



PERÚ

Ministerio de
Relaciones Exteriores



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra



Fourth Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)



*“Defining the Place of RCPs
in a Changing International Migration Landscape”*



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Publisher: International Organization for Migration
17 Route des Morillons
1211 Geneva 19
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 717 91 11
Fax: +41 22 798 61 50
E-mail: hq@iom.int
Internet: www.iom.int

© 2013 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Fourth Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)

*“Defining the Place of RCPs
in a Changing International Migration Landscape”*

Lima, Peru
22–23 May 2013

SUMMARY REPORT



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Contents

Chair's Summary	1
I. Setting the scene: RCPs in a changing international migration landscape	4
II. From Gaborone to Lima: Taking stock	6
III. RCP engagement with regional bodies and interregional forums	8
IV. RCP–GFMD interaction	13
V. RCP input to the 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development	15
VI. Conclusion.....	18
Annex I: Participant List	27
Annex II: Final Meeting Agenda.....	31
Annex III: Consolidated Responses from the RCP Questionnaire	33



Chair's Summary

The fourth **Global Meeting of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs) Chairs and Secretariats** took place in Lima, Peru, on 22–23 May 2013 under the theme “*Defining the Place of RCPs in a Changing International Migration Landscape.*”

Representatives of RCP Chairs and Secretariats¹, regional bodies² and inter-regional forums on migration participated alongside experts from ICMPD, ILO, IOM and UNHCR. Representatives of past, present and future chairing governments of the **Global Forum on Migration Development (GFMD)** and the representative of the **Special Representative of the Secretary General for International Migration and Development** also participated in the conference which was chaired by the Government of Peru, with secretariat support from the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

As host of the 2011 Third Global Meeting of RCP Chairs and Secretariats, the Government of Botswana shared the outcomes of the last global meeting of these entities. Representatives from the Bali Process, Budapest Process, MIDSA and SACM further highlighted key features of their dialogue and cooperation processes, and specific actions they have undertaken since the previous global meeting. The OAS led a discussion involving representatives of the League of Arab States, the European Union, ECLAC and ECOWAS on how best regional bodies and inter-regional fora might best engage with RCPs.

The background study commissioned for this conference – entitled ***Regional Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms on Migration: Approaches, Recent Activities and Implications for Global Governance of Migration*** – highlighted that regional and inter-regional consultation mechanisms on migration have emerged and expanded, particularly over the last fifteen years, as an important means for fostering dialogue and cooperation amongst states with common migration interests and challenges. While some are organized regionally and others more thematically, they have received and continue to receive considerable attention by policymakers and practitioners and are an important component of the global migration landscape. They serve an important function in pursuing common perspectives and practical arrangements at the regional level and across migration areas that span geographic regions.

The discussions that followed brought to the fore the view that although the majority of these mechanisms were not set up with the explicit aim of promoting global migration governance, they are recognized by the participants as having contributed significantly to de facto convergence of perspectives and policy in some regions, as well as to the building of capacity in a wide range of migration governance domains.

Participants also acknowledged the value of opportunities for sharing amongst the various regional and inter-regional entities specifically dedicated to migration as well as those with a migration pillar of their work. Equally, participants stressed the importance of fostering greater opportunities for exchange between the regional consultation mechanisms on migration and global level dialogues on migration, such as the **Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)** and the forthcoming

1 Abu Dhabi Dialogue; Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime; Budapest Process; Colombo Process; IGAD-RCP; Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC); Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM); Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA); Migration Dialogue for West Africa (MIDWA); Puebla Process; Prague Process; South American Conference on Migration (SACM); and 5+5 Dialogue (Regional Ministerial Conference on Migration in the Western Mediterranean). Representatives of two dialogue processes that are yet to be formalised – the Almaty Process and the Migration Dialogue for Central African States (MIDCAS) – also participated.

2 European Union (EU), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), League of Arab States, Economic Commission for Latin America, the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Andean Community, the Organization of American States (OAS).

UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD). Participants stressed that these are mutually informative and reinforcing mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation on migration, and collectively constitute important components of the existing global migration architecture, informed by the normative framework comprised, amongst others, of international human rights, international labour standards, refugee and transnational organised crime law.

Participants welcomed the opportunity to deliberate on the four roundtable themes of the upcoming HLD – **Mainstreaming migration into development frameworks, Protection of migrants rights, Multi-stakeholder coherence and cooperation** and **Regional and global labour mobility** – and shared important regional perspectives and lessons learned with respect to each. They stressed the need to ensure that these regional perspectives, as well as the role of the RCPs and inter-regional forums, be explicitly recognized in the Secretary General’s report to the HLD.

In the various breakout sessions and plenary discussions, participants brought to the fore several key points, as follows:

- Migration has become a more significant global policy domain and is relevant to nearly all states in all regions;
- There is need for continued engagement at the local, national, regional and inter-regional level to improve migration outcomes for both migrants and states;
- There are huge potential benefits in expanding and sustaining cross-regional interaction and of advancing engagement with global level dialogues such as the GFMD, the HLD and the IOM International Dialogue on Migration (IDM);
- Further, RCPs and inter-regional forums can play an important role in preparing for GFMD and HLD deliberations and taking forward outcomes at the regional level, to the extent relevant;
- There is need to support the ongoing efforts at the global level to define a post-2015 development agenda, and the emerging understanding of the relevance of migration to all three pillars of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental, as well as to conflicts and disaster situations -- and therefore its potential relevance to several aspects of the emerging agenda.
- Participants acknowledged the role of IOM as the global lead agency on migration and in particular its efforts to promote, facilitate and support regional and global debate and dialogue on migration as well as the support it has provided to RCPs and other fora for migration dialogue and cooperation.

This meeting was timely in view of the forthcoming second General Assembly High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and the Development to be convened on 3–4 October 2013, and the call in **General Assembly Resolutions A/RES 65/170 and A/RES/67/219** for Member States to **contribute to the HLD**, and to its preparatory processes, through amongst others, appropriate regional consultative processes.

The participants expressed the wish to draw to the attention of the Secretary General and the United Nations General Assembly the following key conclusions of the meeting:

- 1) Regional Consultative Processes on migration (RCPs) and emerging inter-regional forums on migration (IRF) are critical pieces of the global institutional architecture on migration, and an important means for fostering dialogue and cooperation among states with common migration interests and challenges. Their impacts go well beyond information exchange and are now directly impacting policy, practice, capacity and cooperation.
- 2) There are important benefits in expanding engagement at the regional and inter-regional level, including and within regional economic, trade and development entities, and advancing interaction between these two levels and the global migration dialogue processes with a view to improving outcomes for both migrants and states.
- 3) RCPs and IRFs have an essential role to play in contributing to deliberations at the global level such as the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) and the High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD).
- 4) RCPs and IRFs often have an important role to play in fostering productive linkages between migration and development, as well as in enhancing the protection of human rights of migrants, in particular of those in vulnerable situations.
- 5) Deepening the evidence base, information exchange and the sharing of lessons learned, particularly on enhancing the benefits of migration for human and societal development, constitute important next steps in this field.

Participants expressed deep gratitude to the **Government of Peru** for generously hosting and chairing these deliberations.

Lima, 23 May 2013

I. Setting the scene: RCPs in a changing international migration landscape

Statements revolving around the intended focus of this fourth Global RCP Meeting dominated the meeting's opening session. Speakers included the Honourable Claudio de la Puente, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Peru, who delivered the keynote address, which was followed by an introductory statement by Ambassador William Lacy Swing, Director General of the International Organization of Migration (IOM). Setting the scene for subsequent discussions in plenary and working groups, both speakers recognized the continued relevance of RCPs as forums for informal and non-binding dialogue and collaborative approaches on migration at the regional level. Taking place against the backdrop of the 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD), the meeting provided a platform for reflection on potential synergies with other dialogues and processes that deal with migration at the global and interregional levels. Both speakers encouraged participants to use the meeting to collectively review contemporary migration challenges and the role that RCPs play in addressing these at the global level.

