

Taking Action on Migration and Development - Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation

Second Meeting of the Steering Group

Palais des Nations, Geneva, Room XXIV

18 April 2011

Chair: H.E. Ambassador Eduard Gnesa, Swiss GFMD Chair

Swiss GFMD Taskforce: Mr. Dominique Paravicini, Mr. Manuel Jakob, Mr. Shabarinath Nair, Mr. Markus Reisle, Mr. David Svarin, Ms. Malin Frankenhauser, Mr. Gottfried Zuercher, Mr. Mark Engler, Mr. Philippe Kaeser, Dr. Irena Omelaniuk, Dr. Rolph Jenny, Estrella Lajom Roman

Attendance: All 35 Member Countries¹ of the GFMD Steering Group

Report of the Proceedings

I. Welcoming remarks by the Chair-in-Office

Ambassador Eduard Gnesa, Swiss GFMD Chair, warmly welcomed the 44 delegates from 35 countries to the second meeting of the Steering Group (SG). He explained that the meeting was intended to give an overview of the thematic meetings taking place in 2011, as well as to provide information concerning the Extended FOF Meeting in December and the GFMD funding situation in 2011. He also announced that a meeting of the Assessment Team would take place immediately after the SG meeting, with the aim of discussing the 2nd draft of the Assessment Questionnaire.

II. Adoption of the Agenda

The Provisional Agenda that was earlier circulated by email was adopted by the Steering Group in toto.

III. GFMD 2011 Work Program – Thematic Meetings

The Chair elaborated on the thematic program for this year's GFMD, which will entail the organization of smaller thematic meetings around the world, with the aim of making the GFMD more focused and action-oriented. The themes of these meetings were carefully selected to ensure their global relevance and to follow up on outcomes of the last meeting in Puerto Vallarta, thereby promoting the consolidation of the GFMD process.

¹ The GFMD Steering Group includes Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Most of the meetings would take place in the regions, and aim to attract policymakers in the field who will discuss 2 or 3 key issues related to the 2011 central theme, “Taking Action on Migration on Development – Coherence, Capacity and Cooperation”.

The Chair gave assurance that the proposed GFMD meetings in the regions would not affect the respective agenda of the various regional processes, nor diminish the global character of the GFMD. A series of consultations had been held with a number of governments who expressed their interest to help the Swiss Chair organize these smaller meetings in the regions. Several meetings would surely take place this year, and some others were still being put together by concerned members of the Swiss Taskforce, in close consultation with other governments and with support from international organizations. A brief overview of each of these thematic meetings was outlined with a powerpoint presentation.

Under Cluster I on *Labour Mobility and Development*, the following thematic meetings were reported:

- A meeting entitled, Markets for Migration and Development (M4MD), will be held in Berne on 13-15 September, to focus on the private sector’s engagement in labour market planning. This will be in partnership with the World Trade Institute and Business for Social Responsibility, a global business network with more than 250 member companies. Already the Philippines, France, Spain, Brazil and Colombia confirmed their participation. A follow up meeting concerning the role of the private sector may also be convened by Canada.
- A workshop on lowering the costs of migration for higher development gains was successfully organized last January in Dubai by the United Arab Emirates with support from the Swiss Chair. This was held in the context of the Abu Dhabi pilot labour exchange program between Asia and the UAE states. The Chair was currently in consultation with the Government of Bangladesh to organize a follow up thematic meeting on Labour Migration in Asia. For this purpose, the Chair had accepted the invitation to address the Colombo Process Ministerial Meeting on 20 April.
- To promote better regulation and protection of the global care industry, a workshop will be organized in Jamaica in September, in cooperation with UN Women and the IOM. The workshop would like to bring government officials from Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as from North America, Africa, Europe and Asia to discuss gender and family concerns, specifically in regard to the global care industry, which are of interest to countries of origin and destination alike, as well as Civil Society and the private sector. The Chair would also like to see parallel workshops in the African and Asian regions on this topic. To this end, the Chair had approached the African Union Commission and the European Commission to look into the possibility of bringing this issue of global care workers into a meeting on female migration that is due to take place later this year in the framework of the Migration, Mobility and Employment Partnership. The MacArthur Foundation offered to fund three such smaller meetings in the regions.
- A meeting on south-south labour mobility in West Africa in cooperation with Nigeria was also being explored by the Chair. This meeting would combine Cluster I and III by discussing instruments and policies that facilitate legal labour migration, address the specific needs of domestic workers, the social consequences for families and social security protection of workers, as well as

support evidence-based policy-making. The target participants would include experts from other regions that deal with the free movement of persons.

