



REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA



Australian Government
Department of Immigration and Citizenship



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra



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



Enhancing Cooperation
on Migration through Dialogue and
Capacity-building



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.

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: <http://www.iom.int>

ISBN 978-92-9068-627-9
© 2011 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.

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

**Enhancing Cooperation
on Migration through Dialogue and
Capacity-building**

Gaborone, Botswana
25–26 October 2011

SUMMARY REPORT

Contents

Glossary	5
Executive Summary	7
1. From Bangkok 2009 to Gaborone 2011: RCPs in a changing global migration landscape	9
2. RCP capacity: Identifying and addressing challenges.....	11
3. Emerging migration challenges and opportunities: Towards evidence-based policymaking....	15
4. Towards enhanced international cooperation on migration.....	19
4.1 Complementary regional mechanisms for international cooperation on migration	19
4.2 The GFMD and HLD 2013	21
5. Conclusion	23
Annex I: Final agenda	27
Annex II: List of participants.....	33
Annex III: Questionnaire on challenges and opportunities: Overview of responses.....	37
Annex IV: Overview of principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)	43

Glossary

5+5 Dialogue	Regional Ministerial Conference on Migration in the Western Mediterranean
Abu Dhabi Dialogue	Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin and Destination in Asia
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
APC	Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants
Bali Process	Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime in the Asia-Pacific region
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Market
Colombo Process	Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin in Asia
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
GFMD	Global Forum on Migration and Development
GMG	Global Migration Group
IGAD-RCP	Intergovernmental Authority on Development Regional Consultative Process on Migration in Eastern Africa/Horn of Africa
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
IGC	Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (includes countries in Europe and North America as well as Australia and New Zealand)
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRF	Inter-regional Fora
MIDSA	Migration Dialogue in Southern Africa
MIDWA	Migration Dialogue in West Africa
MTM Dialogue	Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue in Europe and North Africa
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
Puebla Process	Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) in North and Central America
RCP	Regional Consultative Process on Migration

SACM	South American Conference on Migration
SADC	Southern African Development Community
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Executive summary

On 25–26 October 2011, the Government of Botswana, in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), hosted the Third Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs) in Gaborone, Botswana. The meeting which took place under the broad theme of **“Enhancing cooperation on migration through dialogue and capacity-building”** was attended by more than 75 participants, including representatives of the chairing governments and/or secretariats of 10 RCPs, made possible by the generous funding of the governments of Australia, Switzerland and the United States of America. The governments of Mexico, Switzerland and Mauritius, in their respective capacities as current, former and future chairs of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), were also in attendance. Additionally, Thailand as the host of the 2009 Second Global Meeting of RCP Chairs and Secretariats, representatives of various regional organizations, and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) for Migration participated.¹

The main objective of the meeting was to identify common challenges and opportunities that RCPs face and to continue the reflection process on concrete tools for the enhancement of their capacity. The meeting built on the outcomes of the second global meeting of RCPs held in Bangkok, Thailand in June 2009, and drew upon the RCP-related recommendations that have emanated from the GFMD since its inception. The meeting agenda and discussions were informed by RCPs’ responses to a pre-meeting questionnaire on the challenges and opportunities that RCPs face.²

Participants were cognizant of the fact that the international migration landscape has changed considerably in the past years as a result of the global economic crisis, growing anti-migrant sentiment, and several man-made and natural disasters. There was the general view that RCPs, as informal and non-binding regional platforms for dialogue on migration, are growing in importance and relevance in terms of their impact and with respect to how global migration challenges are being addressed at the regional level.

Keeping pace with the developments that have occurred since the 2009 meeting, participants took advantage of the meeting to consider challenges encountered in the work of RCPs, as well as opportunities arising from a solution-oriented and forward-looking perspective. There was broad recognition that the enhancement of an RCP’s capacity is a prerequisite to turning challenges into opportunities. In this regard, several good practices and concrete tools to strengthen RCPs were identified and discussed.

The meeting also sought to get RCPs to reflect on the question of the potential they have to contribute to evidence-based policymaking on contemporary migration challenges, including: responses to migration crises in humanitarian situations; the migration, climate change and environment nexus; and the integration of development into migration policy. Thematic discussions explored the regional dimensions of emerging migration challenges and affirmed that RCPs are viable mechanisms to assist States in harmonizing their approaches, including through better data collection and analysis.

Finally, the meeting stimulated discussion on different forms of international cooperation on migration, also including complementary regional mechanisms, and the potential relationship between RCPs and the GFMD. Participants in this respect identified several points of common interest and substantive overlap of the different migration dialogue processes. The need for broader recognition of the potential for improved exchange and cooperation on migration issues between the various regional migration dialogue processes, and between these and global processes for dialogue on migration such as the GFMD and the 2013 United Nations High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD), were acknowledged.

1 See annex II to this report which contains a more detailed list of participants.

2 For a consolidated analysis of responses, see annex III to this report. Also see annex IV, “Overview of principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)”.

I. From Bangkok 2009 to Gaborone 2011: RCPs in a changing global migration landscape

The question of relevance and purpose of this third Global RCP Meeting was the primary focus of the meeting's opening session. This session featured a keynote speech by the Honourable Peter Letlhogonolo Siele, Minister of Labour and Home Affairs, Government of the Republic of Botswana; an introductory statement by Ambassador William Lacy Swing, Director General of the International Organization of Migration (IOM); and a statement by Mr. Chutintorn Gonsakdi, Deputy Director-General, International Organizations Department, Kingdom of Thailand (representing the host of the 2009 Global RCP meeting).

The opening session set the tone for subsequent discussions highlighting that, by providing forums for informal and non-binding exchange of views, experiences and approaches on migration challenges, RCPs are in several instances helping to bridge differences between States and fostering cooperative approaches, at least at the regional level. All three speakers further agreed that much of the success of RCPs can be attributed to their agility in adapting their agendas to emerging migration challenges that have and will continue to change the global migration landscape.

In his keynote speech, **Minister Siele** reminded delegates that in the globalized world we live in today, people, goods and services are continuously on the move. The Minister asserted that collective rather than unilateral responses are needed to manage the various challenges that States in different regions face. Also, such responses need to be developed with due regard to migration trends and dynamics. Reflecting on some of the main migration challenges in the context of the Southern Africa region, Minister Siele recalled the importance of the **Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA)** as a consultative process that provides States in the region with a forum to more effectively coordinate and harmonize their migration management practices. Minister Siele pointed out that MIDSA has been an invaluable platform for deliberating on migration challenges and increasing awareness of both the challenges and best practices in various areas, including health, human trafficking, border management and facilitated migration. Minister Siele specifically recalled the key role that MIDSA played in the drafting of the **Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on the Facilitation of the Movement of Persons**. The slow progress made on the adoption of the Protocol is an indicator of the need for further dialogue on enhancing cooperation on migration in the region. Minister Siele emphasized that IOM has been an important partner for RCPs and stressed that States in this region will continue to look to IOM for support and assistance. However, he also highlighted that States needed to ensure government ownership and leadership of RCPs.

The IOM Director General, Ambassador Swing, in his introductory remarks noted that the 2011 global meeting was taking place on the eve of several noteworthy anniversaries, including the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the first RCP in 1985; the fifth anniversary of the GFMD process that held its first meeting in 2007; and the sixtieth anniversary of IOM, established in 1951. He further pointed to the added significance of the meeting, occurring as it did two years from the second United Nations High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD), which is set to take place in 2013. Ambassador Swing highlighted three main challenges that have changed the global migration landscape over the past years: 1) migration emergencies; 2) the lingering financial crisis; and 3) the case for high- and low-skilled workers. The Director General expressed the view that RCPs will likely continue to be privileged workplaces where participating States share and test their thinking on migration policy. To ensure that RCP agendas remain relevant and focused, the Director General encouraged participants to further explore the many linkages between migration and related policy fields such as employment, human rights, and social welfare.

Mr. Chutintorn Gongsakdi, Deputy Director-General, International Organizations Department, Kingdom of Thailand reflected on the outcomes of the previous global meeting of RCPs,³ expressing confidence that this third meeting would follow the same constructive spirit of the 2009 meeting – promoting the benefits of international cooperation in order to fully harness the potential of international migration. Mr. Gongsakdi highlighted several positive developments that had occurred in the last two years, observing, for example, that a “fresh wind” blowing within the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime is leading to several progressive developments in the Asia-Pacific region. In his remarks, Mr. Gongsakdi also found that information-sharing between RCPs had improved over the past two years, acknowledging in particular the usefulness of the Internet-based platform on RCPs which IOM had re-launched following the recommendation of the 2009 meeting. This page seeks to provide useful and up-to-date information on the work of RCPs worldwide, thereby enhancing the possibility for interchange between them that could serve their respective interests.⁴

3 For the report of the 2009 Global RCP meeting, see <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/regional-consultative-processes/2009-global-rcp-meeting> (last accessed on 15 November 2011).

4 See <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/rcps> (last accessed on 15 November 2011).

2. RCP capacity: Identifying and addressing challenges

The presentations and discussions that ensued highlighted the view that in order to build on the positive developments that were occurring on the global RCP landscape, it is important to create conditions under which good practices can thrive and benefits accrue to participating States from their engagement in RCPs. There was the general sense that such conditions do not as yet exist for all RCPs, but that there is a broad range of tools to render RCPs more effective and sustainable. Numerous good practices were identified, some of which included adequate and sustainable funding arrangements for RCPs and appropriate participation and ownership of RCPs by participating Member States. In addition, participants referred to a number of practical steps that needed to be undertaken in order to overcome some of the key challenges that RCPs face, including the need for comprehensive operating modalities, the strengthening of secretariat structures and the interchange with other RCPs and, whenever deemed potentially beneficial, civil society organizations.

Participants drew attention to the differences and asymmetries that will sometimes exist between participating States of RCPs in terms of capacity, level of engagement and, at times, of the reality of divergent interests in the case of RCPs with heterogeneous memberships. Some RCPs, including for example the **Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM)** in Europe and North Africa, provide a forum for discussion for countries of origin, transit and destination with differing interests and views on the RCP's thematic focus. There was general consensus that differences that will at times exist between States belonging to an RCP are both a challenge and an opportunity.

Resources

The lack of resources continues to negatively impact the effectiveness and sustainability of several RCPs. As the planned activities of many RCPs are funded on an ad hoc and often short-term basis, this leaves them with little possibility to plan in advance and to follow up on outcomes of previous meetings. A number of delegates suggested exploring more creative funding sources and solutions, although there was broad agreement that the contributions of participating States of RCPs should be the first point of reference if ownership and sustainability concerns are also to be addressed. An encouraging example in this respect is the **Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)-RCP**, which has started looking into funding opportunities and already secured funding for its next meeting from IGAD States.

State commitment

There was agreement among participants that States' commitment is a prerequisite for the success of an RCP, with the provision of funds being seen as a major sign of participating States' commitment. Nonetheless, there are other ways in which States show their commitment to an RCP, for example, through regular attendance of meetings or taking the lead on thematic working groups. A number of participants contended that, owing to insufficient levels of political and financial commitment by participating States, RCPs' potential to foster coordinated approaches within regions was not being fully achieved.

Participation in RCP meetings

Ensuring the right level of participation in meetings was similarly identified as a challenge for almost all RCPs. Two possible reasons for this were put forward: First, there has been a proliferation of forums and processes on migration issues over the past several years, and the increasing number of actors and processes on migration threaten to undermine the effectiveness of existing ones by overstressing their already limited human and financial resources. Further, many States were also

thought to lack the required resources to participate in all meetings at the appropriate level and/or with the required technical expertise. This in particular concerns high-level, ministerial meetings where the participation of ministers or vice-ministers is impeded by competing obligations and priorities. Second, several participants pointed to a lack of coordination at the national level with a view to ensuring appropriate representation at meetings. While migration was widely accepted as being a cross-cutting issue concerning a broad range of ministries and institutions at the national level, only a few States have whole-of-governance approaches to migration and appropriate coordination mechanisms in place.

Choice of issues for discussion

Participants voiced the view that the selection of thematic issues is key to ensuring that an RCP remains relevant to its membership, thereby fulfilling its purpose of fostering cooperation. Several participants observed that some RCPs have tended to focus on security issues which seemed to promise the greatest potential for consensus and joint action. However, the working and meeting agendas of many RCPs have progressively evolved over time to include a wider range of issues of relevance to their regions of concern. **The Intergovernmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugees and Migration (IGC)**, as the oldest of these consultative processes, for example, has over the years adapted to changing migration realities by shifting from its initial focus on asylum and protection to immigration and integration issues in recent years. The chairmanship of the IGC rotates on an annual basis and each chair determines a main theme for the duration of its chairmanship. It was also mentioned that the IGC, more than any other process, is composed of like-minded Member States that share similar concerns and views.

Another example of an evolving working and meeting agenda is the **Bali Process**, which focuses on addressing the challenges of irregular migration in the Asia-Pacific Region. In its almost 10 years of existence, the Bali Process has evolved from an initial strong security focus towards a more holistic approach to irregular migration. For instance, during its 2011 Ministerial Meeting, its members agreed to set up a Regional Cooperation Framework, with a view to ensuring a more comprehensive and coherent approach to the management of irregular migration in the region, including policy harmonization on questions of asylum practices and refugee protection.