In his keynote speech, Vice-Minister de la Puente emphasized that migration has been a fact of life since the beginning of recorded history and is now gaining more relevance in an increasingly globalized world. The global economic crisis and resulting high unemployment rates in many countries have negatively impacted on the public perception of migrants and have led to infringements of their rights. Existing cooperation mechanisms at the regional and global levels need to address these challenges and contribute to migration governance with the support of agencies of the United Nations system and key stakeholders such as the IOM. RCPs have played an especially important role in promoting dialogue on migration challenges in the Americas. Of particular significance are the Regional Conference on Migration (the "Puebla Process") – an RCP bringing together several Central American States – and the South American Conference on Migration (SACM), which came into being in 1999 in Lima, Peru. The Vice-Minister highlighted that the Union of South American States (UNASUR, currently under the pro tempore chairmanship of Peru) has made significant progress towards establishing a South American citizenship, which will guarantee its holders free movement and higher standards of access to social security and labour markets throughout the UNASUR region. Much of the progress made by UNASUR has been made possible through the work of subregional mechanisms such as the Andean Community and MERCOSUR (the "Southern Common Market"). The Vice-Minister emphasized that with an estimated 10 per cent of its own population living abroad, the Government of Peru remains a key supporter of global and regional consultation mechanisms on migration and continues working towards the full recognition of migrants' rights and the potential of migrants to contribute to development. He expressed his hope that the upcoming HLD in New York would lead to more coordinated responses to global migration challenges.

The IOM Director General, Ambassador William Lacy Swing, for his part stressed that the spread of RCPs and interregional forums are a clear demonstration of States' recognition of the value of collaborative approaches to addressing global migration challenges on the basis of consensus. The question of how the various regional, interregional and global processes on migration interact with each other continues to be a feature of various discussions, including in the context of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). The Director General further pointed out that the upcoming HLD raises the question of what structures would be most suitable for the many inter-State forums to interact in a regular and constructive way with international organizations. In this respect, the second HLD provides a rare opportunity to improve the governance of migration for years to come, with a strong impact on migration and development from the local to the global level, while keeping the rights and well-being of migrants at the centre of the debate. Finally, the Director General reaffirmed IOM's continued commitment to support States in the formulation of

cooperative approaches to migration issues and by providing expertise, wherever needed, to these valuable migration dialogues and consultation processes, which governments have created.

Conference deliberations were informed by the IOM-commissioned study, *Regional Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms on Migration: Approaches, Recent Activities and Implications for Global Governance of Migration*.³ The study reviews 25 inter-State consultative mechanisms on migration: 18 RCPs and seven other mechanisms, termed “interregional forums on migration” (IRFs), which appear to depart from the classic RCP model in some meaningful way. Each case review includes a background on the origin and development of the mechanism; a brief discussion of the evolution of its agenda; the identification of any linkages with multilateral agreements; and a note on the placement of the mechanism within the taxonomy of mechanisms suggested by the author. The study concludes by outlining implications for the more harmonized governance of migration. The increasingly close linkage of some RCPs with regional economic/trade bodies is seen as especially significant, providing an opportunity for movement towards formal regional migration agreements. At the same time, RCPs and similar processes could not possibly be judged fairly by their instrumental value in promoting global migration governance, as this is not part of their explicit mission; in addition, there is no apparent international consensus that such a global agreement is needed. The study concludes that the de facto policy coherence developing among countries that belong to established RCPs and IRFs is the main achievement of these mechanisms, and is the primary driver of increased global coherence in migration governance.

³ The study, authored by Charles Harns, is available at www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/What-We-Do/docs/2013-Global-RCP-Background-Study_MRS45.pdf.

II. From Gaborone to Lima: Taking stock

Participants repeatedly stressed the added value of the Global RCP Meetings that have taken place so far since the first one of 2005.⁴ Following a recommendation made by the RCP chairs and secretariats at the 2009 meeting in Bangkok, the meetings are now being held on a biennial basis. Participants recognized that the Global RCP Meetings have contributed to regular and sustained exchange between RCPs from different regions that might otherwise not have the occasion to interact. Several delegations used the opportunity of the Lima meeting to update other participants on the progress made by their respective bodies on the issue of capacity enhancement of RCPs – the overarching theme of the 2011 Global RCP Meeting in Botswana.

The Government of Botswana, host of the third Global RCP Meeting, shared the outcomes of that meeting, which took place under the broad theme “Enhancing cooperation on migration through dialogue and capacity-building” and sought to identify common challenges and opportunities that RCPs face. The meeting was attended by more than 75 participants, including the representatives of chairing governments and/or secretariats of 10 RCPs. Participants exchanged views on how to enhance the effectiveness of RCPs and identified good practices, key among them predictable and sustainable funding arrangements, and ownership of RCPs by participating Member States. Participants also highlighted comprehensive operating modalities, the strengthening of secretariat structures, the opportunity to exchange with other RCPs and, whenever deemed potentially beneficial, the participation of civil society organizations, as areas that merit focused attention.

In the panel and plenary discussion that followed, important developments in several RCPs since the last Global RCP Meeting were discussed.

The Bali Process announced that a Regional Support Office (RSO) had recently been set up to implement activities under the Regional Cooperation Framework and to act as secretariat for the process, handling information-sharing, supporting capacity-building actions, encouraging the pooling of common technical resources, and offering logistics, administrative, operational and coordination support for joint projects. Since its establishment, the RSO has supported a number of projects for Bali Process participating States, including one on enhancing the collection, use and sharing of data; another in voluntary return support and reintegration assistance; a regional round table on irregular movements by sea; and a pilot study on information exchange and data analysis on irregular migration by sea. The RSO is also mapping and analysing the protection situation of unaccompanied and separated children in South-east Asia and is developing a roster of migration experts, with the aim of making them available to Bali Process participating States for short-term technical and capacity-building actions.

The Budapest Process presented to participants on the history of the process since it was established 20 years ago, which has been marked by expansion in terms of both membership and geographic coverage. During its first phase (1993–2003), the process focused on cooperation among countries in Central and Eastern Europe. In its second phase, cooperation was extended to other countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. In 2010 the Budapest Process entered its third phase, characterized by extending cooperation to include countries from the “Silk Route region.”⁵ In April 2013 a ministerial conference hosted by Turkey, as the incumbent Chair of the Budapest Process, adopted the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration, which establishes a “Silk Routes Partnership for Migration” with the objective of promoting dialogue and mutual cooperation in managing migration flows taking

⁴ For the documentation of all Global RCP Meetings, visit www.iom.int/cms/en/sites/iom/home/what-we-do/regional-processes-1/global-rcp-meetings.html.

⁵ This includes the following new participating countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq and Pakistan.

place along the Silk Route corridor. The Budapest Process is now moving towards implementing the Istanbul Declaration with funding from the European Union.

Launched in 2000, the Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) recently gained new momentum, including through a ministerial meeting level held in Namibia in 2010. At this meeting, ministers recommended the integration of MIDSA into the Southern African Development Community (SADC), in order to ensure follow-up and action on MIDSA recommendations. In 2012 a MIDSA technical meeting was held in Mauritius to develop the Regional Action Plan on Labour Migration for Southern Migration, which will be discussed by the second MIDSA Ministerial Conference, to be held in July 2013 in Maputo, Mozambique.

Since 2000 the South American Conference on Migration (SACM) has been convened on a yearly basis to discuss migration issues and develop initiatives and programmes for international migration in South America. Under the pro tempore chairmanship of the Government of Chile, and with the technical support of IOM as SACM Secretariat, the twelfth South American Conference in November 2012 provided a forum to discuss a wide range of thematic issues, including the implementation of the South American Plan for Human Development of Migration; the enhancement of States' migration management capacities; and SACM's relationship with regional integration processes such as UNASUR and MERCOSUR. Further, the twelfth conference featured a discussion on the upcoming HLD and SACM's relationship with the Global Forum on Migration and Development.

In the discussion that followed, several participants pointed out that the thematic priorities and agendas of their respective RCPs have evolved over the years. It was noted that one of the great advantages of RCPs is that their working agendas remain flexible and can be adapted in light of new challenges and emerging issues. Areas identified by participants where stronger RCP engagement may be needed include crisis situations with migration consequences, and more generally, the public perception of migrants.

It was further noted that different processes move at different speeds, and that the challenges to be addressed by them will for the most part remain region-specific. The working agenda Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue, for example, which provides a forum for discussion for countries of origin, transit and destination in Europe and North Africa, has been shaped to a considerable extent by the challenges posed by complex patterns of mixed migration.

Finally, participants discussed key developments since the last Global RCP Meeting in Gaborone in terms of the creation of new processes. Of particular note is the recommendation by nine Member States of the Economic Community of Central African States to establish a Migration Dialogue for Central African States during a meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo in February 2012. In October 2012 the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Immigration similarly recommended the establishment of a COMESA-RCP, which is expected to be officially launched in 2013. Finally, Central Asian States were expected to launch the Almaty Process during a ministerial conference in Almaty, Kazakhstan in June 2013. (The Almaty Process was indeed launched according to plan.) Representatives of these fledgling dialogue processes participated in the Lima RCP meeting.

