

## MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

### EUROPEAN MIGRATION NETWORK, NORWAY CONFERENCE IN OSLO 18 JUNE 2012, HOTEL BRISTOL

Conference report by Marie Kvamme

The conference was opened by moderator **Jan Paul Brekke** from EMN Norway, who welcomed all participants on behalf of the three members of the Norwegian EMN contact point: the Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration and the Institute for Social Research.

**Pål K. Lønseth**, State Secretary at the Norwegian Ministry of Justice and Public Security, gave the conference's opening speech. Lønseth said Norway is closely connected to European developments on the area of migration through our participation in the Dublin and Schengen cooperation. He also highlighted that Norway's participation in EMN complements these ties, and that EMN reports have been useful in policy making.

Lønseth submitted that Norwegian policy and practice is to a great extent already harmonised with that of other European countries, and that he is looking forward to an even stronger cooperation. Migration is increasing, and both governments and researchers have been studying why people migrate, and how these processes can be managed. The clear pattern is that migration goes from developing to developed countries. Lønseth continued by pointing out that the most vulnerable persons do not possess the means to travel and migrate, which is in most cases costly.

It was highlighted that for many developing countries, migrants are significant contributors to the economy, and that circular migration can ensure the need for extra workers is satisfied in developed countries. Further, Lønseth said it is essential to create arenas for cooperation between developing and developed countries. He referred to the report of the Global Commission on International Migration published in 2005, and said one of its outcomes was the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). Norway supports the work of the GFMD, and has followed developments on the European and international levels closely.

Lønseth further mentioned that the Norwegian Government recently presented its white paper on displaced children, where the intention has been to look at this theme in a broad context. One of the issues in the white paper are safeguards in the asylum procedure, another issue is reintegration in countries of origin. Lønseth underlined that it is essential to protect children's rights both at national and international levels.

Despite international initiatives with regard to migration and development, it has proved challenging to agree on the way ahead. It appears difficult to maintain the momentum from just a few years ago. Lønseth suggested one explanation for this may be a gap in expectations on the part of developing and developed countries, respectively. Developing countries have expectations about visa free travels and labour migration quotas, whereas the developed countries' focus is on return.

The next presentation was given by Juris Doctor **Vigdís Vevstad**, representing EMN Norway, who introduced the conference topic. Vevstad started out by highlighting that people have been on the move throughout history, and that this is still the case today. With reference to current statistics, she showed that approximately 214 million people or 3 % of the world's population live outside their countries of origin. Further, most migrants move for other reasons than persecution or generalized violence, notably, the overall driving force is work. Today, migration flows take place both from south to north, east to west and south to south. Those who can afford to move far away have a better chance of earning more.

Vevstad underlined that migration can be beneficial both to sending and receiving countries, and to migrants themselves. She then asked the question how we can measure such benefits from migration. Statistics from 2010 show that 440 billion dollars were sent to home countries that year. Such transferred money can have great positive effects, for example when invested in education or business. Apart from money, migrants also ensure skills are transferred, such as experiences with the rule of law and democratic ideas.

On the other hand, it was also indicated that problems arise from migration, for example that poor countries lose important resources unless migrants return home, also known as brain drain. However, when migrants return, this implies a brain gain. Vevstad said it is therefore crucial that migrants are given incentives to return after having acquired experience and education abroad. Another measure to increase benefits for developing countries from migration is to facilitate remittances.

Vevstad stated that the Norwegian participation in the European Migration Network and in the Academic Network for legal Studies on Immigration and Asylum in Europe (the Odysseus network) brings Norway closer to its European neighbours. Further, she said a strengthened academic approach to migration issues is a prerequisite for an enhanced policy approach. However, it was also warned that any lack of facts or evidence should not be an excuse for inaction on the area of migration policy.

Vevstad reminded that powerful actors do exist on the international arena, such as the GFMD and the High-level Dialogue scheduled for 2013. In preparing for these events, she said, it is important to hear the perspectives of the EU, and from sending and receiving countries here on the conference. She pointed to the fact that while Norway is currently a receiving State, this was different not long ago. She also emphasised the importance for the conference discussion that a high level representative from a sending country was present to speak about the perspective of an important sending country, the Philippines.

