

**GFMD Working Group on Sustainable Development and International Migration  
(WG SD & IM)<sup>1</sup>**

## **GFMD 10-Year Review**

### **Follow-up on the recommendations towards an implementation plan**

### **Key Features and Supporting Recommendations**

1) Background.....	1
2) Purpose.....	2
3) GFMD Key Features.....	3
3.1. What We Are.....	3
3.2 What We Do & How We Do It.....	4
4) Recommendations Proposed for Immediate Adoption by the GFMD Steering Group.....	4
4.1. Pillar 1: Preparatory Process and Summit (Substance).....	4
4.2. Pillar 2: Institutional Framework.....	6
4.3. Pillar 3: Financial Framework.....	8
5) Recommendations Requiring Further Consideration.....	9
5.1. Pillar 1: Preparatory Process and Summit (Substance).....	9
5.2. Pillar 2: Institutional Framework.....	11
5.3. Pillar 3: Financial Framework.....	12

### **1) Background**

- 1.1. As stated in the [GFMD 2019 Concept Paper](#), the Ecuadorian GFMD Chair in Office is committed to follow up on the GFMD 10-Year Review report by holding “in-depth discussions on the review findings and recommendations with GFMD participating States and other stakeholders” (see GFMD 2019 Concept Paper). “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”. “The GFMD Working Group on Sustainable Development and International Migration will meet in between the preparatory meetings to contribute to the Chair’s ambition in this regard by formulating concrete actions to implement the recommendations of the 10-year review.”
- 1.2. The [Terms of Reference](#) adopted by the GFMD Steering Group on 20 February 2019 state that the GFMD Working Group on Sustainable Development and International Migration will:

---

<sup>1</sup> Previously known as the “ad hoc Working Group on the 2030 Agenda and GCM”. As per the new Terms of Reference adopted by the GFMD Steering Group on 20 February 2019, the title of the group has been changed to the current name.

- “review, assess and further develop the recommendations and findings laid out in the report on the GFMD Ten Year Review” and;
- “report to the special sessions of the Future of the Forum during GFMD Summits, update and make proposals to the GFMD Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum on the implementation of recommendations from the report of the GFMD Ten-Year Review, including a roadmap for further follow-up towards this end.”

1.3. The recommendations contained within this follow-up document broadly correspond to those contained within the [GFMD Review 2018](#). Those recommendations were made in response to perceived “structural weaknesses” of the GFMD. As the GFMD Review 2018 says,

“While it has largely thrived on informality, GFMD also suffers from some resulting structural weaknesses. It has repeatedly struggled to secure a succession of Chairs and continues to rely on a bare-bones Support Unit. Its financial support has come from a small share of participating States that have begun to reduce their contributions in recent years. Decisions made, such as on a long-term financing model or the rotation of members of the GFMD Steering Group, are difficult to enforce. Furthermore, constituents have criticized the GFMD as a still too formal and discussion-only format, lacking ‘teeth’ when it comes to following up on its outcomes. Its agenda is seen as skewed towards addressing migration over development policy concerns while shortchanging normative considerations. Civil society, in particular, is seeking greater inclusion in all aspects of the Forum.”

1.4. This is a working document and should be considered in conjunction with the GFMD Review 2018. During the course of considering the recommendations of the GFMD Review 2018, the Working Group on Sustainable Development and International Migration has identified and proposed a series of further recommendations for adoption. These additional recommendations are footnoted within the document.

## 2) Purpose

2.1 The purpose of this document is to provide a framework for discussion of the recommendations contained within the 10-Year Review. As per the 10-Year Review Roadmap, it comprises three parts:

- GFMD ‘Key Features’
- Recommendations Proposed for Immediate Adoption by the Steering Group
- Recommendations Requiring Further Consideration

2.2. The **GFMD ‘Key Features’** sets out a generic description of what GFMD is, what it does, and how it does it. The purpose is to establish a structure through which the recommendations of the 10-Year Review can be assessed, as well as introducing a future-focused narrative that reflects the consensus on the value and purpose of GFMD.

