Background Paper

(Original version: English)

Roundtable 3 - Policy and Institutional Coherence to Address the Relationship between Migration and Development

RT Session 3.1: *Assessing the impact of migration on economic and social development, and addressing its cause-effect relationship*

Co-Chairs of RT 3.1: Governments of Argentina, Kenya and Switzerland

Team members preparing the session: Colombia, France, Mauritius, Mexico. Morocco, Republic of Moldova, Sudan; the European Commission and the European Union Delegation, IFAD and IOM

Roundtable 3 Coordinator: Dr. Rolph Jenny

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the first GFMD meeting in Brussels in 2007, policy and institutional coherence has been a mainstay of the GFMD process. The discussions on this multi-faceted issue have focused on mainstreaming migration into development planning, how to develop coherent policies to this effect, the role and usefulness of data and research to support such policy-making, and on promoting greater institutional coherence within government, including the role of the GFMD national focal points.[1]

At the 2009 Athens GFMD meeting, participants called for more research aimed at evaluating a range of programmes and policies, including assessments of their impacts on the development of communities, families, and migrants themselves in both origin and destination countries. Specific areas highlighted were *Migrant Integration, Return and Reintegration of Migrants, Circular Migration, Diaspora Contributions, and the Costs of Migration*.

Athens also suggested pursuing the issue of *Migration Profiles* as a tool for a comprehensive approach to data collection and more coherent migration and development policies. It further recommended keeping governments informed on recent developments with regard to *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)* and *National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs)*[2].

This paper is prepared for Roundtable Session 3.1 in Mexico which will promote discussion on the above areas, with special emphasis on **impact assessments of migration and development programmes and policies** and the further development of **Migration Profiles**.

The paper concludes with suggestions, proposals and key questions aimed at facilitating the discussions in Session 3.1 and which session participants may wish to consider.

The paper also draws on the conclusions of the seminar on 'Assessing the Impacts of Migration and Development Policies' which the GFMD ad-hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research organized in Vienna from 30 June to 1 July 2010. This seminar was attended by some 50 participants from governments, international agencies and expert bodies, and was prepared, *inter alia*, by means of an 'Informal Inquiry on Policy Impact Assessments' with GFMD participating governments. The findings of the seminar and related inquiry are included in this paper.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

2.1 Definitions

Part of the challenge of impact assessment is a lack of consensus on terminology. First, there is a distinction to be made between migration projects, programmes, and policies, and impact assessment applies to all three.

- A **project** is unique and is of definite duration. In the migration context projects are often undertaken by national or international agencies and organizations, for example to deliver a specific outcome for a specific group of migrants. An example might be a project to provide business set-up training for a group of returnees from a specific country in order to assist them reintegrate.

---

[1] An informal mechanism, the GFMD ad-hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, has also been established to maintain the focus on policy and institutional coherence, *inter alia* by taking stock of relevant GFMD outcomes and related follow-up and by organizing inter-sessional events on specific topics and issues. It also undertook an in-depth review of relevant outcomes of and possible follow-up to the 2009 Athens GFMD meeting.
[2] This paper only briefly addresses NAPAs since the issue of climate change, migration and development will be addressed in Mexico Roundtable Session 3.2.

- A **programme** is a portfolio of projects, intended to achieve an overall goal. In the migration context, for example, a programme on migrant integration might combine a set of projects concerning specific outcomes (education, housing, health) for a selected group of migrants (children, asylum seekers, disabled).

- A **policy** is a principle or set of guidelines to guide decisions. Thus a national migration policy may set targets as regards the admission of migrants, or conditions for them to remain and work in the country; or to promote circular migration.

A second distinction needs to be made between monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment.

Monitoring is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project or programme progresses. It is aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project's or programme's implementation, and matches their progress towards achieving the results planned during the planning phases. It helps to keep the work on track, and can let managers know when things are going wrong. Monitoring is a 'snapshot' in time.

Evaluation is the comparison of actual project and programme results against the original plans. It considers initial objectives and intended results, the extent to which they have been accomplished, and how they were accomplished. It entails a far more in-depth study than monitoring.