Operating modalities

Participants noted the importance of operating modalities that detail the working arrangements and the organizational structure of RCPs. There was general agreement among participants that these should be as exhaustive as possible, and tailored to the specific context and purpose of the concerned RCP. It was emphasized that a “one-size-fits-all” approach is neither realistic nor desirable. Various delegations shared their own experience with operating modalities. The Bali Process, for example, operates on the basis of distribution of responsibility to ensure functionality, despite its large and diverse membership comprising 44 countries and 31 observers, including various international organizations. Australia and Indonesia, co-chairs of the process since its inception, have cooperated closely to provide leadership and ensure that the often differing views within the process are balanced and reconciled. The monitoring and implementation of activities and initiatives in the core thematic areas of the process are guided by a Steering Group, whereas an ad hoc group (composed of the co-chairs, 14 selected governments, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and IOM) has allowed for focused and targeted discussion on key issues. The **Regional Conference on Migration (Puebla Process)** was mentioned as a good example in this respect, as its frequent meetings at the technical level are complemented by regular meetings at the political level, including an annual Ministerial Meeting. The **Colombo Process** was expressly commended for the adoption of operating modalities earlier this year at its Fourth Ministerial Consultations.

RCP secretariats

In the context of the extensive discussions that took place on the need for comprehensive operating modalities and a strong institutional framework for RCPs, the role of RCP secretariats received particular attention. It was pointed out that secretariats often provide a broad range of services, from logistical to substantive input and technical assistance, depending on the priorities and needs of participating States. Participants stressed that maintaining a functional secretariat is essential for the convening of regular meetings and for communication amongst participating States, and could also play a role in the implementation of follow-up activities. However, several participants noted with concern that only few RCPs have an established secretariat with dedicated staff. Participants positively referred to the secretariat support function that international organizations such as IOM, the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) and UNHCR continue to provide to a number of RCPs.

Information-sharing

Another critical issue identified by participants was that of exchange of information and good practices between participating States belonging to an RCP, as well as between RCPs and civil society, inter-regional fora (IRF) focused on migration, and global processes for dialogue such as the GFMD and the HLD. Participants noted that cooperation between RCPs has been much improved over the past years, not least through the three global RCP meetings that have taken place so far. That RCPs in recent years have been looking to invite participants from other governments/regions was viewed as a positive development that would likely further the expressed objective of enhancing cross-fertilization between RCPs in different regions. The Bali Process took the opportunity of this gathering to note that it was considering inviting representatives from other RCPs to attend a special session on the occasion of its tenth anniversary in 2012.

Outreach and partnerships

No clear view was expressed on the role that civil society organizations should play, but several participants acknowledged that civil society organizations have on-the-ground experience and expertise to contribute to certain thematic discussions. A number of RCP delegates reported that civil society organizations had been engaged in specific thematic discussions in the past, either as participants or as observers. However, this had for the most part been done on an ad hoc basis. Several participants in this respect noted that engaging civil society may compromise the informal posture that they adopt when participating in RCP deliberations, confident in the knowledge that they are all working according to Chatham House rules. Loss of informality runs the risk of undermining what up to now remains a key strength of RCPs – informal and depoliticized/de-mediatised dialogue.

International organizations have played a critical role in supporting the various RCPs, not only as secretariats (see above), but also as partners. IOM, for example, continues to participate in several RCPs in various capacities, most frequently as secretariat, but often also as technical expert at the request of participating States – undertaking research studies, implementing agreed project activities, providing policy advice and carrying out capacity-building activities. ICMPD and UNHCR have also provided support to RCPs either through institutionalized relationships or on an ad hoc basis. UNHCR stressed its availability to assist States on cooperation to enhance refugee protection and recently convened an “Expert Meeting on International Cooperation to Share Burdens and Responsibilities”.⁵ Other agencies that were specifically mentioned as partners of RCPs in discussions were the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Interpol and FRONTEX.

⁵ See UNHCR, Expert Meeting on International Cooperation to Share Burdens and Responsibilities, 28 June 2011, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4e9fed232.html> (accessed on 22 November 2011).

3. Emerging migration challenges and opportunities: Towards evidence-based policymaking

The potential contribution of RCPs to evidence-based policymaking on issues of regional and global concern received much attention and triggered discussion throughout the meeting. Participants were in agreement that RCPs provide unique spaces for politicized and potentially sensitive issues to be discussed with a certain degree of openness among States.

Issues that were identified as being of particular concern to various RCP Member States included the growing anti-migrant sentiment, the worrying increase in xenophobia in different regions and countries, the challenges of mixed migration flows, and the human rights of migrants during all stages of the migration process. There was broad agreement among participants that RCPs can play a key role in assisting governments to highlight the positive sides of migration and have the potential to engage more actively in the protection of migrants' rights. As a positive example, Member States of the **South American Conference on Migration (SACM)**, during its recent eleventh session in Brazil, reaffirmed the priority given to the respect and promotion of the human rights of migrants, condemning in particular migration policies that violate the fundamental rights of migrants and limit their access to education and health, often encouraging the adoption of racist, xenophobic and discriminatory attitudes.

Some delegates called upon RCPs to advocate for the ratification of the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. However, the view was also expressed that RCPs are not in a position to push their members to ratify international instruments, and that they should rather focus on providing technical advice to advance issues of common concern.

There was extensive discussion in the break-out groups on the potential role of RCPs with respect to the following (emerging) migration issues: 1) responses to migration crises in humanitarian situations; 2) strengthening integration of migration and development into policy; and 3) the migration, climate change and environment nexus.

Participants recognized that all three themes were of vital importance to governments in their bid to better manage migration, even while each of these themes may affect different regions and countries all over the world to varying degrees. Notwithstanding the need for coordination and policy development at the national level, it was felt that RCPs have the potential to fill knowledge gaps that exist with regard to all three issues, including through enhancing the collection and analysis of relevant data.

Responding to migration crises in humanitarian situations

In 2011 and under the chairmanship of the United States, the IGC dedicated its yearly Full Round Consultations to the theme of "Humanitarian responses to crises with migration consequences". Some of the key outcomes of the IGC discussions on this theme were presented in the break-out group on "Responses to migration crises in humanitarian situations", stimulating a lively exchange of views and experiences among participants. The IGC identified and discussed a range of possible scenarios that may trigger crises with migration consequences, including political upheaval, pandemics and natural disasters. Participants showed particular interest in the tools identified to address some of these situations, including, for example, temporary protection schemes as already exist in the United States.

Participants further agreed that there exist myriads of possibilities for instability that could trigger large-scale migratory movements. These call for thorough analyses and differentiated responses which should be developed with due regard to the causes of a disaster (man-made or natural) and the time dimension of a disaster (sudden or slow-onset), and be tailored to whether movements triggered by a disaster are internal, cross-border, or both. Participants further emphasized the need to establish criteria to be used to determine that a situation qualifies as an emergency and only thereafter initiate action in response to the situation. Participants agreed that assessments and response planning could include immediate as well as longer-term actions, and suggested that States might also wish to take advantage of the specific experience and expertise of international organizations through Joint Action planning, wherever possible.

The migration, climate change and environment nexus

In the break-out group session on the “Migration, climate change and environment nexus”, participants acknowledged the need for holistic and comprehensive approaches to addressing the complex effects of climate change on present and future migration patterns. There was a call for greater dialogue to enhance awareness of the needs of persons displaced by the effects of climate change and to foster understanding of migration not only as a survival strategy, but also as an adaptation strategy to climate change. Dialogue needs to be fostered at the national, regional and global levels in order to achieve consensus on the most pertinent issues. It was recognized that climate change and environmental issues are being dealt with by several ministries at the national level, and participants encouraged a whole-of-government approach to develop more holistic and comprehensive approaches. Several participants suggested that providing platforms for the sharing of good practices in this domain could support processes at the national level and inspire concrete action by participating States. Another suggestion that arose was that RCPs could be a vehicle through which to foster the adoption of regional framework agreements on climate change that provide for measures on migration, protection and adaptation with the well-defined objective of mitigating the suffering of those persons most affected by climate change.

From a more global perspective, participants highlighted the importance of burden-sharing mechanisms to ensure that countries most affected by the effects of climate change are assisted in addressing the immense challenges they face. The specialized expertise of international organizations could be better utilized. Some participants suggested the development of a cluster approach under the framework of the Global Migration Group (GMG)⁶ to enhance cooperation and coordination among agencies, including through the designation of lead agencies, depending on the expertise required for specific aspects of climate change, environment and migration.

Strengthening integration of migration and development into policy

In the break-out group on “Strengthening integration of migration and development into policy”, participants raised questions about the correlation between migration and development, including whether development drives migration or migration drives development. There was consensus that the relationship is a mutually dependent one, although it was suggested that a more comprehensive analysis on the interlinkages between development and migration at national and local levels could help to define clear policy objectives and ensure consistency in approaches. Reference was made in this respect to Migration Profiles which have been conducted in various countries over the past years. Prepared based on a coherent set of indicators, Migration Profiles provide a comprehensive situation report on the state of migration in a given country.⁷ In some countries, for example Jamaica,

6 The GMG “is an inter-agency group bringing together heads of agencies to promote the wider application of all relevant international and regional instruments and norms relating to migration, and to encourage the adoption of more coherent, comprehensive and better coordinated approaches to the issue of international migration.” See <http://www.globalmigrationgroup.org> (last accessed on 7 November 2011).

7 For further information on Migration Profiles as information tools for strategic policy planning, see also <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/migration-research/migration-profiles> (last accessed on 20 November 2011).

the Migration Profile tool has evolved into a comprehensive process to include training and the building of key stakeholders' capacity to maintain and update migration databases.

The Jamaican experience was discussed in some detail during the meeting. Going beyond the existing extensive Migration Profile for Jamaica, the government adopted a National Development Plan (Vision 2030 Jamaica) which ensures that international migration is adequately measured, monitored and influenced to serve the development needs of Jamaica. Interesting features of the plan include comprehensive monitoring mechanisms for the mainstreaming of migration and development in different sectors, and a National Working Group on International Migration and Development which comprises representatives from various ministries as well as from civil society organizations, academia and migrant associations.

The discussions went on to highlight a common challenge for migration stakeholders: enhancing public awareness of migration so as to ensure triple-win solutions that benefit not just countries of origin and destination, but also the migrants themselves. Several participants expressed the view that some RCPs do not focus on the whole spectrum of migration opportunities, especially those RCPs whose focus is more on security rather than the development aspects of migration.⁸ In this respect, some participants called upon RCPs to do more to advocate for the benefits of migration, including fostering research on the positive impact of migration on economies in light of demographic developments, supporting States to standardize the collection of evidence-based data, and feeding already available data into the policymaking arena. In addition, the suggestion was made that RCPs could engage more actively in capacity-building on these issues, for example by seconding experts to national governments. Stressing the dialogue function of RCPs, participants further noted that RCPs can contribute to removing technical obstacles to free movement within a given region and may, in addition to their proven ability to foster regional responses, also stimulate targeted bilateral initiatives on issues of common concern.

There were also strong calls from some participants to have RCPs involve migrants as they consider more innovative approaches to migration, especially with regard to its potential developmental impact, and to ensure that migrants' human rights are respected at all stages of the migration process. Some participants felt that RCPs could consider exploring possibilities for enhanced outreach to diaspora communities with the aim of strengthening the political participation of diasporas in host countries. Acknowledging the importance of migrant remittances in the development of sending countries, some participants suggested that RCPs could be used as forums to discuss how technical obstacles to the flow of remittances could be overcome. However, a number of participants also highlighted the risk of further enhancing the dependence of some receiving countries on remittances. One delegate emphasized the importance of not losing sight of the fact that remittances are private funds and that, consequently, planning on how these could be used to enhance a country's development may not be appropriate.

⁸ Compare also the discussions on the selection of topics for RCP meetings, as reflected in chapter 2, "Choice of issues for discussion", of this report.

4. Towards enhanced international cooperation on migration

A prominent theme was the question of the place of RCPs in an increasingly globalized yet politically and institutionally fragmented world that lacks a single normative framework for migration management. There was consensus that States are increasingly looking to RCPs as the vehicle through which to achieve regional responses to regional migration challenges, understanding that cooperative approaches trump unilateral action in complex regional settings. One participant referred to RCPs as possible “building blocks of an eventual global governance regime for migration”, noting that RCPs have contributed significantly to progress in international dialogue and cooperation migration over the past decade or so.

Notwithstanding the common characteristics of RCPs and potential areas of substantive overlap, the observation was made that each process is bound by a unique history, funding mechanism and regional specificities, and will always be subject to the priorities of its participating States. There was also broad consensus that RCPs are only one, albeit crucial, forum for dialogue on migration issues.

The first HLD in 2005 and the subsequently established GFMD have been significant platforms for discussing migration issues from diverse standpoints. In recent years, various regional economic and political organizations have included migration to their agendas, and several IRF that have come into being regularly deliberate on migration issues.