2.3 The **Recommendations of the 10-Year Review** have been divided into two parts: those that are unlikely to meet with significant resistance or prolonged discussion by Member States (Recommendations Proposed for Immediate Adoption by the Steering Group); and those that are potentially more politically contentious and will therefore require further clarification and consideration (Recommendations Requiring Further Consideration). Where recommendations are proposed for further consideration, guiding questions are formulated to assist in decision-making.

### 3) GFMD Key Features

#### 3.1. What We Are

<b>IMPROVING HOW MIGRATION IS GOVERNED</b>	GFMD is founded on an idea: that better-informed governments govern better. We are the only state-led global process where all stakeholders involved in – and affected by – migration governance can meet as partners and equals and examine how governments can improve their migration policies.
<b>LINKING MIGRATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</b>	Migration and development are closely interlinked, as is recognised by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDGs). By looking in-depth at the drivers and impacts of migration, our goal is to introduce and investigate approaches that are long term and that provide sustainable solutions to the challenges of migration.
<b>SPACE FOR CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSIONS</b>	Discussing migration will always be contentious because migration creates change. There are no one-size-fits-all approaches, with different contexts creating different responses. By inviting stakeholders with diverging views to come together, we aim to take up contentious issues and nurture trust by fostering debate from different perspectives. As a forum, we are neutral and are not aligned with any particular viewpoint.
<b>FOCUSED ON PRACTICAL OUTCOMES</b>	GFMD is more than just a forum for discussion. By strengthening understanding, we strive to improve the context in which global, regional, national and local agreements and policies are made. We build on experiences at all levels of migration governance to produce outcomes that are tangible, practical and accessible and can be replicated by governments and - as appropriate - other stakeholders.
<b>STATE-LED, INFORMAL, VOLUNTARY, AND INCLUSIVE</b>	Being state-led, informal, voluntary and inclusive are the core principles on which GFMD is organised. Our agendas reflect the priorities of governments, while being open to inputs by other stakeholders. Our role is to facilitate free discussion, not to hold to account. And non-government participants – including from <a href="#">civil society</a> , the <a href="#">private sector</a> and <a href="#">local authorities</a> – are not just contributors, but co-partners in a joint endeavour.

## 3.2 What We Do & How We Do It

<b>POLICY</b>	Encouraging discussion that leads to improved policy is at the heart of what we do. GFMD seeks to enable access to – and the exchange views about – information and data on the relevance and impact of different migration policies. We identify emerging themes and bring cohesion to help stimulate learning, using methods and formats that facilitate common understanding and guide policy implementation. We strive to be innovative, not only in our selection of issues, but also in the ways by which we address them.
<b>PARTNERSHIPS</b>	Successfully implementing policy requires collaboration between governments and stakeholders in society more widely. GFMD serves as a platform to form coalitions and networks around emerging issues, build partnerships and launch policy initiatives.
<b>PEER LEARNING<sup>2</sup></b>	GFMD encourages debate and discussion. We believe that joint analysis and scrutiny plays a positive role in improving policy outcomes. GFMD provides space for Member States to share experiences in implementing global commitments relating to migration, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants, and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM).

## 4) Recommendations Proposed for Immediate Adoption by the GFMD Steering Group

N.b. See section 2.3. above for clarification regarding methodology for the classification of Recommendations.

### 4.1. Pillar 1: Preparatory Process and Summit (Substance)

	<b>Original Recommendation</b>	<b>Explanation for Status / Clarifications</b>	<b>Proposed Final Text for Adoption</b>
1.1 <sup>3</sup>	<b>Consider re-arranging current Summit format:</b> current format is one day	<i>Organisation of the Summit is at the discretion of the Chair; recommendation does not</i>	<b>Rearrange current Summit format</b> to one day of simultaneous stakeholder

<sup>2</sup> In line with the objective of the GFMD 2019 Chair Ecuador to play a bridging role, and consistent with the GFMD's voluntary character, the term "peer review" in the GFMD 10-Year Report is replaced with "peer learning" in the context of the GFMD Review follow up process.

