

**Recommendations to the GFMD Steering Group  
Proposal for SG Discussions on GFMD´s Report of the 10-year review**

As Ecuador has assumed the GFMD Chairmanship in 2019, the discussions around displacement, migration and development are high on the political agenda. Both the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) have set out provisions for improved international cooperation to address large movements of people.

Convened as a consultative process outside the UN system, the GFMD is an informal, state-led and non-binding forum that aims at offering a platform to openly discuss challenges and find action-oriented solutions in the context of migration and development. The elevation of the migration topic to the top of the international agenda, including the adoption of the GCM and the creation of the UN Migration Network, requires the GFMD to situate itself within this new environment without losing its core identity. Against this backdrop, the 2017-2018 GFMD Co-Chairs, Germany and Morocco, commissioned an expert team to prepare a 10-year review that has formulated recommendations and conclusions for the GFMD going forward. This report was presented at the 11th GFMD Summit in Marrakech in December 2018.

During its 2019 GFMD Chairmanship, the Chair plans to hold more in-depth discussions on the review findings and recommendations with GFMD participating States and other stakeholders throughout the year. For this purpose, Ecuador proposes to address clusters of the report´s recommendations during the three envisaged GFMD preparatory meetings in Geneva in February, May and September 2019 as follows: February: review of the 3-P vision (policy, partnerships, peer-review); May: review of GFMD´s financial basis; September: review of operational recommendations to improve GFMD´s overall “user experience”.

To steer the discussions and ensure action-oriented proposals with concrete timelines on how to implement the recommendations, the Chair will prepare three discussion notes elaborating on each recommendation cluster in more depth. This way the GFMD participating states can acquire a better understanding of the added-value, recommendations and proposed actions, and prepare their inputs accordingly. The Chair may invite members of the expert team that undertook the review in 2018 to support the discussion and potential follow-up steps.

Ecuador proposes the following cluster structure:

1. In line with the **3-P** (policy, partnerships, peer-review) **vision for the future of the GFMD,** which wasarticulated by the expert team, the GFMD may consider the following actions:

**Policy Space:**

* + **Establish sector-specific networks** that facilitate consultations among key ministries and agencies (e.g. interior, labor, social affairs, and development) on a voluntary and regular basis to foster understanding among officials that are not usually involved in international cooperation, and to encourage inter-ministerial communication ahead of GFMD Summits and a more holistic approach to national policy-making on migration and development.
  + **Establish issue-specific, multi-stakeholder working groups** that are State-led but include other relevant stakeholders, to give sustained attention to difficult policy questions, for example the issue of mixed migration.
  + **Create a dedicated window for interaction with the research community** (think tanks, academia) – online, at SG and FOF meetings, and during GFMD Summits – giving researchers a chance to present and provide analysis of important findings and trends, while allowing governments and others to ask questions and discuss policy implications.
  + **Differentiate the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum meetings**: The profile of the SG could be raised by cultivating it as a Group of Friends, enrolling the network of former GFMD Chairs to help curate informal meetings at the Ambassadorial/Director General level. The frequency of FOF meetings could be reduced to twice a year, featuring a more substantive agenda, for example by inviting expert presentations or facilitating a dialogue among stakeholders.
  + **Introduce state-of-the-art facilitation techniques** at the GFMD Summit and in other meeting formats, inter alia RT preparatory meetings, by insourcing outside professional expertise to offer GFMD focal points and/or participants a chance to learn facilitation skills as a professional development opportunity embedded in the GFMD process with a view to subsequently engaging their skills in the GFMD process.

**Partnerships Space:**

* + **Establish a solutions-driven “marketplace” to match potential partners**: The GFMD could provide an online and in-person marketplace for governments and other stakeholders who have a specific solution or tools that they are willing to share (e.g. to facilitate a bilateral labor migration agreement or local immigration integration) in order to help others develop their own solutions.
  + **Support the formation of outcome-oriented partnerships through Migration Labs**: Building on the Migration Lab pilot that was undertaken during the German-Moroccan GFMD Co-Chairmanship, the GFMD could seek to forge a partnership for the replication of Migration Labs tailored to solving problems in specific regional, national and local contexts.
  + **Strengthen the system of GFMD focal points** by asking States to designate a Technical Committee on Migration and Development (TCMD) composed of relevant government agencies that would provide a broader interface for the GFMD and a motor for action on migration and development nationally, including by seeking actively to promote partnerships and cooperation with other States.

