

*Taking Action on Migration and Development - Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation*

**First Meeting of the GFMD Steering Group**

Palais des Nations, Geneva, Room XXIV

08 February 2011

**Chair:** H.E. Ambassador Eduard Gnesa,  
Swiss Special Ambassador for International Cooperation on Migration

**Attendance:** 33 Countries<sup>1</sup> (Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America)

**Report of the Proceedings**

***I. Welcoming remarks by the Chair-in-Office***

Ambassador Eduard Gnesa, Swiss GFMD Chair, called the first meeting of the GFMD Steering Group (SG) to order and warmly welcomed the delegates from 33 countries. He presented the members of the Swiss GFMD Taskforce, the International Advisors, and the GFMD Support Unit Head, who joined him at the podium.

The Chair mentioned the hand-over of the GFMD Chairmanship from Mexico to Switzerland on 3 December 2010 in Bern. He thanked Mexico for its excellent Chairmanship which culminated in a stimulating and productive meeting in Puerto Vallarta last November. Mexico now forms part of the 2011 GFMD Troika, together with the current Chair Switzerland and the 2014 Chair Sweden. A day earlier, the 2011 GFMD Troika held initial consultations in the presence of Mr Peter Sutherland, Special Representative of the UN Secretary General (SRSG) for international migration and development.

The key objective of the Steering Group meeting would be to discuss and review the Chair's proposed Concept Paper for 2011 GFMD. The Chair thanked all governments who contributed to shaping the 2011 GFMD agenda at the margins of the Puerto Vallarta meeting and, recently, by way of comments on the draft paper. He expressed the hope that the SG would reach agreement on the concept paper, which would be shared later with the Friends of the Forum (FOF).

Before moving to the agenda, the Chair thanked all SG members for their confidence in, and support of the Swiss Chair. This is crucial inasmuch as the success of the GFMD process depends in large measure on the governments' engagement and cooperation. He also informed the delegates that there would be a short meeting of the Assessment Team immediately after the SG meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Steering Group is currently comprised of 35 Member Countries. See <http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-supporting-framework/steering-group.html>

## II. Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair sought the adoption of the Provisional Agenda. No comment was heard from the floor; hence, the Agenda was duly adopted. The Chair announced that he would inform about the state of affairs regarding the 2012 Chairmanship under "Any other business".

## III. GFMD 2011 Draft Concept Paper

The Chair circulated the draft Concept Paper to both the SG and the FOF on 21 January 2011, and requested written comments by 04 February. A number of governments and international organizations submitted their written comments, for which the Chair was very thankful. It was important to have a concept paper that was acceptable to as many governments as possible, while being mindful of their different preferences and perspectives.

After listening to the ideas and suggestions received so far, the Chair, on behalf of the concerned agencies of the Swiss Government, namely, the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Federal Office for Migration and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, had chosen the 2011 GFMD overarching theme, **“Taking Action on Migration and Development - Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation”**.

Under this overarching theme, the **key objectives** of the 2011 GFMD were:

- (i) to focus on action by drawing on the concrete experiences of migration practitioners “on the ground” in order to test some of the practical applications of GFMD discussions and outcomes so far,
- (ii) to do this in partnership with GFMD participating governments, while also involving regional and inter-regional processes and bodies, international organizations and Civil Society, and
- (iii) to decentralize the GFMD activities, but bring back their results to an extended Friends of the Forum meeting at the end of the year, thus preserving the global character of the process.

To achieve these objectives, and in the absence of a full annual GFMD meeting, the Chair has proposed a different format for 2011, whereby the process will move to the field, to the regions and countries where governments and other partners seek to make policies and programs work “on the ground”. A series of small, focused and action-oriented meetings will be organized in partnership with interested governments and other stakeholders such as the international organizations and the civil society. Key ingredient for the success of this format is the readiness of the varied partners to take some responsibility in implementing the thematic work plan. Each thematic meeting will have a focused agenda limited to a few concrete key issues and questions, in contrast with the often rather general agendas of traditional Roundtable sessions.

The Chair was aware that some governments might see the proposed program as ambitious. But he clarified that the “ambitious” component was in the process and on the question of how the Forum would be organized this year, not necessarily the choice or range of themes. The Swiss limited the thematic selection to some core, ongoing concerns of the GFMD, most of them outcomes of the Puerto Vallarta meeting, some reaching back to the earliest GFMD discussions in Brussels 2007, even to the High Level Dialogue and the findings of the Global Commission on International Migration. Some of these may well find resolution in 2011 and perhaps contribute to a GFMD “Checklist” of principles and good practices for all interested policy makers.

The Chair also intended to promote further the global character of the GFMD by ensuring that the FOF and the SG remain the central reference points for the whole process. There will be an Extended Friends of the Forum (E FOF) meeting at the end of 2011, where all the strings would be brought together by discussing the outcomes of the various thematic meetings held in 2011.