Together, monitoring and evaluation allow for **impact assessment. Impact assessment assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention, whether a project, programme, or policy.** The impact can be in the short or long term, positive or negative, direct or indirect, and intended or unintended. Impact assessment helps answers key questions for evidence-based policy making: what works, what does not work, where, why, for whom, and for how much? Overall impact assessment is an essential element in the policy cycle, which progresses through the following stages: agenda setting, policy formulation, adoption, implementation, and impact assessment. It helps inform changes to policies to make them more effective and sustainable.

2.2   Assumptions

In focusing on impact assessment, this paper is based on three main assumptions.

First, impact assessment is a critical stage in developing policy coherence. It is used to judge the overall merit of a policy; to determine to what extent it has achieved its stated aims; to identify what is and is not working and for whom; and to guide the next cycle of policy-making and programming.

Second, while development cooperation is one of the most intensively assessed government sectors, the impact (and costs) of migration policies *on development* are often unknown.

Third, assessing the impact of migration policies is complex. For example, it can be difficult to establish a cause-effect relationship between the policy and its outcomes; and there is usually a time-lag around most data on migration and related impacts. It may be particularly difficult for governments to undertake policy impact assessments since in many instances they lack appropriate capacity and established assessment mechanisms. As migration-related policies are often spread across or funded by different government departments, a further challenge is coordinating monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment. Governments also need to be prepared to accept mixed results from impact assessments, including low impact, unintended consequences, and negative outcomes

3. POLICIES AND PRACTICES

3.1 Current practices in impact assessment

Nine countries responded to the June 2010 'Informal Inquiry on Policy Impact Assessments': Côte d'Ivoire, six members of the European Union (Belgium, France, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, and Spain), Moldova and Switzerland. Though the sample is very limited and almost entirely based on replies by countries of one single region, responses even from this small sample of countries demonstrated a wide range of current practices on policy impact assessment:

- Few impact assessments of policies that specifically target migration and development are currently taking place
- Procedures for impact assessment differ for projects and programmes implemented by government and those funded by government and implemented by external partners
- Where impact assessment takes place within government, institutional responsibility varies significantly
- The requirements for reporting by external implementing partners also vary widely

Six of the nine countries have established formal policies for impact assessment; and the three that have not, reported that they are considering developing them. Côte d'Ivoire, for example, has established a task force to develop a national migration policy including a mechanism for monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment. In Moldova, the Netherlands and Switzerland, impact assessment is specific to migration and development policies. Moldova has allocated institutional responsibility for monitoring the implementation of its 'Action Plan on Stimulating the Return of Moldovan Migrants Working Abroad', 'Programme of Action for Supporting Persons Born in the Republic of Moldova Residing Abroad', and 'National Action Plan on Protecting Moldovan Citizens Residing Abroad'. The Netherlands plans an assessment of the impact of its 'International Migration and Development 2008' Policy Memorandum in mid-2011. The Swiss Global Programme on Migration and Development has developed evaluation criteria for all its projects and programmes and plans to assess their impact in a mid-term and final assessment. In the other three surveyed countries impact assessment is targeted on immigration and integration (Finland and Spain), or is part of a wider assessment of development assistance (Denmark).

In six of the nine countries (Belgium, Finland, France, Moldova, Spain, and Switzerland) government staff undertakes monitoring, evaluation, and assessment of projects and programmes. Of the three countries where government staff were not reported to be involved, there was no response on this question from Côte D'Ivoire, Denmark tends to commission external evaluations, and the Netherlands relies on half-yearly reports and regular discussions with implementing partners.

In some of those countries that involve government staff, assessments are undertaken by the specific department or ministry with responsibility for the particular project or programme. In Moldova, in contrast, an inter-departmental committee has been established to monitor the implementation of the Joint Declaration on Moldova-EU Mobility Partnership, including representatives from the Ministry of Labour, Social Protection, and the Family, as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration. Similarly, in Switzerland an inter-departmental Steering Group has been established to monitor assisted voluntary return programmes. In France the Inter-ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development reviews all funded projects and takes decisions on follow-up action. Also in the case of France, joint assessments are undertaken with national partners in bilateral projects and programmes.

Seven of the nine surveyed countries reported funding of external evaluations of government projects and programmes related to migration and development - Belgium, Denmark, Finland,

France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Switzerland – although in the case of Spain and Switzerland external evaluations take place very occasionally.

