number of substantive recommendations.

The discussion revolved around the six domains of the framework as well as specific recommendations for strengthening the proposed measures. In addition, two cross-cutting themes emerged: the need to ensure a human rights-based approach throughout the six domains and the complexity of “capturing” the diverse and multifaceted nature of migration policies through synthetic indicators based on a single or a few survey questions per domain. The sections below present the main issues discussed and recommendations made.

The six domains:

Participants acknowledged that measuring countries’ well-managed migration policies was a challenging endeavor. Throughout the session, there was a clear tension between the need to assess the specificities and nuances of migration policies and the need to gain an overall picture through summary measures.

Several experts concurred with, and underscored the relevance of, the six domains proposed. Suggestions for improvement included merging or reducing the number of domains. One participant suggested the possibility of utilising one overarching domain, migrant’s rights, and integrating the remaining dimensions as sub-domains. Drawing on best practices from the region, one government official suggested that the South American Migration Conference, a regional consultation process, might offer an alternative framework consisting of four components: policy, normative, institutional

structure, citizen's participation. As the discussion ensued, an expert pointed out that the six domains presented by IOM and DESA were the result of an ongoing process and that it might be most productive to focus on reformulating the proposed measures rather than modifying the domains. Along this line, the remainder of the exchange focused on enhancing the proposed measures and questions.

A further recommendation was to better define who the respondents should (ideally) be, with a view to improving response rates and the accuracy and quality of the responses. Further breaking down the six domains would be beneficial, both for reformulating questions and for making more clear to respondents what they would be expected to answer.

The proposed measures:

Overall, participants recommended formulating questions in a way that would introduce directionality, allowing to measure progress, and to capture variability across time and space. In this regard, it was noticed that most of the proposed questions were binary, and that it would be better to allow for graduated answers whenever possible. In addition, some participants suggested that more than one question per domain might be necessary to better address the complexity of the issue being considered. A common observation was that most of the proposed questions had a strong focus on destination countries. In this regard, one government official suggested to reformulate the questions to make the instrument applicable to both sending and receiving countries, and to situations of departure, arrival, transit, and return.

Some participants stressed that it would be beneficial to use a glossary of terms, and suggested reviewing the one utilized in the Montevideo Consensus, since it is based on agreed language.

In terms of key issues to include that were missing in the proposal, several participants identified bilateral agreements on return as critical for the region, especially for Mexico and Central America. For the domain on international partnerships, gathering data on the ratification of international law and international legal instruments related to migration and the inclusion of such international agreements into national laws was recommended as an important question.

Using information from existing indexes, like the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX),² was also suggested, as well as adding questions for countries to indicate migration-related policies by sub-national government entities.

In addition, several participants called for the inclusion of questions on the percentage of migrants in an irregular legal status in the country, the number of migrants whose status had been regularized, and the number of migrants in temporary work programmes. With regards to integration policies, proposals included using open ended questions, as well as more specific types of integration policies, such as those outlined in question 3.6 of the 11th Inquiry. To better capture the role of non-state actors, one participant suggested to ask about legal mechanisms in place to encourage the participation of migrant networks and civil society.

Streamlining a human rights-based approach to migration:

Most participants recommended a stronger focus on migrant rights. They emphasized that regularization was critical for ensuring migrant rights. One participant illustrated how without legal documentation, migrants often remain marginalized and were at increased risk of abuse.

Participants also called for the methodology to better address the issue of regularization. Experts from academia and government officials inquired on the reasons why the question on migrant rights and integration, and the domain on safe and orderly migration did not make explicit reference to regularization. It was noted that questions in both domains referred to migration governance in

² <http://www.mipex.eu/>

terms of border controls, which suggested a security-based approach. The positive results of the Agreement on Residence for Nationals of States Parties of Mercosur and Associated States was identified as a concrete example of a regional agreement and best practice in Latin America and the Caribbean that had ensured pathways to regularization, decent work and transferability of social security, among other.

Participants also called for greater attention to the needs of groups in vulnerable situations including indigenous peoples, women and children. Indeed, mainstreaming gender across the domains, and capturing information on unaccompanied minors were identified as crucial. In addition, the workshop discussant suggested making explicit reference to migrants and their families, in line with UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members their Families.

Capturing the complexity and diversity of migration:

A number of participants emphasized the complexity of measuring well-managed migration policies, given the diverse and multidimensional nature of human mobility.

Participants underscored the need to better capture the range of policies within countries. For example, a government might adopt distinct policies for different categories of migrants such as high- and low-skilled migrants. Likewise, countries might have different policy approaches for immigration and emigration. Moreover, sub-national policies might be distinct from national policies. The example of sanctuary cities in the United States of America was one of several cited to illustrate the need, as well as the challenges, involved in trying to better grasp these aspects in the proposed measures for this indicator.

In addition, participants suggested that the measurement of SDG indicator 10.7.2 should reflect the role of legislators, since, in some cases, parliaments rather than line ministries might oversee the design of migration policies. Several participants called for measuring the degree of implementation of migration-related legislation. As part of policies oriented toward emigrants, one government official advocated for the inclusion of an indicator on “active consular diplomacy” and the work of consular networks, to assess their role beyond the basic notary duties.