Two specific topics were highlighted as particularly central for the conference: Remittances, and the issue of readmission linked to development assistance. Vevstad said the short-term aim of the conference organizers was to bring together actors from abroad and from within Norway, for an exchange of ideas and experiences. The long-term aim was to have contributed to not staying inactive, but to trigger a sense of responsibility at the national, regional and global level.

Next speaker was Dr. **Nicola Piper** from Freiburg University, who lectured on the topic *A Comprehensive Approach: Global, Regional and National Challenges and Solutions*. Piper said her presentation had two objectives. Firstly, to make an analytical link between the concepts of development, mobility and rights, referred to as the DMR nexus. Secondly, to relate this nexus to the world of work and employment.

On the first point, Piper stressed that development, mobility and rights are not always discussed together, in a consistent manner. However, she said, this is essential in order to bring the rights approach into the discussion. Further, these issues must be related to work, as migration is changing the world of employment. Piper employed the term “mobility” instead of “migration”, proposing that the former is more useful in the era of globalization.

The presentation next turned to some reflections on the history of the topic migration and development. Piper showed this subject was heavily discussed in the 1960s and 1970s. Before the 1990s, migration was treated within a human rights framework, culminating in the 1990 UN Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers. Post 1990, focus shifted to emphasise linkages between migration and development. Important developments in this regard were the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, which in Chapter X of its programme of action referred to migration within a development framework.

Further significant steps were the Global Commission on International Migration set up in 2003, the appointment of Peter Sutherland as Special Representative of the Secretary General on migration and development in 2006, the 2006 UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, and the since 2006 annually held GFMD.

Piper submitted that GFMD has become the primary forum for inter-governmental discussions about migration and development policy on the global level. She said human rights are not completely absent from this process. However, they tend to be mentioned only in a footnote, and migrants’ rights have almost disappeared from the intergovernmental discourse at the highest level.

It was indicated that two main discourses can be traced at the global level. Firstly, one directed at migration management and legal control. Secondly, what can be termed the “migration-development nexus”, where in particular remittances have been a subject of discussion. Piper suggested that one reason for this was that this is an activity that can easily be measured. In addition to these two topics, she framed a rights based approach as a third current theme of concern on the global level, highlighted by actors such as UN experts, trade unions and migrants’ associations. The aim of this approach is to remind countries of their human

rights obligations towards migrants.

Piper next underlined that migration does not only mean South to North migration, which was estimated by the UNDP in 2009 to comprise only approximately one third of all migration. A recent trend within Europe has been migration from the countries particularly affected by the financial crisis, such as Ireland or Spain. Migration includes different situations, including irregular, permanent, short-term rotating and temporary migration.

It was emphasised that important issues as regards migration and employment includes that many who end up in low skilled jobs are not not-skilled, known as brain waste or de-skilling. In this regard, recognition of education taken abroad is an important issue. Piper suggested that one of the most significant violations of migrants' rights concerns non-payment of wages, late payment or underpayment. She said this is detrimental both to development and to the migrant's own development. She further highlighted that costs of migration often gain too little attention, costs both in financial terms and in terms of split families, for example women leaving young children behind.

In relation to rights, Piper said the approach often is to focus on the most vulnerable migrants, such as children or victims of trafficking. While these are important issues, such persons are not the only migrants whose rights are being abused. Notably, a pertinent concern is abuse of migrants' rights at the workplace. Piper next turned to look at the implications migration has on the world of work. She pointed out that worker recruitment has become institutionalised in the form of bilateral agreements, memorandums of understanding (MOUs) and regional mobility regimes. Rights almost never appear in these various agreements. Further, workers are not, or to a limited extent, included in the welfare schemes of the countries of migration.

In sum, Piper stressed that migrants are subjected to violations relating to modern forms of slavery and lacking payment, discrimination in the form of non-recognition of skills, criminalisation in the form of illegal status and the social costs of being far away from family. These challenges are due to a rights deficit in current policy making, where such issues are not addressed properly.

Turning to the issue of regional mechanisms for advancing the rights of migrants, Piper presented an Inter-American Commission on Human Rights ruling from 2002, which was groundbreaking in finding that all migrants are covered by the principle of equality. In effect, a person retains his or her rights at work, as a worker, regardless of whether the person is legally in a country or not.