The two ad-hoc Working Groups should support this process by selecting priority outcomes from last year and moving their implementation forward, as part of their own work plans for 2011. To this end,

both Working Groups have already commenced their work. Under the auspices of the ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development, the UAE, in partnership with Switzerland, just held a workshop on the labour recruitment industry. On the other hand, the ad hoc Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research recently held a meeting to agree on a work plan that could help implement cluster III of the proposed 2011 program.

To complement the Working Groups, the Chair hopes to strengthen the Platform for Partnership's role in 2011 as a mechanism to showcase outcomes of the GFMD, and help bring together partners interested in participating in any of the proposed follow-up projects.

The Chair briefly outlined the substance and intention of each cluster under the thematic work program. There are essentially 2 policy themes this year, as reflected in Clusters I and II: I) Labour mobility and development and II) Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies. The third theme in Cluster III focuses on the policy supports, namely planning tools for evidence-based migration and development policies that should underpin all other thematic areas.

### ***Cluster I: Labour mobility and development***

Cluster I recognizes that the increasing global mobility of workers presents government with some of the biggest development challenges in the 21st century. The GFMD has identified some strategic policies and good practices as preconditions for enhanced development outcomes of migration, including more linked-up labour market and migration planning, matching of skills and jobs, lower migration costs for migrants, regulation of recruitment agencies, social and income security for temporary and circular migrants, and special consideration of gender.

Under this cluster, the Chair has selected three focused, practical and closely inter-linked strategies for making labour migration work better for countries of origin and destination and for the migrants. These could be co-organized with the Chair by interested governments, and taken forward by, for example, the Working Group on protecting and empowering migrants for development, within the ambit of regional, inter-regional or inter-agency initiatives.

1. *Engaging the private sector in labour market planning* -- the intention was to correct an omission in public policy making on migration and development, by including the private sector, specifically business, in a debate on labour market planning. The Chair would propose a meeting co-organized with interested governments and business leaders, for example from the World Economic Forum network, international manpower agencies, social partners and other relevant institutions.
2. *Lowering the costs of migration for higher development gains* -- it stemmed from earlier discussions about how high costs of migration for the migrants can raise the risks and vulnerabilities and lower the potential developmental gains of migration. High recruitment fees can contribute to this. Following the recommendations of Puerto Vallarta, a recent workshop was organized by the UAE in cooperation with the Chair in Dubai on the "Recruitment of Workers for Overseas Employment" in the context of the Abu Dhabi pilot labour exchange program between Asia and the UAE states. The Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development is likely to follow this up with further workshops in countries of origin, and on social security and income protection of temporary contract workers abroad.
3. *Better regulating/protecting the global care industry* -- the care industry was showcased in Puerto Vallarta as an extreme example of how gender, family, temporary migration and poor labour market policies can interact negatively to reduce the human and economic development potential of migration. This issue was of interest to countries of origin and destination alike, as well as Civil Society and the private sector. In Puerto Vallarta, some governments requested specific follow-up in this field, for example in cooperation with UN

Women and other expert agencies, possibly under the auspices of a new Working Group on Gender.

***Cluster II: Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies***

Irregular migration has been a concern of the GFMD since 2007, but was mainstreamed as a full Roundtable theme for the first time in Puerto Vallarta. It was clearly an important and sensitive issue for development, and general recommendations have repeatedly been made in previous GFMD meetings.

The Swiss Chair would like to become more specific and see how governments, in particular at the regional and inter-regional levels, are taking action on this through concrete and workable partnerships within and across borders. For this purpose, state-led regional and inter-regional events could review and report on national practices and cross-border strategies of cooperation between origin and destination countries in managing irregular migration, also taking into account the development-related causes and implications of irregular migration and the special vulnerabilities of migrant women and men in an irregular situation.

The Chair has already consulted informally with some of these processes to ascertain how the Cluster II theme could be integrated into, or be added to their 2011 agendas. Some processes have already indicated their in-principle agreement to partner with the Chair on this, including the Puebla Process, Rabat Process, Bali Process and the IGC. Reports of these meetings will be presented to the Chair and the FOF at the end of the year.

***Cluster III: Planning tools for evidence-based migration and development policies,***

This cluster will seek concrete follow-up in testing and completing three specific planning tools recommended by previous GFMD meetings and the GFMD Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research:

1. The issue of '*Mainstreaming migration into development planning*' has been a key feature of GFMD discussions and outcomes. A recent Handbook on this matter, published by the Global Migration Group for use by government policy-makers and practitioners, contains detailed guidance on how to define linked-up migration and development policies and programs. In cooperation with interested governments and the Global Migration Group, one or more meeting/s would be convened with governments and other actors to promote the use of the Handbook and test its initial implementation. Support would also be provided by the ad-hoc Working Groups.
2. *Assessing the impacts of migration and development policies* has also figured highly on recent GFMD agendas. Following a Working Group seminar in Vienna last year, the Puerto Vallarta GFMD again stressed the need and usefulness for governments to develop and strengthen assessment exercises with the technical support of relevant international agencies and other bodies, as may be necessary. A technical workshop could be organized in 2011 with interested governments, experts, and international agencies through cooperation with the World Bank's Centre for Mediterranean Integration in Marseille and IOM. Such a meeting would also be related to the EU/EC program on impact assessments for 'Policy Coherence on Development'.
3. Moving forward with *the implementation of Migration Profiles* would constitute another priority for the Chair, following the endorsement in Puerto Vallarta of the usefulness of Migration Profiles as a comprehensive data and information tool for evidence-based policy making on migration and development. In order to further promote Migration Profiles and measure progress on their implementation, meetings could be held in different regions with governments, relevant agencies and experts. With the support of the Working Groups, these meetings with governments would be spearheaded by relevant international agencies and bodies, such as the EC, UNITAR, IOM and other GMG agencies.