III. RCP engagement with regional bodies and inter-regional forums

The relationship between RCPs and regional and interregional forums received considerable attention throughout the two-day meeting. Several delegates drew attention to the fact that RCPs are increasingly engaging with formal regional bodies, as well as with similarly structured dialogue processes that have an interregional character. A number of participants expressed the view that RCPs that are embedded in or which maintain close contact with regional economic communities (RECs) have the greatest potential to spawn formal regional agreements on migration.

Participants acknowledged the need for the IOM-commissioned background study to inform the meeting, as it provided a comprehensive overview of existing consultative mechanisms and explored their particularities, including on issues such as their linkages, if any, with more formal regional bodies. The discussions proceeded to explore regional perspectives on how these interlinkages might be further enhanced. Particular attention was drawn to regional bodies that work closely with both RCPs and IRFs, with a view to drawing any potentially useful lessons.

The Organization of American States (OAS) was offered as a good example of a regional body that has become increasingly engaged in migration issues. Mixed-migration flows pose key challenges to states in the Americas and by their very nature require regional approaches, particularly as regards the protection of the rights of vulnerable migrants. OAS has not only set up the Special Commission on Migration Issues (known by its Spanish acronym, CEAM) as a designated focal point within the organization, but has also initiated several initiatives in this respect, including a number of studies and a course on migration issues delivered jointly with the IOM. As a regional political body, it has also maintained close links with several subregional mechanisms dealing with migration, including MERCOSUR.

The League of Arab States (LAS) has similarly been focusing on the issue of international migration and Arab expatriates since its establishment. Migration is a very relevant issue to LAS because the Arab region is both a sending and receiving region for migration. The uprisings that have characterized several countries in the Middle East in recent times can be expected to have strong effects on the movement of people and, therefore, on the public perception of migrants, but it is too early to tell which direction and magnitude it will take. LAS and its specialized organizations offer a framework for Arab countries to cooperate on issues related to migration and human mobility within the region. However, LAS has also for a long time engaged in intraregional cooperation in the field of migration. With Europe as the main destination region for migrants from the LAS region, cooperation has grown between European countries and LAS Member States. A prominent example of a structured interregional cooperation platform is the Barcelona Declaration of 1995, which provides the basis for cooperation between the European Union and countries in the Southern Mediterranean. LAS has participated in all of these meetings. Further, it has supported the work of the Abu Dhabi Dialogue and issued a number of pertinent reports and studies on migration and hosted a number of conferences and meetings, including on the issue of Arab expatriates. LAS has further proposed the establishment of a Working Group on International Migration in the Arab Region, in order to promote coordination and minimize the duplication of efforts in the region.

The European Union (EU) is unique in its political, judicial and economic structure, characterized by States limiting their sovereignty in certain specific areas and instead exercising them at the regional level. Informal consultations helped the EU to become a regional economic community in a first instance, and subsequently, move towards regional integration. In the early 1990s, EU Member States made progress towards formalizing cooperation by pooling and delegating specific sovereignty rights to the EU. Today the EU provides for the freedom of movement within its borders and has an

integrated common migration policy. Informal consultations at the regional level have helped these developments and continue to be a distinguishing feature of the EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, including among EU Member States. Drawing from the experience of the EU, it would seem that the informal and non-binding nature of RCPs should not be a hindrance to formalization at a later stage. The EU, through its Global Approach, continues to support seven regional migration dialogues in Africa (through the Rabat Process and the Africa–EU Partnership); in Asia and Europe (through the Prague Process, Eastern Partnership and the upcoming Silk Routes Partnership); in Central and South America (through the EU–CELAC Structured Dialogue on Migration); and as well as with the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP). The EU is likewise engaged in structured bilateral dialogue on migration and mobility with more than 25 countries, most of which are neighbouring countries. In addition, the EU supports several interregional initiatives. As a prominent example, the EU will shortly launch a 26-million euro initiative to support the implementation of the ECOWAS Free Movement of Persons Protocol and the ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration. Further, the EU promotes a series of policy instruments, such as migration profiles⁶ and mobility partnerships.⁷

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) is one of the five UN regional economic commissions tasked with furthering economic development at the regional level and with the reduction of social inequality in their respective regions. Migration is one of the issues addressed by the regional commissions as they seek to enhance regional and interregional cooperation on migration issues. They have further been closely involved in preparations for the first HLD in 2006 and have contributed to preparations for the upcoming second HLD, including through their chairmanship of the Global Migration Group (GMG) in the first half of 2013. Although the link between migration and development is still not widely accepted, ECLAC has, over the past years, significantly expanded its role in regional cooperation on migration. It has recently published a study on regional and interregional perspectives on migration and put together an inventory of migration practices in the LAC (Latin America and the Caribbean) region. An example of interregional cooperation is the EU–LAC structured dialogue on migration, for which both the EU and ECLAC have provided considerable support as regional entities representing individual Member States.

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) is composed of 15 West African countries. Founded on 28 May 1975, following the signing of the Treaty of Lagos, its mission is to promote economic integration across the region. From the outset, the free movement of persons within the ECOWAS region was considered as critical by Member States, and gradual progress towards this goal has been made over the years. Between 1980 and 1985, the right of entry was granted to all citizens of ECOWAS Member States. In a second phase, the right of residence was added. Today, ECOWAS passports allow for 90 days of stay in any ECOWAS country. Community citizens can be domiciled and look for employment in any Member State without any discrimination. The ECOWAS protocol on free movement, as well as other ECOWAS regional mechanisms, needs to be implemented at the national level. Beyond the free movement of community citizens, ECOWAS is looking at the issue of mixed and irregular migration, remittances in the region and into gender aspects of migration. ECOWAS has further sought to strengthen the Migration Dialogue for West Africa as a platform for informal discussions on migration issues among ECOWAS Member States.

In the discussion that followed these various presentations, several participants noted that the AU Migration Policy Framework for Africa has been providing important guidance for the development

6 Prepared based on a coherent set of indicators, each Migration Profile provides a comprehensive situation report on the state of migration in a given country. For further information on Migration Profiles as information tools for strategic policy planning, see www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/migration-research/migration-profiles.

7 Mobility partnerships offer a concrete framework for dialogue and cooperation between the EU and its Member States on the one hand, and non-EU countries on the other. The cooperation focuses on three areas: legal migration, migration and development, and the fight against irregular migration. For more information, see http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/global-approach-to-migration/specific-tools/index_en.htm.

of subregional approaches, including harmonized approaches of different RECs and RCPs in the AU region. The experience of other regional bodies was highlighted, including that of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA). COMESA, somewhat similar to the EU, was established in 1994 with the vision of establishing a fully integrated regional community within which goods, services, capital and labour can move freely across the borders of its 19 Member States. In October 2012 the COMESA Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Immigration recommended the establishment of a COMESA–RCP, which is expected to be launched officially in 2013.

Attention was drawn also to a number of successful interregional initiatives, including the EU–LAC Structured and Comprehensive Dialogue on Migration and the Euro-African Dialogue on Migration and Development (the “Rabat Process”). Both processes have held regular meetings and have inspired activities spanning countries in two different regions. Like other interregional initiatives and forums, the Rabat Process and EU–LAC involve a number of regional organizations, including the AU, the EU and ECLAC.

In three designated working groups and subsequent plenary discussions, participants exchanged views on the following aspects: (a) deepening inter-RCP interaction, (b) enhancing RCP cooperation with other regional and international forums and (c) RCP impact on migration policy and practice. Out of these discussions also emerged a number of concrete recommendations.

Deepening inter-RCP interaction

Throughout the meeting, participants recognized the value of the Global RCP Meetings as a means to deepen inter-RCP interaction by providing a structured platform for the regular exchange of views and good practices between RCPs from different regions. The overview of the work of different RCPs across different regions provided by the meeting’s background study was noted as an essential contribution towards improved understanding of RCPs and similarly structured dialogue processes that have a migration focus. In the same vein, participants noted that several RCPs maintain their own websites or webpages, which are useful points of references. The comprehensive section dedicated to RCPs that was launched by IOM on its own website, following the recommendation of the 2009 Global RCP Meeting, was noted as a platform through which RCPs could make available information on their work that they wish to share with RCPs from other regions.⁸ While this platform has been up and running for a while now, its usefulness and effectiveness as an information exchange platform is possible only if it is fed with regular updates from the various RCPs.