In her concluding remarks, Piper said the DMR nexus has three core aspects, including mobility rights (freedom of movement), the right to work and also rights *in* work. She underlined that the concept of decent work is central, as addressed in the newly adopted ILO Convention no. 189 on Decent Work for Domestic Workers (2011). The reason this is central for migrants is that they are highly represented among domestic workers. In a global perspective, Piper advocated for a strengthening of the ILO, for example through State ratifications of the said Convention 189. On a national level, she said States should ensure core labour standards are complied with, and are made part of national law. Further, social clauses should be included in regional charters and in bilateral labour agreements.

After the presentations, the floor was opened for questions to Nicola Piper.

Jan Paul Brekke asked what was the difference between the migration and development debate before and at present. To this, Piper said the major difference, starting in the early 2000s, is how the debate is now shaped in more positive terms. Migrants are recurrently celebrated as agents of development, which can be seen as linked to the neo-liberal paradigm with its focus on individual responsibility.

Among other questions was one from Eivind Hoffmann (the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration), who asked whether a strengthening of the ILO and its instruments is feasible. Piper replied that this is enormously difficult, which is why the social movement level is so important. Strengthening the ILO will take a long time. The ILO is also in need of reform, and more countries must become members. Concurrently, we must acknowledge the successes, such as the Domestic Workers Convention.

The next lecturer was **Imelda Nicolas**, Cabinet-level Secretary and Chairperson of the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO), who presented the topic *From a Major Source Country: Updates on the Philippines' Migration Management Structure and Programs*. Nicolas first pointed to the fact that the Philippines is the world's third largest source of migrants, after China and India. 2010 numbers show that approximately 9,45 million Filipinos live overseas. They migrate for a variety of reasons, including family, work, business, education and, especially in the 1970s, also for political reasons. The high number of migrants has resulted in a substantial amount of remittances to the Philippines, constituting 10,7 per cent of GDP in 2010. Concurrently, Nicolas highlighted that high migration comes with a substantial social cost, including brain drain, split families, children left without parental care and dependency on remittances.

Nicolas said the obligation to protect overseas workers is established in the Philippine Constitution. Further, protection of Filipinos abroad is one of the three Pillars of Foreign Policy in the Philippines. Accordingly, many government agencies work on these issues. One example presented by Nicolas was the Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers' Affairs, which is a central agency for providing services to Filipinos abroad, such as legal or medical assistance. Among other agencies, she also mentioned the recently created National Reintegration Centre for Overseas Filipino Workers, which has the purpose of offering reintegration support to returnees. Another office is the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration, which among other things was involved in evacuating Filipinos who were forced to return to the Philippines during the Arab spring. Nicolas further highlighted the importance of an information seminar, which is mandatory for Filipino workers leaving the country to work abroad. The seminar has the purpose of preparing the workers for different aspects of the migrant experience, ranging from practical tips to information on working contracts.

Next, Nicolas presented the CFO, which has the mandate of promoting the interests of Filipinos abroad, in addition to the objective of maintaining their links with the Philippines. Among the Commission's activities are orientation seminars directed at Filipinos destined to leave the country, with different programmes for different categories of migrants. For example, the Commission provides a specialized programme for youth based on peer counselling. Another example is a mandatory programme for fiancés and spouses of foreign nationals, which is an important measure to combat human trafficking in the guise of marriage. The CFO also organises a distinct pre departure orientation programme for Europe bound au pairs, installed as part of the process towards the lifting of the general ban on au pairs in May 2012.

Nicolas said the Philippine Government's commitment to ensure the welfare of Filipinos abroad is reflected in various national legislations. The CFO has also contributed to the inclusion of 60 migration related provisions in the Philippine Development Plan for the years 2011 to 2016. One project aims at leveraging overseas Filipinos' remittances for local economic development through social enterprises, cooperatives, rural banks and micro-finance institutions, in cooperation with the local government level.

Among several other initiatives presented was a financial literacy program for overseas Filipinos, conducted by the CFO in cooperation with other actors. Nicolas also highlighted a recently installed program aimed at raising 2nd and 3rd generations of overseas Filipinos knowledge and appreciation of Philippine culture.

