

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

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand
8 November 2017

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

Organized by:

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

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)

I. Overview

The workshop “Measuring the SDG indicator on countries with well-managed migration policies” took place at the headquarters of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in Bangkok, Thailand on 8 November 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 ESCAP. The regional workshop was the second of two; the first having been co-organized by UN DESA, IOM and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) on 29 August 2017 in Santiago, Chile.¹

The goal of the workshop was to discuss the proposed methodology for measuring Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 10.7.2, *number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies*, with national representatives and experts from the Asia-Pacific region. The workshop was held as 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.

Thirty-three participants, including government officials from twenty countries, as well as representatives from UN DESA, IOM and ESCAP attended. This report highlights the main issues discussed and key recommendations provided.

II. Opening

Mr. Nagesh Kumar, Director of the Social Development Division, ESCAP opened the workshop. He noted that roughly one-third of the migration-related SDG indicators, including indicator 10.7.2, had been classified by the United Nations Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) as “tier III”, meaning that they had no internationally established methodology or standards.

UN DESA and IOM had been working closely together to develop a methodology for this indicator that could produce meaningful and timely information, building on existing data sources. As co-custodians of indicator 10.7.2, one of the priorities for UN DESA and IOM was to ensure its reclassification to a “tier I” indicator so that it could be used to inform the global review of SDG target 10.7, as well as relevant thematic reviews at the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF). For the indicator to be reclassified, the co-custodians needed to document, among other, the involvement of governments and national statistical systems in the development of the indicator methodology and the regional representativeness of the results of pilot studies.

The goal of the workshop was to contribute to this process by sharing the proposal on the methodology for indicator 10.7.2 with participants and seeking their views and feedback. Stressing that “what was not measured, was not achieved”, Mr. Kumar closed his statement by underscoring the importance of ensuring that the proposed methodology reflected different national and regional priorities and perspectives.

¹ See also: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/events/other/22/index.shtml>

III. Joint presentation on measuring SDG indicator on countries with well-managed migration policies

In introducing the proposed methodology for SDG indicator 10.7.2, Mr. Frank Laczko, Director of the Global Migration Data Center, IOM noted the inherent challenge of balancing a synthetic, robust indicator with the breadth and scope of target 10.7 as formulated in the 2030 Agenda. As co-custodians of 10.7.2, UN DESA and IOM recognized that the proposed indicator was neither expected nor designed to be comprehensive; hence the importance of other, complementary tools such as IOM's Migration Governance Indicators (MGI) (discussed below).

Mr. Laczko drew attention to IOM's Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF), which provided the conceptual framework for the draft proposal, noting that the MiGOF consisted of three principles (adherence to international standards and fulfillment of migrants' rights; evidence and "whole-of-government" approach for policy formulation; and engaging with partners to address migration related issues) and 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). In line with the MiGOF, the proposed methodology for measuring SDG indicator 10.7.2, comprised six policy domains, with one proxy measure for each domain (see table 1).

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

	Domain	Proxy measure
1.	Migrant rights	Degree to which migrants have equity in access to services, including health care, education, social security and welfare benefits
2.	Institutional capacities	Dedicated institutions, legal frameworks and policies or strategies to govern migration
3.	Migration governance	Government measures to ensure safe and regular pathways to migration
4.	Cooperation and partnerships	Extent of stakeholder inclusion and participation in migration policy formulation and implementation
5.	Migration and development	Government measures to maximize the development impact of migration
6.	Cross-border forced displacement	Government measures to deliver comprehensive responses to refugees and other forcibly displaced persons

Ms. Clare Menozzi, Population Affairs Officer, Population Division, UN DESA then provided an overview of the United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development (the Inquiry); identified as the main instrument for collecting data for SDG indicator 10.7.2 in the draft proposal. The Inquiry was a long-standing survey, mandated by UN General Assembly and sent on behalf of the Secretary-General to all Permanent Missions in New York on a periodic basis. The Inquiry contained a module on international migration that was being revised to include questions related to SDG indicator 10.7.2. Part of the plan for revising the module included strengthening cooperation with agencies with a

field presence, including IOM, to improve the timeliness and coverage of country responses and provide a more direct channel for answering eventual queries about the Inquiry. The twelfth round of the Inquiry would include six additional questions; one for each proxy measure. Ms. Menozzi shared some examples of how the questions in the revised Inquiry might be formulated focusing on the proposed questions for domains 1, *human rights*; 2, *institutional capacities*; and 4, *cooperation and partnerships*.