The Chair then opened the floor for comments, questions or suggestions on the work program of Cluster I. Seven delegates reacted to the presentation.

1. The representative of Canada confirmed that it was thinking of holding a thematic meeting on the role of the private sector in the GFMD. However, no further information was yet available.
2. One delegate asked if the powerpoint presentation could be provided via email or in a printed out version. The Chair replied in the affirmative.
3. One delegate thanked the Chair for all the work that had been done, particularly on the first Cluster, and confirmed its interest in the private sector meeting to be held on 13-15 September.
4. One delegate conveyed the Government's important appreciation of all issues concerning cross border people movements, whether in the context of regular or irregular migration. It was highlighted that the recently held 4th Ministerial Meeting in March 2011 in Bali achieved some significant efforts in combating people smuggling and trafficking. As co-chair of the Bali process, the Government expressed support for the Chair's work plan, but requested more details on the thematic meetings, particularly those concerning gender, family concerns, and recruitment issues.
5. Another delegate thanked the countries that have so far offered to host the meetings, and believed that these meetings could provide important inputs to the discussion at the end of the year. The delegate expressed the Government's interest in two meetings – a) the meeting in Berne which would hopefully discuss the involvement of the private sector in the context of the human rights of migrant workers, and b) the meeting in Jamaica on protecting the global care industry, in relation to gender and family issues.
6. The representative of Bangladesh appreciated the Chair's acceptance of the invitation to address the Colombo Process meeting in Dhaka, and confirmed the Government's interest to host and co-chair with Switzerland an event in Dhakka, the details of which would be fleshed out during the Chair's visit to Dhakka.
7. One delegate urged the Chair to study the scheduling of the thematic meetings, most of which appeared to be happening during the fourth quarter of the year. This was important in light of other international meetings happening in Geneva, and in order to maximize the participation from the capitals.

The Chair turned to Cluster II on '*Addressing irregular migration through coherent migration and development strategies*'. Irregular migration is an important and sensitive issue for development, and general recommendations have repeatedly been made in GFMD meetings to give more focus on this issue. The Chair has consulted with some of the regional processes to find out if this theme could be discussed within the framework of regional processes or alternatively in a broader context, while still anchoring the discussions in regions.

- The Chair announced that he would take part in the Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) Full Round in May in Miami. He also said that he received an invitation to participate in the Puebla Process Vice Ministers' meeting in the Dominican Republic in June. Meantime, the Chair was continuing discussions with

some governments in Latin America on the possibility of hosting a thematic meeting in the region.

- The Chair made reference to his participation in the Bali Process Senior Officials Meeting in March, and mentioned that discussions with the two co-chairs Australia and Indonesia were going on, to explore the possibility of organizing a thematic meeting in the region.

Four (4) Governments offered their comments to the Chair regarding the work plan of Cluster II.

1. The representative of the United States of America, current IGC Chair, gave an update on the possibility of the IGC organizing a thematic meeting in the second half of the year. Initial consultations with the IGC Members indicated some tentative support for this idea. Currently, the IGC Chair is in the process of formalizing its proposal, which will be presented at the full IGC round in May for decision by the heads of delegations.
2. Two delegates supported the idea to link the Forum with the South American Conference on Migration (SACM). One of them informed the meeting that a suggestion was already made to the current SACM Chair, Bolivia, to find a link between the GFMD and SACM. Two dates were tentatively established, firstly on 12 – 13 May in Santiago, Chile or in the second half of 2011, venue to be announced later. Bolivia would await contact from the Swiss Chair to define the possible terms of their cooperation.
3. Another delegate stressed that the different thematic meetings should cover both development and migration agendas equally. The Chair immediately gave assurance that development was at the center of the discussions on Cluster I.

