Thematic consultation 3: International cooperation and governance of migration in all its dimensions, including at borders, on transit, entry, return, readmission, integration and reintegration

Moderator’s opening remarks panel 1: International cooperation and governance of migration in all its dimensions

- The last ten years has seen major advances in the area of global cooperation on migration.

- Since the first High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, we have seen the formation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the inclusion of migration in the 2030 Agenda. The Second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development yielded a consensus declaration and we have now decided for these High-level Dialogues to be held on a regular basis.

- Last year pushed these advances even further. IOM finally joined the United Nations and the New York Declaration from the September Summit saw the commitment to develop the two Global Compacts – on refugees and on migrants.

- Together the entry of IOM into the UN-system, the New York Declaration and these two compacts present a unique opportunity to improve the global cooperation on international migration.

- Still we have to approach this opportunity keeping in mind the vast challenges at hand.

- Over the last couple of years we have witnessed the devastating consequences of large movements of refugees and migrants. The consequences of war, human rights abuses and lack of opportunities. The consequences of poor management of migration and the mismatch between the number of people wanting to migrate and the opportunities to do so through regular channels.

- We have seen migrants dying, and being sold into modern day slavery and exploited in the parallel structures of society.
At the same time, we fail to take note of the contributions of migrants to our societies, and we fail to put the policies in place that could improve the development effects of migration even further.

Much of what we have seen is a result of failure to govern migration – nationally, regionally and globally.

As I am sure we will hear more about from Mr Maniatis, the Sutherland Report identified key policy priorities as we pursue efforts to improve this cooperation:

- Managing crisis-related movements and protecting migrants at risk;
- Building opportunities for regular mobility;
- Addressing irregular migration, including through combatting trafficking and smuggling and ensuring effective returns; and
- Fostering the development effects of migration.

In order to deliver on these objectives we need forms of cooperation and intergovernmental dialogue that improve the implementation of agreed principles and commitments made.

This can be done through joint initiatives and concrete solutions aimed at specific challenges.

Through enhancing the capacities of consular services and migrant support centres along key migration corridors, for example, migrants’ lives can be saved, exploitation prevented and human rights protected, while also contributing to more effective returns.

By providing technical capacities to facilitate the negotiation, implementation and follow-up of bilateral and regional agreements on mobility, labour and skills can move more freely under decent working conditions. Such efforts would also go a long way towards ensuring orderly migration and enhancing the development impacts of migration.

The Global Compact on Migration could provide us with a clear Plan of Action, with concrete commitments of these sorts, clear timelines, roles and responsibilities, measures of success and a regular follow-up mechanism.

But we also need to consider how to improve the forms of cooperation and intergovernmental dialogues themselves.

We could consider signalling to the UN system that there is need for greater system-wide coherence and more effective cooperation globally and at a country level.

The UN System has suffered from the proliferation of migration issues across the system without a clear leadership. This was highlighted in the Doyle Report, it was highlighted in the report by the Global
Commission on International Migration and, most recently, it was highlighted in the Sutherland Report.

- The Global Compact on Migration could contribute to streamlining the migration functions within the UN-System and to realizing the potential of IOM’s entry into the United Nations.

- We might consider building on the central role of IOM in the preparation of the Global Compact on Migration and assigning the Organization with a coordinating function in the follow-up of this Compact.

- If we look further down the line, we could also consider how to streamline the international dialogues and processes on migration. We have the Global Forum on Migration and Development; the International Dialogue on Migration of the IOM and the recurring High-level Dialogues on International Migration and Development.

- Some of these were set up in a different era – when migration was a non-starter in the UN system. Now that we have crossed that hurdle, we may wish to explore how to generate synergies and maximize the value added of these processes.

**Moderator’s summary from panel 1: International cooperation and governance of migration in all its dimensions**

- During this panel the importance of the GCM contributing to global governance of migration through a framework for cooperation and compromise was highlighted.

- Some suggested that the GCM needs to be based on a long-term vision. This can be challenging since the longer term challenges and opportunities of migration cannot be solved or realized within the short time-frame of a single term in office for any government. It would seem therefore that we will need to approach the GCM with patience.

- Speakers also pointed to the value of breaking down the longer-term goals into action plans or roadmaps with regular milestones. Through clear deliverables we should be able to demonstrate progress even with a longer-term horizon.

- Numerous member states mentioned the importance of implementation. It would be no exaggeration to suggest that the success of the GCM could be measured in terms of what concrete action it manages to achieve. In relation to this, some speakers picked up on the recommendation in SRSG Arbour’s issue brief to set up a dedicated funding mechanism and welcomed this. Others questioned the value added of a new funding mechanism, suggested it might be an unwelcome burden on donor countries and that other options – such as coordinating existing funding streams – could be explored.
Different levels of governance and cooperation were highlighted: local government, national government, bilateral agreement, regional frameworks for cooperation, such as RCPs as well as international cooperation.

A key issue for consideration will be at what level one best address what issues. In the EU we have worked with the principle of subsidiarity, meaning decisions are taken at the lowest level possible.