<sup>3</sup> Recommendation 1.1. and 1.2. were developed by the Working Group for Sustainable Development and International Migration subsequent to the publication of the GFMD Review 2018

	of Civil Society, followed by Common Space, followed by government consultations. Propose changing to one day of simultaneous stakeholder consultations, followed by 2 – 3 days of joint consultations (in effect, reorienting the Summit towards full Common Space).	<i>require extra funding or political buy-in. It would strengthen idea of GFMD as a joint endeavour between governments, civil society, business and local administrations. It also resonates with Ecuador’s ambition to provide more spaces for interactive multi-stakeholder exchanges during the Quito summit.</i>	consultations, with 2 – 3 days of joint consultations (in effect, reorienting the Summit towards greater Common Space). The Summit may begin with an inaugural ceremony, attended by all stakeholders, before the separate consultations, then resume for common space.
1.2	<b>Conduct a thorough assessment of roundtable-based format</b> at GFMD Summits and assess scope for alternative formats for engaging stakeholders in thematic discussions.	<i>Significant feedback from Member States (MS) and stakeholders suggesting that previous roundtable format is not successful in encouraging informal debate.</i>	<b>Conduct a thorough assessment of roundtable-based formats</b> at GFMD Summits and assess scope for alternative formats for engaging stakeholders in thematic discussions.
1.3	<b>Introduce state-of-the-art facilitation techniques</b> at the GFMD Summit and in other meeting formats, inter alia Round tables (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.	<i>Facilitation techniques are in the hands of the chair; recommendation does not require political buy-in, though there may be additional costs that future Chairs need to consider. Capacity should be developed in the Support Unit (SU) to incorporate professional facilitation techniques for longer-term benefit.</i>	<b>Introduce state-of-the-art facilitation techniques</b> at the GFMD Summit and in other meeting formats, inter alia, Round tables (RT) preparatory meetings, by insourcing outside professional expertise and build capacity within the Support Unit (SU) to on-board these practices for the long term.
1.4	<b>Support the formation of outcome-oriented partnerships through <a href="#">Migration Labs</a>:</b> 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.	<i>The experience of 2017 - 2018 shows that some lab formats – e.g. those focused on specific issues like GCM goals or migration related SDGs, prioritized by a Member State or group of Member States – are quick to organize. However, consideration should be given to costs and organizational requirements, as well as environmental impacts.</i>	<b>Support the formation of outcome-oriented partnerships through the development of innovative formats.</b> For example, building on the <a href="#">Migration Lab pilot</a> that was undertaken during the German-Moroccan GFMD Co-Chairmanship 2017-2018, the GFMD could seek to forge partnerships for the replication of Migration Labs to address challenges in specific regional, national and local contexts, with the

			participation of relevant non-governmental stakeholders. Consideration should be given to the use of technology to minimize need for air travel.
--	--	--	--