The Chair proposed to draw extensively on the structures, work plans and cooperation of the government-led GFMD Working Groups, as well as the regional and inter-regional consultation processes, to help GFMD achieve an action-oriented and focused program for 2011. But governments will continue to be the key actors of all events organized under these three clusters.

This approach would shift the focus of the GFMD back to government practitioners and policy-makers in the capitals, where there will also be a need to rely heavily on the cooperation of the national GFMD focal points. It was the Chair's intention to strengthen the national GFMD focal point system and to reinforce the different roles of the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum, as evidenced by the fact that these meetings will not necessarily be organized back-to-back.

### **Comments from the floor**

The Chair opened the floor for discussion on the proposed format and the thematic Concept Paper. He welcomed any comments and offers of assistance that could help realize the 2011 work program. He expressed the hope that the Steering Group would reach agreement on the concept, to enable its implementation.

19 Governments came forward with their comments below. They all thanked and congratulated the Chair for assuming the Presidency for 2011 and for the draft Concept Paper, and also reiterated their support.

### **Theme and Objectives**

1. Four delegates found the work program outlined in the paper to be ambitious. One of them suggested that the innovative program should ideally be conducted in the framework of the global approach to migration, as adopted by the EU and recognized by the Forum as a global framework of action. It would be useful to think of tools to develop in order to achieve tangible results in terms of instruments and regulations on each of the axes of the global approach that was adopted by the EU.

This delegate noted a need for clarification as regards the title chosen by the Presidency for 2011. The title "Coherence, capacity and cooperation" seemed relatively vague and could be applied to any activity; it did not necessarily refer to the key concept of the Swiss presidency – particularly its focus on new actions, new partners, etc. Other terms were suggested which would seem more apt to describe the nature of the proposed Swiss concept – e.g. global approach, partnerships, shared responsibility, diasporas and development.

2. In contrast, another delegate thought that the definition or the title chosen by the Chair was broad-based, yet it was understandable that it might not be appropriate to accommodate all issues within the purview of the discussions for 2011. The broad title was appropriately flexible.
3. The delegate of the former GFMD Chair Mexico thanked Switzerland for taking up the leadership of 2011 GFMD. He pointed out the need to reflect on the bigger picture in the initial phase of the Swiss Chairmanship. He noted that many of the voiced preoccupations related to what was or was not accomplished in Puerto Vallarta. For Mexico, the 2010 GFMD brought three fundamental developments:
  - a) It has modified the dynamics of discussions and dialogue on migration, leaving behind a vision of "developing and developed countries", "South versus North," country of origin versus country of destination", etc.
  - b) Progress was made in priority areas by redefining stereotypical concepts traditionally used in the migration discourses.

- c) It allowed better representation of civil society and improved mutual understanding between the government and the civil society, which facilitated a more intense and open dialogue.

In light of the above, he believed that it was most important to continue the evolution of political dialogue of the Forum in 2011, by strengthening the capacity for dialogue and understanding, getting rid of the myths surrounding the migration discussion, and finding intelligent, constructive and practical solutions that would be beneficial for all.

4. One delegate thanked the Mexican government for effectively organizing the fourth meeting of the GFMD, and Ambassador Gomez Camacho for his inspired leadership of the Steering Group last year. He supported the objectives of the draft Concept Paper for GFMD 2011 and particularly welcomed the introductory description of GFMD as “a state-led voluntary process dedicated to informal, non-binding and outcome-oriented dialogue”. He agreed with the Swiss approach that the GFMD emphasis in 2011 should be on outcomes.

The delegate warmly welcomed the Chair’s proposed 2011 theme which builds on the past work of the Forum and at the same time moves the process into new practical areas of potential cooperation, all the while ensuring its continued informal voluntary character.

5. Five (5) other delegates supported the choice of the GFMD 2011 theme and thematic clusters. One of them was hopeful that it would promote greater coherence, capacity and cooperation in order to harness the migration and development nexus for more effective and real gains for the countries and migrants themselves.
6. One delegate believed that the GFMD in its fifth year should be strengthened, and that the theme of the Swiss Chair contributes to consolidating the activities of the GFMD.
7. One delegate noticed that the topic of climate change and migration was not included as a key theme in 2011, and he asked if there were any plans to include it at the final meeting.
8. Another delegate, however, noticed that the proposed theme of the work programme seemed less coherent than the previous ones, where all Roundtables were structured towards one main theme, thus assuring thematic continuity. In the 2011 programme, the connection between the theme and all other activities is not clear. This delegate also stressed that the GFMD is a consultative process and not an action-oriented forum.
9. Two (2) other delegates stressed that the dialogue between countries continue as the cornerstone of the GFMD, and that politically, it was very important to ensure the dialogue continues for the benefit of all.