Mr. David Martineau, Associate Policy Officer, IOM provided further details on the MGI. The MGI, which was also based on IOM's MiGOF, was part of IOM's work at the country level aimed at assessing country-specific migration governance structures. The MGI, which similarly to the Inquiry was voluntary in nature, comprised some ninety questions related to migration governance, including bilateral labour agreements and remittance schemes, and border control and enforcement practices. IOM was currently planning the third round of the MGI, having covered fifteen countries from five regions in the initial, pilot phase, and fifteen additional countries during the roll-out in 2017. By 2018, IOM expected to have covered a total of forty-five countries across all regions.

In concluding the presentation, Mr. Laczko underscored that the questions in the MGI were complementary to those in the proposed methodology for SDG indicator 10.7.2. Further, he reiterated that the United Nations Inquiry and the MGI were two different and complementary tools: the former serving as the primary data source for the global monitoring and review of SDG indicator 10.7.2; and the latter providing more "granular" policy information to promote greater policy coherence and build country capacity to enhance migration governance.

IV. Interactive discussion

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. Most of the discussion centered on six overarching themes: (a) recognizing the limitations of the proposed methodology; (b) clarifying the relationship between the domains in the proposed conceptual framework; (c) more explicitly defining the concepts used in the proposed methodology; (d) refining the scope and wording of the domains, proxy measures and draft questions; (e) ensuring the policy relevance of the proposed methodology for countries of origin, transit and destination alike; and (f) better aligning the proposed methodology with goal 10 of the 2030 Agenda. The concerns, challenges, recommendations and ideas exchanged around each overarching theme are summarized below.

a. Recognizing the limitations of the proposed methodology

During the discussion, participants agreed that the framework for SDG indicator 10.7.2 was not intended to monitor the impact of policies. Mr. Martineau noted that the goal was to gather data on policy frameworks and inputs, through appropriate categorical variables. Assessing the impact of migration policies was a complex endeavor that went beyond the scope of SDG indicator 10.7.2. In terms of the questions that could be added to the next round of the Inquiry, the aim was to better document the existence and range of policy approaches at the country level rather than assess the impact or effectiveness of such policies.

Owing to the limited scope of the proposed methodology, Mr. Laczko also reiterated the importance of avoiding duplication of work that was already being done elsewhere, as might occur in areas related to human trafficking, refugees, or remittances. Ms. Menozzi noted that the development of SDG indicator 10.7.2 would likely evolve over time. Because there were yet no standardized measures for monitoring migration, the indicator would represent an advance in and of itself.

b. Clarifying the relationship between the domains in the proposed conceptual framework

In reply to a question on the ordering and interrelationship of the domains in the proposed methodology, Mr. Martineau stressed that the six domains were intended to be interrelated and complementary. The list as presented in table 1 was only one of many possible visual representations. The co-custodians recognised that domain 1, *human rights*, was cross-cutting. They also acknowledged that better articulating the relationship between the various domains in the framework would be helpful.

c. More explicitly defining the concepts used in the proposed methodology

Several participants asked for clarification regarding the concepts employed in the proposed methodology, including the scope and wording of the domains themselves (see also sub-section d below). One participant suggested that the co-custodians develop a glossary of relevant concepts and definitions. Given the complex nature of the domains, proxy measures and questions, the glossary would help respondents to provide more accurate answers. Ms. Menozzi pointed out that the IAEG-SDGs required co-custodians to present extensive metadata on the indicators to apply for graduation from “tier III”.

d. Refining the scope and wording of the domains, proxy measures and draft questions

There was broad consensus that some of the domains, as formulated in the proposal, were conceptually overlapping. In this regard, a number of participants voiced support for revising the wording of domain 3, *migration governance*, to ensure that it was complementing rather than duplicating aspects of domain 2, *institutional capacities*.