Turning to look at remaining challenges, Nicolas stated that migration and development remain distinct policy areas, which means coordination between different institutions is still a challenge. Further, the Philippines hopes to be able to create a databank on migration and development, which would improve the prospects for evidence-based policy formation. Lastly, Nicolas highlighted the challenge that local governments perceive migration and development to be the responsibility of the national government. A new project under way aims at integrating migration and development also at the local level.

Subsequent speaker was **Jørgen Carling**, Research Director and Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), whose presentation was entitled *Remittances between integration, transnationalism and development*. Carling said his lecture would focus on why remittances are interesting, and on what results research from PRIO has arrived at. He is leading a research project on remittances from migrants in Norway, which focuses on two groups of migrants – Somalis and Pakistanis.

Carling related remittances to the three other terms in the lecture title. Firstly, remittances can be analysed in light of migrants' integration. Norway has a large group of Pakistani immigrants, ca. 18 000 persons living in Norway were born in Pakistan. Integration is one way of describing their relationship to other persons in Norway.

Turning to the term transnationalism, Carling said remittances constitute a transnational practice, and concerns how migrants in Norway relate actively to people in Pakistan. He emphasised that remittances as transnational practice can be about a commitment to roots, identity, family, politics or property abroad. While remittances exist in parallel to other ways of relating to home countries, remittances are a key element in migrants' connections with their countries of origin. Persons who send money make a sacrifice, and remittances therefore say something about these persons' commitments to the relationship. From the perspective of Pakistan, what can be analysed is how remittances influence social development in a broader sense. Ethnographically, the moral dimension is also very important, that people feel obliged to contribute and to send money.

Carling continued by discussing the perspective of change in remittances over time. In Norway, migrants from Pakistan were initially workers, who sent money back to their families. As also close family members came to Norway, remittances were instead sent to other relatives. However, if a person no longer had any obvious receivers of remittances, the tendency would often be that he or she instead would invest in property in the country of origin. Carling stressed that transfer of money should not only be perceived as a financial remittance, as such transfers also maintain and change the relationships between persons.

Next, focus was turned to the issue of connections between remittances and integration. Carling said suspicions had been surrounding remittances in Norway, suspicions that were primarily linked to transfer mechanisms. When the PRIO research project started up, there were only two service providers in Norway, because of restrictive legislation, whereas Sweden had several thousands. This meant sending money was expensive, and that providers could not offer transfers to all places, which forced people to resort to illegal services to be able to support their families. Today this has changed, and there are now many different operators.

Regarding the question whether remittances have influenced development, it was highlighted that in comparison with aid, remittances outnumber official aid in terms of numbers. However, Carling said the question is overwhelmingly complex, and that it be analysed from the perspectives of short-term, long-term, family and society at large development. Carling stated that as a micro level mechanism, the fact that remittances go into households is important. Further, even when no money is sent, if families know they have a safety net, this is positive for the economy. The reason is that families can take a little more risk and invest a little more if they know someone can be contacted and send money, if the family loses everything.

Carling further highlighted that we have now had a decade of hope and enthusiasm about migration. However, international migration remains the elephant in the room in international affairs. The issue is not talked about on the global level the same way as trade, even though migration shapes global society. He also said the approach of migration and development has been a relief for the debate. It made it possible to talk about migration without really talking about migration.

It was showed that three "R's" is one way to describe the links between migration and development outcomes: Recruitment, remittances and return. Carling said that if well managed, both the country of origin, the individual and the country of destination could benefit from migration. As regards recruitment, there can be different winners and losers. If a skilled worker is lost, maybe the country of origin loses. However, if the person who migrates is a drug dealer, the country of origin may be happy he leaves. On a personal level, migration is often a good opportunity for the migrant. As concerns remittances, the country of origin is the most obvious winner. On the personal level, the migrant might experience pressure to remit. For the country of destination, remittances do not make much of a difference. Hence, remittances are a less conflictual issue on the migration and development agenda. As regards return, many different scenarios can be envisaged. One possibility is that a return agreement is made with a country of origin in exchange of aid. Here, the migrant is the loser.