The Chair explained that Cluster III on "Tools for evidence-based migration and development policies" intends to build on the intensive exchange and outcomes of previous meetings, as well as the activities of the Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research. The work plan of this cluster will include the following events:

- The Government of Moldova will host a global event on mainstreaming migration into development planning at the end of September 2011. The meeting will discuss the GMG handbook on mainstreaming migration into development planning which is intended for practitioners and policy makers, and contains detailed guidelines for governments to define migration and development policies and programmes.
- Also, in cooperation with the IOM and the World Bank, the Chair will organize a workshop on Migration and development policy assessment indicators to be held in Marseille on 13-15 June, and co-chaired by Belgium and Morocco.

The delegate from Morocco confirmed his Government's co-chairing role in the Marseille meeting, together with Belgium. This technical workshop would be organized by the World Bank and IOM, with the aim of assessing impact and outcomes of migration management, interventions, rationale, methods and mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation tools. The issue of impact assessment has been part of the work program of the Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research since 2010. It was extensively discussed at the Vienna seminar in June last year and was reported on at the Puerto Vallarta meeting, wherein it was recommended that GFMD continue focusing on assessment and evaluation, particularly of the impact of policy making. The workshop also aims to strengthen and promote a culture of evaluation and foster the establishment of a clearing house for indicators, methods of evaluation and capacity building activities for governments to be able to conduct such evaluation.

Co-chair Belgium seconded the statement made by Morocco and emphasized that migration and development has always been a priority for Belgium as first Chair of the GFMD in 2007. The workshop on assessment of M&D policies is thus of strong interest to the Government.

- Another meeting will focus on the CORIAM (Codéveloppement Rural Intégré dans l'Atlas Marocain) project involving the Moroccan diaspora in France. This meeting in September will be organized by the Governments of France and Morocco, to look closely at the functioning of cooperation between migrant organizations and host governments. The 3-day meeting will entail field visits to different villages. Participants from North and West Africa, as well as from other regions of the world, will assess the project and identify key factors of success.

The representative of Co-chair Morocco first shared his observation that the reticence during the previous meeting of the Steering Group about the fear of decentralization of the Forum was starting to vanish, given the positive comments offered so far. He then explained that the CORIAM meeting seeks to understand and concretize the concept of M&D at the local level. By going to the field, participants will be able to see and witness good experiences in terms of what the diaspora can provide to development at the local level. The details and program of the meeting were still being worked out.

Co-chair France thanked co-chair Morocco for being on board, not only in terms of organizing the meeting, but, more importantly, in trying to show its concrete efforts in enabling its diaspora to contribute to development. He also underscored that Cluster III lies at the core of the problems that the GFMD is attempting to examine. Development is indeed one of the essential elements of GFMD meetings, which makes this thematic meeting even more relevant. While the CORIAM meeting will be a local event, its impact will not remain local, for a number of reasons: 1) the coverage will be a fairly wide region; 2) it will try to illustrate on the ground a development process that has been ongoing for the last 25 years at the initiative of the migrants themselves who had an early vision to link migration and development; 3) it will showcase the efforts of the French government in fully supporting this development policy; 4) the partner countries in the region are also involved in various regional processes; and 5) it will be discussed at the final meeting of the GFMD this year. The meeting could be a unique immersion experience for the participants. Both co-chairs were hopeful that this thematic meeting would be one of the highlights of the Swiss GFMD.

The Chair then discussed subtheme 3 of the 2011 work programme which is the implementation of migration profiles. In Athens and Puerto Vallarta the governments endorsed the usefulness of Migration Profiles (MP) as a comprehensive data and information tool for evidence based policy making on migration and development. To this end:

- A global seminar on Migration Profiles will be held on 30 June 2011 in New York, with the support of the Swiss Chair. The overall objective of this event will be to present the concept of Migration Profiles as a strategic policy tool and to share experiences and lessons learned from previous such exercises. At present, the government of Ghana and Moldova have confirmed their participation as co chairs.

The delegate from Ghana confirmed the Government's continued interest in contributing to the success of the 2011 Forum. Ghana was also happy to co-chair with Moldova the seminar in New York, which will be a follow up to the priorities identified at the Puerto Vallarta meeting, wherein the usefulness of migration profiles as an information tool for evidence based policy making on M&D was endorsed.