Beyond the Global RCP Meetings, there are other opportunities for RCPs from all regions to come together, including in the context of GFMD working groups and summits.⁹ The Bali Process, for example, recently invited a number of RCPs to attend its tenth anniversary commemoration. This November 2012 gathering also provided an opportunity for RCPs to reflect on their achievements in the area of regional cooperation to address the scourge of human trafficking in their region.

Notwithstanding the progress that has been made over the years in promoting inter-RCP interaction, participants suggested that there is potential to further deepen the exchange of good practices across regions. One concrete recommendation made in this respect was the production of a compilation of RCPs’ good practices in different thematic areas.

Finally, participants acknowledged the resource constraints of RCPs and participant countries, and suggested the use of more cost-effective methods of interaction, for example, through the use of modern telecommunication tools such as videoconferencing. RCP secretariats can and should play

⁸ See www.iom.int/rcps for more information.

⁹ For further discussion on RCP–GFMD interaction, refer to the succeeding section (“RCP–GFMD interaction”).

a key role in improving the sharing of information between RCPs. Other participants pointed out that a key obstacle to effective information flow between participating countries was the absence of clear focal points for RCP matters. Given the high turnover of staff, the designation of institutional focal points, rather than individuals, may be a better approach.

RCP impact on migration policy and practice

Throughout the discussion, participants reaffirmed the relevance of RCPs by enumerating various interventions, underlining the fact that RCPs have in many instances evolved to have an impact beyond mere trust-building and information exchange. There was consensus that most RCPs have reached a point where they attempt to formally impact migration policy. The general perception that RCPs are focused solely on dialogue does not hold true, as RCPs are increasingly moving towards implementation and operationalization of their conclusions and recommendations.

The policy impact of RCPs is felt at different levels (national, regional and global). However, it was also acknowledged that measuring RCPs' impact on migration policy and practice is difficult in many cases – not least because changes in law or practice of individual participating countries can be attributed to different factors in most cases.

The close linkages of many RCPs with regional economic bodies in various regions were noted alongside the mutual impact that these entities have on each other. In instances where RCP recommendations are taken further by more formal bodies, the impact of RCPs on migration policy and practice is most visible. The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) RCP and MIDSA (which has close ties with SADC) were mentioned as concrete examples in this respect.

However, several participants emphasized that the policy impact of certain stand-alone RCPs has been also significant over the years. This includes the work of the Bali Process, the Budapest Process and the Prague Process, which have all evolved to work in a very action-oriented manner and have initiated a number of concrete capacity-building initiatives in their respective regions. Similarly, the 5+5 Dialogue has developed a regional action plan to guide activities by participating countries. Another example mentioned was the Colombo Process, which served as a platform for process members to look into coordinated responses to the Libya crisis (which affected many migrant workers) and contributed to the establishment of an emergency fund at IOM.

Enhancing RCP cooperation with other regional and interregional forums

There was broad recognition of the different geographic layers of cooperation on migration, and several participants made the point that RCP deliberations have accelerated the coming into being of bilateral agreements between participating States. In the context of the discussion on RCP cooperation with established regional bodies and other interregional forums, the interaction between: (a) the national and the regional, (b) the regional and interregional and (c) the regional and global levels were considered to be of particular relevance. Concluding observations noted that interaction at all three levels is essential to harmonized migration governance. At the global level, IOM's International Dialogue on Migration was mentioned as another forum for migration policy dialogue, in addition to the HLD and the GFMD.¹⁰

Participants agreed on the benefits of expanding engagement at the regional and interregional levels, including within regional economic, trade and development entities, and advancing interaction between these two levels and global migration dialogue processes, with a view to

¹⁰ For a more detailed discussion on the HLD and GFMD, refer to the succeeding section ("RCP-GFMD interaction").

improving outcomes for both migrants and States. It was noted by several participants that trust-building remains a precondition for cooperation. The informality of discussions that have marked RCPs has proven to be a crucial ingredient for successful outcomes.

Participants noted the need to engage beyond regions in order to address migration challenges comprehensively, but also recognized that regional dialogue and integration is a precondition for effective interregional cooperation. It was further noted that a number of RCPs have identified cooperation with other regions as an important aspect of their work. The Puebla Process and SACM, for example, have met regularly to discuss migration challenges within and across their respective regions.

A number of participants pointed out that global migration governance needs to be built from the bottom to the top, and not the other way around, and that there is a need for balance between action and dialogue at all levels. However, a number of participants also noted that there is a need for more consensus between key migration stakeholders, as well as clear guidance from the global level to give impetus for more coherent action at the national and regional levels. A number of participants in this respect expressed their hope that the upcoming HLD would result in a more integrated global migration agenda. There was general agreement that RCPs and IRFs have an essential role to play in contributing to migration deliberations at global forums such as the GFMD and the HLD.

IV. RCP–GFMD interaction

The GFMD is an informal, non-binding, voluntary and government-led process established in 2006 as a result of discussions at the first HLD, held in the same year. Representatives of the former (Mauritius) and would-be (Turkey, speaking also on behalf of Sweden) GFMD Chairs provided an overview of the work of the forum and laid down the priorities of their respective chairmanships. These presentations were followed by panel and plenary discussions on how RCPs can strengthen the process of regional input to GFMD deliberations and how they can contribute to regional follow-up to GFMD outcomes.

Mauritius, the first African country to chair the GFMD, organized its 2012 chairmanship around the theme “Enhancing the human development of migrants and their contribution to the development of communities and States.” The summit meeting that was held in November 2012 in Port Louis, Mauritius, brought together over 500 delegates, including ministers and vice-ministers from 129 States. Several speakers remarked on the success of the 2012 GFMD forum in terms of the depth of the debates, the exchange of good practices between participating countries, the inclusiveness and interactivity of the sessions and the high level of African engagement. Under the Mauritian chairmanship, the GFMD assessment exercise (based on the responses of 66 governments and 10 GFMD observers to a questionnaire) was concluded; new critical emerging issues, such as South–South migration and migrants in distress, received heightened attention; and a labour mobility initiative supported by several African governments was launched. All of this was achieved despite the fact that Mauritius is a small island developing State, with limited resources and funding compared to previous GFMD Chairs-in-Office.

The representative of the Government of Turkey reflected on the future of the GFMD, on behalf of the current and incoming GFMD Chairs (Sweden and Turkey, respectively). Sweden assumed the role of GFMD Chair on 1 January 2013 and will host the seventh GFMD meeting in Stockholm on 14–16 May 2014. The years 2013 to 2014 mark an important period for the global debate on development and migration – with the upcoming second HLD and the ongoing work to identify new global development goals. Sweden and Turkey are both committed to seizing this opportunity and make the work of the GFMD even more relevant.

Sweden has chosen the overall theme “Unlocking the potential of migration for inclusive development” for its chairmanship and has set these three mutually reinforcing objectives: (a) working towards a more development-focused forum (including attracting development policymakers to the forum); (b) a more dynamic forum (including an important role for civil society and the private sector); and (c) a more durable forum (including, importantly, progress towards more stable and predictable funding for the forum).

Turkey indicated that its will to take on the GFMD chairmanship in 2015 was spurred on not only by the increasing significance of migration issues for Turkey, but also by its commitment to development issues. Turkey is still in the early stages of determining priorities for its chairmanship. Complementing the work of previous GFMD Chairs and working closely with Sweden, Turkey has nevertheless identified thematic areas of human mobility (including lifting obstacles and barriers such as visa restrictions), the human rights of migrants, and addressing discrimination and xenophobia as potential priority areas. Following the example of previous GFMD Chairs, Turkey will develop priorities and a road map in close consultation with all relevant stakeholders. In light of its positive experience with and involvement in various RCPs, including, foremost, the Budapest Process, Turkey is committed to including RCPs in GFMD deliberations during its chairmanship.

The GFMD presentations were followed by a plenary discussion on how closer ties between RCPs and the GFMD might be created. It was noted that the recently concluded GFMD assessment report contains a recommendation to explore a closer relationship between the GFMD and RCPs. In addition, it was pointed out how the Swiss GFMD 2011 Chair had put forward a proposal to RCPs for them to co-convene thematic seminars and meetings, but received few positive responses. During the panel discussion that followed, RCP representatives shared their views on: (a) how the process of regional input to GFMD deliberations might be strengthened and (b) how RCPs can contribute to regional follow-up to GFMD outcomes.