Carling then turned to a presentation of findings from the PRIO research project. A first question concerned who remits, and he said different background factors might influence the decision to remit or not. Examples are attachment to country of origin, attachment to country of destination, financial situation, employment, and individual characteristics such as age. Another background factor, which proved decisive, was country of origin, as enormous differences were found between different countries: While two thirds of Somalis send remittances at least once a year, only one third of Pakistanis do. Moreover, when comparing persons who are equal as regards the factors listed above, the finding is that Somalis are five times more likely to remit than Pakistanis. Carling indicated that this is one of the substantial findings of the research project.

Other findings included that for Somalis, the financial situation of a household, and whether it struggled to make ends meet, was not determinative for their propensity to remit. However, what did make a difference was whether household members had employment or not. Carling suggested as explanations for these findings that there are urgent needs in Somalia, meaning that households in Norway will remit even if they do not themselves have much. Further, if an urgency happens in Somalia, people there are more likely to call relatives who are working, to ask for help, which is why the employment situation influences a person's likeliness to remit. As for Pakistanis, a different tendency was found: What did matter was the financial situation of the household. Also, remittances were to a greater extent linked to tradition and culture, and seen as a good and moral thing to do.

In conclusion, Carling stated that remittances are interesting not only because of their financial importance but also on account of what they tell us about migration and development.

The audience was invited to ask questions to Imelda Nicolas and Jørgen Carling.

Carling was given the question what would be good advice to other countries as regards reintegration measures. To this, Carling answered that long-term integration is a challenge. For example, if someone receives training before moving back to their country of origin, as part of the preparation before the return, it is essential that this training give the person skills that are needed in the country of origin.

Another question regarded whether the PRIO research project had considered those who never remitted. It was answered that two thirds of Pakistanis do not remit once a year. Further, Carling highlighted that the same way people should have a real choice whether to migrate or to stay in their country of origin, people should also be allowed to choose whether to remit or not. We should not demand from migrants that they remit.

In another question it was pointed out that sending remittances is a private activity, and asked what the role of the State can be. Carling answered that we can only promote remittances as a channel for development. He also underlined that a great part of the money transferred is used to pay debts, because migrating is expensive. Governments should not steer, but maybe encourage how remittances should be used.

Questions asked to Nicolas included whether the Philippine Government actively encourages migration, and if yes, whether it was a positive thing that a government encourages its citizens to leave their home country. She answered that the Government is definitely not encouraging migration. However, they recognize the reality of migration and the right of people to move.

The pursuant speech was given by **Malin Frankenhaeuser** from the International Centre for Migration Policy Development, who presented the topic *Current Trends in view of the UN High Level Dialogue*. Frankenhaeuser first gave an overview of what has been going on, on the global level, as concerns migration and development. She highlighted the first UN High-level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2006, which was the first time a high-level event devoted exclusively to international migration had been organised by the General Assembly. The second high-level dialogue will take place in September 2013.

Frankenhaeuser said one outcome from 2006 was the creation of the GFMD. The GFMD is not an organisation, but an informal and non-binding process, with the central theme *Enhancing the human development of migrants and their contribution to the development of communities and states*. Civil society organisations are invited to hold parallel meetings some days before government conferences, and to share their deliberations with States. An assessment of the GFMD is currently on going to see what it has achieved. One of the findings is that States are satisfied with the GFMD to a great extent, or somewhat satisfied. Many governments also report that the GFMD has helped bringing migration to a high policy level nationally.

It was also highlighted that the fact that the GFMD is an informal process where governments can speak about controversial questions, is something many countries are satisfied with. Frankenhaeuser added however, that some countries would have wanted a more formal system, and that migration could be a part of the UN system. Among the challenges with the GFMD are that unless you are an active government, you

are not really steering the process. Frankenhaeuser said the EU as such is not very active. She also mentioned as a further challenge that few governments spend money on the GFMD, although it is not an expensive process to finance. It is, moreover, difficult to find governments who are willing to host the forum because of the costs. Based on this, Frankenhaeuser said, the question can be asked how interested governments really are.

Commenting on the GFMD process, Frankenhaeuser highlighted that there is now more awareness of what we mean when we speak about migration and development, that this area is not only linked to remittances. As regards civil society activity, she said it is difficult to have one voice from civil society, and also that it is hard to engage the private sector in questions relating to migration. As regards thematic discussions in the GFMD, a trend is that there is a move to a capability and human development approach, as opposed to only looking at global, regional and national development. Meanwhile, Frankenhaeuser indicated that whether or not this is implemented in practice is a different story. A further issue is to bring irregular immigration on the agenda. However, Frankenhaeuser said this is controversial. She further stated that looking more at what all countries can do at home is essential. Notably, to look at systematic failures, for example how rules in a country create a status that is irregular.