### **2011 Format**

1. Some delegates signalled support for the proposed format of thematic meetings, citing the following points:
  - a. The decentralized model has the potential to provide focused discussions and action-oriented outcomes.
  - b. It could bring closer the regional processes that are involved in migration and development, and it could result in ground-breaking agreements at national, regional and international levels. However, the exact number of meetings should be specified.
  - c. Another delegate took note of the new and innovative approach of decentralizing GFMD activities to the field as an effort to increase GFMD’s relevance on the ground.
  - d. It could possibly increase the ownership of GFMD outcomes as more time for discussions would be possible.

- e. Closer cooperation between GFMD and the RCPs and inter-regional fora (IRFs) can provide new and innovative opportunities to engage a wider array of migration practitioners. This could be done without sacrificing the global nature of the Forum. The prime advantage of the GFMD is its ability to build linkages, where appropriate, between regional migration structures, while preserving the independence of regional fora themselves.
2. Nine (9) delegates expressed concerns about the proposed format for GFMD 2011:
- a. Having dispersed meetings under the different clusters may run the risk of the Forum losing its substantive focus and coherence. All issues should be addressed equally and in a balanced manner.
  - b. The format of small meetings on specific subjects in different regions may pose a challenge in terms of continuity and relevance of the debate, as well as ensuring adequate geographical representation. This could be challenging both logistically and financially, particularly for developing countries.
  - c. The informal, non-binding, state-led character of the GFMD is essential. Hence, holding a series of smaller thematic and focused meetings in different regions may create tension.
  - d. The effective participation of delegations, especially from developing countries, must be carefully taken into consideration. Holding too many meetings might have the unintended effect of limiting participation, thus becoming a barrier to a more inclusive dialogue and information-sharing. This would also apply to inputs from the civil society.
  - e. The number of events contemplated may not be feasible.
  - f. Holding regional dialogues and meetings was worrying not only financially and logistically, but especially in political terms. The biggest achievement of the GFMD process lies in its capacity to hold discussions among all countries representing different angles of the migration phenomenon – origin, transit and destination. The potential of generating dialogue between and among varied regions might be lost, because by definition, these regional processes evolve among like-minded countries or touch upon limited themes. If the regional meetings format was to be followed, an innovative approach that can replicate a genuine dialogue needs to be adopted.
  - g. The GFMD should not try to influence the agenda of the RCPs. Conversely, the RCPs should not impact the overall global discourses that have been the hallmark of the GFMD process.
  - h. The idea of smaller thematic meetings in cooperation with government, international organizations, and regional bodies may jeopardize the state-led nature of the Forum and its added value of gathering on an equal footing both origin and destination countries.
  - i. It may harm the global character of the GFMD. It raises questions about how developing countries will be able to participate in all meetings, and whether or not countries that have the means to participate in all meetings will be allowed to do so.
  - j. Considering that most donors of the GFMD process are presently in a difficult situation, it is not clear what the financial implications of the proposed format would be for the donors, i.e., which parts of the programme would need support.
3. Some suggestions were offered to the Chair concerning the engagement of the RCPs/IRFs and the organization of regional thematic meetings:
- a. Instead of outsourcing the meetings to RCPs, invite relevant regional mechanisms to share their experiences in GFMD Friends of the Forum meetings in Geneva.
  - b. The linkages between regional and global level consultations will have to be carefully managed. The regional meetings could be provided with very specific issues to address. Similar discussions and debates should be held across regions and should finally be synthesized at a global level of FOF meeting.

- c. The regional meetings must have the flexibility to also come up with their own issues of concern.
- d. Care should be taken not to dilute the Forum's identity and unique role at the international level as an informal state-led process.
- e. Ensure that whatever topics are addressed in these regional meetings are of global interest and include global participation.
- f. The engagement of GFMD in regional activities need not be limited to the Chair; there should be a process whereby participating governments are given the opportunity to participate in the selection of regional activities which the GFMD will engage in, and for what desired outcomes.

### **Partnerships**

1. The idea of involving a variety of stakeholders was generally supported, as the Forum should continue to be a platform for enhanced partnerships between governments, international organizations, civil society and the private sector. This partnership model may enhance the legitimacy and ownership of the debate by and among varied stakeholders in future discussions on migration and development.
2. One delegate emphasized that building alliances and partnerships is a core element of the GFMD. It can only be achieved through a clear understanding of each other's role and added value in a holistic discussion that is mindful of the changing, multidimensional nature of global mobility and, thus, of the migration and development nexus. Promoting partnerships leads to sharing responsibility between all stakeholders involved.
3. One delegate cautioned about the voluntary, informal and state-led nature of the GFMD, and the need to continue promoting an open and transparent dialogue primarily between states.
4. Another delegate declared willingness to co-chair one of the meetings this year and provide financial support upon receiving more information.
4. Some held strong views about the role of the international organizations as partners in the process. At least five delegates believed that co-chairing of thematic meetings should not be done by international organizations, but only by States. The international organizations should provide expert assistance.
5. Others asked about the role and participation of the civil society in the activities of the decentralized and regional process. They offered some suggestions to the Chair:
  - a. It is necessary to discuss and consider the selection criteria of the different representatives of the civil society who would be involved in the process in order to ensure the relevance of their contributions. In this regard, the proposed international civil society committee that would liaise with the Chair must have diverse representation and bring together a range of civil society actors.
  - b. The GFMD can benefit from more sustained and systematic input from the civil society. Listening to the voices of migrants themselves can better inform policy makers and practitioners.
  - c. The value of the Common Space exercise in Puerto Vallarta should not be lost, and a similar form of engagement should be pursued.