4.1 Complementary regional mechanisms for international cooperation on migration

The 2011 Global Meeting sought to increase understanding of what other dialogue and consultations mechanisms exist at the regional level aside from RCPs. In this regard, the meeting focussed on the work that regional economic and political communities (RECs) and IRF are undertaking in the area of migration. Representatives from the Caribbean Community and Market (CARICOM), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) provided delegates with short presentations on the work of their institutions in the field of migration during a designated session on “Complementary mechanisms for international cooperation on migration”. In subsequent discussions, participants acknowledged the considerable achievements being made by RECs and IRF in different regions.

In the Caribbean, Member States of CARICOM have established the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME), with the aim of harmonizing Member States’ social security legislation and ensuring free movement and equal treatment of residents throughout the CARICOM region. It was stressed that the CSME is linked to greater objectives of: 1) fostering unity between CARICOM Member States; and 2) furthering the benefits of migration for all migrants, including by strengthening safeguards to the dignity and well-being of migrants. The CSME agreement allows CARICOM nationals to establish a business in any Member State and provides a guarantee that they will be treated as a national of that State and will enjoy full entitlement to pension benefits. It was noted that the implementation of this agreement has not been without challenges. Difficulties along the road have included: differences in retirement ages and benefits levels between CARICOM Member States and poor labour market recruitment practices in some countries, leading to serious information gaps in some instances. However, CARICOM Member States have endeavoured to view these challenges as possible opportunities for the further enhancement of their national social security systems as well as for the development of their countries.

A second example of regional cooperation on migration issues outside of the RCP framework that was discussed was that of COMESA. COMESA was established in 1994 with the vision of achieving a fully integrated, internationally competitive and regional community within which goods, services, capital and labour are free to move across the national borders of its 19 Member States. COMESA

immigration authorities meet on a regular basis to review the implementation of decisions by the COMESA Council. Additionally, there is an annual meeting of Ministers of Member States responsible for immigration matters. Following the adoption of two protocols in the early 1980s and late 1990s which aimed at the relaxation and eventual elimination of visa requirements, the COMESA Heads of State and Government adopted a Protocol on the free movement of persons in 2001. To date, the Protocol has only been ratified by one State, but COMESA has stepped up efforts to obtain the required number of ratifications for the Protocol to enter into force and has pursued capacity-building activities with the objective of ensuring that the Protocol is put into effect with relative ease once it has been ratified by COMESA Member States. Amongst other ongoing activities, COMESA adopted a model law for the harmonization of Member States' legislation on immigration policy in 2006 and has partnered with IOM for proposals on establishing Migration Profiles in the COMESA region.

The ACP was described as representing a different model of cooperation, given that it is an inter-regional initiative bringing together 79 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. A key objective of the ACP that was mentioned is to contribute to the creation of a new, fairer and more equitable world order. The principal partner and donor of the ACP is the EU, and all but one State has signed the ACP–EC Partnership Agreement (also referred to as the Contonou Agreement). Migration is one of the areas covered by the ACP–EU cooperation framework, which extends to a wide range of areas such as trade, development, finance, political dialogue, humanitarian assistance, climate change, agriculture and fisheries. The ACP, like RCPs, strives to ensure more collaborative approaches on a range of issues, including migration policy. Recently, the ACP has strengthened its activities to improve South-South migration research and policymaking. Amongst other initiatives, an ACP Observatory on Migration has been set up in 12 pilot countries with conceptual support from IOM and funding from the EU and the Government of Switzerland. The ACP Observatory on Migration aims to establish a network of research institutions and governmental entities dealing with migration in the six regions where the ACP Group of States are located.⁹

The discussions that ensued validated the value of having different cooperation instruments that may cover various aspects of migration, especially when addressing complex migration challenges. However, participants stressed the need to foster greater exchange between economic and political organizations, on the one hand, and RCPs, on the other, given the considerable overlap in membership and in geographic and thematic scope.¹⁰ There was broad agreement that potential synergies between RCPs and these complementary regional and inter-regional mechanisms need to be further explored and strengthened. Additionally, the suggestion was made that RECs and IRF with a migration focus could possibly be included in existing information-sharing mechanisms between RCPs, and between these and the GFMD.

Various participants noted the existing linkages between RCPs and RECs in some regions. **IGAD-RCP** was cited as an example in this respect given its formal links to the six East African countries that comprise the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). **MIDSA** membership is similarly aligned with that of the SADC and was established with the aim of fostering cooperation between SADC Member States on migration-related issues and enhancing their capacity to manage migration. For example, MIDSA has played a crucial role in the drafting of the SADC Protocol on Free Movement.¹¹ The **Migration Dialogue for West Africa (MIDWA)** was inaugurated by the **Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)** in 2000 and has been designed to encourage ECOWAS Member States to discuss common migration issues and concerns in a regional context. The **MTM** anchors its work in the priorities and approaches agreed at the political level, in particular through the Rabat Process, Euro Med and within the framework of the EU–Africa Partnerships on Migration Mobility and Employment.

9 The six areas are West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. For more information, see <http://www.acpmigration-obs.org> (last accessed on 21 November 2011).

10 Compare also the discussions on participation in different fora on migration and the challenges this imposes on Member States in chapter 2, "Participation in RCP meetings", of this report.

11 See also the discussion of MIDSA developments in chapter 1 of this report, specifically the remarks made by Minister Siele.

4.2 The GFMD and HLD 2013

The GFMD troika – representatives of the former (Mexico), current (Switzerland) and future (Mauritius) GFMD chairs – provided an overview of the work of the GFMD under their respective chairmanships.

Under the chairmanship of Switzerland in 2011, a new format for the process was introduced. Instead of the usual year-end GFMD meeting, the 2011 chair organized a series of smaller, focused and action-oriented meetings in support of its flagship theme “Taking action on migration and development – coherence, capacity and cooperation”. Under three thematic clusters: labour mobility and development; addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies; and planning tools for evidence-based migration and development policies, some 14 meetings were held in various locations around the globe. Each of the 14 meetings produced a number of recommendations and outcomes, which will be presented and discussed at the Concluding Debate in Geneva, Switzerland on 1–2 December 2011. Some of these meetings were referred to in the course of the two-day meeting in Gaborone to illustrate the richness and diversity of discussions. In two complementary workshops in **El Salvador** and **Turkey**, some 60 to 80 participants discussed challenges faced in trying to combat irregular migration. Meetings in **Jamaica** and **Ghana** brought together a broad range of stakeholders comprising governments and representatives of international organizations and civil society. The discussions focused on possible policy responses to the challenges posed by the global care industry. Meetings were also held in **Dubai** and **Dhaka** focusing on ways and means to reduce the cost of migration in order to generate more development gains for migrants.¹²

The Swiss GFMD chair put the proposal to several RCPs to co-convene thematic seminars and meetings under the GFMD framework in 2011, and the **MTM** co-organized one of the 14 GFMD thematic meetings held in **Morocco** on the “Contribution of migrant associations to development”. However, it was noted that the Swiss chair’s initiative of outreach to RCPs has not been received as favourably as the Swiss chair had hoped. Consequently, in the view of the Swiss chair, this raises the important question of how the GFMD should relate to RCPs in light of the commonality of their objectives, one being global in character and the other being regional.

The former Mexican chair of the GFMD pointed out that the GFMD represents a compromise formula that was reached among United Nations Member States at the 2006 High-Level Dialogue. The current set-up balances two competing views that existed among United Nations Member States: a number of States had argued that migration should be discussed and addressed within a normative framework such as that presented by the United Nations, while other States favoured a forum outside the framework of the United Nations which would primarily serve the purpose of exchange of good practices and discussions at the technical level. Under the chairmanship of Mexico in 2010, the GFMD sought to provide a forum for the exchange of information, presentation of good practices and discussion of contentious issues, including States’ different views on the politics of migration. Mexico, during its chairmanship, put much emphasis on creating a productive environment for addressing, but not necessarily resolving, complex political migration issues within the framework of the GFMD. To this end, it initiated discussions for a conceptual approach to migration which neither avoids substantive discussions nor perpetuates existing prejudices, polarization or divides between countries on the sending and receiving ends of the migration spectrum. The suggested conceptual framework centres around human development as an overall objective to which States could agree and addresses questions of shared prosperity and shared responsibility, as well as the development of partnerships for finding solutions to difficult problems.

¹² More information on all 14 thematic sessions held by the GFMD in 2011 is available at www.gfmd.org (last accessed on 11 November 2011).

Outreach to civil society has received increased attention in the work of the GFMD and it was stressed by the Mexican and Swiss GFMD chairs that civil society organizations participating in GFMD workshops and meetings have learned to accept their role in these meetings as contributors to the forum rather than as activists.

Mauritius, as the GFMD chair for 2012, is in the process of identifying priorities and – in consultation with the previous GFMD chairs and the Government of Sweden that will chair the GFMD in 2013 – is preparing the work programme for its upcoming chairmanship. The Government of Mauritius expressed a willingness to retain certain elements of the decentralized and targeted approach that have been tested by the GFMD in 2011 under Swiss chairmanship. As the first African country to chair the GFMD, Mauritius will seek to ensure the inclusion of an African perspective in this global discourse on migration and development. The second phase of the assessment of the GFMD will be continued in 2012, with the focus being on the strategic and political discussions among GFMD participating governments on the future of the GFMD.

In his presentation, the Special Advisor to the SRSR on Migration and Development outlined the history and road to the 2013 HLD. He highlighted that, prior to the first HLD, there had been a number of initiatives, within and outside the United Nations, to address migration in its international dimension. However, no formal approach had been pursued by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), mainly because many governments saw migration as a matter of national sovereignty. Under these circumstances, the UNGA decided to hold a special event in 2006, a High-Level Dialogue, adding the notion of development to that of migration, thus making it more palatable to potential dissenters. At the end of 2005, Peter Sutherland was appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General to lead the United Nations effort to prepare the HLD. The Special Adviser pointed out that the UNGA has, on various occasions, recognized the achievements made by the GFMD since its inception and encouraged international organizations dealing with migration to more fully integrate development issues into their work. The UNGA has further invited governments and international organizations to examine regional aspects of international migration and development in the report of the Secretary-General on this item, and in the preparatory process of the 2013 HLD. The Special Adviser remarked that although the UNGA is yet to decide on the agenda for the second HLD, it is to be expected that discussions will also draw from outcomes of the GFMD process to date, in addition to being informed by the findings of the ongoing assessment of the objectives and functioning of the GFMD by its members, which is expected to be concluded in 2013.

The discussion that followed demonstrated broad recognition of the importance of the first HLD of 2006, and the resulting establishment of the GFMD as a forum bringing together States to deliberate on migration and development issues outside the United Nations framework but with links to it. The second HLD will be equally important, presenting as it does an opportunity to take stock of achievements to date in terms of global dialogue on migration and provide suggestions for the way forward.

However, it was recognized that the interplay between RCPs and the GFMD remains insufficiently articulated. While most States that participate in RCPs also participate in the GFMD, joint activities or meetings are rare, and when they have happened, this has tended to be in an ad hoc manner. Overall, there was agreement that more discussion is needed to clarify what kind of relationship would be desirable to cultivate between the GFMD and RCPs so as to maximize possible synergies. It was emphasized that while the GFMD does not seek to intervene on the agendas of RCPs, the outcomes and recommendations of its meetings have policy relevance for all regions. Consequently, the relationship between the GFMD and RCPs could be retained as a possible agenda item for further discussion at the 2013 HLD.

5. Conclusion

The relevance of RCPs as mechanisms for inter-State cooperation on migration was repeatedly affirmed throughout the two days of deliberation. Along with this acknowledgement of their relevance was also broad agreement that many RCPs are sorely in need of capacity enhancement if they are to fulfil the role for which they were constituted and that they have the potential to play. Participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity that this third global meeting of RCPs provided them to exchange views and experiences, as well as to identify good practices and tools. The meeting suggested concrete measures for the enhancement of RCPs, including the adoption of standard operating modalities, the strengthening of secretariat structures, and increased exchange with and outreach to existing and potential partners. Above all, the meeting underlined that how effective an RCP is will always be a function of participating States' commitment, including their willingness to ensure sustainable funding and to fully engage and provide leadership on a sustained basis.

The potential of RCPs to contribute to evidence-based policymaking as relates to many of the current migration challenges – including responses to migration crises in humanitarian situations, the migration and climate change nexus, and the integration of development into migration policies – was recognized. There was a great interest among participants in learning from the experience of other RCPs, in particular with regard to concrete tools and mechanisms developed in other regions and countries to ensure awareness of emerging migration issues so as to adjust their focus as needed, and to improve the collection of relevant data.

The need for better coordination and improved exchange at the national, regional and inter-regional levels was a cross-cutting issue in discussions. Beyond the need for enhanced information-sharing and coordination between RCPs, discussions also extended to the question of how best to improve interaction with existing platforms for cooperation on migration such as RECs, inter-regional fora, and global dialogue processes such as the GFMD and the HLD. There was broad agreement that coordination between these processes is critical if duplication is to be avoided and synergies maximized.