The Chair further explained that in addition to the global meeting in New York, other regional workshops on migration profiles will be organized. In this regard, the Chair has started close

consultations with the government of Azerbaijan to see the possibility of organizing such a thematic workshop in Baku, which would envisage the participation of a diverse group of States, particularly from Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Silk Route Countries and others. Moldova offered its readiness to co-chair this seminar.

- A second regional workshop could take place in Asia, possibly in the Philippines. The Chair will meet with the Philippine Minister of Labor while in Dhakka to look into the possibility of hosting a thematic workshop on migration profiles in Manila.

The delegate from the Philippines reiterated the Government's support to the project of migration profiles. It is being hoped that this workshop will proceed, given the presence of policymakers from major sending countries in Asia, who may benefit from this timely and necessary tool for policy making. The details of this possible hosting will be discussed and hopefully finalized during the meeting of the Chair and the Philippine Labor Minister in Dhakka.

The Chair opened the floor for further comments, but no other delegates intervened. The Chair promised to send out a copy of the thematic meeting schedule which can be passed on to the capitals. More information about these thematic meetings will also be disseminated as they become available, to help Governments in deciding on their possible participation.

IV. Information on the Extended Friends of the Forum Meeting

Ambassador Gnesa presented a tentative program of the final meeting of the Friends of the Forum to be held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva on 1 - 2 December, with the following key points:

- To preserve the states-led nature of the GFMD process, the meeting will be open only to UN Member States and some 40 GFMD Observers. For practical reasons, delegation sizes will be limited to 3 for Government delegations and 2 for Observer delegations.
- Like in the past, the Government Meeting will be preceded by Civil Society days on 29 – 30 November in another location. More details about the organization and venue would be given by Mr. John Bingham during the next FOF meeting on 28 June.
- The meeting will start with opening remarks by representatives of the Swiss Chair, the UN Secretary General or his representative, Peter Sutherland, the Chair of the Global Migration Group, and the Chair of the Civil Society Days.
- Following the example in Puerto Vallarta, a Common Space will take place after the opening remarks, in lieu of the General Debate. Thus, the opening plenary will be attended by all government delegates, as well as representatives of the civil society, who will be carefully chosen by the CS organizing committee. Neither the theme nor format of the common space has yet been defined; thus, suggestions would be most welcome.
- The results of the various thematic meetings in the regions will be presented and discussed during breakout working sessions, to be chaired by governments, who as far as possible will be the same as those organizing the thematic meetings throughout the year. To guarantee focused and meaningful discussions, summaries of the thematic meetings will be made available in the beginning of November in the three official GFMD languages – English, French and Spanish -- together with guiding questions for governments to address at the Extended Friends of the Forum meeting.
- On 2 December in the afternoon, a Special Session on the GFMD Assessment (Phase 1) will be held, during which the Chair will outline the results of the survey to be launched

in mid-May 2011. The session will be chaired by the Swiss Chair, with the assistance of the Assessment Team and the support of Mr. Peter Sutherland.

- The Extended Friends of the Forum meeting will close with the conclusions of the simultaneous working sessions and the report on the special session on the GFMD assessment. The incoming Chair of 2012 GFMD will then be invited to deliver a statement. As in the past, the outgoing GFMD Chair will officially close the meeting.

When the Chair opened the floor for comments and suggestions on the tentative plans for the Extended Friends of the forum, seven (7) delegates, as well as Mr. Sutherland, offered their views, as follows:

1. One delegate thought that the meeting seemed to be very similar to the GFMD plenary meeting held in Mexico, Greece, Philippines and Belgium. Thus, he questioned why it continued to be called an Extended Friends of the Forum meeting. Two other delegates seconded this comment. The delegate also expressed concern about holding it in Geneva, on the eve of the IOM 60th Anniversary Council Meeting and the UNHCR Ministerial event celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the Refugees Convention and Anniversary of the Statelessness Convention. It will also coincide with the IGC Mini Full Round and other meetings, which could be distracting.
2. Another delegate inquired about the difference between the E FOF and the Steering Group meetings. He urged the Steering Group to look at the question of duplication between the meetings of the Friends of the Forum and the Steering Group. His Government suggested rationalizing some of the meetings either by merging them or reducing the number, particularly in view of financial constraints and the current difficulties with fund raising.
3. Two delegates asked if the afternoon session of the first day and the morning of the second day will be strictly reserved to States or if civil society will have a role to play during these two sessions. Another delegate requested the Chair to present during the next meeting some details on the civil society participation in the E FOF meeting, particularly on the matter of the Common Space.
4. One delegate emphasized the importance of having the right representation during the E FOF, which should gather experts from migration and development fields and other relevant fields.
5. One delegate enunciated that the title E FOF could be problematic, because the Friends of the Forum do not meet at an expert level.
6. Another delegate believed that a maximum 3 delegation size was too limited, considering that Ministers always bring 1 or 2 additional delegates with them.
7. Another delegate understood that the final meeting in December should be the crowning of a year-long work. This means that it must not break from the thematic meetings that will be held around the world. Governments are all responsible for the success of these meetings by guaranteeing their participation at a suitable level.

Mr Sutherland added his remarks on the above comments. He drew attention to the extensive work that has been done by the Swiss Chair and explained to the Steering Group that the challenges facing the E FOF meeting need to be addressed by all Member States, not only by the host government. The E FOF must bring together participants from the capitals representing the twin areas of responsibility of migration and development, at a level of participation comparable

to those in Puerto Vallarta and other previous meetings. It must be ensured that the E FOF will not be a talk shop of the Geneva community dealing with migration issues.

The Chair shared most of the views that were expressed. He explained that Geneva was chosen as venue because of the smaller number of participants and the lower budget for the meeting, compared to the Puerto Vallarta or the Athens meeting. He affirmed that the meeting envisaged the participation of experts and specialists who are better suited to discuss the results of the thematic meetings. He gave assurance that there will be a Common Space between the civil society and governments. He also agreed that the E FOF will be organized based on the results of the thematic meetings. Finally, he expressed openness to reconsidering the title of the E FOF meeting and the delegation size, but pointed out that the final details will also depend on the available funds on hand.

V. Funding

The Chair moved on to the issue of funding, which had two sub-items: 1) the funding situation for 2011 under the Swiss Chair and 2) the overall GFMD funding mechanism as raised by the UN Special Representative in a paper made available to the governments earlier.

The Chair said he would discuss the first issue, after which he will turn over the floor to Mr. Sutherland, who will then elaborate on the second issue. The Chair reminded the Steering Group that on 4 February, Switzerland submitted to all Friends of the Forum a core budget proposal amounting to USD 2,155,232. So far, the following pledges have been received by the Chair:

- 1) USD 25,000 from Australia to cover advisory services
- 2) EUR 100,000 from Denmark, likely to be earmarked for the participation of developing countries
- 3) EUR 50,000 from the Netherlands for the 2011 GFMD Support Unit budget
- 4) EUR 80,000 from Sweden for the 2011 GFMD Support Unit budget
- 5) USD 100,000 from IOM to cover advisory services.

The Chair thanked Netherlands, Sweden, Australia and Denmark for their generous contributions, and invited all members of the Steering Group to make additional financial contributions to the GFMD. He emphasized that some USD 1 Million or 45% of the 2011 GFMD core budget remained uncovered to date.

In particular, the Chair still lacked some USD 400,000 for the participation of developing countries in the Extended Friends of the Forum meeting, some USD 400,000 to cover the ongoing costs of the Support Unit, and some USD 70,000 for the Assessment Exercise. In order to address this imbalance, the Chair would welcome any contributions from governments, within the scope of their financial possibilities. The Chair was confident that further support will be forthcoming, inasmuch as the number of governments that provided financial and in-kind contributions to the GFMD process has grown steadily since 2007 -- from 6 in Brussels to 11 in Manila, 12 in Athens, and 16 in Puerto Vallarta.

The Chair reiterated that all governments can partake of the benefits of the GFMD process in a spirit of shared ownership. However, in the same vein, all governments have a shared responsibility in sustaining the needs of this global process.