In all the responding countries (France did not respond to this particular question) operational organizations that receive government funding for projects are required to conduct their own internal monitoring, evaluation, and assessment. Standard requirements are technical and financial reports of activities undertaken, generally including quantitative information on outputs, such as the number of people served by each project. Belgium, for example, requires an activity report at the end of each semester of a project, and an annual financial report. Finland applies a standard procedure to all *ex ante* impact assessment for projects in the development field that specifically requires an assessment of impact on gender equality, social equality, rights and opportunities for vulnerable groups, and HIV/AIDS. The Dutch government normally assesses the organizational capacity of external parties to undertake monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment, before entering into a contract.

A number of national respondents also identified specific challenges related to monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment of projects, programmes and policies on migration and development.

Some of these challenges and issues were also identified during the Vienna seminar, as follows:
- Assessments are in many instances limited to the monitoring of national practices since there exist no formally established assessment mechanisms to measure the (longer-term) policy impact of migration on development (including human development).
- Policies that focus on the impact of migration on development are relatively recent; impact assessment outcomes are therefore sporadic.
- Notwithstanding the complexity of assessing the longer-term impact of migration and development policies, there is a need to develop a 'culture of evaluation' and governments should recognize the importance of creating the necessary assessment mechanisms.
- Assessments should take account of the inter-linkage between policies, objectives, activities and related assessment indicators, namely 1) define the policy (challenge to be addressed, longer-term goal to be achieved); 2) determine the objectives of the policy; 3) set out the activities (sequence of project actions to achieve objectives); and 4) define the result indicators that are best suited to measure the attainment of the objectives and the expected impact of the policy. Among other tools, a logical framework approach can be useful in defining the inter-linkage between policy, objectives, activities, outcomes and impacts.
- Capacity-building within government is required both to conduct impact assessments and to commission and review impact assessments by external evaluators. There exists a serious gap between government assessment expertise and the more advanced knowledge of international agencies and expert groups. Governments and specialised agencies and experts should share their evaluation experiences and findings to develop 'collective knowledge.

Equally, some examples of effective practice emerged:
- The existence of interdepartmental bodies to review migration and development policies, including their impact assessment, were reported on positively
- The identification of specific benchmarks for evaluating the impact on human development of projects and programmes (for example their impact on gender equality or rights and opportunities for vulnerable groups) allows for more systematic reporting by external implementing partners
- Joint impact assessments involving bilateral national partners were reported on positively
- Another model identified for *exchanging experience* on impact assessments was the project 'Linking Emigrant Communities for More Development – Inventory of

Institutional Capacities and Practices', implemented within the framework of Pillar II on Migration and Development of the Dialogue on Mediterranean Transit Migration

In the case of Mauritius, which currently runs a number of circular migration projects with Canada, it is too early to assess the overall impact of these projects. However, these projects are closely monitored: Before departure, migrants are informed of living and other conditions in Canada, followed by extensive interviews in Canada with the Mauritian workers, their employers, and their relatives in Mauritius. This has allowed for a systematic collection and analysis of information as the projects progress, including a preliminary evaluation of their effectiveness. In October 2009 a major monitoring and evaluation exercise was conducted along these lines. Mauritius has also signed a circular programme agreement with France, which will be implemented in the near future. This agreement also includes provisions for the economic and social reintegration of the workers back in Mauritius.

3.2   Practices and policies in migrant integration

Integration policies are designed to enable migrants to realize their personal, economic and social potential; ensure that their human rights are protected; reduce levels of alienation and marginalization, and thereby to contribute to national security and help establish and maintain social cohesion and harmony. Countries with a strong tradition of immigration, such as Argentina, Australia and Canada, have long recognized that the inclusion, protection and acceptance of migrants is critical for ensuring that their immigration programmes work to the benefit of all concerned in the host country: the migrants, their families, the new host communities, the economy, and the labour market.

Also, as discussed in Roundtable 2.1 at the 2009 GFMD, the social and economic inclusion, protection and acceptance of migrants in countries of destination can enhance their potential to contribute to the development in countries of origin.

Integration is a long-term and complex process, and there is no one-size-fits-all model. Positive practices widely recognized in the context of long-term or permanent immigration are based on such key areas as language, employment, health, education, housing and social cohesion. More specific integration strategies include social support programmes and/or special self-help and outreach programmes that engage NGOs, migrants, ethnic and religious groups, including through migrant resource and support facilities.