Finally, participants called for regular and sustained exchange between RCPs, bringing in other relevant actors as needed, if they are to keep pace with the dynamic pace of change on the migration landscape in virtually all regions. As such, it was suggested that the Fourth Global Meeting of RCPs should take place in 2013, in keeping with the agreement to hold these meetings on a biennial basis.





Annexes

Annex I:

Final Agenda



REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA

With the support of



Australian Government
Department of Immigration
and Citizenship



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra



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

Enhancing Cooperation on Migration through Dialogue and Capacity-building
25–26 October 2011
Gaborone, Republic of Botswana

25 October 2011 DAY I	
07:30 – 09:00	<i>Registration</i>
09:00 – 09:50	OFFICIAL OPENING
	<p>WELCOME REMARKS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Lucky T. Moahi Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs Government of the Republic of Botswana - Director of Ceremonies <p>STATEMENT BY HOST OF RCP GLOBAL CONSULTATION 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Chutintorn Gongsakdi Deputy Director-General, International Organizations Department Kingdom of Thailand <p>STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. William Lacy Swing Director General, International Organization for Migration (IOM) <p>KEYNOTE ADDRESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hon. Letlhogonolo Peter Siele Minister of Labour and Home Affairs, Government of the Republic of Botswana
09:50 – 10:20	<i>Coffee break</i>
10:20 – 11:00	<p>INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p><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></p> <p>Facilitator: <i>Mr. D.M. Moremi</i>, Deputy Director of Multilateral Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Government of the Republic of Botswana</p>

11:00 – 13:00	<p>Taking stock of opportunities and challenges <i>This session will be informed by the consolidated responses to a self-assessment questionnaire on challenges and opportunities completed by the principal RCPs. A presentation of the key opportunities and main challenges from the perspective of the RCPs will be given and will be followed by an interactive discussion exploring how dialogue and capacity enhancement can strengthen the ability of RCPs to harness opportunities and address challenges constructively.</i></p> <p>Presenter and moderator: Ms. Elizabeth Adjei, Advisor on Migration – Government of Ghana</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of opportunities and challenges from RCPs’ self-assessment <p>Discussants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Minister Rodrigo do Amaral Souza</i>, Director General of Legal Affairs and Immigration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil – South American Conference on Migration (SACM) • <i>Ms. Caroline Njuki</i>, Regional Political Integration and Human Security Support Programme, Inter-Governmental Authority on Development – (IGAD RCP) • <i>Mr. Gottfried Zürcher</i>, Deputy Director, Federal Office for Migration, Federal Ministry of Justice and Police, Switzerland – Mediterranean Migration Transit Dialogue (MTM) • <i>Dr. Zafar Ahmed Khan</i>, Secretary, Ministry of Expatriates’ Welfare and Overseas Employment, Bangladesh (Colombo Process) • <i>Mr. James Larsen</i>, Ambassador for People Smuggling Issues, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Bali Process) • Plenary discussion
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break
14:00 – 16:00	<p>Enhancing the capacity of RCPs <i>Building on the discussion from the preceding session, the possible means for enhancing the capacity of RCPs will be examined, as will the role that operating modalities could play in improving the functioning of RCPs. The session will include a group exercise to explore the various capacity enhancement possibilities.</i></p> <p>Moderator: Mr. Vincent Williams, Project Manager, Southern Africa Migration Project (SAMP)</p> <p>Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ms. Maureen Achieng</i>, Head, International Partnerships Division, IOM • <i>Ms. Catherine Harris</i>, Senior Regional Protection Officer, UNHCR • Discussion • Group exercise and feedback • Plenary discussion
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee break

16:30 – 18:00	<p>Complementary regional mechanisms for international cooperation on migration</p> <p><i>This session will consider complementary mechanisms for international cooperation on migration, including presentations from economic and political communities in regions that have no established RCPs or are looking at establishing an RCP. An interactive discussion session will allow participants to consider possible linkages between these mechanisms and existing RCPs.</i></p> <p>Moderator: Mr. Vincent Williams, Project Manager, Southern Africa Migration Project (SAMP)</p> <p>Cooperation on migration in the framework of regional economic and political communities</p> <p>Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Reginald Thomas, Executive Director, National Insurance Services, West Indies • Mr. Houssein Guedi Absieh, Immigration, Free Movement and Labour Expert, COMESA <p>Existing mechanisms for inter-regional cooperation on migration</p> <p>Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Lawrence Chilimboyi, Expert, Political Affairs and Human Development Department, African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States Secretariat • Plenary discussion
19:30	Official dinner
26 October 2011 DAY II	
09:00 – 09:15 Recap of day I - Discussions and outcomes	
09:15 – 10:45	<p>Emerging migration challenges and opportunities: Towards evidence-based policymaking</p> <p><i>This session will provide an overview of and a discussion platform for contemporary migration issues through the dichotomous lens of challenges and opportunities. The importance of evidence-based policymaking and the possible means of incorporating this into migration management will be considered in the thematic group discussions.</i></p> <p>Moderator: Ms. Daniela Morari, Government of the Republic of Moldova</p> <p>Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Todd Young, Branch Chief, US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Mr. Laurent Dalmasso, Programme Officer, Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) • Mr. Md. Sufiur Rahman, Director-General, Economic Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Bangladesh • Ms. Toni Shae Freckleton, Senior Demographer, Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica <p>Group exercises</p> <p><u>Group 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses to migration crises in humanitarian situations <p><u>Group 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The migration, climate change and the environment nexus <p><u>Group 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening integration of migration and development into policy

10:45 – 11:15	<i>Coffee break</i>
11:15 – 13:15	<p>Group exercise feedback and plenary discussion <i>Feedback from the thematic group discussions will be summed up and the session will then be opened up for a plenary discussion that will explore and identify common priorities in the agenda of RCPs as relates to emerging issues, but also with regard to the responses of RCPs to the self-assessment questionnaire as well as the stock-taking session on opportunities and challenges.</i></p>
	<p>Moderator: <i>Mr. Md. Shahidul Haque</i>, Director, International Cooperation and Partnerships Department, IOM</p> <p>Plenary discussion: Identifying common priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common themes distilled from stock-taking exercise and emerging issues • Good practices in cross-fertilization • Exploring and drawing upon synergies/complementarities in policy coherence and resource mobilization • Plenary discussion
13:15 – 14:15	<i>Lunch break</i>
14:15 – 16:00	<p>Towards enhanced international cooperation on migration <i>This session will provide an outline of existing international mechanisms for inter-State cooperation on migration, with presentations on the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) by the current, previous and future chairs. The second part of the session will provide an overview of the United Nations High-Level Dialogue (HLD) on International Migration and Development, with reference to the 2006 HLD and the upcoming 2013 HLD. The potential value of fostering greater cross-fertilization of ideas and practices between RCPs and key international mechanisms for cooperation on migration through mutually reinforcing interactions will be examined.</i></p> <p>Moderator: <i>Mr. John Matthews</i>, Minister-Counsellor Immigration, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva, Switzerland</p> <p>Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of GFMD V - Swiss chair, <i>Ambassador Eduard Carlo Gnesa</i> • Overview of GFMD IV outcomes - Mexico chair, <i>Ambassador Juan José Gómez Camacho</i>, Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations and other international organizations in Geneva • GFMD VI priorities – GFMD VI chair, <i>Ambassador Shree Baboo Chekitan Servansing</i>, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Mauritius to the United Nations and other international organizations in Geneva • Plenary discussion
	<p>United Nations High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development – 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Advisor to the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on Migration, <i>Mr. Francois Fouinat</i> • Presentation • Plenary discussion
16:00 – 16:15	<i>Photo session and coffee break</i>

16:15 – 17:00	CLOSING SESSION
16:15 – 16:30	<p>DIRECTOR OF CEREMONIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Lucky T. Moahi Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs, Government of the Republic of Botswana <p>Summary of meeting discussions and outcomes <i>A brief summary of the discussions and outcomes of the meeting will be presented, giving participants an opportunity to reflect on the deliberations and take note of key action points. A brief outline of any plans for future RCP global meetings, most notably the fourth and fifth meetings in 2013 and 2015, respectively, as well as any self-nominations received for the hosting of the meetings will be made.</i></p> <p>Rapporteur: Ms. Jessica Yutacom, Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)</p>
16:30 – 17:00	<p>CLOSING REMARKS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. William Lacy Swing Director General, International Organization for Migration (IOM) • Hon. Letlhogonolo Peter Siele Minister of Labour and Home Affairs, Government of the Republic of Botswana <p>VOTE OF THANKS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Tímea Erzsébet Lehoczki Representative of the Former Chair of the Söderköping Process (Hungary) and Legal Expert, Department of European Cooperation, Ministry of Interior, Republic of Hungary

Annex II:

List of Participants

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

Enhancing Cooperation on Migration through Dialogue and Capacity-building 25–26 October 2011 Gaborone, Republic of Botswana

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	Email
1.	Australia	Bali Process	Mr. James Larsen	Ambassador for People Smuggling Issues, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	james.larsen@dfat.gov.au
2.	Australia	Bali Process	Ms. Nicole Guihot	Executive Officer, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	nicole.guihot@dfat.gov.au
3.	Indonesia	Bali Process	Mr. Habib Achsanul	First Secretary Political Affairs, Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the UN and other International Organizations in Geneva	achhabib@yahoo.com
4.	Australia	IOM/ Bali Process	Mr. Lance Bonneau	Senior Regional Programme Development Officer, IOM Canberra	lbonneau@iom.int
5.	Bangladesh	Colombo Process	Dr. Zafar Ahmed Khan	Secretary, Ministry of Expatriate's Welfare & Overseas Employment	drzafar60@gmail.com secretary@probashi.gov.bd
6.	Bangladesh	Colombo Process	Mr. Md. Moniruzzaman	Deputy Secretary, Employment Wing, Ministry of Expatriates Welfare and Overseas Employment	monir65@gmail.com mzaman201@yahoo.com
7.	Uganda	IGAD-RCP	Mr. Sasagah Godfrey Wanzira	Directorate of Citizenship and Immigration Control, Ministry of Internal Affairs	sgwanzira@yahoo.co.uk
8.	Ethiopia	IGAD-RCP	Mr. Mulugeta Beshir	Director General Diaspora Engagement Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	kerykelil@gmail.com
9.	Ethiopia	IOM/ IGAD RCP	Mr. Josiah Ogina	Head of Office, IOM SLM Addis Ababa	jogina@iom.int
10.	USA	IGC	Mr. Todd Young	U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security	todd.young@dhs.gov
11.	Switzerland	IGC	Mr. Laurent Dalmasso	Programme Officer, Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees – IGC	l.dalmasso@igc.ch
12.	Namibia	MIDSA	Mr. Joseph Kashea	Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration	jkashea@mha.gov.na
13.	Namibia	MIDSA	Mr. Nehemia Nghishekwa	Deputy Director, Immigration and Border Control, Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration	nnghishekwa@mha.gov.na
14.	Angola	MIDSA	Dr. Simao Milagres dos Santos Tchitungo	Migration Inspector, Ministry of Interior	Simao.milagres@sme.ao

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	Email
15.	Angola	MIDSA	Mr. Da Costa Canda Correano	Cabinet of International Exchange and Cooperation, Ministry of Interior	coreanocanda@hotmail.com
16.	South Africa	IOM/MIDSA	Ms. Mukondi Mpeiwa	Regional Policy Liaison Officer, IOM Regional Office for East and Southern Africa	mmpeiwa@iom.int
17.	Nigeria	MIDWA	Mr. S.O. Olaniyan	Assistant Director (ECOWAS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs	olaniyan.ecowas.nationalunit@gmail.com
18.	Senegal	IOM/MIDWA	Ms. Alexia Scarlett	Regional Policy Liaison Officer, IOM Dakar	ascarlett@iom.int
19.	Switzerland	MTM	Mr. Gottfried Zürcher	Director, Migration Policy Department, Federal Office for Migration	gottfried.zuercher@bfm.admin.ch
20.	Austria	MTM	Mr. Julien Simon	Programme Manager, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)	Julien.Simon@icmpd.org
21.	Dominican Republic	Puebla Process/ RCM	Mr. Washington González	Vice-Minister , Ministry of Interior, Secretaria de Estado de Interior y Policia	wgonzalez@mip.gob.do
22.	Panama	Puebla Process/ RCM	Mr. Teniente Luis Peñaloza Moreno	Servicio Nacional of Migración, Asuntos internos	lpm31@yahoo.es luy33@hotmail.com
23.	Mexico	Puebla Process/ RCM	Mr. Oliver Bush	RCM Coordinator	obush@iom.int
24.	Brazil	SACM	Minister Rodrigo do Amaral Souza	DG of Legal Affairs and Immigration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Rodrigo.amaral@itamaraty.gov.br
25.	Hungary	Söderköping Process	Dr. Lehoczki Tímea	Legal Expert, Department of European Cooperation, Belügyminisztérium/ Ministry of Interior	timea.lehoczki@bm.gov.hu
26.	<u>Govt of Botswana</u>		Hon. Peter Letlhogonolo Siele	Minister of Labour and Home Affairs	
27.			Mr. Lucky Moahi	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
28.			Mr. D.M. Moremi	Deputy Director, Multilateral Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation	
29.			Ms. Flora Lekoko	Deputy Director of Immigration	
30.			Ms. Neo Lelang	Acting Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
31.			Ms. P. Kgabi	Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
32.			Ms. V. Mogegeh	Director, Department of Women's Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
33.			Mr. Buthseba Mbongwe	Director, Department of Internship, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
34.			Mr. Kaelo Jane	Director, Department of Occupational Health, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
35.			Mr. C. Kalaote	Director, Madirelo, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	
36.			Mr. Micheal Mokgautsi	Acting Director, Department of Civil and National Registration, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs	