At this juncture, he announced that Mr Sutherland's funding mechanism proposal would be discussed after the lunch break. He invited reactions from the floor before he suspended the meeting for lunch break. Three delegates intervened:

1. Australia announced that it would increase its contribution to USD 150,000 this year. 50% of this contribution will be earmarked for the advisory fees of the Senior Policy Advisor to the Chair, and the other 50% will be non-earmarked.
2. Another delegate reiterated the need to widen the donor base and stressed that the commitment to GFMD could also be measured in monetary form. Thus, all governments were encouraged to step forward and offer even a symbolic support, which could then help others to make some contribution.
3. Another delegate repeated his earlier intervention that there could be some scope for rationalizing some of the costs, particularly as regards the preparatory meetings that happen throughout the year.

The Chair announced a lunch break and informed the Steering Group that the meeting would resume at 15.00 hours.

The Chair reconvened the meeting at 15.15 hours. Sub-item II of the agenda point 5 concerns the long term funding issue of the GFMD process. To elaborate on this point, the Chair gave the floor to Mr. Sutherland, who earlier made a proposal for a more predictable funding mechanism which was circulated to the Steering Group earlier.

Mr. Sutherland reminded the Steering Group that he already outlined the most important elements of the paper during the first meeting in February. Without pre-empting the outcomes of the GFMD assessment and the High Level Dialogue in 2013, the evidence has shown that the GFMD has been reasonably effective and well appreciated by the Member States. However, the process was bedevilled by the funding issue. He clarified that the issue was not the unavailability of funding, but its lack of predictability that could give sufficient assurance to a developing country that may consider hosting the GFMD. This lack of predictability fosters uncertainty about the whole process.

He reckoned that promoting predictability while maintaining the voluntary nature of a state-led process is difficult to achieve. On one hand, donor states should have the opportunity to present the budget in their national arena, in time to make a commitment for the following year. On the other hand, a developing country that is considering hosting the GFMD should have an advanced indication of available funds. Otherwise, it results in scrambling around at the last minute, as in the present situation in trying to seek a developing country to host the 2012 GFMD.

A more predictable funding mechanism must be found without having to rely all the time and excessively on the same handful of donors. The paper thus outlines some basic ideas about setting up an annual standard budget of about USD 2 Million per annum, including the cost of the Support Unit and the main conference. It argues that pledges should come sufficiently early, preferably not later than the first quarter of a year, to enable the selection and finalization of the hosting of a developing country for the following year. This pledging system does not have the certainty of a quota system; but the latter does not sit well with the voluntary and non-binding character of the GFMD.

Governments need to decide whether or not the proposed model was doable. Some degree of commitment from the Member States would be needed. It does not have to be a legally binding commitment, but it does require people to step up to the mark. Otherwise, there will be no host for 2012, and the sustainability of the process until the High Level Dialogue in 2013 will be in question. It would be an irony if the GFMD process will be damaged irreparably after it has been deemed to be relevant and beneficial for many governments.

Ten (10) delegates offered their views and expressed appreciation for the proposal put forward by Mr Sutherland. Most of them acknowledged the need to promote some predictability in the funding situation of the GFMD. The following specific comments were made:

1. Many supported the idea that making advanced pledges could effectively contribute to increasing the financial predictability of the GFMD process, without harming its informal and voluntary character. Some of them believed that this mechanism could make it easier for future chairs from developing countries to decide on actually taking up the Chairmanship.
2. Three delegates welcomed the idea of formulating a standard annual GFMD budget that could promote more transparency and help keep the costs of each hosting under control. Another delegate found the annex to be helpful in setting out the projected costs of hosting the GFMD. A suggestion was made that each host should report on the actual cost of hosting the Forum at the end of each year, to be checked against the proposed annual budget. He urged for streamlining and rationalization of the meetings.
3. Two delegates rejected the option of a GFMD ticket system, in order to preserve the voluntary nature of the GFMD funding mechanism.
4. A few delegates believed that making early commitments beyond a particular year would be difficult due to national budgetary constraints and political situation. One added that the economic standing or quality of the host, as well as the Chair's concept paper could also affect the ability to draw in early pledges.
5. However, two delegates pointed out that inasmuch as the GFMD is a global process, governments have the collective responsibility to keep it alive, if that is the common wish of governments. Contributions should not be affected by the perceived wealth of a host country. To this end, one of them confirmed that they would continue their annual support regardless of the Chair-in-office. Another also thought that despite the annual budgetary cycle, advanced pledges could be made at the beginning of the year.
6. Some delegates anticipated that the mechanism and format of the GFMD would be re-examined at the 2nd High Level Dialogue (HLD) in New York in 2013. The funding issue is both a consequence and a cause of the problem presented by the GFMD's informal nature and the fact that it is not part of the UN system. A suggestion was made to compare the proposal with the estimate of a possible cost of the GFMD process if it were operating within the UN system.
7. One delegate was in favor of setting up a GFMD Trust Fund -- a reserve fund established from the contributions of Member States.
8. Several delegates opined that the proposal should not pre-empt the results of the GFMD assessment exercise that will be carried out in the next two years. The assessment will, among other things, focus on the future modalities of the Forum, including the funding requirements.
9. One delegate believed that there is an inverse relation between the informality of the process and funding predictability. Member States can be called upon to announce their pledges in advance, but they cannot be made to comply. The results of the assessment and the UN HLD may change drastically the GFMD funding mechanism, but there was no point in belabouring this uncertain issue. He thus urged the meeting to focus on the issue of 2012.

In his response to the comments made, Mr Sutherland observed the overwhelming support for the spirit of the proposal. He agreed that the GFMD's immediate focus should be on 2012, but he wanted to emphasize two points. Firstly, the GFMD funding proposal is relatively small compared to the standards of contributions that go into most multilateral activities. While the budget in question could be raised easily from the NGO, private and other philanthropic areas, this would be contrary to the intention of promoting ownership of the GFMD by and among the governments. Indeed, the Forum has been well supported by the MacArthur Foundation, but its ownership and states-led character has been maintained through the years. Secondly, there is no way to predict the outcomes of the High Level Dialogue in 2013, and on how it will affect the GFMD's link with the UN. Hence, the funding issue today may well continue into the future. As many have pointed out, due to the informal support mechanisms of the Forum, greater support is needed for developing countries than for developed ones. However, the GFMD process belongs to everyone; therefore, financial support should be extended by the whole community of Member States to both developed and developing hosts.

Concerning the national budgetary processes that could affect the ability to make early pledges, Mr Sutherland thought that the amounts involved are unlikely to destabilize the budget of any state, even the least developed countries. Besides, any pledge to be made will be treated as a provisional one, subject to approval of the budgetary authorities of the state. He thus asked for some degree of support for the proposal, in order to offer some assurance to a possible host of 2012.

The Chair summed up the discussions on a positive note that more "yes" were heard in support of the principles outlined in the paper. He was optimistic that the proposal would not undermine the results of the assessment exercise or the HLD in 2013. He suggested that the proposal be tried this year in order to find a developing country Chair for 2012. He announced that the Chair and the SRSB would prepare a joint letter addressed to all Friends of the Forum, explaining the urgent funding situation and asking for early pledges.

VI. GFMD Assessment

The Chair gave a brief update on the current state of play of the GFMD assessment exercise. He announced that the Assessment Team would meet immediately after the Steering Group meeting. The purpose would be to discuss and finalize the second draft of the assessment questionnaire, which will be sent out to all governments in early May. Governments will have 2 months to fill in the questionnaire and return it to the Support Unit. After collecting all the responses, the Chair, with the assistance of the assessment specialist, will prepare a draft report on phase 1 of the assessment exercise. The draft report will be closely coordinated with the Assessment Team, and the final report will be presented and discussed during the special session on the GFMD assessment at the E FOF meeting in December.

A delegate inquired about the timelines for phase 2 of the assessment exercise. The Chair explained that this will be discussed at the E FOF meeting. As soon as the first phase has been completed, the GFMD Assessment Team will meet to decide on how to proceed with the second phase.