Finally, support was voiced for taking non-state actors into consideration. The role of civil society organizations and migrant networks were cited as critical elements of migration governance that needed to be included in the measurement of the indicator. Best practices from the region were presented, including a council in São Paulo, Brazil, where migrants actively participated in the formulation of the migration policy at the city level.

V. Closing

In the closing session, Ms. Bridget Wooding, Director of Observatorio Migrantes del Caribe (OBMICA), and workshop discussant, underlined the important step forward represented by the inclusion of migration in the SDGs. After reiterating the need for conceptualizing each of the domains in terms of relevance for countries of destination, transit or origin, Ms. Wooding summarized the discussions, focusing on each of the six proposed domains.

In his closing remarks, Mr. Beltrand thanked participants for the rich discussion. He noted that the main challenge lied in measuring the impact of migration policies, beyond the existence of an entity responsible for designing or implementing such policies.

Mr. Bravo, after briefly describing the work ahead, thanked all participants for their excellent contributions.

Recommendations:

1. Enhance the human rights perspective in the six domains
2. Consider including access to health, education, decent work, and justice among the measures of migrant integration
3. Include a question on the percentage of migrants with an irregular legal status in the country, the number of migrants whose legal status had been regularized and the number of migrants in temporary job programmes.
4. Include measures and questions on regularization programmes, including number of regularized persons
5. Include measures on the ratification of the relevant international laws and international legal instruments, including the integration of international agreements on migration into national law
6. Mainstream gender into the six domains
7. Add an additional measure on unaccompanied children
8. Consider drawing on regionally agreed instruments such as the Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development
9. Map out whether the measures are applicable for all countries and if not, specify whether they apply to countries of origin, transit and destination
10. Attempt to better capture distinct policies within countries, including policies at the sub-national level
11. Add measures on the role of civil society organizations and migrant networks, critical elements of migration governance
12. Consider including a measure on the role of legislators and parliaments, as well as on the degree of implementation of migration legislation
13. Include a glossary of terms in the Inquiry instrument, using agreed language
14. Formulate questions so as to introduce directionality, to better measure progress and capture variability

Annex

MEASURING THE SDG INDICATOR ON COUNTRIES WITH WELL-MANAGED MIGRATION POLICIES

Santiago, Chile, 29 August 2017 (Conference Room Z-407, ECLAC)

Overview

The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) and the Organization for International Migration (IOM) have been collaborating in the development of the methodology and measurement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) indicator 10.7.2 on well-managed migration policies, to inform the global evaluation of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. DESA's Population Division is currently implementing a technical cooperation project aimed at strengthening national capacity for the production and use of information on this issue. The project includes funding for this activity. The goal of this activity is to analyze and discuss with national representatives and experts about the methodology for measuring target 10.7.2, *Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies*, which is part of the 2030 Agenda.

Programme (9 a.m. to 1 p.m.)

Opening

- Paulo Saad, Director, Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre (CELADE), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
- Jorge Bravo, Chief, Demographic Analysis Branch, Population Division, UN DESA
- Diego Beltrand, Regional Director for South America, IOM

Joint introduction of the methodology and measurement of SDG indicator 10.7.2

- Jorge Bravo, UN DESA and Diego Beltrand, IOM

Interactive Panel on the methodology and measurement of SDG target 10.7.2

- Moderador: Jorge Martínez Pizarro, CELADE, ECLAC
- Discussant: Bridget Wooding, Director, Caribbean Migration and Development Observatory (OBMICA)

**MEASURING SDG INDICATOR ON COUNTRIES WITH WELL-MANAGED MIGRATION
POLICIES**

Santiago, Chile, 29 August, 2017 (Conference Room Z-407, ECLAC)

Participant List

Salvador Berumen
Deputy Director General
Migration Policy Unit, SEGOB Mexico
Mexico

Liduvina Magarín
Vice Minister for Salvadorans Abroad, and
Pro-Tempore President of CRM
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
El Salvador

Alejandro Canales
Researcher on Migration and Development
University of Guadalajara
Mexico

William Mejía
Grupo de Investigaciones en Movilidad Humana
Colombia

Marcela Cerrutti
Researcher
Centro de Estudios de Población (CENEP)
Argentina

Cristián Orrego
Advisor on Migration Policy
Alien Status and Immigration Office
Chile

Duval Fernandes
Professor
Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais
Brazil

Claudia Silva
Chief of Studies Section
Alien Status and Immigration Office
Chile

Pedro Hernández González
Assistant Director International Migration
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Chile

Bridget Wooding
Director
Observatorio Migrantes del Caribe, OBMICA
República Dominicana

ECLAC-CELADE

Paulo Saad
Director
CELADE-Population Division, ECLAC

Jorge Martínez Pizarro
Researcher
CELADE-Population Division, ECLAC

IOM

Diego Beltrand
Regional Director for South America
IOM

Ezequiel Texidó
Programme Officer, Regional Office for South
America
OIM

United Nations

Jorge Bravo
Chief, Demographic Analysis Branch
Population Division, DESA

Inés Finchelstein
Consultant
Population Division, DESA