### **GFMD Support Mechanisms**

As regards the Forum's support mechanisms, two delegates supported the Chair's approach to promoting more synergy between the Forum and the ad hoc Working Groups, by integrating the activities of the two ad hoc Working Groups (WGs) with the 2011 work plan. One delegate



suggested that the respective work programmes of the two groups should be submitted to the SG for further enrichment before final approval by the Chair.

### **Friends of the Forum and the Steering Group**

1. The SG should assume a leading and essential role and the FOF should also play a very important role in the innovative format this year. The FOF meeting should be a platform of further dialogue. The agreed tasks of the SG and FOF should be further differentiated to avoid duplication and overlapping.
2. The FOF must not only be a group of delegates regularly updated on progress made, but a group which will assist the SG in the implementation of the work programme.
3. One delegate cautioned that if SG meetings are not held back-to-back with FOF meetings, this may incur very high travel costs, especially for developing countries. In this regard, pending the assessment of the future of the Forum, it was suggested to hold a reduced number of meetings in Geneva, which will mainly be on substantial agenda topics.
4. One delegate fully supported the idea of organizing the E FOF at the end of 2011, which would be attended by the participants of the thematic and regional meetings. It was suggested that States should discuss substantive issues relating to thematic discussions throughout the year, the assessment exercise and the future of the Forum.
5. Delegates wanted to know the difference between the E FOF and the regular annual meeting. Also, more information is needed in terms of civil society participation in the E FOF.
6. Two (2) delegates stated that E FOF should not become a large-scale meeting like the regular GFMD, which would undermine the decentralized process. E FOF should focus on synthesis of regional discussions and be a forum for sharing of best practices.

### **Cluster 1**

1. For the sake of clarity and efficacy, one delegate advised to bring the 3 Clusters closer to the 3 themes of the global approach to migration. Clusters 1 and 2 correspond entirely to the first two themes of the global approach. Cluster 3 could focus on the important issue of the role of diasporas and their benefits for the countries of origin in terms of remittances and transfer of new technology for development.
2. Two (2) delegates held the view that there was not enough emphasis on the core issue of human rights of migrants in Cluster 1.
3. Nine (9) delegates underlined the importance of involving the private sector. The innovative idea of including business in the labour market plan is very good and there are many interesting developments in relation to business, labour mobility and human rights, which could be reflected in the draft Concept Paper.
4. One delegate supported the proposed theme and anticipated that this cluster will enable the GFMD to consider such issues as:
  - a. what types of labour migration schemes yield the greatest economic benefits to receiving countries;
  - b. what schemes most effectively discourage the loss of skilled personnel from sending countries without compromising the freedom to emigrate; and
  - c. what government practices are most effective in monitoring recruitment companies to prevent exploitation and abuse of migrant workers.

5. Another delegate stated that lowering the costs of migration is the priority for his government and suggested that optimizing the flow of remittances be included under Cluster 1.
6. It was also suggested to include the issue of migration intermediaries – how active are they in different countries and in respective sectors, in what ways do governments regulate migration agents and other intermediaries?
7. The proposal on global care workers was welcomed, inasmuch as it could highlight recent legislations that increase protection for domestic workers, and also bring additional attention to the challenges facing women migrants.

## **Cluster 2**

1. Three (3) delegates encouraged a more balanced view on irregular migration, particularly on the harm arising from irregular migration to migrants themselves as subjects of human rights. Stronger emphasis should be placed on human rights and on curbing discrimination.
2. Another delegate remarked that the diagnosis in the Concept Paper seemed to be rather one-sided and unbalanced. Coherent and comprehensive approaches in the context of bilateral and regional cooperation agreements should be found.
3. Three (3) delegates subscribed to the idea that shared responsibility for managing irregular migration should be coupled with shared responsibility for the underdevelopment of developing countries of origin. The developmental aspect should thus be further elaborated. The linkages between migration and development ought to be made stronger. The focus on opportunities that come from migration and development must be well highlighted, not only the challenges and problems that are encountered.
4. One delegate welcomed the issue of irregular migration as a follow up to the discussions in Puerto Vallarta, and suggested further exploration of such questions as:
  - a. how to establish shared responsibility between countries of origin, transit and destination, to better manage migration, while protecting the human rights of migrants;
  - b. what can origin, transit and destination countries do on their own or together with other countries to reduce human trafficking and stop those who seek advantage of the vulnerable status of irregular migrants; and
  - c. what principles and practices can be adopted to improve shelter management, safe return and reintegration programmes.
5. Another delegate believed that irregular migration issues could be addressed within a context of relevant regional consultative processes. The Bali process could make a valuable contribution to the global dialogue, particularly on issues concerning people smuggling and trafficking and transnational crime. The Bali process could offer GFMD an insight into bilateral and regional cooperation partnerships and highlight the advantages of shared responsibility in countering irregular migration.
6. One delegate opined that transferability of rights should also be discussed and more countries must be encouraged to join a convention on social security. It is important to show joint responsibility in building institutional capacity.
7. Another delegate commented that Cluster 2, like in other clusters, should be provided with strategies. He wanted to know how the discussions in the framework of the regional processes would take place.