## 4.2. Pillar 2: Institutional Framework

	Original Recommendation	Explanation for Status / Clarifications	Proposed Final Text for Adoption
2.1	<p><b>Create designated oversight structures for Partnerships and Review:</b> The Steering Group should consider tasking individual members or specific groups, such as the ad hoc Working Group on the 2030 Agenda and GCM<sup>4</sup>, to take responsibility for overseeing the GFMD's enhanced role in promoting partnerships and facilitating a meaningful review of progress towards agreed commitments.</p>	<p><i>Use of pre-existing Working Groups could offer a quick mechanism for organizing and finding volunteers. WG on SD&amp;IM may be able to create sub-Working Groups on specific themes that address SDGs and GCM commitments. Consideration should also be given to alternatives to Working Group structures and enthusiasm of Member States to carry additional burdens.</i></p>	<p><b>Create designated mechanisms for Partnerships and Review.</b> The Steering Group should consider requesting that individual Member States or specific groups take responsibility for overseeing the GFMD's enhanced role in promoting partnerships and facilitating a meaningful review of progress towards agreed commitments.</p>
2.2	<p><b>Strengthen the GFMD Support Unit (SU),</b> 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.</p>	<p><i>A review of the SU can be started quickly on the basis of the 10 Year review. Longer-term decisions regarding the SU will need to be made in light of decisions relating to <b>Recommendation 2.8</b> (relationship between the Support Unit and IOM), but this need not be a hindrance to starting the Review.</i></p>	<p><b>Strengthen the GFMD Support Unit (SU),</b> starting with reviewing its actual scope of work, adequately classifying posts, revisiting hosting arrangements, and addressing additional capacity needs to support knowledge management as well as outreach and communications, in particular.</p>
2.3	<p><b>Differentiate the Steering Group (SG) and Friends of the Forum (FOF) meetings:</b> 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</p>	<p><i>The organization of the preparatory meetings is in the hands of the chair; recommendation does not require extra funding or a political buy-in. Consideration should be given to the risk that by reducing the frequency of meetings of the</i></p>	<p><b>Differentiate agendas of the Steering Group (SG) and Friends of the Forum (FOF) meetings:</b> The FOF meetings could feature a more substantive agenda, for example by inviting expert presentations or facilitating a dialogue among stakeholders.</p>

	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.	<i>FOF, GFMD's visibility is reduced.</i>	
2.4	<b>Strengthen the system of GFMD focal points</b> 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.	<i>Use of pre-existing focal points can provide a quick way to identify if there is any interest from Member States (MS) and if the proposal is doable given their national coordination processes. Support Unit will need to ensure that the list is frequently updated.</i>	<b>Strengthen the system of GFMD focal points</b> to provide a broader interface for the GFMD and a motor for whole-of-government action on migration and development nationally, including by seeking to actively promote partnerships and cooperation with other States.
2.5	<b>Introduce the option of a Geneva-based GFMD Summit:</b> 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.	<i>Financially easy to explain, due to lower costs for the overall GFMD and any presidency. Potentially politically sensitive as the hosting of the Summit may be perceived as a political opportunity to position a country (visibility). It should stay as an option in the hands of the incoming Chair, without a gradual transition that would make it permanent.</i>	<b>Introduce the option of a Geneva-based GFMD Summit.</b> The GFMD could give governments the option to organize the annual Summit in Geneva, which could significantly reduce the costs of holding the Chairmanship.

### 4.3. Pillar 3: Financial Framework

	Original Recommendation	Explanation for Status / Clarifications	Proposed Final Text for Adoption
3.1	<p><b>Undertake the outstanding review of the GFMD Long-term Financing Framework</b> 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.</p>	<p><i>Idem as per 2.2 (review of SU): A review can be started quickly on the basis of the 10 Year review. The independent auditor of GFMD expressed in their 2018 audit the need for a comprehensive review: “In our view, GFMD needs predictable funding to support its activities...to deepen policy dialogue and coherence, as well as take [on] new tasks arising from the adoption of the GCM.”</i></p>	<p><b>Undertake the outstanding review of the <a href="#">GFMD Long-term Financing Framework</a></b>, organized under Sweden’s Chairmanship, which 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.</p>
3.2	<p><b>Use incentives, such as matching funds, to broaden the circle of GFMD contributors.</b> 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.</p>	<p><i>For actual donors, it could be framed as a part of their contribution. However, matching funds may not be the ideal incentive to pursue. It may, for example, lead to lower funding, should new donors not come forward to match funds.</i></p>	<p><b>Use incentives to broaden the circle of GFMD contributors.</b> For example, funders of the GFMD could incentivize others to contribute by offering matching funds for earmarked projects that are unlocked only if other governments and stakeholders, such as large INGOs, businesses or municipalities, make contributions as well.</p>
3.3	<p><b>Expand in-kind contributions from all participating States</b> 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.</p>	<p><i>It already happens through financial contributions that are earmarked. Existing contributions could be “branded” as in kind contributions so as to motivate other countries to do so.</i></p>	<p><b>Expand in-kind contributions from all participating States</b> 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.</p>