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	Email
37.	<u>Govt of Botswana</u>		Mr. Mathews Lesholo	Senior Assistant Commissioner, Ministry of Defence, Justice & Security, Botswana Police	
38.			Mr. C.A. Mojafi	Deputy Permanent Secretary (IL), Ministry of Labour & Home Affairs	
39.			Ms Rose P. Sennanyana	Commissioner of Labour	
40.			Mr. Silas Motlalekgosi	Commissioner of Prisons	
41.			Ms. Sissy V. Seemule	Botswana Mission in Geneva	botgen@bluewin.ch
42.			Mr. Thebeyame Tsimako	Commissioner of Police	
43.	Switzerland	GFMD 2011 Chair	Ambassador Eduard Gnesa	Special Ambassador of Switzerland for International Migration	eduard.gnesa@deza.admin.ch
44.	Switzerland	GFMD 2011	Mr. Jakob Manuel	GFMD Task Force Coordinator	manuel.jakob@eda.admin.ch
45.	Mexico	GFMD 2010	Ambassador Juan José Gómez Camacho	Permanent Representative of Mexico in Geneva	kgomezcc@sre.gob.mx
46.	Mauritius	GFMD Chair 2012	Ambassador Shree Baboo Chekitan Servansing	Ambassador Shree Baboo Chekitan Servansing, Permanent Mission of Mauritius to the UN (Geneva)	mission.mauritius@ties.itu.int
47.	Thailand	2009 RCP Host	Mr.Chutintorn Gongsakdi	Deputy Director-General, Department of International Organization, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	chutintorn@mfa.go.th
48.	Thailand		Ms. Pratana Udommongkolkul	First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Organizations	taesy@hotmail.com
49.	Australia	Panelist	Mr. John Matthews	Minister – Counsellor, Department of Immigration and Citizenship, Australian Permanent Mission to the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland	john.matthews@dfat.gov.au
50.	Australia		Ms. Vicki Parker	Principal Advisor, Boarder and Humanitarian Strategies, Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship	vicki.parker@immi.gov.au
51.	Ghana	Panelist	Ms. Elizabeth Adjei	Advisor on Migration, Government of Ghana	director@myzipnet.com
52.	Belgium	Panelist	Mr. Lawrence Chilimboyi	Expert, Parliamentary Institutions, Political Affairs Department	lawrence@acp.int
53.	United States of America	Panelist	Ms. Jessica Yutacom	Senior Programme Officer, U.S. Department of State	YutacomJW@state.gov
54.	South Africa	Panelist	Ms. Katherine Harris	Regional Protection Officer; UNHCR	harrisk@unhcr.org
55.	Botswana	Delegation of the European Union to Botswana and SADC	Mr. Theo Kaspers	Counsellor, SADC Section	Theodorus.Kaspers@eeas.europa.eu
56.	Botswana	Delegation of the European Union to Botswana and SADC	Ms. Gesine Knolle	Attaché, SADC Section	Gesine.Knolle@eeas.europa.eu
57.	Djibouti	IGAD	Ms. Caroline Muthoni Njuki	Project Manager, Regional Political Integration and Human Security Support Programme, IGAD Secretariat, Economic and Social Development	caroline.njuki@igad.int

No.	Country	RCP	Name	Designation	Email
58.	South Africa	SAMP	Mr. Vincent Williams	Project Manager, Southern Africa Migration Project	vwilliams@idasa.org.za
59.	El Salvador	Central American Integration Initiative (SICA)	Mr. César Ernesto Salazar Grande	Legal Advisor to the Secretary General	csalazar@sica.int
60.	Zambia	COMESA	Mr. Guedi Absieh Houssein	Immigration, Free Movement and Labour Expert, COMESA Secretariat	ghoussein@comesa.int
61.	Moldova	Panelist	Ms. Daniela Morari	Deputy Head of Unit, Department for European Integration	daniela.morari@mfa.md
62.	Bangladesh	Panelist	Mr. Md. Sufiur Rahman	Director General, Economic Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	sufi_rahman@hotmail.com
63.	Jamaica	Panelist	Ms. Tony Shae Freckleton	Manager (Acting) Population & Health Unit, Social Policy Planning and Research Division	tfreckleton@pioj.gov.jm
64.	Ethiopia	African Union	Mr. Philip Bob Jusu	Migration Officer, Division of Labour, Employment and Migration, Department of Social Affairs	jusup@africa-union.org
65.	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Panelist	Mr. Reginald Thomas	Executive Director, National Insurance Services, West Indies	Reginald.Thomas@nissvg.org
66.	France	UNDESA	Mr. Francois Fouinat	Senior Adviser to the UN SRSG for Migration and Development	Fouinat@hotmail.com
67.	Ghana	UNESCO	Mr. Abdul Rahman	Programme Specialist	ar.lamin@unesco.org
68.	Comoros		Ambassador Abdoul Karim Soifoni	Directeur Général des Comoriens de l'Etranger, Ministère des Relations Extérieures et de la Coopération	asoifoini@numericable.fr
69.	<u>IOM</u>		Ambassador William L. Swing	Director General, IOM HQ	wswing@iom.int
70.			Mr. Shahidul Haque	Director International Cooperation and Partnerships Department, IOM HQ	shaque@iom.int
71.			Bernardo Mariano	Regional Representative, IOM Regional Office for East and Southern Africa	BMariano@iom.int
72.			Ms. Maureen Achieng	Head, International Partnerships Division, IOM HQ	machieng@iom.int
73.			Ms. Nyaradzo Chari-Imbayago	Associate Migration Policy Officer, International Cooperation and Partnerships Department, IOM HQ	nchari@iom.int
74.			Mr. Tim Howe	Associate Migration Policy Officer, International Cooperation and Partnerships Department, IOM HQ	thowe@iom.int
75.			Mr. Ragen Nair	Resource Management Support Officer, IOM Regional Office for East and Southern Africa	rnair@iom.int
76.			Ms. Gorata Hetanang	Consultant, Botswana	ghetanang@iom.int

Annex III:

Questionnaire on challenges and opportunities: Overview of responses

Preface

The Third Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs) took place on 25–26 October 2011 in Gaborone, Botswana. It was hosted by the Government of Botswana in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) under the broad theme of “Enhancing cooperation on migration through dialogue and capacity-building”. The main objective of the meeting was to identify common challenges and opportunities that RCPs face and to continue the reflection process on concrete tools for the enhancement of RCPs’ capacity.

In preparation for the meeting, IOM had developed a questionnaire¹ consisting of 10 questions on the main opportunities and challenges of enhancing cooperation on migration within and amongst RCPs, designed also to delineate initiatives undertaken since the second Global RCP Meeting that took place in 2009 in Bangkok, Thailand. Responses to the questionnaire were provided by nine different RCPs, mainly from RCP secretariats, in some cases also in coordination with the respective chairs of RCPs. The feedback received prior to the meeting was used to inform the meeting’s agenda and some of the key outcomes of the survey were also presented and discussed during a dedicated session on “Taking stock of opportunities and challenges” at the conference.²

The present document provides an overview of the general challenges and opportunities identified in the responses to the questionnaire. It complements the Summary Report of the Third Global RCP Meeting in Gaborone, Botswana. The structure follows the order of the questions in the questionnaire.

Question 1: *Several participants at the 2009 Bangkok meeting identified challenges related to internal coordination mechanisms and **ensuring that the right people are present at RCP meetings**. How is coordination undertaken between designated RCP participants and State ministries to encourage streamlined discussion? Have any new coordination mechanisms been put in place with a view to improving on this aspect?*

Responses to the 2011 questionnaire confirm that the final choice regarding participation in RCP meetings needs to be made by the competent authorities in the concerned countries, but it is indicated in several responses that, for various RCPs, there is a lack of coordination mechanisms between the different departments/ministries dealing with migration issues, including on the question of participation in RCP meetings. A number of responses highlight that enhanced coordination between RCP secretariats and State ministries may contribute to ensuring that the right people are present at RCP meetings.

Responses further suggest that whereas participation is addressed on an ad hoc basis for many RCPs, a number of more formalized mechanisms have been developed for some RCPs and/or RCP participating States to coordinate engagement at the national and regional levels. For some RCPs, national focal points have been established to facilitate the nomination and participation of the

1 The questionnaire is available at <http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/microsites/rcps/2011-rcp-global-consultation/questionnaire.pdf> (last accessed on 8 December 2011).

2 Presentation delivered by Ms. Elizabeth Adjei, Advisor on Migration of the Government of Ghana during a dedicated session on “Taking stock of RCPs’ challenges and opportunities” on day one of the Gaborone meeting. The presentation is available at: <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/regional-consultative-processes/2011-global-rcp-consultation> (last accessed on 8 December 2011).

most relevant representatives of their respective governments according to the thematic or region-specific activities proposed. In most cases, foreign ministries are the official point of entry for RCP participation, but informal diplomatic networks and Internet-based portals can also facilitate the broad dissemination of information and communication within and amongst RCPs. Also mentioned is the creation of a regional migration coordination committee by one RCP, an initiative that could assist in the designation of participants to meetings.

Question 2: *What do you consider to be the greatest challenge(s) and opportunities (real and potential) for your RCP from a substantive and/or operational point of view?*

The responses reflect that challenges and opportunities are dependant on the context and area of focus of each RCP and various responses highlight that different environments necessitate different approaches. Nonetheless, responses also suggest that there are a number of general challenges which several RCPs face, as well as general opportunities that consultative processes across different regions share.

According to several responses, it is challenging for RCPs to define their place among the various international, regional and national mechanisms that deal with migration or migration-related issues.³ This includes foremost defining RCPs' relationship with broader political and economic processes at regional levels. Most responses suggest that RCPs need to ensure their integrity as informal processes that work and function independently from more formalized political processes, while at the same time there is an imperative of taking advantage of synergies with the various economic and political bodies dealing with migration issues. One response takes this further by stating that the efforts of RCPs should ultimately complement the goals and efforts of other regional, inter-regional, and global organizations involved in addressing migration.

Some responses also reflect a concern that the increase of fora and processes on migration-related platforms in which RCP participating States are engaged, in some cases risks duplication and/or contradiction of efforts. It is highlighted that RCPs need to be flexible enough to adapt their agendas and programmes in accordance with changes that occur in the global migration landscape and at the political level and that RCPs need to remain relevant to all participating States. This can be challenging, in particular for RCPs with diverse memberships that have to balance out the often different priorities of participating States.

Other key challenges mentioned in the responses include the mobilization of resources to enhance the regularity of meetings and the insufficient institutional capacities of some RCPs.

Most responses note the informal, confidential and process-orientated character of RCPs which allows for open and continuous discussions on shared objectives. Several responses in this respect suggest that some of the challenges that RCPs face can also be seen as opportunities. Among the great strengths of RCPs identified in the responses is their potential to cover various dimensions of migration and to address challenges through the sharing of information, good practices and experiences. The two-tiered level of engagement for technical and political discussions provided by many RCPs is highlighted as both a comprehensive and practical way to structure interactions in this respect.

³ Also compare the analysis of responses received to question 5.

Question 3: *To what extent is your RCP achieving the goals it has set? Is there concrete follow-up after meetings and, if so, what kinds of actions are taken based on recommendations adopted?*

In response to this question, several goals are mentioned that have been formulated by RCPs. In addition to the overall objective of sharing experiences and practices through regular meetings, these include the facilitation of policy debate, the fostering of research and data collection on issues of regional concern, and the provision of technical assistance to participating States of RCPs. Beyond such general goals and objectives, more specific goals for the various RCPs have been set mostly at ministerial conferences or meetings, while their implementation has been overseen by steering groups in some RCPs.

Responses suggest that RCPs have overall been successful in accomplishing their broader objectives and that RCPs provide effective platforms for dialogue between participating States. However there seems to be agreement that sustaining dialogue on an ongoing basis and translating the outcomes and recommendations of RCP meetings into concrete action have been key challenges for RCPs. Some responses highlight that the establishment of operating modalities providing for functional secretariats and/or the development of regional action or work plans have contributed to rendering RCPs more operational.

Some of the concrete follow-up activities mentioned in the responses also include the development of a regional migration policy framework or specific regional thematic project proposals. In addition, follow-up activities have at times been carried out by participating States (individually or involving two or more participating States), including research studies, labour attaché training and pilot projects on issues of particular concern.

Question 4: *Migration is increasingly prominent on the agendas of regional economic and political organizations such as the EU, AU, ASEAN and MERCOSUR, for example. Should the work of RCPs link up directly with the work of these more formal economic and political bodies? What would be the potential benefits and disadvantages of such an association for your RCP?*

According to the responses, most RCPs have formal or informal links to existing economic and political bodies, but with differing levels of engagement. Several responses seem to suggest that it is necessary to consider in more detail the potential benefits and challenges of establishing linkages between the deliberations of RCPs with the work of these more formal economic and political bodies. According to most responses, links with more formal economic and political bodies have both challenges and opportunities.