In relation to domain 6, *cross-border forced displacement*, some participants asked for clarification as to whether the domain also covered internally displaced persons. In addition, some participants were in favor of including policies for refugees, while others were not. Mr. Laczko noted that, at the country level, migrant and refugee policies were often part of a comprehensive, integrated approach. However, since a number of other global processes were already explicitly considering aspects related to refugee policy, care should be taken not to duplicate those efforts in the framework for measuring SDG indicator 10.7.2.

In terms of how the questions might be formulated in the revised module of the Inquiry, a participant noted that the subcategory “employment in public sector” in domain 1, *human rights* might need further clarification, since some countries allowed migrants to be employed in some areas of the public sector, such as health or education, but not other. For domain 2, *institutional capacities*, a participant

observed that referring only to circular migration in the subcategory “bilateral or regional agreements with other countries to facilitate circular migration of workers” might be too restrictive.

- e. Ensuring the policy relevance of the proposed methodology for countries of origin, transit and destination alike

Several participants pointed out that many of the proposed questions were mainly relevant for countries of destination. Others requested clarification as to whether certain questions would be answered by countries of origin, countries of destination, or both. Ms. Menozzi observed that the issue had been raised at the previous regional workshop held at ECLAC, and that it was important to identify questions that were relevant for countries of origin, transit and destination alike. Further, in providing the information to the Inquiry, countries would respond to questions as applicable. Given the limited number of questions to inform SDG indicator 10.7.2 and the global nature of the instrument, participants agreed that the six questions should be relevant for as broad a range of countries as possible.

- f. Better aligning the proposed methodology with goal 10 of the 2030 Agenda

Several participants, including representatives of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), recommended making more explicit reference to migrants in vulnerable situations, in line with SDG goal 10, *reducing inequality within and among countries*. Among others, participants highlighted the importance of emphasizing the specific needs and vulnerabilities of migrant women, including those of domestic workers. They also made reference to access to justice, as well as issues related to migration and climate change, crises and cross-border forced displacement.

Ms. Menozzi underscored the commonalities with feedback received from participants at the ECLAC regional workshop. In that region, recommendations had also stressed the need to place more emphasis on migrants in vulnerable situations, including by enhancing the human rights perspective across the proposed domains, ensuring gender-sensitive approaches, and adding measures related to unaccompanied minors. Mr. Laczko took note of the recommendations and agreed with the importance of aligning the proposed methodology with goal 10 of the 2030 Agenda, in particular, by looking at migrants left behind.

V. Closing

In their closing remarks, Mr. Laczko, Ms. Menozzi and Mr. Martineau noted that the session had been extremely helpful. They stressed that the workshop was part of an ongoing process and invited those present to continue contributing in the dialogue. They thanked participants for their thoughtful engagement and meaningful contributions and closed the meeting.

VI. Recommendations

The following are a summary of the main recommendations made by participants during the workshop:

- Focus on a limited number of core questions to map out policy inputs;

- Provide precise definitions of domains, aiming at self-evident concepts in the labelling of domains 3, *migration governance*, and 6, *forced displacement*;
- Include a “glossary of terms” in the specification of the indicator metadata;
- Avoid duplicating proxy measures and questions and already covered in other instruments;
- Include measures on governments’ policies to support migrants in vulnerable situations;
- Ensure a balance of questions, so that they are relevant to all countries.

Annex 1

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

Bangkok, Thailand, 8 November 2017 (Meeting room A, ESCAP)

Objective

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. The goal of this workshop is to discuss the methodology for measuring indicator 10.7.2, *Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies* with national representatives and experts.