In February 2012, the 10th Coordination Meeting on International Migration was held. Frankenhaeuser said discussions at the meeting give a hint as to what might be discussed on the high level meeting in 2013. A first issue, she said, was the growing importance of South-South Migration and regional migration. Further, focus was on the importance of diaspora involvement in migration and development affairs. Frankenhaeuser noted that another topic discussed was protection of migrants' human rights, which was a great concern for source countries. She said Bangladesh and Sri Lanka are examples of countries that export labour, and without strong labour agreements, this can be a disaster. Among other issues discussed at the meeting was the importance of acting globally. If one country moves ahead, this may affect other countries.

Turning to an evaluation of current trends, Frankenhaeuser pointed to an increased number of conferences and meetings on the issue of migration and development, of which the present conference was an example. Further, she underlined the necessity of obtaining coherence between migration and development. An example of this is to integrate migration into development planning, which many countries are starting to do. Frankenhaeuser presented several further trends, including regional arrangements allowing for freedom of movement within a region, and strengthening of the Global Migration Group (GMG).

The next lecturer was **Geza Strammer** from the EU Commission, DG Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) - EuropeAid, whose presentation was entitled *An EU Perspective on Migration and Development*. Strammer said maximising the positive impact of migration on the social and economic development of partner countries is a key priority for the EU. This can be seen for example in the October 2011 Communication *Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change* and in the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, which is the overarching framework for the EU's external migration policy.

Strammer showed that the main EU instrument to address migration issues from a development perspective is the Thematic Programme for migration and asylum. In addition, he said, there has been a gradual increase in the use of geographic instruments in this domain, in particular in West and North Africa. He stated that while significant results have been achieved so far on the area of migration and development, further challenges also remain to be tackled.

The presentation then turned to the issue of remittances, and Strammer said the EU has adopted significant commitments on this area. The overall aim is to promote cheaper, faster and more secure remittances in order to enhance their development impact. It was mentioned that DEVCO is presently conducting a study of how the EU is implementing its commitments with regard to remittances. From this study, Strammer presented the preliminary finding that the EU tends to focus on flows from Member States to Southern States, while limited attention is given to South-South flows. He said the latter area is one where there is still much work to be done, particularly in Africa, where it is estimated that about 67% of incoming flows come from migrants living in other African countries.

Of other areas on the traditional migration and development agenda, Strammer highlighted that of work with diasporas willing to contribute to the development of their countries of origin. He said diaspora organisations often need to be reinforced in their capacities. Another area is that of mitigating brain drain, especially in the

health sector, while at the same time supporting labour market policies and decent work in partner countries, as a strategy to retain skilled workers. Strammer also mentioned the issue of encouraging circular mobility. He said increased portability of social security rights should be promoted as a key incentive to circular migration.

Strammer then commented on what have been more recent focus areas. He said these include looking at the social consequences migration has on countries of origin, and mitigating the negative impact migration has on those left behind, children in particular. Another topical issue is protection of migrants' human rights in transit countries and the specific needs of vulnerable migrants. Lastly, he mentioned the objective of improving integration of migrants in third countries of destination.

It was highlighted that the challenges faced by partner countries as regards the link between development and migration are much broader and more complex than those that have been addressed within the traditional migration and development agenda. Strammer stated that migration has a significant impact on the development of partner countries. Several governments have based their economic development models partly on immigration or on emigration, often disregarding the economic and social costs this choice entails, as well as the cost effectiveness of migration in terms of growth and sustainable development. Strammer submitted that numerous third countries face migration flows that are essential for their economies. However, he added that many lack a structured and targeted policy framework. Awareness about synergies between migration and other policies, such as domestic employment policy or trade agreements, is often lacking.

Strammer said this calls for a change of perspective. He purported that it could be more appropriate to reverse the concepts and think in terms of *development and migration* rather than the other way around, and a better incorporation of the migration dimension into external cooperation interventions and strategies.