## 5) Recommendations Requiring Further Consideration<sup>5</sup>

### 5.1. Pillar 1: Preparatory Process and Summit (Substance)

	Recommendation	Explanation for Status	Guiding Questions
1.3	<b>Establish sector-specific networks</b> 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.	The establishment of a functioning network is time consuming and requires several organizational steps. Moreover, efforts to mobilise other ministries can vary from country to country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is the recommendation aligned with the organising principles of remaining state-led and informal?</li> <li>➤ How can the recommendation be tailored so as to reflect the voluntary and inclusive principles?</li> <li>➤ What level of resources would be needed to put this recommendation into action?</li> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied with below Recommendation 1.4 (establishment of issue-specific, multi-stakeholder working groups)?</li> <li>➤ To what extent would this recommendation have a transformative effect on GFMD and its value to stakeholders?</li> </ul>
1.4	<b>Establish issue-specific, multi-stakeholder working groups</b> that are State-led but include other relevant stakeholders, to give sustained attention to difficult policy questions, for example the issue of mixed migration.	Idem as above (1.3). Moreover, as with the WG SD&IM, any new Working Group needs approval by the SG, therefore requiring political buy in.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Are there sufficient numbers of stakeholders able to invest the time in Working Groups needed to make this recommendation sustainable?</li> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied with Recommendation 1.3?</li> <li>➤ Are there less onerous alternatives?</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> These recommendations are pending prior to further discussions within the Working Group.

1.5	<p><b>Create a dedicated window for interaction with the research community</b> (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.</p>	<p>Including a new category of stakeholder (as shown by the previous experience with the Civil Society, Private sector, and Mayors) is time consuming and needs to be funded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is this recommendation sufficiently valuable as to merit additional investment?</li> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied together with Recommendations 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8?</li> <li>➤ Would the Recommendation require GFMD to recognise a new category of stakeholder, or are there alternative mechanisms for engaging the research community?</li> </ul>
1.6	<p><b>Establish a solutions-driven “marketplace” to match potential partners:</b> 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.</p>	<p>An online platform needs a proper strategy and vision, which takes time to develop. Moreover, financing is crucial for the platform to stay relevant.</p> <p>However, participants may also wish to consider moving this to ‘Recommendation proposed for immediate adoption by the Steering Group’, as the idea has already been developed under the German-Moroccan co-Chairmanship in 2017-2018.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Can a network of service providers (e.g. KNOMAD, ODI, Centre for Global Development), and others be established to address demands within the scope of their existing programmes?</li> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied together with Recommendations 1.5 (research community), 1.7 (learning hub) and 1.8 (peer-review space)?</li> <li>➤ Is there a genuine ‘customer’ need for - or sufficient interest in - a ‘marketplace’ or would alternative offer similar benefits?</li> </ul>
1.7	<p><b>Develop an online “Learning Hub”</b> 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.</p>	<p>An online platform needs a proper strategy and vision, which takes time to develop. Moreover, financing is crucial for the platform to stay relevant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied together with Recommendations 1.5 (research community), 1.6 (market place) and 1.8 (peer-review space)?</li> <li>➤ What resources would be needed to support a Learning Hub?</li> <li>➤ How can the balance between selecting and curating ‘best practice’, and remaining informal and voluntary be maintained?</li> </ul>

1.8	<p><b>Introduce a peer-learning space into the GFMD:</b> The review could be organized thematically, around clusters of the UN Global Compact on Migration (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.</p>	<p>Introducing a mechanism in which Member States would present their progress in implementing the GCM could be contentious, given that some GFMD members have not adopted the GCM.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ What would be the main features of such a space, especially vis-à-vis the IMRF?</li> <li>➤ Is the recommendation aligned with the organising principles of remaining state-led, voluntary and informal?</li> <li>➤ Instead of peer review, would “peer learning” reflect the substance of this recommendation, or should alternative approaches be considered?</li> <li>➤ Can GFMD play an active role in GCM without some form of ‘peer review’ (or alternative)</li> <li>➤ How can this recommendation be tied together with Recommendations 1.5 (research community), 1.6 (market place) and 1.7 (learning hub)?</li> </ul>