### Cluster 3

One delegate particularly welcomed Cluster 3 and the focus on evidence-based migration. She brought attention to the report by the Norwegian Peace Research Institute of Oslo entitled “Participation of Diasporas in Peace-building and Development”.

The Chair thanked all delegates for their comments which he promised to consider seriously. He then identified the salient questions that came up during the discussions and gave his responses.

1. *Is this still a global process, since thematic meetings will be restricted in size and geographic cover?*

The thematic meetings are intended to be small and focused. But the GFMD will remain global in three important ways: first, the results of all thematic meetings will be reported back to the extended FOF meeting at the end of the year (which in a way may be considered our ‘annual’ meeting of the Forum); second, the Friends of the Forum and the Steering Group remain the heart and soul of the GFMD process; and third, the Chair will try to promote thematic meetings in every region of the globe.

Through this approach, the GFMD may be able to tap into the concrete experiences and lessons learned on the ground that may otherwise never reach the traditional, centrally organized GFMD roundtables. There will be a mix of countries of origin and destination, either within or across regions in all meetings.

2. *Thematic meetings are an interesting concept – but how will the organization and financing work in practice?*

There is not one single modus operandi to fit all purposes and thematic meetings. In general, partners interested in organizing a thematic meeting would get in contact with the Chair and submit a brief concept note and a budget for the meeting. In some cases, the events may be fully funded by the organizers, in others, there may be a co-funding arrangement between the partners and the Chair. This will also apply to the logistical and substantial preparations of the thematic meeting.

Each meeting will be prepared with partners, first and foremost governments, to ensure that the respective agendas are focused and limited to a few and manageable issues and questions. The Chair has already informally been in contact with potential partners (governments, international organizations, etc). There is no intent to set up new teams, constellations of governments or invent new structures. But the Chair would like to team up with government partners and existing processes that will assume substantial, logistical and, if possible, financial responsibility, in order to implement the work plan. GFMD 2011 may also be seen as a test for governments’ ownership of the Forum process.

3. *Can anyone propose and organize a GFMD thematic meeting?*

All Friends of the Forum are welcome to propose ideas, in particular governments. However, the Chair will decide which ideas can be implemented. The key criteria used to select ideas for implementation are: (i) the commitment of the partner; (ii) clear links to the 2011 themes; (iii) governments must be the primary target group; (iv) regional coverage; (v) broad ownership of the process; (vi) and available resources.

4. *Is the GMG playing too strong a role? How strong a role should the GMG play?*

For a few years now, concerns about GMG taking over the Forum have been raised. The GMG agencies have played a crucial role in supporting the Forum with their expertise since the first GFMD in 2007, and sustained input from GMG agencies will also be important in order to implement the proposed work plan in 2011. Governments remain the key actors in the GFMD. But international organizations that make up the GMG are governments' organizations. Governments are their members, their donors and their beneficiaries. They exist to support governments with expertise and knowledge made available for the common good. Sometimes, it makes sense for the GMG experts to sit alongside governments on the podium on issues that they are grappling with together.

5. *What is the role of the Civil Society?*

A new GFMD format also calls for new forms of interaction with Civil Society. The Chair intends to develop, in consultation with Civil Society representatives, a mutually acceptable modus allowing for fruitful interaction. The Chair is convinced that it is the responsibility of Civil Society actors to organize themselves, but the Chair also needs to provide a platform for exchange with Civil Society— this is a central characteristic of the GFMD process.

The Chair is considering the idea to organize a “common space” panel, like in Mexico last year, between Civil Society and governments, on the margins of the E FOF meeting. The modalities remain to be worked out. Additionally, the Chair intends to promote the interaction with Civil Society representatives within regional and domestic meetings.

6. *Why does the Chair intend to work with Regional and Inter-Regional Processes (RCPs and IRFs)*

These processes are led by governments and there have been a lot of discussions on the links between them and the GFMD at various roundtables, both in terms of cross-fertilization and the different character and status of RCPs and the GFMD. The government chairs of relevant regional and inter-regional processes can help the GFMD Chair logistically to reach other governments and offer other support. Without intending to infringe on their independent agendas, it is proposed that specific GFMD themes also be looked at by appropriate RCP meetings, which in many cases are already dealing with these themes.