One example mentioned in this respect is the IGAD-RCP, which focused its last meeting on migration and development, inspired and informed by discussions and the overarching theme of the 2012 GFMD chaired by Mauritius. IGAD-RCP representatives (the secretariat and participating States) were also present in several 2012 GFMD round table meetings. Sweden's call for increased bilateral labour agreements as a step towards multilateral labour agreements is among the priority areas for the next five years that have been identified by Member States of the IGAD-RCP.

For the Abu Dhabi Dialogue (ADD), the GFMD likewise remains a highly relevant global-level platform for the discussion of migration issues of concern to its members. GFMD deliberations and background papers on labour mobility have been of direct relevance for members of the ADD. Several participants, however, noted that there is considerable overlap in the thematic areas discussed by RCPs and the GFMD. While individual RCP participating States have actively contributed to GFMD discussions, there was agreement that the GFMD might wish to consider involving RCPs in a more systematic manner.

A number of participants highlighted the mutual benefits of a more structured relationship between RCPs and the GFMD. It was suggested that the GFMD could learn from the regional experience of RCPs, particularly how these processes have over time gained broad acceptance by participating States and contributed to the development of regional migration policies and influence practice. The Puebla Process was mentioned as one prominent example of a migration dialogue forum that has successfully involved civil society in its deliberations and activities.

Overall, there was agreement on the potential for enhanced interaction between RCPs and the GFMD, and that good practices developed by certain RCPs and IRFs could eventually be replicated at the global level.

V. RCP input to the 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development

In his presentation, the Special Advisor to the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) outlined key developments in the global debate on migration since the first HLD in 2006 and SRSG Peter Southerland's goals for the upcoming HLD. He also reflected on the role of RCPs and invited participants of the Lima meeting to share their expectations and suggestions with regard to how RCPs might provide input to the HLD.

The 2006 proposal by the UN Secretary General to establish the GFMD emphasized the need to respect both the desire for state sovereignty and for the universality of the resulting dialogue forum. The migration and development framing helped improve acceptance of the forum by allowing States to cooperate around positive goals. Over time, the GFMD has learned to address more controversial topics, such as irregular migration and the human rights of migrants. There have been other positive developments at the global level, such as the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention.¹¹ Overall, the desire for cooperation on migration has greatly increased since 2006. That notwithstanding, the GFMD, the GMG, the SRSG, IOM and the myriad RCPs need to consider how their roles should evolve to meet the growing need for substantive leadership at the global level. In SRSG Peter Southerland's view, the upcoming HLD could be a historical turning point in how the international community cooperates on migration and should produce very practical outcomes to help guide the international community over the next decade. While the outcomes of the HLD are for participating States to determine, the SRSG has formulated four key ideas which were presented to participants at the Lima meeting. First, the HLD should produce a robust consensus on how migration can feature in the post-2015 development agenda. Second, the HLD should encourage vigorous debate on the specific migration challenges that can be effectively addressed through greater cooperation at global level. Third, the HLD should address the needs of migrants affected by crisis situations such as civil wars and natural disasters. Fourth, the HLD should provide an opportunity to take stock of GFMD achievements and challenges.

In the SRSG's view, RCPs are an ideal tool for the coming era of greater international cooperation on migration. It was noted that the fact that RCPs function at various speeds and have gradually grown from declarative statements to operational actions is a form of "mini-multilateralism" that the international community should welcome. The SRSG has made it clear that the presence of RCPs at the HLD is very welcome, both in the form of RCP attendance and the Chairman's Summary of the fourth Global RCP Meeting.

Following the remarks by the Special Advisor to the SRSG, IOM's Permanent Observer to New York provided complementary reflections highlighting the significant progress in global debate on migration since 1994, when migration was for the first time put on the international agenda through the Cairo International Conference on Population and Migration. Migration today is still viewed as a matter of national sovereignty, but there is increasing recognition that no one State can address the various migration challenges alone. In the absence of a global normative framework, RCPs have proven to be practical approaches to promoting cooperation between States within the same region, and increasingly, across regions. Despite considerable frustration with the GFMD, this dialogue process has helped to create a global space for discussion on migration which did not exist before. The UN General Assembly resolution concerning the modalities of the 2013 HLD, adopted in December 2012, expressly invites Member States to contribute to the upcoming HLD through regional mechanisms, including RCPs.¹²

11 International Labour Organization (ILO), Convention Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers, 16 June 2011, PR No. 15A.

12 UN General Assembly Resolution on International Migration and Development (A/RES/67/219). See, in particular, paragraph 17: "Invites Member States, through appropriate regional consultative processes and, as appropriate, within other major initiatives in the field of international migration and development, including the Global Forum on Migration and Development, to contribute to the high-level dialogue."

Two suggested ways of doing this were put forward. First, various regional preparatory HLD meetings can (and have been) organized. Second, the regional perspective can be brought to the table by Member States participating in the HLD.

In the discussion that ensued, participants recognized the considerable progress made, but also agreed that the international community is still in a nascent phase of cooperation on migration, even as different levels of cooperation have emerged (including regional, interregional and global). One participant contended that the different levels could be seen as different train tracks, which are not necessarily heading towards the same direction all the time, but are all playing useful roles. Various participants noted that governance of migration is unlikely to start from the top, and added that the experience would seem to suggest that it may, in fact, start from the bottom up.

On the topic of what RCPs can contribute to the second HLD, participants agreed that the fourth Global RCP Meeting was in itself an important contribution. It was recommended that the Chairman's Summary, with agreed-upon conclusions and recommendations, be submitted by the Government of Peru, as host of the meeting, to the UN Secretary General prior to the HLD. One participant suggested exploring the possibility of a side event on RCPs at the HLD. While it was noted that individual Member States could highlight the importance of RCPs in fostering international cooperation on migration issues, there was broad recognition that contributions of individual countries need to be distinguished from formal RCP representation or common positions.

Several participants noted that the upcoming HLD needs to look carefully at the various existing processes for consultation and dialogue on migration (including RCPs), as well as address substantive issues of international migration. One participant suggested that the Domestic Workers Convention could be proposed as a topic of discussion at the HLD and that the HLD should be used by States as a platform to advocate for universal ratification of this Convention and other applicable human rights treaties.

In working groups, participants were given the opportunity to deliberate on the round table themes of the upcoming HLD, including mainstreaming migration into development frameworks, the protection of migrants' rights, and regional and global labour mobility.

Protection of migrants' rights

The protection of migrants' rights was identified as a thematic area that has received increasing attention in RCP deliberations and at the global level. It was noted that while some RCPs in their initial phases focused mainly on security-related aspects of migration, most RCPs have, over time, have expanded their thematic focus and developed more holistic approaches to migration to include issues such as the protection of migrants' rights and migration and development. This is true, for example, of the Budapest Process, which seeks to mainstream and implement the rights dimension of migration in all of its work. The Bali Process is one of the few RCPs that has been specifically set up to address the twin crimes of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, with a view to improving protection for the victims of these crimes. In 2011 Bali Process participating States agreed to set up a Regional Cooperation Framework to further enhance cooperation and address the challenges of irregular migration in the Asia-Pacific region in a more coordinated manner. Participants also discussed the example of the Puebla Process, another RCP that has addressed the issue of migrants' human rights since its inception and has adopted a number of guidelines designed to protect vulnerable migrant groups. Various participants acknowledged the important role that international organizations such as UNHCR and IOM have played in supporting RCPs on the issue of aligning international standards on the treatment of migrants with international human rights standards.

Mainstreaming migration into development

Group discussions revealed that most RCPs have deliberated on the issue of the linkages between migration and development, including on the impact of remittances and the role of diaspora communities. A number of RCPs have discussed the sharing of good practices on mainstreaming migration into development planning. Most recently, IGAD-RCP dedicated a senior officials' meeting to the topic of migration and development. It was noted that the lack of data, as well as the lack of mechanisms for information-sharing and communication between migration experts and development experts, remains a barrier to mainstreaming migration into development planning. Recognizing these gaps, the Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees recently organized a meeting to discuss how development practitioners can be engaged more systematically in the work of migration specialists. It was noted that the interaction between RCPs and RECs has in some instances proven beneficial to formalization of outcomes of RCP meetings, although the experience in this regard varies from region to region.