As regards future strategies, Strammer said DEVCO has several strands of intervention. A first area is the need to consolidate knowledge and awareness in the EU and in partner countries of the interconnections between migration and other policy areas, as well as of the weight of migration in the development model of many third countries. Secondly, he said DEVCO intends to focus more on the local dimension. While so far efforts have been concentrated at the central government level, the drivers and impacts of migration are often most strongly felt at the local level. Moreover, Strammer underlined that DEVCO wants to consolidate and broaden efforts relating to the mainstreaming of migration into development planning and into other policy domains. In this regard, he mentioned inter alia the support already provided to the elaboration of national migration strategies, for example in Mauritania. As a last point, Strammer highlighted that DEVCO will focus more on South-South mobility in the time to come.

The conference's audience was then given the opportunity to ask questions to Malin Frankenhaeuser and Geza Strammer.

Ann-Magrit Austenå from the Norwegian Organisation for Asylum Seekers referred to Frankenhaeuser's comment that children cannot be blamed for what their parents have done, and asked if she could elaborate on this point. Frankenhaeuser said Poland is an example of a country that is conducting a regularisation this spring. She also said in Switzerland schools are not allowed to ask whether a child has a regularised status or not.

Jean Paul Brekke commented on the different mandates for persons working primarily with control versus those who work with development, and asked if Strammer could say something about the combination of these missions in his DG. Strammer replied that DG Home Affairs is the DG that is dealing specifically with migration and security. He also said migration remains a national competence and that most decisions are taken at a national level. Moreover, he stated that Home Affairs looks at migration from an EU point of view, whereas DEVCO has the point of view of development. DEVCO would in some cases work on migration matters not because it is related to the EU, but to development.

The following speaker was **Jean-Pierre Cassarino** from the European University Institute. His lecture was entitled *Linking Cooperation on Readmission with Development Aid: Lessons learnt*. Cassarino commenced by asking the question: How can you link something that is positive – development – with readmission? Further, he asked whether migrants could be actors of change once they are removed.



Cassarino said there is a great difference between readmission and return. Readmission is a form of expulsion and removal, whether enforced or voluntary. Further, he said cooperation between states on readmission is based on asymmetric costs and benefits. However, states believe they will fare better by cooperating, despite the asymmetry. Cassarino showed that the number of bilateral agreements linked to readmission have skyrocketed the last years. He said there are two kinds of agreements: Standard ones, i.e. agreements that follow a specific format. Norway is an example of a country that tries to stick to these standard agreements. Another kind of agreement is those *linked* to readmission. These cover an array of issues, such as visa facilitation, border issues and development aid, and within all these areas, cooperation on readmission is mentioned. Moreover, the cooperation is more closely treated in implementing agreements.

It was then highlighted that such cooperation is part of a broader framework. To understand why States agree on readmission, you must go beyond, and for example look at history. Cassarino stated that a country will put development aid on the table to make the other country become more cooperative. For example as regards issuing of travel documents to the migrants in question, which are necessary to carry out the removal. He added that readmission agreements are there to facilitate the expulsion of a person; they shorten periods of detention and lower the costs for the country of destination.

Cassarino continued by saying that many European countries have over the last ten years realised that incentives are not enough. When it comes to implementing an agreement, the other country will be tempted to ask for more and more. He submitted that Switzerland is a good example. A large number of its readmission agreements do not work effectively because *laissez-passer* which should have been delivered take time. Cassarino highlighted that more flexible arrangements have been adopted the last years. An example is MOUs, and a good example is the recent MOU concluded between Norway and Ethiopia. He said Norway knows a full fledged agreement would have compelled to much processes, such as adoption by parliament.

Next, it was referred to a survey where persons who had returned were interviewed, including those who were assisted or forced. Cassarino said an interesting result is that there is a difference in terms of ability to reintegrate, between those who decide to return without any pressure, and those who are compelled to return. However, he also noted that this is only one of many factors relevant to the ability to reintegrate. One other important factor is *time*. You need time to be able to reintegrate. Further it matters how long you have been away, how long the migration experience is. However, Cassarino stated that factors such as these are not considered in States' return policies. Return has been limited to the fight against illegal migration. He underlined that this is detrimental to the possibilities for a link between return and development. Cassarino also mentioned that circular migration programmes and mobility partnerships are often too short in duration for the persons to be able to collect the experiences necessary to contribute to development in their home countries upon return.