The Chair does not intend to ‘regionalize’ the Forum and will be mindful of preserving the separate and global character of the Forum. The RCPs could address specific questions to be proposed by some governments. The results will be pulled together at the end of the year to formulate 2 or 3 firm principles. Concrete agendas will be communicated later.

Participation of developing countries in terms of logistics is an open question to be decided upon by governments. An organizing government can pay for the invited delegates, or Switzerland can set aside an amount to co-finance such participation.

*The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 13.00 hrs and resumed at 15.00 hrs.*

In reopening the discussions on the proposed concept paper for 2011 GFMD, the Chair emphasized the following points:

1. Regional versus Global
  - a) The Chair will ensure the global scope of the process by having an extended Final Friends of the Forum meeting at the end of 2011.

- b) RCPs and IRFs are not just a collection of like-minded countries, but a mix of countries of origin, transit and destination.
  - c) Not all thematic meetings are limited to regional participation.
  - d) The issue of regional versus global will be managed carefully.
2. State-led nature of the Process
- a) The Chair is acutely aware of the concerns raised, and Switzerland will guarantee that the State-led and global nature of the process will be maintained.
  - b) The State-led orientation does not exclude the engagement of other stakeholders to bring value added to the process.
3. Preparation of Thematic meetings
- a) Governments will contact the Chair and come forward with their proposals; at the same time the Chair will also contact potential partners.
  - b) Each thematic meeting will have its own specific preparations and different modalities, including the participation of governments and other stakeholders, depending on the themes and other relevant factors.
  - c) The Chair is mindful that the participation of developing countries is crucial to the success of the GFMD process.
  - d) The issues of human rights and development will be included in the agenda.

The Chair opened the floor for further comments. One delegate asked if the Chair would revise the Concept Paper and send it back to the FOF for further comments. The Chair answered that following further consultations, they hope to receive proposals from interested partners. Then the final touches will be added to the draft paper which will subsequently be sent back to the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum.

Another delegate raised some specific questions about the E FOF meeting: a) how to include regional discussions in the E FOF? He believed a viable solution could be assigning a rapporteur in these thematic meetings who can then report during the first day of E FOF meeting; b) if financial assistance will be given to developing countries to participate in regional meetings as well, or only in the E FOF meeting; and c) how to engage the civil society between now and the E FOF meeting.

The Chair thanked the delegates for all their comments and questions, but admitted that he did not yet have all the answers to procedural questions raised. Nonetheless, he gave assurance that the methodology would be further developed based on the inspiring comments offered by the SG.

Regarding participation of developing countries in regional meetings, the Swiss Chair expressed openness to co-financing some of them. It is yet not possible to determine how many will be financed, but this will be determined on a case-by-case basis. It is important to seek participation from all regions of the world, as well as by the civil society.

#### ***IV. Organizational matters***

##### **A. GFMD 2011 Budget**

On 04 February, the Chair circulated to the Steering Group a budget proposal amounting to USD 2,155,232, Million, broken down as follows:

• Organizational Costs	1,214,100
• GFMD Support Unit	553,132
• Civil Society	250,000
• Assessment Exercise	138,000
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>USD 2,155,232</u></b>

Of this figure, the Chair intended to cover an amount of USD 677,053, as indicated in the respective budget items. The costs of the thematic meetings were not included in the core budget because a part of these costs would be assumed directly by the organizing partners. However, the Chair has set aside funds to contribute to such meetings costs as necessary. Partners prepared to host and fund or co-fund thematic meeting should therefore contact the Chair with a budget and brief concept note for each meeting, to reach agreement on the necessary funding arrangements.

When the Chair opened the floor for comments, two (2) governments separately declared their intent to contribute to the GFMD Support Unit 2011 budget in the amounts of EUR 80,000 and EUR 50,000, respectively.

## **B. GFMD 2011 Calendar**

The Chair presented a tentative outline of the 2011 Calendar, as follows:

1 <sup>st</sup> Steering Group Meeting	8 February 2011
3 <sup>rd</sup> Assessment Team Meeting	8 February 2011
1 <sup>st</sup> Friends of the Forum Meeting	4 March 2011 <sup>2</sup>
4 <sup>th</sup> Assessment Team Meeting	4 March 2011
2 <sup>nd</sup> Steering Group Meeting	18 April 2011
5 <sup>th</sup> Assessment Team Meeting	18 April 2011
3 <sup>rd</sup> Steering Group Meeting	6 September 2011
6 <sup>th</sup> Assessment Team Meeting	6 September 2011
2 <sup>nd</sup> Friends of the Forum Meeting	7 September 2011
4 <sup>th</sup> Steering Group Meeting	3 November 2011
7 <sup>th</sup> Assessment Team Meeting	3 November 2011
Extended Friends of the Forum Meeting	1-2 December 2011

Two (2) delegates suggested hosting fewer meetings and having back-to-back meetings of the SG and the FOF. The Chair proposed that governments already reserve the date for the E FOF meeting, but assured them of its flexibility, should some states express concerns about its suitability.