Regional and global labour mobility

Participants acknowledged that RCPs have a key role to play in promoting better management of regional labour mobility. By providing informal dialogue platforms, several RCPs are assisting governments in developing legislation, policies and mechanisms to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by international and regional labour mobility. The Abu Dhabi Dialogue (ADD) was mentioned as a particularly prominent platform for discussion among sending and destination countries. It was reported that the ADD in 2012 adopted a Framework of Regional Collaboration to provide interregional guidelines on labour migration. However, participants also acknowledged the heightened risk of migrant exploitation that could be occasioned by more flexible labour markets and mobility schemes. A number of participants, therefore, suggested that RCPs may wish to play an even more active role in addressing these challenges by promoting the development of regional standards and safeguards.

VI. Conclusion

The background study for the fourth Global RCP Meeting – *Regional Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms on Migration: Approaches, Recent Activities and Implications for Global Governance of Migration* – around which the conference deliberations were conducted, provided an opportunity for delegates to deliberate on the place of RCPs and similar forums in a continuously changing migration landscape. The study and the conference deliberations illustrate the extent to which RCPs and IRFs have expanded in recent years, and the important role they are playing in engendering dialogue between States within and increasingly between regions.

The conference deliberations spurred deeper reflection on how RCPs and IRFs might more systematically engage with global forums that, by and large, fulfill the same function – promoting dialogue and cooperation on migration issues between States. While there were no clear answers to these questions, what became evident is that a fuller picture of the interplay between bilateral, regional and global migration governance is an area that requires more attention than it has received up till now.

All in all, the conference served to affirm the continuing important role played by dialogue and cooperation between States – through vehicles such as RCPs, IRFs and similar forums – while also recognizing the limitations of some of these mechanisms, exacerbated by the restricted possibilities for regular exchange across regions, including the exchange of the various good practices that have been developed in some regions and could possibly be replicated in others. In this context, conference delegates underscored the need to strengthen the section dedicated to RCPs on IOM's website, to enable it to more fully achieve its goal of promoting exchange between States and dialogue forums across regions. In the same vein, the meeting once again highlighted the important function that these biennial global meetings of RCPs are playing in nurturing cross-regional exchange and supported their continuance. The next global meeting of RCPs, planned for the latter half of 2015, will take account of the points that this fourth global meeting drew attention to as meriting further reflection.













Annexes

Annex I: Participant List

Fourth Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)

“Defining the Place of RCPs in a Changing International Migration Landscape”

22–23 May 2013
Lima, Republic of Peru

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	E- Mail
1.	Portugal	5 + 5 Dialogue on Migration	Ms. Paula da VELHA	Inspector, Ministry of Internal Affairs	paula.velha@sef.pt
2.	Philippines	Abu Dhabi Dialogue	Ms. Amuerfina REYES	Deputy Administrator, Philippine Overseas Employment Administration	reyesar2002@yahoo.com
3.	Philippines	Abu Dhabi Dialogue	Atty. Leah FORTUNA	Labor Arbiter, Department of Labor and Employment	atty_ltf2000@yahoo.com
4.	Australia	Bali Process	Mr. Michael FRITSCHY	First Secretary, Santiago Mission	michael.fritschy@dfatgov.au
5.	Australia	Bali Process Regional Support Office	Mr. Gregory Charles KELLY	Minister-Counsellor and Co-Manager for Australia	greg.kelly@rso.baliprocess.net
6.	Indonesia	Bali Process	Abdi Satya UTAMA	First Secretary, Peru Mission	absatama0116@gmail.com
7.	Indonesia	Bali Process	Ika Yuniar WULANDARI	Second Secretary, Peru Mission	cultural@indonesia.peru.org.pe
8.	Turkey	Budapest Process	Mr. Fethi ETEM	Head of Migration Department, Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Turkey	fetem@mfa.gov.tr
9.	Turkey	Budapest Process	Ambassador Namik Güner ERPULL	Ambassador, Turkish Embassy in Lima	nerpul@mfa.gov.tr
10.	Hungary	Budapest Process	Ms. Tímea Erzsébet LEHOCZKI	Legal Expert, Department of European Cooperation, Ministry of Interior	timea.lehoczki@gm.gov.hu
11.	Austria	Budapest Process	Ms. Sedef DEARING	Programme Manager, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)	sedef.dearing@icmpd.org
12.	Bangladesh	Colombo Process	Dr. Md Abu Hena Mostofa KAMAL	Joint Secretary, Ministry of Expatriate Welfare and Overseas Employment	mibrahim@live.com
13.	Bangladesh	Colombo Process	Asif MUNIER	Secretariat, Colombo Process	amunier@iom.int
14.	Kenya	Intergovernmental Authority on Development Regional Consultative Process (IGAD-RCP)	Mr. David Nyongesa WAMBILIANGA	Asst. Director, Department of Immigration Services	habari4wambi@yahoo.com
15.	Djibouti	IGAD-RCP	Ms. Caroline NJUKI	Project Manager, Political Integration and Human Security, Regional Economic Community, IGAD Secretariat	caroline.njuki@igad.int
16.	Switzerland	Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC)	Mr. Friedrich LOEPER	Coordinator, IGC Secretariat	f.loeper@igc.ch

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	E- Mail
17.	Mozambique	Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA)	Ms. Marta Isabel MATE	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour	
18.	South Africa	MIDSA	Ms. Sikhulile NGQASE	MIDSA Secretariat Coordinator, IOM Pretoria	sngqase@iom.int
19.	Nigeria	Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) – Migration Dialogue for West Africa (MIDWA) Secretariat	Mr. Luka Anthony ELUMELU	Head, Free Movement and Migration Division, Directorate of Free Movement and Tourism, ECOWAS Commission (Abuja)	tonylukaelumelu@yahoo.com]
20.	Senegal	MIDWA	Mr. Stephane ROSTIAUX	Regional Policy and Liason Officer, IOM Senegal	srostitaux@iom.int
21.	Algeria	Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM)	Mr. Mohamed Kamel ALOUI	MTM Focal Point, Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	mkaloui@hotmail.com
22.	Poland	Prague Process	Ms. Agnieszka KONDEK	Prague Process Targeted Initiative Coordinator; Senior Expert, Migration Policy Department, Ministry of Interior	agnieszka.kondek@msw.gov.pl
23.	Austria	Prague Process	Dr. Radim ZAK	Prague Process Coordinator, ICMPD	radim.zak@icmpd.org
24.	Costa Rica	Puebla Process	Mr. Freddy Mauricio MONTERO MORA	Deputy Minister, Interior and Police	fmontero@migracion.go.cr
25.	Costa Rica	Puebla Process	Sr. Oliver Francis BUSH ESPINOSA	Coordinator, Technical Secretariat	obush@iom.int
26.	Colombia	South American Conference on Migration (SACM)	Dr. Alvaro CALDERON PONCE DE LEÓN	Director, Consular and Immigration Matters, Citizenship Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	alvaro.calderon@cancilleria.gov.co
27.	Chile	SACM	Mr. Pedro Osvaldo HERNANDEZ GONZALEZ	Head, International Migration Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	phernandez@minrel.gov.cl
28.	Argentina	SACM Secretariat	Sr. Diego BELTRAND	Regional Director for South America, IOM	dbeltrand@iom.int
29.	Peru	Andean Community	Mr. Santiago CEMBRANO CABREJAS	Secretary General	
30.	Botswana	Government of Botswana	Mr. Mabuse Mopati PULE	Director of Migration	mmpile@gov.bw
31.	Zambia	Common Markert for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)	Mr. Brian CHIGAWA	Director of Legal and Institutional Affairs	cbchigawa@comesa.int
32.	Republic of the Congo	Dialogue Inter états sur la migration en Afrique Centrale (Inter-State Dialogue on Migration in Central Africa)	Mrs. Stanislas Michel NKOU	Director of Emigration, Ministry of Interior and Decentralization	mkoustains@yahoo.fr
33.	Republic of the Congo	Ministère de l'Intérieur et de la Décentralisation	Marich-Ginalda MAVOUNGOU	Attaché Juridique, Government of the Republic of the Congo	mginalda@yahoo.fr
34.	Chile	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)	Mr. Jorge Martínez PIZARRO	Expert, CELADE (ECLAC Population Division)	jorge.martinez@cepal.org
35.	Switzerland	European Union	Mr. Soenke SCHMIDT	Minister-Counsellor, Migration Issues, European Union Delegation	Soenke.SCHMIDT@eeas.europa.eu