One of the challenges acknowledged in almost all responses is that formalized links with economic and political bodies may compromise the informal and non-binding nature of RCPs, not least as the association between RCPs and formal institutions might impact negatively on the circle of trust that participating States enjoy within the confines of the RCP. It is noted that the level of confidentiality that encourages productive problem sharing/solving of potentially sensitive issues as well as the informality and openness of discussion are two of the major characteristics of an RCP, which may not exist in more formal economic and political bodies.

Another challenge cited is that regional blocks tend to be more binding and formal entities than RCPs. Therefore, participating States may be reticent about entering into collaboration or association with RCPs or committing themselves to any serious engagement with RCPs. The binding and formal structures of regional organizations could conflict with RCPs' primary objective to be flexible in their approach and work.

Several responses, however, recognize that a structured interaction between RCPs and formal economic and/ or political bodies could contribute to ensuring that the outcomes of RCP meetings are endorsed and taken further at a more binding political level. Various responses in this respect suggest that regional economic and political bodies possess the political leverage and necessary capacity to support and/or follow-up on RCP outcomes. Interlinkages between RCPs and economic and political organizations may also increase the possibility of obtaining financial support or mobilizing resources for RCP activities.

Question 5: *Some RCPs have noted the difficulty of addressing sensitive migration issues and situations in a multilateral setting, while issues such as counter-trafficking tend to have broad-based support. What is the experience of your RCP in dealing with issues of sensitivity to its Member States? What tools are used to mediate these issues?*

Responses highlight that there are a number of issues including, for example, irregular and mixed migration flows as well as migrants' rights which may be sensitive to discuss in RCP meetings, given the differing views and experiences of participating States on these issues. There is a strong sense in responses that there is no "one-size-fits-all approach" to address such issues – it seems that different RCPs have developed different approaches to addressing sensitive issues. However, three important prerequisites for addressing sensitive issues mentioned in various responses are: 1) a sufficient level of trust among participating States; 2) specific mechanisms to ensure that sensitive issues are discussed in closed circles; and 3) a high level of sensitivity by all participating States not to share sensitive information beyond the informal consultations.

For those who are regularly addressing sensitive issues, the non-binding and informal character of RCPs is highlighted as an important factor to facilitating open discussion on migration-related matters. In some RCPs, sensitive issues have often been discussed at the margins of meetings, including also in bilateral meetings.

However, various responses also suggest that a number of RCPs have avoided addressing sensitive issues, either deliberately and to reduce the risk political tensions arising within the respective RCP(s) or because there is to date a lack of specific tools or mechanisms to address such issues.

Question 6: *To what extent is there an interchange of ideas and information between your RCP and any other one(s)? Does the RCP/do the RCPs to which your country belongs participate in any inter-regional fora dealing with migration issues? If so, which ones?*

- *What has been the nature and outcome of these interactions and what do you see as the value-add?*

It emerges from the responses that most RCPs deem the exchange of ideas and information with other RCPs useful for their own work. Some responses list concrete examples of cooperation between RCPs, including joint meetings and activities by RCPs, as well as invitations to RCP delegates to participate in the meetings of other RCPs or to share information. In addition, IOM's efforts to increase information-sharing between RCPs, including through a dedicated space on the IOM website with information on the principal RCPs, are positively mentioned. Nonetheless, a number of responses also suggest that not all RCPs have in the past had the opportunity to engage in information-sharing exercises between RCPs and that there is room for further improvement. Beyond RCP interaction with other RCPs, it was not clear to what extent individual countries or RCPs are engaged in inter-regional fora (IRF) dealing with migration issues.

Question 7 and Question 8 (merged): *Increasingly, there is interest among States and other actors to look at the possibilities for synergies and complementarities in international fora dealing with cooperation on migration and development, with the aim of supporting dialogue on mutual areas of interest. In this regard:*

- *Do preparatory discussions take place within your RCP to prepare for GFMD conferences with a view to putting forward a common position on a theme of concern to your RCP?*
- *What other topics of interest to your RCP intersect with themes highlighted in fora such as the GFMD, the United Nations High-Level Dialogue (HLD) or other inter-regional fora? Do you see such alignment as desirable and why?*
- *What discussions are taking place within your RCPs or in other national, bilateral or regional consultative fora that you would like to bring to the attention of the Third Global Meeting of RCPs, whose key outcomes will be fed into the HLD preparatory process? (see questionnaire for complete question 8)*

Responses suggest that, since the 2009 global meeting of RCPs in Bangkok, there have been several key developments, including a growing interest among States and other actors to look at the possibilities for synergies and complementarities in international and regional fora dealing with cooperation on migration and development, with the aim of supporting dialogue on mutual areas of interest. However, responses to the questionnaire also recognize that most RCPs have not had dedicated discussions to prepare for GFMD conferences and to bring forward a common position on issues for discussion at the GFMD.

It is, however, highlighted that some RCPs have contributed to the GFMD decentralized approach in 2011 by co-organizing thematic sessions under the GFMD framework, including thematic discussions on migration profiles, migration and development, and irregular migration.

Most responses validate the relevance of the GFMD and the HLD, as State-led, non-binding fora for dialogue on issues relating to migration and development at the international level, highlighting a broad range of potential issues of interest to RCPs which could be (or have already been) further explored at the GFMD and/or could be relevant for the forthcoming 2013 HLD. Amongst the broad range of issues mentioned are the following: brain circulation; labour migration; protection of migrant's rights; the contribution migrants to the development of their country of origin; the issue of mixed migration flows; responses to complex emergencies; climate change and migration/displacement; better management of student mobility; intraregional and inter-regional cooperation and health challenges of migrant workers.

Question 9: *Does your RCP engage civil society organizations (CSOs) in its deliberations? If so, what are the modalities of this engagement? What do you perceive as the challenges and the benefits that can/do accrue from it?*

A number of responses contain examples of RCP engagement with CSOs and there seems to be agreement that different benefits can accrue to RCPs from engaging with civil society. Firstly, CSOs, through their proximity to the grassroots level, may help identify migration challenges and contribute to broadening discussion on challenges experienced at the micro level. Secondly, CSOs may also play an important role in advocating for migrants' rights. Thirdly, CSOs have in the past assisted to deliver on the outcomes of RCPs. With a few notable exceptions, however, responses generally indicated that such engagements have been on an ad hoc basis.

Notwithstanding the potential benefits for RCPs, a number of responses suggest that the engagement of CSOs can be challenging, especially when representatives are from advocacy groups that carry strong opinions and messages contrary to those of governments in the RCP.

Key conclusions

Responses confirm that RCPs are a relevant platform for States' continued dialogue and collaborative engagement on migration. Despite several challenges highlighted in the responses, there seems to be a general sentiment that there is a wealth of opportunity for RCPs to explore and harness. The main conclusions that can be drawn from responses are:

First, dialogue and capacity-building to enhance cooperation on migration needs to happen within and between RCPs, as well as between RCPs and other fora or processes which have a focus on migration. RCPs can play a complementary role to more formal bodies if they remain informal and confidential in nature, thus encouraging more open discussions on migration-related issues.

Second, there is need for a clearer definition of the respective goals and purpose of existing RCPs – and for proposed new forums to identify and evaluate existing fora before undertaking new ones in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts and enhance synergies on cooperation on migration.

Third, a measure of flexibility in responding to emerging issues of concern to participating States is key for all RCPs. Going hand in hand with this is the importance of ensuring that RCP agendas stay relevant to an often diverse membership with differing priorities. A facilitating measure is fostering dialogue on emerging issues between RCP participating governments, international organizations and civil society, and enhanced cross-fertilization with global processes on migration, including foremost the GFMD and the forthcoming HLD.

Annex IV:

Overview of principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)¹ as of November 2011

Region: Europe and the Former Soviet Union / Europe et ex-Union soviétique / Europa y la ex Unión Soviética

RCP: *Söderköping Process / Processus de Söderköping / Proceso Söderköping* (2001)

Governments: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden and Ukraine (Total: 13)

Chair: Sweden through the Swedish Ministry of Justice

Observers and Partners: Partners include the European Commission (EC), International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Swedish Migration Board (SMB).

There are no official observers, though other governments and the EU Presidency participate in various activities on an ad-hoc basis.

The RCP cooperates on a regular basis with the Finnish Ministry of Interior, UK Home Office, European Network of Asylum Reception.

Researchers and NGOs are invited to take part on occasion, and in 2007 a regional NGO network was established to facilitate the participation of civil society in meetings and activities.

Secretariat: Swedish Migration Board / Migrationsverket, www.migrationsverket.se/info/3233_en.html

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The Söderköping Process was launched in 2001 by the SMB, UNHCR and IOM as a regional consultative process to respond to the challenges of the EU enlargement eastwards, and to promote cooperation on asylum, migration and border management related issues among the countries situated along the eastern border of future EU Member States.</p> <p>Based on the strong support and interest of all participating governments for the Process to continue beyond the implementation phase of the project which ended in June 2009, UNHCR, IOM and the SMB proposed a Strategy for the Future of the Process, which paved the way for the transition of the RCP into a government-led process with rotating chairmanship and stronger involvement of the National Coordinators. The Strategy was endorsed by all ten participating governments and in January 2010, Hungary took the role as the first Chair of the Government led cooperation.</p> <p>The Söderköping Process offers an existing and well-functioning comprehensive concept that could be placed under the aegis of the multilateral dimension of the EaP (Platform 1 and through an establishment of a Panel on Asylum and Migration), thus involving all partner countries, EU Member States, the Commission and other relevant EU bodies. This would create an opportunity for the Eastern Partnership to build further on the network, experiences and results achieved within the Söderköping Process, instead of developing new structures for migration dialogue.</p>	<p>The main objective of the Söderköping Process is to support the alignment to international standards of asylum, migration and border management related policies, as well as legislation and practices, of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. This is done by the sharing of best practices and lessons learned in reforming national asylum and migration management systems to align with the EU.</p> <p>The Söderköping Process has a vast experience in facilitating policy dialogue and the exchange of information on a wide array of migration, asylum and border management issues between the participating states.</p>

RCP: *Budapest Process / Processus de Budapest / Proceso de Budapest* (1991)

Governments: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (FYR), Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom and Uzbekistan (Total: 49)

Chair: Turkey

Co-chair: Hungary

Observers and Partners: Australia, Canada and the USA

European Commission (EC), International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC), IOM, UNHCR, UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Council of Europe (CoE), Centre for International Crime Prevention (UN-CICP), SECI Centre, INTERPOL, Regional Centre of the Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative (MARRI), International Labour Office (ILO), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Executive Committee, Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSEC), Europol and FRONTEX

Secretariat: International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), www.icmpd.org

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The Budapest Process is an intergovernmental dialogue engaging close to 50 Governments and more than 10 international organisations, in developing comprehensive and sustainable systems for orderly migration. It provides for information sharing, exchange of experience and discussion on relevant topics.</p> <p>On the basis of recommendations from Ministerial Conferences (1991 Berlin, 1993 Budapest, 1997 Prague and 2003 Rhodes) topics of common concern, have been identified by the senior officials meeting (annual or bi-annual) as well as geographic and thematic priorities. The Secretariat organises working group meetings on identified topics.</p> <p>The following geographic working groups are currently active:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group on the Black Sea Region, chaired by Bulgaria; • Working Group on the Silk Routes Region, chaired by Turkey; and • Working Group on the South Eastern European Region, chaired by Croatia. 	<p>The Budapest Process has developed over phases; the first phase (1993-2003) focused on cooperation with the Central and Eastern European countries, at that time outside the EU framework, as well as with the countries of South-East Europe.</p> <p>As the Central and Eastern European countries became members of the EU, the second phase (2003-2009) brought the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) into the cooperative framework of the Budapest Process and established a durable network to the East.</p> <p>At the 16th senior officials meeting of the Budapest Process on 3 November 2010 in Istanbul, the third phase with a regional approach was endorsed by participating countries.</p> <p>The third phase will have three priority regions and three Working Groups: the South-East European Region; the Black Sea Region; and the Silk Routes Region.</p> <p>On 4 November 2010, the first meeting on the Silk Routes Region was held in Istanbul including representatives from the new partner countries Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, Iraq, Pakistan and Syria. The second meeting of the Silk Routes Working Group was held again in Turkey in June 2011, where the strategic work plan of the WG was adopted and a project on fostering cooperation in the area of migration with and in the Silk Routes Region was endorsed.</p>

RCP: *Puebla Process (RCM) / Processus de Puebla (CRM) / Proceso de Puebla (CRM)* (1996)

Governments: Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and the USA (Total: 11)

Current Presidency Pro-Tempore: Government of the Dominican Republic

Observers and Partners: Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Peru

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), IOM, UNHCR, Central American Integration System (SICA), Inter-American Commission for Human Rights (ICHR), Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB), UNHCR, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants.