Another thing that was brought up time and again was the whole issue of coherence.

Here issues such as whole of society, whole of government and whole of UN approaches, were discussed.

With reference to whole of society approaches, Member States mentioned the involvement of all relevant stakeholders such as civil society, the private sector, local government and migrants themselves. This was highlighted in relation to the design of the GCM as well as in relation to its implementation. The concept of partnerships was also emphasised by some. This could take different forms – from so called public private partnerships in concrete initiatives formed to solve specific challenges, to involving these stakeholders in the governance structures of migration in relation to certain aspects or at certain levels.

Another issue that was raised was the need for a whole of government approach: having the right coordination mechanisms in place within the government offices to ensure that migration is mainstreamed throughout other policy areas and vice versa.

Finally, a whole-of-UN approach was highlighted.

In this regard, panellists reminded us of the progress made and setting the GCM in the right context:

- The Doyle Report and the GCIM
- The HLD
- The appointment of the 1st SRSG
- The formation of the GFMD
- Migration into the SDGs (especially 10.7), the Sendai Framework and other agendas.
- IOM into the UN.
- Together this means migration has gained a more prominent role in the international cooperation in general and in the UN in particular.

And now we have the New York Declaration, the preparation of the Global Compacts.
Numerous Member States called for a leadership role for IOM in this emerging landscape. While many of those who made such calls worded this in general terms, some specifically pointed to manifesting IOM’s leadership role through a prominent role for the organization in the follow-up of the GCM. A critical question for us to answer in this regard is what that leadership role might entail, especially, in this context, in relation to the follow-up and implementation of the GCM. Member states can give indications of what they expect from their organizations, but they might also expect some suggestions from the IOM as well as from the leadership of the UN in this regard.

In response to the recommendation in the Sutherland Report, which was repeated in SRSG Arbour’s excellent issue brief, the future of the GFMD was also touched upon. While some Member States acknowledged the need for a review of the Global Forum others suggested that the discussions on the future of the GFMD should be held within the GFMD itself.

When it comes to substance a number of issues can be highlighted, including responsibility sharing, human rights and access to labour markets on the one hand and on the other issues related to addressing irregular migration, such as return and security. Not surprisingly different member states gave different priority or emphasis to some of these issues.

In closing, I would like to suggest that form needs to follow function. The appropriate shape of the Global Compact can only be determined once we know what we want it to produce.

Panel 2: transit, entry and borders

- Sweden aligns itself with the statement by the EU Delegation on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

- Sweden advocates long-term, sustainable co-operation based on true partnership, aiming to strengthen their capacity to manage all aspects of migration.

- Sweden appreciates the broad and coherent EU Partnership framework approach where migration is an integrated part in the overall EU foreign and development policy.

- In the short term, we prioritize regional co-operation and joint actions to save lives and prevent smuggling, safeguarding human rights.

- Sweden wants to highlight the vulnerable situation and risk faced by migrants in transit and destination, in particular children, who are unaccompanied or separated from their families. Also in this context, we need to work together to find effective and sustainable solutions. This, within a framework of solidarity and regional and international
cooperation – and in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

- Sweden supports the IOM approach to strengthen the consular capacity of countries of origin, in order to help stranded migrants to return voluntarily. Such support can protect migrants from human rights abuses, exploitation and the dangers that onward movements otherwise could expose them to. Such support was also recommended in the Sutherland Report.

- We need to keep in mind that the majority of movements are through regular channels. We need to consider how to facilitate regular migration, such as family reunification and economic migration, for example through capacity building and sharing of modern technology including with enhanced security features.

Panel 3: Return, readmission, integration and reintegration

- Sweden aligns itself with the statement of the EU Delegation on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

- We welcome this session on return, readmission, integration and reintegration, as they are all essential elements of a well-managed migration system.

- In order to create a comprehensive approach on return and readmission, it is necessary to step up cooperation between countries of destination, origin and transit.

- Drawing on our own and EU experience, a number of lessons of relevance for the Global Compact can be learnt:
  
  o return policies and practices need to correspond to the legitimate interest for speedy and efficient return procedures and the equally legitimate interest to protect human rights and dignity of migrants and refugees;

  o Voluntary return should be preferred, while acknowledging the inevitable need for efficient means to enforce returns where necessary. In this context, the New York Declaration recognizes that all States are required to readmit their own citizens.

  o There are benefits of negotiating readmission agreements through regional groupings like the EU.

  o Bilateral readmission agreements often pave the way for broader cooperation on migration related issues and for enhanced bilateral cooperation in other policy areas. [Similarly, a lack of cooperation in returns, is often associated with a corresponding lack of progress in the overall bilateral contacts.]
The success of return and reintegration programmes is dependent on the expertise of development cooperation, including the principle of ownership, and community-based approaches, which balances the support to and includes returnees and the communities of origin in the reintegration programmes.

In closing, there is an inevitable and important linkage between our policies on admission and our policies on return. Without effective returns, we will also face increased difficulties in our sincere efforts to secure – and to continue to build – public and political support for our admission systems.