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	E- Mail
36.	Peru	International Labour Organization (ILO)	Mr. Javier GONZALEZ-OLAECHEA	Specialist, International Labour Standards Department (NORMES), ILO Lima	gonzalez-olaechea@oit.org.pe
37.	Egypt	League of Arab States (LAS)	Ms. Lobna AZZAM	Coordinator of Arab Expatriates File, Migration and Arab Expatriates Department, LAS	aemigrant.dept@las.int
38.	Mauritius	Government of Mauritius	Mr. Kannen KATHAPERMALL	Officer, Financial Secretary, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	kkathapermall@mail.gov.mu
39.	United States of America	Organization of American States (OAS)	Ms. Carla SERAZZI	Chairperson of the Committee on Migration Issues of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development	cserazzi@minrel.gov.cl
40.	United States of America	Office of the UN Special Representative for Migration and Development	Mr. Gregory MANIATIS	Special Advisor to Peter Sutherland, UN Special Representative for Migration and Development	gmaniatis@gmail.com
41.	Switzerland	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Ambassador Eduard GNESA	Special Ambassador for International Cooperation in Migration	eduard.gnesa@deza.admin.ch
42.	Argentina	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Ms. Eva DEMANT	UNHCR's Regional Representative for Southern Latin America	demant@unhcr.org
43.	Kazakhstan	Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan	Yerlan ALIMBAYEV	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Kazakhstan to the United Nations Office in Geneva	yertot@gmail.com
44.	United States of America		Charles Harns	Expert, RCP/Interregional Forum Research Study	charlesharns@gmail.com
45.	Switzerland	Government of Switzerland	Hans Ruedi BORTIS	Representative of the Swiss Embassy in Lima	christian.robin@eda.admin.ch
46.	Switzerland	Government of Switzerland	Macarena MATUTIS	Representative of the Swiss Embassy in Lima	
47.	Peru	Government of Peru	Amb. Claudio DE LA PUENTE	Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs	
48.	Peru	Government of Peru	Fernando QUIROS CAMPOS	Ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	fquiros@rree.gob.pe
49.	Peru	Government of Peru	Carlos VALLEJO	Advisor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	
50.	Peru	Government of Peru	Carmen Rosa ECHEVARRIA	First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
51.	Peru	Government of Peru	Ruben BLOTTE	First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	rblotte@rree.gob.pe
52.	Peru	Government of Peru	Vanessa BOHORQUEZ	Third Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	lbohorquezc@rree.gob.pe
53.	Peru	Government of Peru	Victor TINCOSO	Administrative Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
54.	Peru	Government of Peru	Eduardo SOUZA	Legal Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
55.	Switzerland	International Organization for Migration (IOM)	Ambassador William L. SWING	Director General	
56.	Switzerland	IOM	Laura THOMPSON	Deputy Director General	

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	E- Mail
57.	New York	IOM	Michele KLEIN-SOLOMON	Permanent Observer to the UN in New York	
58.	Peru	IOM	Jose-Ivan DAVALOS	Chief of Mission, IOM Peru	idavalos@iom.int
59.	Switzerland	IOM	Maureen ACHIENG	Head of International Partnerships Division (IPD), IOM Geneva	machieng@iom.int
60.	Switzerland	IOM	Tim HOWE	Associate Migration Policy Officer, IPD, IOM Geneva	thowe@iom.int

Annex II: Final Meeting Agenda



Fourth Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)

“Defining the Place of RCPs in a Changing International Migration Landscape”

22 May 2013	
0700–0830	Registration
0830–0900	Official opening (Room: Oceanus, S1)
	INTRODUCTORY REMARKS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Richard Steck Bautista, Director of Ceremonies STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. William Lacy Swing, Director General, International Organization for Migration (IOM) KEYNOTE ADDRESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amb. Claudio de la Puente, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Peru
0900–0945	Introductions <i>Participants will be invited to introduce each other (A seating arrangement that allows participants to be seated next to participants from different RCPs/ regions will be adopted.)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator: Mr. Richard Steck Bautista, Director of Ceremonies
0945–1015	Coffee break and group picture
1015–1130	Taking Stock of RCPs' Capacity Enhancement Actions since Gaborone Presentation: Mr. Mabuse Pule, Director of Immigration, Government of Botswana, Host of RCP Global Consultation 2011 RCP Discussants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Gregory Charles Kelly, Minister–Counsellor, Co-Manager of the Australia Regional Support Office (RSO), Bali Process Mr. Fethi Etem, Head of Migration Department, Consular Affairs, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Budapest Process Ms. Marta Isabel Mate, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Labour, Mozambique, Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) Mr. Pedro Hernández González, Head of International Migration Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile, South American Conference on Migration (SACM)
1130–1215	Plenary Discussion
1215–1330	Lunch break
1330–1430	RCP Engagement with Regional Bodies and Interregional Fora Moderator: Ms. Carla Serazzi, Chair, Committee on Migration Issues, Organization of American States Discussants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Lobna Azzam, Coordinator of Arab Expatriates File, Migration and Arab Expatriates Department, League of Arab States Mr. Soenke Schmidt, EU Delegation in Geneva, Minister–Counsellor, Migration Issues Mr. Jorge Martínez Pizarro, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean Mr. Luka Anthony Elumelu, Head, Free Movement and Migration Division, Directorate of Free Movement and Tourism, ECOWAS Commission
1430–1500	Plenary Discussion
1500–1530	Coffee break
1530–1600	Regional and Interregional Consultation Mechanisms on Migration Moderator: Ms. Agnieszka Kondek, Senior Expert, Migration Policy Department, Government of Poland, Prague Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation (based on the 2013 IOM-commissioned study) Charles Harns, Study Author

1600–1645	Break-out Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group 1: Deepening inter-RCP interaction (Room: Atlantis, third floor) <i>Facilitator: Ms. Timea Lehoczki, Legal Expert, Department of European Cooperation, Ministry of Interior, Government of Hungary</i> Group 2: Enhancing RCP cooperation with other regional and international forums (Room: Atlantis, third floor) <i>Facilitator: Mr. Soenke Schmidt, EU Delegation in Geneva, Minister–Counsellor, Migration Issues</i> Group 3: RCP impact on migration policy and practice (Room: Oppian, third floor) <i>Facilitator: Dr. Charles Harns, Study Author</i>
1645–1745	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapporteur Reports (30 minutes; 10 minutes per group) Plenary Discussion (20 minutes) Conclusions and Wrap-up <p>CLOSING OF DAY 1</p>
1900	COCKTAIL (HOSTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF PERU)
23 May 2013	
0830–0900	Recap of Day I – Discussions and Outcomes (Room: Oceanus, S1)
0900–0930	Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) Moderator: Ambassador Eduard Gnesa (Government of Switzerland) GFMD: What has it achieved and where is it going? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mr. Kannen Kathapermall, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Government of Mauritius, GFMD Chair for 2012</i> <i>Mr. Fethi Etem, Head of Migration Department, Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Turkey (incoming GFMD Chair for 2015)</i> Discussion
930–1000	RCP–GFMD Interaction Moderator: Ambassador Eduard Gnesa (Government of Switzerland) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ms. Amuerfina Reyes, Deputy Administrator, Overseas Employment Administration, Government of the Philippines, Abu Dhabi Dialogue</i> <i>Mr. Freddy Montero, Vice-Minister of the Interior, Government of Costa Rica, Puebla Process</i> <i>Ms. Caroline Njuki, Project Manager, IGAD Secretariat</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Strengthening the process of regional input to GFMD deliberations” - “Contributing to regional follow-up to GFMD outcomes”
1000–1030	Plenary Discussion
1030–1100	<i>Coffee break</i>
1100–1200	Fourth Global RCP Meeting Input to the Second HLD* Moderator: Dr. Alvaro Calderon Ponce de León, Director, Consular and Immigration Matters, Citizen Service, Government of Colombia, SACM Presentation: Looking to the Second HLD and the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda <i>Gregory Maniatis, Special Advisor to SRSg for Migration and Development Presentation: Preliminary Reflections by RCPs on the Second HLD:</i> <i>Michele Klein–Solomon, Permanent Observer to the United Nations, IOM</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plenary Discussion
1200–1315	Break-out Groups: Preparing for the Four Round Tables of the Second HLD* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group 1: Mainstreaming Migration into Development Frameworks (Room: Oceanus, S1) <i>Facilitator: Ms. Caroline Njuki, Project Manager, IGAD Secretariat</i> Group 2: Protection of Migrant Rights (Room: Atlantis, third floor) <i>Facilitator: Ms. Paula da Velha, Inspector, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Government of Portugal, 5+5 Dialogue on Migration</i> Group 3: Regional and Global Labour Mobility (Room: Atlantis Hall, third floor) <i>Facilitator: Mr. A.H.M. Kamal, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Expatriate Welfare and Overseas Employment, Government of Bangladesh, Colombo Process</i>
1315–1430	<i>Lunch</i>
1430–1530	Rapporteur Reports from Break-out Groups and Plenary Discussion
1530–1615	<i>Coffee break</i>
1615–1700	Plenary: Endorsement of the Joint Statement of the Chairs and Secretariats of the Fourth Global RCP Meeting Moderator: Director of Ceremonies
1700–1730	CLOSING REMARKS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ms. Laura Thompson, Deputy Director General, IOM</i> <i>Ambassador Fernando Quiros Campos, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Peru</i>

* United Nations High-level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD).