The Regional Network for Civil Organizations on Migration (RNCOM) is a coalition of civil society organizations (CSOs) from all 11 RCM Member States. It is neither a member of nor an observer to the RCM but participates in many aspects of the RCM including seminars, workshops, and conferences.

Secretariat: Technical Secretariat (TS)

IOM provides the TS with technical cooperation and administrative support. www.rcmvs.org/

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The three main areas of discussion are migration policy and management; human rights of migrants; migration and development.</p>	<p>The current priorities of the Puebla Process include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study the possibility of establishing links with other cooperation processes in the area of migration and development; • Formulate social development policies linked to migration processes; • Enhance border cooperation; • Promote better understanding of the regional migration phenomenon through a long-term comprehensive approach; • Develop guidelines for the return of unaccompanied migrant minors; • Promote migration and health activities; • Strengthen respect for the human rights of migrants regardless of status with special attention to vulnerable groups such as women and children; • Ensure international protection of refugees; • Enhance cooperation in the return and reintegration of repatriated migrants; • Promote cooperation to combat migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons; • Share best practices in the facilitation of remittance flows; • Undertake activities in the area of “Integration and Insertion of Migrants”.

RCP: *SACM (South American Conference on Migration) / SACM (Conférence sud-américaine sur les migrations) / CSM (Conferencia Sudamericana sobre Migraciones)* (1999)

Governments: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay and Venezuela (Total: 12)

Current Presidency Pro-Tempore: Uruguay (Presidency Pro-Tempore alternates every year between sub-regions, i.e. Southern Cone and Andean)

Observers and Partners: Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland and the USA
 Andean Community of Nations (CAN), ECLAC, ILO, IOM, Latin American Economic System, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UNHCR, groups affiliated with the Catholic Church or defending human rights.

Secretariat: Technical Secretariat (TS)

IOM provides the TS with technical cooperation and administrative support,
www.oimconosur.org/varios/index.php?url=conferencia

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>Governments hold meetings to share views and information on topics including migration and development; diasporas; rights of migrants; integration; information exchange; migration statistics; human trafficking and smuggling.</p> <p>Depending on the needs, a technical preparatory meeting for the Annual Conference takes place two or three months before the Conference.</p>	<p>The current priorities of SACM include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure respect for the human rights of migrants regardless of their status (rejection of the criminalization of irregular status); • Promote discourse on migration in relation to development; • Strengthen dialogue and political coordination among States; • Highlight the value of contributions made by migrants to development in countries of destination; • Highlight the significance of migrants’ contributions to the welfare and cultural enrichment of societies in countries of origin; • Promote the participation of representatives from civil society in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of programmes on migration matters.

RCP: *5 + 5 Dialogue (Regional Ministerial Conference on Migration in the Western Mediterranean) / Dialogue 5+5 (Conférence ministérielle régionale sur la migration en Europe occidentale) / Diálogo 5 + 5 (Conferencia Ministerial del Mediterráneo Occidental sobre Migración)* (2002)

Governments: Algeria, France, Italy, Libya, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Portugal, Spain and Tunisia (Total: 10)

Current President: Malta

Observers and Partners: IOM, ILO and ICMPD

Secretariat: No official secretariat

In the past, IOM has provided technical cooperation and logistical support whenever requested by the relevant Presidency.

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>Informal dialogues are held on an ad hoc basis in which governments cooperate and exchange information and analysis on topics such as migration trends; irregular migration and trafficking in human beings; migration and co-development; the role of diasporas; migrants' rights and obligations; integration; movement of people and regular migration flow management; labour migration and vocational training; migration and health; local cooperation; and gender equality in the context of migration.</p>	<p>The 2008 Evora Conference held in Portugal highlighted the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of as well as need of establishing a coherent and complementary strategy on migration with other regional and international fora; • Need to facilitate and create channels for regular migration for labour purposes; • The importance of measures for enhancing the impact of migration on development in the countries of origin; • Need to establish integration models grounded on the principles of promoting and respecting fundamental human rights. <p>Pursuant to the recommendations adopted at the Evora Conference, Portugal and Tunisia jointly organized an expert workshop on circular migration held in Tunis in February 2009.</p>

RCP: *MTM (Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue) / MTM (Dialogue sur la migration de transit en Méditerranée) / MTM (Diálogo sobre las Migraciones de Tránsito en el Mediterráneo)* (2003)

Governments: Algeria, Cape Verde, Egypt, Ethiopia, EU 27 Member States, Ghana, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal, Switzerland, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey (Total: 45 MTM Partner States)

Chairing depends on the activities carried out.

Observers and Partners: The MTM Dialogue is currently in its fourth phase, entitled “A Dialogue in Action”.

Most of the MTM activities are implemented in consortium with relevant international actors. The current MTM Partner Agencies are: Europol, Frontex, IFAD, Interpol, IOM, UNHCR, and UNODC.

Invited Observers are Australia, Community of Sahel and Saharan States (CEN-SAD), Eurojust, General Secretariat of the European Council, IGC, International Organisation for Peace, Care and Relief (IOPCR), League of Arab States, MARRI, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UNESCWA).

Secretariat: International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), www.icmpd.org

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The MTM development has been articulated around four phases: 2002–2003: Exploratory Phase; 2004–2005: Consolidation Phase; 2006–2008: Project Phase; 2009–ongoing: A Dialogue In Action.</p> <p>The aim of the fourth phase is to implement capacity-building and operational projects encompassing a dialogue component to facilitate dissemination of results at regional level and provide a solid platform to discuss exchange, elaborate recommendations, and agree on future steps and build-up spin-off initiatives. The MTM Dialogue is organized along two pillars.</p> <p>Pillar I aims to address the issues related to irregular and mixed migration. Areas of discussion include irregular migration/ human smuggling as well as trafficking in human beings, asylum and protection; as well as return and readmission.</p> <p>Pillar II addresses medium and long-term issues related to migration and development. Areas of discussion include the mapping of institutional frameworks, capacities and practices of countries of origin and destination in the field of migration and development; and strengthening African and Middle Eastern Diaspora policies for more development, notably through South-South and South-North exchange. Pillar II also promotes cooperation on labour and circular migration.</p> <p>The MTM Secretariat and MTM Partner States also actively participated in other frameworks and ensure dissemination of results and cross-fertilization notably with the 5+5 Dialogue, the Rabat Process, the African-EU MME Partnership, and the EuroMed.</p>	<p>Since 2009, the MTM Secretariat implements the program Linking Emigrant Communities for more development. The first phase 2009-2010 focused on the mapping of the various frameworks and initiatives within which countries of origin operate to build-up relations with their diasporas and to facilitate their role as potential agents of development. This phase, implemented in partnership with IOM resulted in the publication of the Inventory of National Institutional Capacities and Practices. The second phase of this program was launched mid-September 2011 under the title Strengthening African and Middle Eastern Diaspora Policies through South-South Exchange (AMEDIP). Its aim is to translate the results of the previous phase into action through south-south cooperation. Its first step will be to launch National Consultations in all the targeted countries of origin so as to elaborate, based on the information provided by the Inventory, a List of Priorities to be addressed through cooperation with other countries of origin. These cooperation requests will be facilitated through the implementation of the South-South Expert Exchange Mechanism. The dialogue component will be carried out in the form of thematic workshops and expert meetings where the results of these state-to-state exchanges will be shared and discussed. This project will run until 2014.</p> <p>The MTM Secretariat also implements the project Interactive Map on Migration (i-Map) www.imap-migration.org which serves as a platform for exchange of information and portal to access information in the field of irregular and mixed migration and migration and development.</p> <p>In parallel to the i-Map, the MTM Secretariat implements in partnership with the authorities of France, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom the project MTM i-Map Informal ILO Network. The project aims, in partnership with countries of destination Immigration Liaison Officers posted in countries of origin or transit, to support coordination among the local ILOs and cooperation with relevant national authorities of the country where the ILOs are posted. Both the i-Map and i-Map Informal ILO Network projects will run until 2014.</p>

RCP: *MIDWA (Migration Dialogue for West Africa) / MIDWA (Dialogue sur la migration pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest) / MIDWA (Diálogo sobre la Migración para África Occidental)* (2000)

Governments: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo (Total: 15)

Observers and Partners: France and Switzerland.

Conseil des Organisations Non Gouvernementales d'Appui au Développement (CONGAD), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), International Labour Office (ILO), IOM, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Organisation of African Unity (OAU), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA), UNAIDS, UNHCR, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and World Food Programme (WFP)

Secretariat: No official secretariat

Based on the Memorandum of Understanding between IOM and ECOWAS signed in July 2002, IOM provides support to capacity-building activities targeting both ECOWAS institutions and Member States.

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>In December 2000, in cooperation with IOM, the ECOWAS inaugurated a regional consultative process with the major aim of accelerating the regional integration process and addressing problematic migration issues in regional fora. The MIDWA process was specifically designed to encourage the ECOWAS Member States to discuss common migration issues and concerns in a regional context for which immediate solutions may not be forthcoming on a national level.</p> <p>MIDWA addresses five key areas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of peace and stability in West Africa and protection of migrants' rights; • Contribution of men and women migrants to the development of their country of origin; • Alleviating poverty in emigration areas; • Information, sensitization and research into the different aspects of West African international migration; • Intra-regional and inter-regional co-operation. 	<p>On January 18, 2008 ECOWAS adopted a Common Approach on Migration, which should serve as the general framework for MIDWA initiatives. It identifies six key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free movement of persons within the ECOWAS zone; • Management of regular migration; • Combating human trafficking; • Harmonizing policies; • Protection of the rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees; and • Recognizing the gender dimension of migration. <p>ECOWAS Department of Free Movement is currently coordinating the implementation of the ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration.</p>

RCP: *MIDSA (Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa) / MIDSA (Dialogue sur la migration pour l’Afrique australe) / MIDSA (Diálogo sobre la Migración en el África Meridional)* (2000)

Governments: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. (Total: 15 members + 9 observer countries)

Current MIDSA Chair: SADC Chair - Namibia

Observers and Partners: Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (USA) have participated in past MIDSA meetings as observer countries.

Observer institutions that have also been involved in past MIDSA meetings include the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat, SADC Parliamentary Forum, NEPAD, the African Union (AU) Commission, the Southern African Migration Project and relevant UN agencies such as UNHCR, UNDP (depending on the themes of the workshop).

Relevant academics, humanitarian NGOs, legal advocacy groups, faith-based organizations and regional associations are invited to its workshops on an ad-hoc basis.

Secretariat: No official secretariat

IOM provides technical and administrative support. www.migrationdialogue.org/

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>MIDSA focuses on 7 main themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irregular migration; • Migration and development; • Migration and health; • Capacity building in migration management; • Forced migration; • Labour migration; and • Migration policies, legislation and data collection. 	<p>The current priorities of MIDSA are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist SADC governments to respond to the AU Strategic Framework on Migration and AU Common Position on Migration and Development; • Stimulate discussion and debate on the implications of ratifying the SADC Draft Protocol on the Facilitation of Movement; and • Assist governments to participate in global debates about migration and development e.g. Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM); UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development; and Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). <p>The first MIDSA ministerial conference ‘Managing Migration through Regional Cooperation’ took place in November 2010. Recommendations generated from the meeting included agreements on strengthening coordination among SADC States on managing migration, encouraging the ratification of the Protocol for the facilitation of free movements of persons in SADC countries, promoting labour mobility raising public awareness regarding the risks of irregular migration and engaging diasporas in national development strategies.</p>

RCP: *IGAD-RCP (Inter-governmental Authority on Development - Regional Consultative Process on Migration) / IGAD-RCP (Processus consultatif régional de l’Autorité intergouvernementale pour le développement pour la migration) / RCP IGAD (Proceso Consultivo Regional sobre Migración IGAD (Autoridad Intergubernamental para el Desarrollo))* (2008)

Governments: Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda (i.e. IGAD Member States) (Total: 6)

(Eritrea temporarily suspended its membership)

Observers and Partners: African Union (AU) Commission, IOM and the members of the IGAD Partners Forum (Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, European Commission, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank), and other partners, notably:

- Transit countries: Chad, Egypt, Libya, Niger, Tunisia and Yemen
- Other Regional Economic Communities (RECs) including ECOWAS, EAC, SADC, ECCAS, CENSAD
- Relevant NGOs, UN Agencies and IGOs on ad hoc basis (depending on the themes of the Consultations)

Secretariat: IGAD Secretariat in collaboration with the AU Commission and IOM.

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>IGAD-RCP aims to facilitate dialogue and regional co-operation in migration management amongst IGAD Member States by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fostering greater understanding and policy coherence in migration; • Strengthening regional institutional and technical capacities to implement the Migration Policy Framework for Africa; and • Improving inter-state and intra-regional cooperation on migration management among countries of origin, transit and destination. <p>14 priority areas identified by experts which the IGAD-RCP will be responsible for are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration and development • Labour migration • Social integration of migrants, • Protection of migrants’ rights, • Smuggling and trafficking in persons, • Migration data and research, • Migration and health, • Migration and trade, • Migration and environment, • Migration and security, • Voluntary return of migrants, • Mixed migratory flows and protection of refugees, • Movement of pastoralist communities, and • Brain drain and unethical recruitment. 	<p>In addition to the establishment of mechanisms for continuous dialogue and co-operation among IGAD Member States on migration and related issues, the identified priority areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation and capacity building; • Information collection, dissemination and sharing; • Enhance dialogue and cooperation between the IGAD Member States and countries of other regions; and • Progress toward formulation and harmonization at the national and IGAD level of legislation, policies and practices in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal/labour migration management; - Irregular migration, trafficking and smuggling, - Border management; and - Migration and development matters.