**Peer-Review Space:**

* + **Introduce a peer-review space into the GFMD:** The review could be organized thematically, around clusters of GCM objectives, as well as around cross-cutting implementation and review challenges, such as developing and financing national GCM implementation plans, exploring various partnership models, and the development and testing of indicators for measuring progress. The latter issues may require more in-depth and continued discussion, e.g. in the form of a working group or Lab.
  + **Develop an online “Learning Hub”** that would extend the existing online Platform for Partnerships (PfP) and improve upon it by a) introducing “quality control” criteria for good practices and, potentially offering States and others who have submitted practices the opportunity to access evaluation services; and b) developing more interactive tools for online knowledge sharing, such as online communities of practice, tutorials and online learning courses.

1. **Review of GFMD´s financial basis**, whereby the GFMD might consider the following **short-term actions**:
   * **Undertake the outstanding review of the GFMD Long-term Financing Framework** that was scheduled for 2017, to take stock of progress made in achieving the objectives of the Financing Framework, identify bottlenecks, and assess the GFMD’s financing needs going forward, including alternative avenues for resource mobilization.
   * **Leverage special initiatives and new formats to generate income** outside the regular GFMD budget, which could, however, support core GFMD functions such as knowledge management by generating overhead for the Support Unit. A special project could be, for instance, the replication of the Migration Lab format.
   * **Expand in-kind contributions from all participating States** as well as other GFMD stakeholders – e.g. the shouldering of travel costs, seconding experts, hosting meetings, or providing professional services and expertise (knowledge management, meeting facilitation) – to broaden ownership and reduce the financial needs of the Forum.
   * **Use incentives, such as matching funds, to broaden the circle of GFMD contributors**: Longtime funders of the GFMD could incentivize others to contribute by offering at least a share of their financial support in the form of matching funds that are unlocked only if other governments and stakeholders, such as large INGOs and businesses, make contributions as well.

Over the next couple of years, the GFMD will need to assess, if a more fundamental overhaul of its financing model is needed, by considering the following **long-term** actions:

* + **Explore the introduction of an annual fee for all GFMD-participating States** based on country income classification (high-income countries pay the most, low-income countries the smallest annual contribution) and, possibly, membership of the decision-making ranks within the GFMD, i.e. members of the Steering Group could face enhanced responsibilities in terms of membership fees and an obligation to pay on time or be suspended from the SG.
  + **Carefully plan a possible transition to membership fees**: A stopgap measure may be required to facilitate the testing of and transition to a new financing model. To this end, the GFMD could ask donor countries that have provided it with significant financial support over the last decade to continue doing so while a new system of membership fees is being tested and rolled-out.

1. **To broaden ownership of the GFMD and improve the overall “user experience”**, the GFMD might consider the following operational actions:
   * **Reduce the frequency of GFMD Summit meetings**: With the creation of the Regional and International Migration Review Fora, it could be considered to hold the GFMD Summit meeting only every second year, so that it alternates with the RMRFs and IMRF.
   * **Extend the GFMD Chairmanship to two years**: If the frequency of Summit meetings is reduced, it might be feasible to extend the Chairmanship periods to straddle both, a non-Summit and a Summit year. Alternatively, countries could also opt for a co-chairmanship arrangement covering two years and a jointly organized Summit meeting.
   * **Introduce the option of a Geneva-based GFMD Summit**: The GFMD could gradually transition to a permanent presence in Geneva by giving governments the option to organize the annual Summit there, which would significantly reduce the costs of holding the Chairmanship.
   * **Create designated oversight structures for Partnerships and Review**: The Steering Group should consider tasking individual members or specific groups, such as the ad hoc Working Group on the 2030 Agenda and GCM, to take responsibility for overseeing the GFMD’s enhanced role in promoting partnerships and facilitating a meaningful review of progress towards agreed commitments.
   * **Strengthen the GFMD Support Unit,** starting with reviewing its actual scope of work, adequately classifying posts, and addressing additional capacity needs to support knowledge management as well as outreach and communications, in particular.
   * **Revisit the relationship between the Support Unit and IOM** to ensure the SU receives the operational support it requires, and to clearly define its relationship with the UN Migration Network, in particular about cooperation, and potentially joint staffing, for the CBM. As it becomes clearer how the GFMD will fit with the rest of the emerging GCM architecture, States may in due course wish to consider further integrating the Support Unit with the IOM.

Based on this structure, the Ecuadorian GFMD Chair will address the clusters in its **three preparatory meetings in a chronological order,** starting with the 3P cluster in the preparatory meeting in February. To steer the discussions and ensure action-oriented proposals with concrete timelines on how to implement the recommendations, the Chair will prepare three discussion notes elaborating on each recommendation cluster in more depth. This way the GFMD member states can acquire a better understanding of the added-value, recommendations and proposed actions, and prepare their inputs respectively.