To measure the effect and impact of integration policies, some countries have identified the following sources of indicators:

- Regularization of migrants as a fundamental basis for any interaction within society (e.g. Argentina)
- Linguistic integration and proficiency level of migrants in the language(s) of the host country (e.g. Canada, Argentina and Greece).
- Preventing discrimination against migrants, such as equality and non-discrimination legislation, and public awareness campaigns. For example, Argentina has created a *National Institute against Discrimination, Xenophobia and Racism* (INADI), which has devised a *'Discrimination Map of Argentina'* and launched a nationwide public awareness campaign, which also focuses on migrants.
- Integration within national education systems, i.e. performance of immigrants in schools; choice of schools and universities; propensity of immigrants to carry on in post-secondary and further education; comparison of data with native born.
- Social integration i.e. the well-being and participation of migrants in the social life of the host society; actual access of migrants to the health system of the host countries; and the propensity of marriages between immigrants and nationals.

- Political integration i.e. membership in associations, unions, and political parties; immigrant organizations; immigrants' participation in elections; and political representation at the local, regional, and national level.
- Economic integration i.e. participation of immigrants in the labour market; rate of immigrant employment and unemployment rates; household income as compared to the national average; and distribution of immigrants in various employment sectors compared to the distribution of the overall working population.
- Residential integration i.e. area of settlement; level of regional concentration; and nature and quality of the housing.

3.3 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and National Adaptation Programmes of Action

As discussed in Roundtable 3.1 at the 2009 GFMD, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) are key strategy documents that provide a basis for integrating migration into development policy and practice.

Since the preparation of the GFMD 2009 Background Paper, four more countries have submitted new Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers – Nicaragua, Tajikistan (expanding on the March 2009 PRSP), Togo, and Uganda. All four make reference to migration, in ways that reflect the specific national context. Nicaragua's PRSP, for example, identifies emigration as a potential solution to the problems of poverty and unemployment, but equally notes the impact of the global financial crisis on rising unemployment among Nicaraguan migrants abroad, in turn resulting in a reduction in remittances. It also recognizes the need to improve border management. Tajikistan's PRSP also identifies emigration as a key element in reducing unemployment and generating remittances. It identifies specific obstacles to labour migration, including the lack of specific skills and insufficient financial resources; calls for more bilateral agreements on labour migration and return; and focuses on protecting the rights of Tajik migrants. Togo's PRSP identifies internal migration as an important reason for inter- and intra-regional imbalances, and proposes the establishment of agricultural, industrial, and service 'hubs' to try to reduce the pressure on internal migration, especially from rural to urban areas. Finally, Uganda's PRSP notes an increase in remittances between 2000 and 2007 (there is no reference to the more recent impact of the global financial crisis on remittances); and acknowledges the continued emigration of health professionals.

The inclusion of migration issues in all four of these most recent PRSPs demonstrates the continuing integration of migration into development policy and practice. The different migration issues that are addressed across the four PRSPs also demonstrate the way that migration and development are related in different ways in different national contexts. At the same time what is missing in all four papers are specific policy proposals for enhancing the contribution of migration to development.

Since the preparation of the GFMD 2009 Background Paper, a further six countries (Afghanistan, Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Solomon Islands, Togo, and Yemen) have submitted National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), bringing the total to 44 countries. Afghanistan's NAPA makes reference to migration both as a cause and a consequence of environmental degradation, with particular reference to the disruption of traditional migration routes, and growing pressure on rural-urban migration. Togo's NAPA also makes reference to the disruption of seasonal migration as a result of the effects of climate change. Yemen's NAPA proposes job creation in areas that are susceptible to outmigration as a result of environmental degradation, to try to stem rural-urban migration. It is striking that the NAPA of the Solomon Islands makes no reference to migration, even though it is a low-lying island state threatened by rising sea levels, a combination which many experts have predicted will result in outmigration. Neither is there any mention of migration in the NAPA of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Chad's NAPA in contrast predicts migration both from within

Chad but also from neighbouring countries to Lake Chad in response to the effects of desertification.

While the integration of migration issues into PRSPs and NAPAs is a positive step towards greater policy coherence, it is not sufficient. Participants at the Vienna seminar identified the need for 1) a more systematic mainstreaming of migration into development policies, at the global and specific sectoral levels; 2) a stronger focus on the design and implementation of relevant policies; and 3) the elaboration of specific monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

In September 2010 a *Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Planning Tools* will be published jointly by IOM, ILO, UNDP, and UNICEF, providing practical templates and checklists for guiding national efforts to integrate migration and development. This joint approach by agencies of the Global Migration Group merits particular mention as it aims to ensure a common and coordinated approach among relevant agencies, and can also facilitate cooperation with interested governments and potential donors.