## **V. GFMD Assessment**

The Chair provided a brief update on the state of affairs regarding the GFMD assessment exercise. He announced that the third meeting of the Assessment team would take place immediately following the SG meeting. The purpose would be to select an assessment expert to support the Task Force in organizing and implementing the first phase of the GFMD assessment under the auspices of the Chair and the Assessment Team. The Chair intends to organize meetings with the Assessment Team on a regular basis to make the process as transparent as possible. The SG and FOF will be kept abreast of developments.

A few delegates took the floor and gave their comments on the assessment exercise:

1. One sought clarification of “neutral questions” to be raised in the assessment exercise, given that the assessment is not only technical but also highly political, on which the future of the Forum will depend.
2. One delegate anticipated that the SG will be closely involved in the assessment process and urged the Chair to update the SG members on further developments prior to the latter’s meetings.

---

<sup>2</sup> Upon advice by several governments of a conflicting event, the Chair moved the first meeting of the Friends of the Forum to 15 March 2011.

3. Another suggested that the work progress of the Assessment Team be discussed at the FOF meetings so that all states can contribute to the assessment exercise.
4. Regarding experts who are to carry out the assessment work, they should work in tandem with the Assessment Team and remain accountable to them.
5. It would be useful to reactivate the system of Focal Points to help with the assessment process.
6. It was suggested to hold the Assessment Team meeting before the SG meeting to enable swift reporting and promote transparency. The Chair agreed to this proposal and underlined that it was important to involve the capitals in the process.

The Chair committed to send a paper on the progress of the Assessment Team in September 2011, after the team will have concluded the first phase of its activities.

## **VI. Any other business**

### **A. Proposal to establish an ad hoc Working Group on Gender**

The Chair gave the floor to Dr Irena Omelaniuk to update the Steering Group on developments regarding the proposal to establish an ad hoc Working Group on Gender. Dr Omelaniuk reported that the recommendation to establish a GFMD ad hoc Working Group on Gender was an outcome of Roundtable 2.2 in Puerto Vallarta. It was supported at the time by a number of participating governments and UN Women. Since then, two governments have written to the Chair to reiterate said recommendation. It has been proposed that the Working Group should pick up on gender-related outcomes from Puerto Vallarta and help move them forward as far as they relate to the thematic programme of the 2011 Chair. The Chair emphasized the need for interested governments to first submit a concept paper and a work plan. As with the other Working Groups, 2 co-chairs would be needed, preferably from developing and developed countries. Proposals in writing would be welcomed by the Chair.

### **B. 2012 Chairmanship**

The Chair informed the SG that no state had so far come forward to take the Chair for 2012. The 2011 GFMD Troika have joined efforts in finding a new Chair, but all Steering Group members were invited to assist in this endeavour. It was important to find a new Chair as soon as possible, i.e., before June.

At this juncture, the Senior Adviser to the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General (SRSG) for Migration and Development, Mr Francois Fouinat, asked for the floor. He confirmed that the subject of finding the 2012 Chair was a source of concern for the SRSG, Mr Peter Sutherland. In Puerto Vallarta, Mr Sutherland raised an issue which was intimately linked to the identification of the Chair for 2012 -- the funding of the Forum.

As a follow up, Mr. Sutherland had prepared a Draft Paper on Possible Funding Mechanisms with a long-term perspective for the GFMD. The paper considers two approaches that could promote some predictability of funding to enable prospective Chairs to assess the potential costs of hosting the Forum before assuming the presidency:

1. The first approach is to introduce a quota system, i.e. automatic contributions from countries participating in the Forum. This compulsory approach, however, runs contrary to the informal and voluntary character of the Forum.
2. Maintaining voluntary contributions is the only option. The voluntariness has to be combined with a better system to introduce predictability. It is important to estimate the average cost that any country would have to consider if chairing the Forum. This annual budget would also include the cost of the Support Unit.

The proposal roughly estimated, on the basis of experience, that the average total cost (hosting the Forum plus operations of Support Unit) would be EUR 1.6 Million, equivalent to USD 1.8 – 1.9 Million. The amount does not provide for civil society participation or cover any expenditure linked to the ad-hoc working groups, the GFMD Assessment exercise and the Platform for Partnerships.

In his paper, Mr Sutherland suggested that early in the year preceding the Forum, governments should start pledging contributions for the following year. The decision to host the Forum would be based on a clear indication of available funding, thus removing a major obstacle, especially for developing countries.

Mr Fouinat enjoined the SG members to consider the paper because of the urgent necessity to identify a Chair for 2012, preferably from Africa. The Chair thanked him and opened the floor for comments.

One delegate agreed that the issue of funding was extremely important and urged the Chair to take up this issue in the next meeting of the SG and the FOF. In reply, the Chair undertook to distribute the paper and put the issue on the agenda of the next SG meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting on a hopeful note that the process was on the right track. He thanked the SG members for their active participation.

The first meeting of the GFMD Steering Group was adjourned at 16.00 hrs.

\*\*\*

*GFMD Support Unit*  
([supportunit@gfmd.org](mailto:supportunit@gfmd.org))  
28 February 2011