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

Opening

Nagesh Kumar, Director, Social Development Division, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)

Joint presentation on measuring SDG indicator on countries with well-managed migration policies

- Frank Laczko, Director, Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC), Department of International Cooperation and Partnerships, International Organization for Migration, IOM
- Clare Menozzi, Population Affairs Officer, Population Division, UN DESA
- David Martineau, Associate Policy Officer, IOM

Interactive panel discussion on the methodology and measurement of SDG indicator 10.7.2

Annex 2. List of participants

Australia

Mr. Frederic Jeanjean
Senior Policy Officer
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Azerbaijan

Mr. Arif Mammadov
Head of Division for Humanitarian Affairs
Humanitarian and Social Affairs Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Bangladesh

Ms. Nahida Sobhan
Director General (MEA)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms. Nasreen Jahan
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Expatriates' Welfare and Overseas
Employment

Mr. Mohammad Quamrul Hasan
Minister (Consular)
Embassy of Bangladesh, Bangkok, Thailand

Bhutan

Mr. Thinlay Norbu
Senior Desk Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Canada

Mr. Stephan Stebelsky
Counsellor (Immigration)
Embassy of Canada, Bangkok, Thailand

Cook Islands

Ms. Chere Arthur
Compliance and Office Manager
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Immigration

France

Mr. Christophe Carlucci
First Secretary
Embassy of France, Bangkok, Thailand

India

Ms. Priyanka Sethi
Assistant Director
Directorate General of Labour Welfare,
Ministry of Labour and Employment

Kiribati

Ms. Beereka Iotebwa
Labour Officer
Ministry of Labour and Human Resource
Development

Nepal

Mr. Bhuwan Prasad Acharya
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Labour and Employment

Mr. Tirtha Raj Wagle
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

New Zealand

Ms. Kerry Greig
First Secretary – Risk Manager
Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment

Pakistan

Mr. Raja Manzoor Ahmad Kayani
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and
Human Resources Development

Philippines

Ms. Maria Regina Angela Galias
Interim Officer-in-Charge
Commission on Filipinos Overseas

Mr. Reynaldo Cancio
Assistant Director
National Economic and Development Authority

Ms. Joanna Lyn Rodriguez
Emigrant Services Officer
Commission on Filipinos Overseas

Ms. Domini Velasquez
National Economic and Development Authority

Republic of Korea

Ms. Jung Hyun Ryu
Specialist and Assistant Permanent
Representative to UNESCAP
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Singapore

Mr. Kalaivanan Pannerchilvam
Senior Operations Management Executive
Immigration and Checkpoints Authority

Sri Lanka

Ms. Kalani Priyangika Hewa Kankanam Gamage
Manager, Bureau of Foreign Employment

Ms. Deepa Sannasooriya
Senior Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Employment

Ms. Susie Perera
Director, Organization and Development
Ministry of Health

Tuvalu

Mr. Tealei Fakaso
Senior Assistant Secretary for Human
Resource Management
Office of the Prime Minister

Mrs. Leilani Saitala
Principle Immigration Officer
Department of Immigration

United Arab Emirates

Dr. Tatiana Karabchuk
Assistant Professor of Sociology
UAE University

Vanuatu

Mr. Allan Liki
Immigration officer - Vanuatu National Disaster
Management Office

Viet Nam

Ms. Mai Dinh
Officer, Consular Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Ms. Michelle Klein Solomon
Senior Policy Adviser to the Director General, IOM

Ms. Nnette Motus
Regional Director
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, IOM

Ms. Argentina Szarbados
Regional Director
Regional Office for South-Eastern Europe, Eastern
Europe and Central Asia, IOM

Mr. Frank Laczko
Director
Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM

Ms. Mariko Tomiyama
Senior Regional Policy and Liaison Officer
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, IOM

Mr. David Martineau
Migration Policy Officer
Multilateral Processes Division, IOM

United Nations Population Division

Ms. Clare Menozzi
Population Affairs Officer
Population Division, UN DESA

Ms. Ines Finchelstein
Consultant
Population Division, UN DESA

**United Nations Economic and Social Commission
for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)**

Mr. Nagesh Kumar
Director
Social Development Division, ESCAP

Ms. Vanessa Steinmayer
Chief a.i, Sustainable Demographic Transition
Section
Social Development Division, ESCAP