After the speech, a comment from the audience pointed out that a country should not deny its citizens their right to return home. Cassarino replied that readmission agreements are not a new phenomena. However, he would not say this is a good reason to justify them. It is actually the procedure for readmitting which is problematic. He said it is a problem that readmission is artificially linked to development. Also, it is a problem that readmission is linked to fighting illegal migration, because such agreements do not deal with illegal migration, only the consequences thereof. The real issues linked to illegal migration are such challenges as poverty, underdevelopment and inequality.

The conference's final lecturer was **Trygve G. Nordby** from Scanteam, sharing his reflections on the topic *Migration and Development – The Road Ahead?* Nordby began his presentation by saying it is interesting to notice how the discourse on migration and development has changed over time. As examples of relevant questions in the discourse, he mentioned those of whether less or more development leads to less or more migration, and whether migration creates development in the home country.

Nordby underlined that there has been a general suspicion towards a wider international discussion on migration. However, the GFMD has provided a new non-political arena for such discussion. Moreover, he referred to the 2012 Hague Global Hearing on Refugees and Migration, a hearing that discussed current trends and what will happen in the time to come. Nordby said these trends include, firstly, that migration will increase. Moreover, migration has become more complex: the distinctions between legal and illegal migration, forced and voluntary, are more blurred than previously. He also mentioned as other tendencies

that migration is more temporary and circular than earlier, and that South-South migration is increasing. Further, Nordby said there is now more public debate on migration in all countries. It was also indicated that the public mood is increasingly negative towards migration. Not only in Europe, but also in Asia and South Africa.

The presentation then switched focus to operational opportunities that are open to countries, as regards migration and development. Firstly, Nordby said diasporas can help developing their countries of origin, and that States can provide financial support to such diaspora development projects. Secondly, he highlighted that training programs can be implemented to prevent negative brain drain. Other points included the importance of facilitating and securing sustainable development in the context of return. Here, Nordby said each time a country moves from conflict to non-conflict, the UN and other organisations ask States to wait returning people until the country in question has been able to return its IDPs. However, States usually want to return migrants without waiting.

Nordby further suggested there is a need for more research and evidence on migration and development, for increased cooperation with NGOs, businesses and diasporas. Moreover, he said legal reforms could facilitate increased mobility and circle migration, and that migrants' rights should be strengthened. Nordby then discussed possible reasons as to why a migration and development synergy might not appear. He said there can be a conflict of interest between the purpose of control and readmission often associated with ministries of the interior, versus development ministries' more altruistic focus on countries of origin. In this regard, he noted that when migration directorates are under ministries of foreign affairs, focus tends to be more on human rights than when they are under home affairs ministries.

Further, Nordby shared a set of assumptions relevant to the debate. Firstly, migration and development needs to be defined by migration actors as well as by development actors, as a joint program area. Secondly, governments need to establish and resource cross-departmental task forces. Third, there is a need for more evidence-based competence on migration and development. Fourth, research institutions, NGOs and diasporas need to be fully involved. Fifth, the transnational nature of migration and development needs to be fully accepted – politically and legally. For example, when there is no way to keep a dual citizenship, this is a hindrance for circular migration. Sixth, migration and development cannot be advanced by narrow domestic motives of reducing immigration, or if returns are increased to certain developing countries. Seventh, it was noted that migration and development is not a quick fix, but must be done in a long-term perspective.

Summing up, Nordby said what is beyond discussion is that there is a great potential for enhanced migration and development efforts and results in countries of origin and destination. He suggested there is a lack of sufficient institutions in countries of origin and destination, and a lack of internal coherence. Nordby also underlined that existing rights regimes are insufficient to meet the vulnerability of many migrant workers.

The lecture was concluded with a presentation of issues concerning further developments. With regard to the use of the term mobility instead of migration, Nordby questioned whether this might lead to less focus on integration and migrants' rights. He also asked whether a new UN agency for migration could help securing a focus on and implementation of migration and development. Further, he inquired whether biometry could give an assurance of state control and open up for increased migration. Here, Nordby submitted that biometrics might be a key to a more relaxed approach and create possibilities for circular migration.

The conference was concluded with a brief question and answer session, involving several of the conference speakers and participants.