## 5.2. Pillar 2: Institutional Framework

	Recommendation	Explanation for Status	Guiding Questions
2.6	<p><b>Extend the GFMD Chairmanship to two years:</b> 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.</p>	<p>Politically sensitive as a potential Chair will need to commit before knowing how the financing will be dealt with over an extended period of 2 years. To be dealt with in conjunction with 2.7 (Summit every two years).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How can the recommendation be tied together with Recommendation 2.7 (Summit every two years)?</li> <li>➤ Would increasing the Chairmanship to two years be a barrier to less wealthy MS coming forward to Chair?</li> <li>➤ Were there lessons from the German-Morocco joint Chairmanship (2017-2018) that can be reflected on?</li> </ul>

2.7	<p><b>Reduce the frequency of GFMD Summit meetings:</b> 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 Regional migration review forums (RMRFs) and International migration review forum (IMRF).</p>	Idem as above (2.6).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How can the recommendation be tied together with Recommendation 2.6?</li> <li>➤ Would reducing the frequency of GFMD Summit meetings have a negative effect on the overall visibility / relevance of GFMD?</li> <li>➤ Is consistency in length of Chairmanship / frequency of Summits important, or could incoming Chairs be given more flexibility to choose solutions that work for them?</li> </ul>
2.8	<p><b>Revisit the relationship between the Support Unit (SU) and IOM</b> 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 Capacity Building Mechanism (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 SU with the IOM.</p>	<p>Politically sensitive at this point as the GFMD needs to identify its role within the new global governance (in relationship with the UN Network among others). Many MS value the independence of GFMD from the UN system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is the recommendation aligned with the organising principles of remaining state-led and informal?</li> <li>➤ What benefits, if any, would accrue from having the SU integrated into IOM?</li> <li>➤ What alternative, long-term and financially sustainable options are available?</li> </ul>

### 5.3. Pillar 3: Financial Framework

	Recommendation	Explanation for Status	Guiding Questions
3.4	<p><b>Leverage special initiatives and new formats to generate income</b> outside the regular GFMD budget, which could, however, support core GFMD functions such as knowledge management by generating overhead for</p>	<p>Likely needs further consideration within context of the Long Term Financing Framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Are there likely to be customers for these types of formats?</li> <li>➤ What role, if any, can businesses play in supporting the financing of GFMD?</li> <li>➤ How can the Business Mechanism be empowered</li> </ul>

	the Support Unit. A special project could be, for instance, the replication of the Migration Lab format.		to raise GFMD's profile in the business community?
3.5	<b>Explore the introduction of an annual fee for all GFMD-participating States</b> 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 (SG) could face enhanced responsibilities in terms of membership fees and an obligation to pay on time or be suspended from the SG.	Politically sensitive. Potentially incompatible with GFMD status as voluntary, although the introduction of a fee may be one solution to preserving the sustainability and functionality of the Forum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is the recommendation aligned with the organising principle of remaining voluntary and informal?</li> <li>➤ How would differentiated fees based on income classification impact the sense of ownership enjoyed by MS?</li> <li>➤ Would the threat of 'sanctions' deter MS from coming forward to participate in the SG?</li> </ul>
3.6	<b>Carefully plan a possible transition to membership fees:</b> 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.	Politically sensitive. Potentially incompatible with GFMD status as voluntary, although the introduction of a fee may be one solution to preserving the sustainability and functionality of the Forum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Are there alternatives to a Membership Fee structure, including, e.g. incentives for MS to commit funds over a longer period of time than just one year?</li> <li>➤ Would non-paying MS be able to attend / participate as 'observers'?</li> </ul>