VII. UN Informal Thematic Debate

The Chair announced that the President of the UN General Assembly was organizing an Informal Thematic Debate on International Migration and Development to take place on 19 May 2011 in New York. This would be an ideal forum at the UN level to discuss the important issues of migration and development, as a prelude to the High Level Dialogue in 2013. He then invited Mr Sutherland to say a few words on this important event.

Mr Sutherland assumed that everybody had seen a copy of the concept note of the Informal Thematic Debate. For the first time, the General Assembly will address migration in an interactive format. In essence, the debate was developed to afford the opportunity to assess what the dialogue on migration and development has achieved in the last 5 years, what were lessons learned, and how have States put this body of knowledge into practice back home. It would also offer the opportunity to develop further the thinking on what governments would like to achieve after the HLD in 2013.

The program will be divided into 2 sessions, each with 5 panellists and a Chair who will spend about an hour each exploring two themes – 1) the contribution of migrants to development and 2) improving international cooperation on migration and development. Panellists will include policy makers, members of Civil Society, experts and international organization representatives. States will be represented by senior policy makers and Ambassadors in New York. In the concept note sent to the States, the President of the General Assembly has posed a series of questions for the panellists and their participating States to address.

- Session 1 asks the questions: a) how can governments support their nationals working abroad as assets for their national economies and social development in their countries and communities?; b) what social and other policies have proved effective or are needed to maximize the benefits of migration for development?
- Session 2 raises the questions: a) what are concrete outcomes and best practices achieved by the regional and global cooperation mechanisms, including, informal consultative processes, in which Member States discuss migration and development issues; b) what are good models and lessons learned in the context of bilateral agreements?

Prior to the thematic debate, on 17-18 May, the GMG will be hosting a Symposium on “Migration and youth: harnessing opportunities for development”, which would also be open to Member States.

The Chair thanked Mr Sutherland for his presentation and announced that the GFMD Chair was also invited to participate in the Informal Thematic Debate. He would speak in the 2nd panel on the issue of improving international cooperation on migration and development. The Chair will take this opportunity to report on the achievements of the GFMD, as well as on the challenges that the process has faced and continues to face.

No questions or comments were made regarding this agenda item.

VIII. Any other business

a) 2012 Chairmanship

The Chair offered some additional information about the 2012 Chairmanship. One year before the HLD and halfway through the assessment of the GFMD, this critical issue must be resolved quickly. Very few governments have expressed interest or willingness to consider the chairmanship, and as yet have reached no conclusive agreement in their capitals. Hosting the forum is indeed a major decision for any government, but there is a big support network comprised of the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum which helps make each annual Forum a success, both in substance and financial terms. All governments share an interest in making it work and in preserving its unique states-owned character. But this can only be done if governments also shared in the responsibility of hosting it.

b) Platform for Partnerships

The Chair recalled the presentation on the renewed PfP during the first meeting of the Friends of the Forum held last 15 March. He reiterated that the PfP is a tool to showcase existing practices

and to promote new initiatives and partnerships. Over the past month, some governments, including Mexico, Netherlands, UAE and the Philippines, have started engaging actively in the PfP by sharing projects and practices which are now posted on the online Pfp.

To step up the efforts at collecting practices and help realize the objectives of the Platform for Partnerships, the Support Unit will be organizing some small informal group discussions on the Pfp, involving primarily the members of the GFMD Steering Group. These meetings will take place in May and aim to:

1. Elaborate on the GFMD Pfp's potential as a tool to facilitate and showcase projects, programs and policies of governments in the field of migration and development;
2. Receive feedback and discuss the Pfp, in order to be able to improve and adjust the functionalities of the Pfp to governments' needs; and
3. Explore potential projects and practices that could be showcased on the Pfp.

The Chair encouraged the Steering Group to participate in these focused group discussions, the results of which will be presented at the 2nd meeting of the FOF on 28 June.

As there were no other matters in the agenda, nor additional comments or questions, the Chair closed the meeting with a note of thanks to all the delegates. The complete attendance of the Steering Group members was taken as a very clear sign of their governments' commitment and support of the GFMD process.

The second meeting of the GFMD Steering Group adjourned at 16.30 hours.

Prepared by:

GFMD Support Unit
(supportunit@gfmd.org)