3.4   Migration Profiles

Some 70 different types of Migration Profiles have been implemented since 2006 and Migration Profiles have continued to attract widespread government attention since the last GFMD meeting in 2009. The Global Migration Group undertook a review of the Migration Profiles template and the GFMD Working Group seminar in Vienna subsequently identified a number of key issues regarding the purpose, process and character of Migration Profiles. At the seminar, governments such as Ghana and Moldova briefed partcipants on their concrete experiences with (extended) Migration Profiles and stressed their usefulness in fostering effective migration and development policies and systems by means of comprehensive data and enhanced government knowledge on migration trends and related development implications. The development of extended Migration Profiles can be an effective tool for enhancing coherence between migration and development policies.

The following findings and conclusions emerged from the Vienna seminar:
- The content of Migration Profiles has been <u>extended</u> to include a comprehensive range of issues relevant in the migration and development context, such as labour market conditions, income levels, human development indicators, migrants' access to rights, 'brain drain', health, diaspora, education, trade and other factors related to the *impact of migration on the development of concerned countries*.
- Migration Profiles contribute to the mainstreaming of migration factors into national development plans, and have emerged as key tools for interested governments to develop *coherent national migration and development policies* that are based on a vast array of relevant data.
- Migration Profiles are implemented as part of national capacity building efforts to enhance government knowledge on migration and development, support governments in creating or enhancing greater inter-ministerial coordination and institutional coherence. They are part of a wider process towards achieving more effective migration governance by providing comprehensive national data, and Migration Profiles should be up-dated in regular intervals.
- The elaboration of Migration Profiles is a sustained process of activity that assesses the present and longer-term impact of migration on development and should be implemented by special inter-ministerial task forces or similar entities, to be supported by technical cooperation with specialized international agencies.
- Migration Profiles are owned by governments and concerned countries define the priorities, objectives and scope (template) of a national profile. International agencies support the process.

- A mechanism for sharing experiences between countries that already have Migration Profiles and those are that are preparing them would be useful.
- A balance needs to be struck between designing Migration Profile templates that are adapted to particular national migration priorities, but that also allow for international comparability of data.
- Finally, the development, in the near future, of a comprehensive guidance note on how to implement Migration Profiles was recognized as a positive step forward.

4. SUGGESTIONS AND PROPOSALS TO POLICY MAKERS

4.1 Mainstreaming migration in development policies

Further attention is needed on raising awareness of the importance of mainstreaming migration into national, regional and global development policies, and cooperation strategies; and responding to mainstreaming challenges. Understanding and achieving consensus on this overarching goal is a also precondition to developing a stronger 'culture of evaluation', proper techniques for assessing the impact of migration and development policies, and taking full advantage of the potential of Migration Profiles.

4.2 Improving impact assessment

A first step towards improving national impact assessment is to recognize the significance of the process for policy coherence, and develop a national 'culture of evaluation'. In many cases this may require the establishment of a specific organisational framework, as well as a legislation requiring impact assessment for all publicly-funded projects.

Whether undertaken by government staff or external evaluators, effective tools and approaches for impact assessments are required, which should include the identification of clear policy objectives, the definition of appropriate indicators linked to development, and agreement on the intended beneficiaries. A standard system is also needed for requiring external implementing partners to provide impact assessments.

At the national level, the best developed and most effective policy impact assessments often take place in sectors other than migration, for example the public health sector and development sector, and there may be lessons to learn across national sectors through cross-fertilization. An interdepartmental body might be best suited to oversee monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment across government.

Greater cooperation with international organizations or expert groups can assist governments develop better methodologies for impact assessment. There may also be scope for a 'clearing house' that allows governments to learn from one another's experience with impact assessment of migration and development policies, including more systematic exchanges with relevant international agencies.

Especially as migration and development policies almost always impact several countries, joint impact assessments on a bilateral or regional basis would allow the full developmental impacts of migration policies in both origin and destination countries to be assessed, while simultaneously promoting dialogue and potentially also contributing to capacity development in less developed countries.