RCP: *Colombo Process (Ministerial Consultation on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin in Asia) / Processus de Colombo (Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'œuvre contractuelle pour les pays d'origine en Asie) / Proceso de Colombo (Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen en Asia)* (2003)

Governments: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam (Total: 11)

Current Chair: Bangladesh

Observers and Partners: The 2003 Ministerial Consultations had no observers. In 2004, the only observer was Afghanistan (which subsequently officially joined the grouping in 2005).

In 2005, the following countries were invited as observers: Bahrain, Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

Several organizations were also invited as observers: Asian Development Bank (ADB); Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); Department for International Development UK (DFID); EC; Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC); ILO; United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the World Bank.

Secretariat: IOM provides technical support to the process since its inception in 2003 and serves as its Secretariat. www.colomboprocess.org

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The Colombo Process has three thematic foci:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of and Provision of Services to Overseas Temporary Contractual Workers. In particular, protecting these workers from abusive practices in recruitment and employment, and providing them appropriate services in terms of pre-departure information and orientation and welfare provisions; • Optimizing Benefits of Organized Labour Mobility. This includes the development of new overseas employment markets, increasing remittance flows through formal channels and enhancing the development impact of remittances; and • Capacity Building, Data Collection and Inter-State Cooperation. This includes institutional capacity building and information exchange to meet labour mobility challenges; increasing cooperation with destination countries in the protection of overseas temporary contractual workers and access to labour markets; and enhancing cooperation among countries of origin. 	<p>The Colombo Process has had Ministerial Consultations in 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2011.</p> <p>The Ministerial Consultations in Bali in 2005 set forth action-oriented recommendations relating to the welfare of overseas workers and support services. Recommendations were also made to optimize the benefits of organized overseas employment and cooperation on managed labour mobility between countries of origin and destination. Pursuant to these recommendations and with funding from the European Commission's AENEAS programme, the Colombo Process has undertaken activities in working with governments and private institutions to enhance national capacity and to establish linkages among countries to better facilitate legal labour mobility; the dissemination of information to potential overseas temporary contractual workers regarding legal labour opportunities and procedures and the risks of irregular mobility in order to ensure that these potential workers make informed decisions; and in fostering regional cooperation efforts among major Asian labour source countries and with major countries of destination in promoting legal labour mobility channels and opportunities and thus reducing irregular movements.</p> <p>The Fourth Colombo Process Ministerial Consultations were held in Dhaka, Bangladesh from 19-21 April 2011 under the theme Migration with Dignity. The meeting resulted in the adoption of a Dhaka Declaration as well as Operating Modalities for the Colombo Process. An IOM study on Labour Migration from Colombo Process Countries: Good Practices, Challenges and Ways Forward was also discussed and endorsed at the Ministerial Meeting.</p>

RCP: *Abu Dhabi Dialogue (Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin and Destination in Asia) / Dialogue d'Abou Dhabi (Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'œuvre contractuelle intéressant les pays d'origine et de destination en Asie) / Diálogo de Abu Dhabi (Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen y destino en Asia)* (2008)

Governments: 11 Colombo Process countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam)

9 Asian destination countries (Bahrain, Kuwait, Malaysia, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, United Arab Emirates and Yemen) (Total: 20)

Observers and Partners: France, Germany, Japan, US, Mauritius, Republic of Korea, Poland and EC

Secretariat: Joint Secretariat provided by the Executive Bureau of the Council of Ministers of Labour of the Gulf Cooperation countries (EB) and IOM.

IOM provides support at technical and expert level.

www.colomboprocess.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46&Itemid=29

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The concrete output of the Abu Dhabi Dialogue is the Abu Dhabi Declaration, which defines a new collaborative approach, forward-looking and action-oriented, to better address issues of temporary contractual labour mobility and to optimize its benefits for the development of both countries of origin and destination as well as the workers themselves.</p> <p>Participating States identified the following four key partnerships through which they wish to foster information sharing, promote capacity building, technical cooperation and interstate cooperation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing knowledge in the areas of: labour market trends, skills profiles, temporary contractual workers and remittances policies and flows and their interplay with development in the region; • Building capacity for effective matching of labour demand and supply; • Preventing illegal recruitment practices and promoting welfare and protection measures for contractual workers, supportive of their well-being and preventing their exploitation at origin and destination; and • Developing a framework for a comprehensive approach to managing the entire cycle of temporary contractual mobility that fosters the mutual interests of countries of origin and destination. 	<p>The priorities of the ADD include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the roles and responsibilities of all actors (governmental and private) at each stage of the contractual work cycle (from recruitment to preparation to movement to work in a host country to return and reintegration) to ensure safe, protected and beneficial labour mobility. • Elaboration of concrete projects activities (“practical outcomes” and related plan of action) to realize these partnerships. • Elaboration of a regional multilateral framework on temporary contractual labour mobility. <p>The next ministerial conference will take place from 17-19 April 2012 in Manila, Philippines.</p>

RCP: *APC (Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants) / APC (Consultations intergouvernementales Asie-Pacifique sur les réfugiés, les personnes déplacées et les migrants) / APC (Consultas intergubernamentales de Asia y el Pacífico sobre refugiados, desplazados y migrantes)* (1996)

Governments: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Fiji, Hong Kong SAR*, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Laos, Macau SAR*, Malaysia, Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Caledonia (France), New Zealand (until 2003), Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu and Viet Nam (Total: 32 + Hong Kong SAR and Macau SAR)

*Special Administrative Region of China

Current Chair: Samoa

Observers and Partners: IOM, UNHCR, Pacific Immigration Directors' Conference (PIDC) Secretariat (The United Nations Inter-agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (UNIAP) participated in the 8th Plenary of the APC in 2003 based on the agreement of that plenary)

Secretariat: A permanent Secretariat established in January 2007 offers operational and administrative support to the Coordinator appointed by the Chair.

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>APC was established in 1996 to provide a forum for the discussion of issues relating to population movements, including refugees, displaced or trafficked persons and migrants. Its aim is to promote dialogue and explore opportunities for greater regional cooperation.</p>	<p>Recent APC activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sub-regional workshop on the implementation of refugee legislation in the Pacific (20-21 November 2008); • A regional workshop on refugee status determination (10 March 2009). • There are presently no planned activities.

Others: Like-minded States (IGC); Thematically-organized (Bali Process) /
 Autres: Etats de même sensibilité (IGC); classement thématique (Processus de Bali) /
 Otros: Estados afines (IGC); organizado por temas (Proceso de Bali)

RCP: *Bali Process (Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime) / Processus de Bali (Processus de Bali sur le trafic de migrants, la traite des êtres humains et la criminalité internationale qui s’y rapporte) / Proceso de Bali (Conferencia sobre el contrabando y la trata de personas y el crimen transnacional conexo) (2002)*

Governments: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, DPR of Korea, Fiji, France (New Caledonia), Hong Kong SAR*, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Laos PDR, Macau SAR*, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, United States, Vanuatu, Viet Nam (Total: 41 + Hong Kong SAR and Macau SAR) Special Administrative Region of China

Co- Chairs: Australia and Indonesia

Thematic coordinators:

- Policy Issues and Legal Frameworks: New Zealand;
- Policy Issues and Law Enforcement: Thailand

IOM and UNHCR have participant status.

Observers and Partners: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK; Asian Development Bank (ADB), APC Secretariat, EC, ICMPD, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), IGC Secretariat, ILO, INTERPOL, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and World Bank

Secretariat: Monitoring and implementation of related activities and initiatives of the Process are guided by a steering group composed of the governments of Australia, Indonesia, New Zealand, Thailand as well as IOM and UNHCR. www.baliprocess.net

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The overarching objective of the Bali Process is to encourage and facilitate regional cooperation in addressing the transnational crimes of people smuggling and trafficking in persons, including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of more effective information and intelligence sharing - member country Ministers at the two initial Ministerial Conferences and reaffirmed at the third and fourth Ministerial Conferences held in April 2009 and March 2011, respectively; • Improved cooperation among regional law enforcement agencies to deter/ combat people smuggling and trafficking networks; • Enhanced cooperation on border and visa systems to detect and prevent illegal movements; • Increased public awareness in order to discourage these activities and warn those susceptible; • Enhanced effectiveness of return as a strategy to deter people smuggling and trafficking; • Cooperation in verifying the identity and nationality of illegal migrants and trafficking victims; • Enactment of national legislation to criminalize people smuggling and trafficking in persons; • Provision of appropriate protection and assistance to the victims of trafficking, particularly women and children; • Enhanced focus on tackling the root causes of illegal migration; • Assisting countries to adopt best practices in asylum management, in accordance with the principles of the Refugee Convention; and • Advancing the implementation of an inclusive non-binding regional cooperation framework under which interested parties can cooperate more effectively to reduce irregular movement through the region. 	<p>The current thematic priorities remain the strengthening of regional policy and law enforcement cooperation to combat trafficking and smuggling in all its forms, including maritime ventures, which put the lives of those being smuggled or trafficked at very considerable risk.</p> <p>At the most recent Ministerial Conference in 2011, ministers endorsed a Regional Cooperation Framework under which bilateral and sub-regional arrangements to address irregular migration could be implemented. This framework recognized that while law enforcement of border measures are important they are not enough and it is important to consider the protection and asylum aspects of irregular flows.</p> <p>The Ad Hoc Group’s priority is to operationalize the RCF at the sub-regional level, including through the establishment of a Regional Support Office to be based in Bangkok, Thailand.</p>

RCP: *IGC (Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees) / IGC (Consultations intergouvernementales sur les politiques concernant l'asile, les réfugiés et la migration) / IGC (Consultas Intergubernamentales sobre Asilo, Refugiados y Políticas de Migración)* (1985)

Governments: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the USA (Total: 17)

Current Chair: Germany

Observers and Partners: IOM, UNHCR and EC

Secretariat: IGC Secretariat. www.igc.ch

Main areas of discussion	Current priorities
<p>The major focus of discussions in the IGC from 1985-1992 was asylum; from 1992 the focus shifted to enforcement: inter alia, return, smuggling, and technology.</p> <p>In 2001, the IGC held its first meeting on immigration and since has also focused on specific aspects of immigration and integration, including security and migration, legal and illegal migration, labour migration, and circular migration.</p> <p>Each Chair identifies a theme for the duration of its year-long Chair and holds a specific workshop on it; Ireland identified “Designing Effective Immigration Systems” as its theme for 2006/2007, which reflects the growing interest among IGC States in immigration/integration issues. Sweden’s theme for its Chair (2007/2008) was “Circular Migration”. The theme of the Chair Switzerland (2008/2009) was “Skilled Labour Migration: Opportunities for National and International Cooperation”. The theme of the USA (2010/2011) is “Humanitarian Responses to Crisis with Migration Consequences”.</p> <p>The 2011/2012 theme of the German Chair is “Motives for Migration”.</p>	<p>Since 2005, following a strategic review, IGC has three core activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asylum/refugees; • Admission, control and enforcement and; • Immigration and integration. <p>There is a growing emphasis in IGC States on immigration and integration following a reduction in asylum numbers and the rising importance of these other topics.</p> <p>IGC currently has standing working groups on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asylum/ refugees; • Immigration; • Integration; and • Admission, control and enforcement <p>There are crosscutting working groups on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology; and • Country of origin information. <p>Another crosscutting working group on Data meets on an ad hoc basis, as required.</p>

N.B. The following information has been compiled and updated thanks to the assistance of the RCP secretariats where they exist and/or staff of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) involved in supporting the RCPs. As an overview, by its nature it is not intended to be exhaustive. However, it would benefit from additional input and further review in order to make it more complete and accurate. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and encouraged, and should be sent to Tim Howe at IOM (by e-mail to thowe@iom.int or by fax to +41 22 717 9487), to be incorporated into future versions.

Endnote:

¹ Two of the RCPs covered in this matrix are not organized geographically and appear at the end of this matrix. Although not included in this matrix, other regional groups on migration exist, of various types. Examples include the Cluster Process, the MARRI (Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative) Regional Forum, the Central American Commission of Migration Directors - Comisión Centroamericana de Directores de Migración (OCAM), the Pacific Immigration Directors Conference (PIDC) and the Joint Consultations on Migration (JCMs). This matrix is based on a matrix prepared by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Global Commission for International Migration (GCIM) in connection with a joint IOM-GCIM workshop on Regional Consultative Processes on Migration, held in Geneva from 14-15 April 2005. It has been updated by IOM for the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Brussels on 9-11 July 2007, for the GFMD in Manila on 27-30 October 2008, and for IOM’s Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF) session on 11-12 May 2009, based on the IOM Member States’ decision to discuss IOM’s role in supporting RCPs at this session.