Annex III: Consolidated Responses from the RCP Questionnaire

The 2013 Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs) took place in Lima, Peru on 22–23 May. Hosted by the Government of Peru, in collaboration with IOM, the meeting sought to facilitate the sharing of experiences and the exchange of views on the value and benefits of cooperation and dialogue on migration, in particular with respect to how global migration challenges are being addressed at the regional level. In preparation for the global meeting, the IOM conducted a survey of activities and developments within the principal RCPs since the previous meeting in Gaborone, Botswana in 2011.

The 2013 Global Meeting took place against the backdrop of the 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD), and aimed to provide a platform for reflection on potential synergies with other processes and forums that deal with migration at the global and interregional level. Thus, of particular interest was the information on the type of activities that RCPs were considering in preparation for the upcoming HLD, scheduled for the autumn of 2013. Various sessions at the meeting drew upon inputs provided by the RCPs through the questionnaires designed to facilitate information exchange and discussion. Responses were received from the nine RCPs (including the Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees; the Bali Process, the Budapest Process, the Prague Process and the Puebla Process; the Intergovernmental Authority on Development RCP; Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa; and the Abu Dhabi Dialogue).

Questions	Consolidated responses
1. Have there been important shifts in emphasis of the agenda of your RCP since its inception? If so, please provide details on this shift.	<p>Most responses to this question indicate that there have been a number of notable shifts in the agenda of RCPs since their inception. Many of these responses indicate that the RCPs' agendas have evolved to adapt to emerging migration issues and, given the growing demand for effective responses, to address better cooperation and coordination across regions. With some RCPs, the agenda changed in line with political developments in the region, including new policy directions taken by regional political bodies. Overall, responses suggest that the agendas of many RCPs have over time evolved from an initial focus on security issues towards more holistic approaches to migration.</p> <p>A number of responses note that significant progress has been made towards meeting the objectives that RCPs set at their inception. In some cases, ministerial meetings of participating States of RCPs have helped to give more political weight to RCP discussions and have facilitated the adoption of declarations that provide a framework for the implementation of concrete activities.</p>
2. Has your RCP influenced formal regional agreements on migration, or, in turn, been influenced by such agreements?	<p>There seems to be agreement that RCP deliberations have, overall, benefited and substantiated regional policy debate. Several responses further indicate that RCPs are increasingly influencing formal regional agreements on migration, including by facilitating the exchange of information between signatory States; however, a number of responses also contend that it is difficult to measure the impact of RCPs on formal regional agreements. Overall, it is clear from the responses that not all RCPs have influenced formal regional agreements to the same degree, and that only few RCPs have been set up with this express aim. In some cases, RCPs do not only influence formal agreements, but regional agreements providing the basis for those RCPs are linked very closely to RECs in some regions.</p>

Questions	Consolidated responses
3. Does your RCP have any interaction with other RCPs?	<p>According to the responses, all the RCPs surveyed have had interactions and exchanges with other RCPs but to a varying extent. Most RCPs interact with each other through workshops and meetings, such as those hosted by other RCPs. Many responses also highlight the usefulness and relevance of RCP participation at the Global RCP Meetings that take place on a biennial basis.</p> <p>Workshops, events and meetings hosted by RCPs that invite others to join on an ad hoc basis provide opportunities for them to collectively engage with each other in the exchange of practices and information. These forums also offer a useful opportunity for RCPs to share lessons learned and develop strategies to address common challenges. Overall, responses emphasize the positive outcomes that result from RCPs' cooperation and coordination with other regional processes and initiatives.</p>
4. Does your RCP engage with any interregional forums dealing with migration?	<p>More than half of responses to this question indicate that RCPs have interacted with interregional forums. Other responses show that a number of RCPs, on the other hand, have not connected directly with interregional forums on migration, but most of these suggest an interest to pursue such an engagement in the near future.</p>
5. How does your RCP engage with the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)? Do preparatory discussions take place within your RCP in the lead-up to GFMD conferences, and/or are there any mechanisms in place to follow-up on GFMD discussions?	<p>The responses to this question reveal that a number of RCPs have interacted with the GFMD on particular occasions. For example, members of the RCPs have in the past been invited to join GFMD meetings to obtain their views and opinions, and to help generate recommendations for the meetings. Some RCPs have participated in the GFMD 2013 meeting hosted by Mauritius as Chair, and they plan to maintain engagement with the GFMD. Moreover, there have been informal consultative meetings prior to GFMD meetings in some RCPs. In addition, the responses suggest that even when there have not been preparatory discussions for a RCP ahead of GFMD conferences, GFMD outcomes have nevertheless been incorporated into RCPs' agendas. A number of responses highlight the similarities of the GFMD and RCPs with respect to their informal and nonbinding structures outside of institutional frameworks.</p>

Questions	Consolidated responses
<p>6. Resolution UN/RES/A/C.2/67/L.15/Rev.1 of 2012 on international migration and development invites Member States “through appropriate regional consultative processes and, as appropriate, other major initiatives in the field of international migration, including on international migration and development, to contribute to the High-level Dialogue.” In this regard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What discussions are taking place within your respective RCPs or in other national, bilateral or regional consultative forums that you would like to bring to the attention of the Fourth Global Meeting of RCPs? 	<p>The responses to this question suggest that various RCPs have held discussions on the issue of migration and development. A number of responses suggest that the outcomes and recommendations of these meetings should be taken into consideration at the upcoming HLD. One response notes that the mainstreaming of migration policies remains a topic of particular relevance to many countries and should be further discussed in regional and global forums on migration. Responses also indicate that some RCPs have held workshops to enhance participating States’ understanding of the HLD, and to identify issues of particular concern that could be brought to the attention of the upcoming HLD. It was positively noted in some responses that IOM and its partners have organized regional meetings to prepare for the HLD and in which RCPs have participated. Some RCPs have also held meetings to reflect on their own work and achievements made over the past years. As an outcome from such a meeting, one RCP has published a report describing the first decade of the process’s activities and accomplishments. One response notes that there should be more coordination/dialogue between the RCPs to bring together labour-sending and -receiving countries together.</p>
<p>7. Resolution UN/RES/A/C.2/67/L.15/Rev.1 decided that there would be four thematic round tables at the 2013 HLD. What thematic overlaps of the HLD round tables with the current priorities of your RCP are there? What recommendations would you like for the Fourth Global RCP Meeting to put to the 2013 HLD?</p>	<p>Most responses to this question indicate that there are substantial thematic overlaps of the HLD round tables and the priorities of the RCPs. Activities of RCPs have overlapped with the themes of the four round tables. Some responses indicate that for some RCPs, the four round table themes are almost identical with their current priority areas. One RCP expressed that it is planning on commissioning a comprehensive study on policies and legislation in countries of origin and destination. This study would be thematically related to the HLD Roundtable 4 on regional and global labour mobility.</p> <p>Regarding recommendations for the 2013 HLD, a number of responses suggest that the HLD should take into account the achievements, as well as concrete good practices, of RCPs in different regions and different areas over the years. Some responses contain more specific suggestions, including that the HLD should promote enhanced response capacity to mitigate the impact of emergency situations for migrant workers, enhance dialogue and cooperation between countries of origin and destination and address specific concerns of vulnerable groups of migrants. Other recommendations include improving of public perception of migration, factoring migration into development planning, protecting migrants’ human rights, enhancing knowledge-sharing and promoting policy coherence and institutional development.</p>



International Organization for Migration (IOM)