With regard to assessing the impact of migrant integration practices and policies, and while recognizing that there is no one-size-fits-all model, successful governments' experiences could be shared among interested countries, including indicators that may contribute to measuring the concrete effects of such practices and policies.

4.3   Pursuing progress on Migration Profiles

Migration Profiles should be based on the migration and development priorities of concerned countries and the ownership of these countries needs to be reaffirmed. More government capacity needs to be developed to implement Migration Profiles and sustained cooperation with relevant international agencies is required to this effect.

Migration Profiles should be seen as key tools for interested governments to develop coherent national migration and development policies that are supported by comprehensive and policy-relevant data and research.

The elaboration of Migration Profiles is a sustained process of gathering data to assess the present and longer-term impact of migration policies on development and to provide the necessary inputs to future migration policy and decision-making. They should thus be implemented by special inter-ministerial task forces or similar entities, and be supported by technical cooperation with specialized international agencies.

An appropriate balance needs to be struck between designing Migration Profile templates that are adapted to particular national migration priorities, and templates that allow for international comparability of data.

The comprehensive note on how to implement Migration Profiles, to be published in the near future, can offer useful guidance to interested governments.

4.3   <u>QUESTIONS</u> TO GUIDE THE ROUNDTABLE 3.1 SESSION DISCUSSIONS

4.3.1   <u>Mainstreaming migration in development planning</u>

i)   How can interested governments and relevant international bodies best raise awareness of the importance of mainstreaming migration into national, regional and global development policies, and pursue action in this context? And to what extent could interested governments take advantage of the September 2010 inter-agency *Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Planning Tools*, to sustain and increase cooperation with relevant international agencies in this area?

4.3.2   <u>Policy Impact Assessments</u>

i)   How can a national 'culture of evaluation' be fostered and strengthened? Which actors should 'champion' this cause and what could be the role of relevant international agencies and experts in promoting capacity building initiatives to strengthen the expertise of governments in support of impact assessments and to share their knowledge with interested governments?

ii) How can the GFMD, including its ad-hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, support such initiatives and efforts by sustaining its focus on the issue of impact assessment, in cooperation with interested governments and relevant international agencies and expert groups?

iii) What is the most effective way to undertake impact assessments of migration and development policies? When assessing policies, should governments be encouraged to use proper evaluation grids to assess impact and sustainability as well as establishing the inter-linkage between policy, objectives, activities, outcomes and impacts?

iv)   Since the best developed and most effective policy impact assessments often take place in sectors other than migration, what lessons could be learned through cross-fertilization with these other government and policy sectors? How could such national experiences on impact assessments of migration and development policies best be shared, for example by means of an interdepartmental body that monitors evaluation and impact assessment across government? And could a 'clearing house' for sharing national experiences on impact assessments be created, with the support of relevant international agencies?

v)   Since migration and development policies often impact several countries, would more joint impact assessments on a bilateral and regional basis, and between origin and destination countries, be conducive for assessing the full developmental impacts of migration policies in concerned countries, and would this approach simultaneously promote dialogue and potentially contribute to capacity development in less developed countries?

vi)   Which integration indicators are most useful in assessing the inclusion, protection and acceptance of immigrants in host societies, and how could interested countries share their national experiences in assessing the effects and impact of migrant integration, including related impact indicators?

4.3.3 **Migration Profiles**

i)   To what extent can extended Migration Profiles contribute to policy and institutional coherence on migration and development?

ii)   Through its discussions on Migration Profiles should the GFMD continue supporting a coherent process of developing such profiles, as well as encouraging relevant international agencies and expert groups to pursue in a coordinated approach their cooperation with interested governments to plan and implement Migration Profiles?

iii)   How can Migration Profiles best be implemented, and how should relevant international institutions and agencies provide technical and financial support to interested governments in developing Migration Profiles? Could a comprehensive guidance note on how to plan and implement such profiles contribute to the implementation process?

iv)   Keeping in mind the ownership of Migration Profiles by implementing governments, based on their own national migration and development priorities, how can an appropriate balance be struck between designing Migration Profile templates that are adapted to particular national migration priorities, and templates that also allow for international comparability of data?

iv)   Can Migration Profiles make a contribution to develop longer-term coherent and effective migration and development policies, including their usefulness in creating better government coordination and cooperation at the national level?

vi)   What would be the advantage of developing Migration Profiles in a regional/sub-regional context?

15 September 2010