

Towards a Global Compact for Migration: A Development Perspective

A Series to Inform the Debate

Revised February 2019

Issue No. 5

Reimagining Skilled Migration Partnerships to Support Development

By Kate Hooper

Executive Summary

In the wake of the 2015–16 refugee crisis along the southern border of the European Union, efforts to build legal migration pathways between countries of origin and destination have become a top policy priority. There is a growing recognition among policymakers that their migration-management strategies need to include expanded legal migration opportunities for key countries of origin, so as to provide prospective migrants with an alternative to irregular migration. Policymakers are revisiting the idea of skills partnerships as a way to facilitate migration while encouraging development in origin countries.

While there is a long history of partnerships to encourage low-skilled labor migration, for example, in seasonal agriculture, few to date have focused on skilled migration. This partly reflects the most common skills profile seen in many countries of origin, where a relatively small share of the population has completed tertiary or even secondary education. Countries of origin may also be reluctant to facilitate skilled emigration, citing their investments in the human capital of their residents, and fears of depleting these stocks. However, origin countries often do reap benefits from skilled emigration, including remittances and opportunities to develop and transfer new knowledge and skills, and to establish new networks for trade and investment. Demand for skilled workers in destination countries is growing, as needs in health care and other sectors evolve and increase, and as populations age and more people leave the workforce. In turn, qualified professionals in certain sectors (such as nursing) struggle to find employment in some countries of origin, presenting an opportunity for greater cooperation to facilitate skilled migration.

So far, the record on partnerships to facilitate skilled migration has been mixed. Some programs, such as Germany's Triple Win project, which recruits nurses from the Philippines, Serbia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, have been running successfully for several years. But many pilot programs do not get scaled up; evaluations cite reasons such as limited employer buy-in, dis-



appointing on-the-job performance, and high operational costs. Middle- or high-skilled migrants often need months of intensive language and vocational training to enable them to work in their chosen profession in another country, and many projects struggle to meet and share these costs without deterring employers from participating altogether. In turn, whether origin countries experience the development benefits of facilitated skilled migration often hinges on the decisions of individual migrants: benefits risk being diminished if migrants choose to stay in the destination country on a long-term basis or if they cannot put their new skills to use when they do return home.

With these challenges in mind, the “global skills partnership” approach put forward in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration suggests investing earlier in the migration cycle and focusing on training prospective migrants instead of recruiting professionals who are already qualified in their field. The idea is that for the same cost as training one person in a destination country, governments and employers could afford to train several people to the same standard in a sending country. Trainees would include some people primed to move and work in the destination country, and others who may choose to stay at home. Countries of origin would benefit from the latter group, and all participants would receive high-quality training, regardless of their decision to leave, return, or stay. But, to date, this global skills partnership model remains largely untested. The Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC) is a rare example, offering Australian vocational training to students in the Pacific Islands with the goals of building skills and encouraging graduates to move to Australia. But while the APTC’s training is highly rated by employers and participants, very few of its graduates have moved overseas. Questions remain, for the APTC and around the world, about how to deliver training that is beneficial for both destination- and origin-country employers, how to align training standards among countries, and how to distribute the costs of training so they are shared by employers,

governments, prospective migrants, and people who participate in the program but decide not to move abroad.

Regardless of which model policymakers opt for, they face the challenge of designing partnerships that can facilitate skilled migration successfully while also ensuring that migrants, destination countries, and countries of origin all see concrete benefits from their participation. Past experiences both with traditional partnerships and the global skills partnership model put forward by the Global Compact offer important insights. Encouraging mobility necessitates thinking carefully about which sectors to target, ensuring high demand in destination countries and a surplus workforce in countries of origin, securing longer-term migration opportunities (beyond the temporary ones usually offered by labor-migration programs), and bridging skills gaps in a cost-effective way. These factors, coupled with strong political and employer buy-in and good outcomes for employers and migrants alike, help determine whether a pilot program will be scaled up or renewed. In turn, ensuring that skilled migration will foster development in countries of origin also requires careful consideration. Key factors include predeparture investments, how and where migrants can put their skills to use effectively if they return, and opportunities for diaspora members to transfer skills and resources even if they choose not to return.

I. Introduction

In the wake of the 2015–16 refugee and migration crisis, policymakers in the European Union and elsewhere are revisiting the idea of creating partnerships between migrants’ countries of destination and origin as a means of expanding legal migration pathways. The European Commission and its Member States are in the process of developing pilot legal migration programs with several African countries.¹ Such efforts reflect a growing recognition that migra-

tion-management strategies need to include expanded legal migration opportunities for people from key countries of origin.

Over the years, bilateral partnerships have encouraged labor migration in high-demand sectors, while also encouraging skills development that can benefit migrants and countries alike. Many of these partnerships have focused on seasonal, low-skilled migration in the agricultural and tourism industries, reflecting both demand for cheap labor in these sectors in key destination countries and the skill levels and educational backgrounds prevalent in many countries of origin.

While relatively few partnerships have focused on middle- or high-skilled migration to date, there is growing interest in the role such programs could play in facilitating labor migration between destination and origin countries. Demand for middle- and high-skilled workers in some destination countries is rising, driven both by emerging labor and skills shortages in high-growth industries and by populations aging and more people leaving the workforce.² While the scale of current and future shortages is much debated, it is clear that immigration will play a role in addressing them. Meanwhile, in some countries of origin, qualified professionals in certain sectors (such as nursing) struggle to find employment, presenting an opportunity for partnerships that can link skilled migrants with destination-country employers.

But, to date, bilateral partnerships have yielded mixed results both in terms of encouraging people to move and in maximizing the potential development benefits of skilled migration. Many programs do not get beyond the pilot stage, facing limited buy-in from employers or migrants and high operational costs. Questions remain about the benefits for countries of origin, particularly if migrants choose to remain in the destination country on a long-term basis or if they cannot put their new skills to work when they return home.

With these challenges in mind, policymakers are now revisiting the fundamentals of how to de-

sign and target these programs. The final text of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration,³ released in July 2018, highlights two partnership models that could promote skills development:

- More traditional partnerships or programs, which offer professional work experience or training in *destination countries*, with an avenue for temporary or permanent employment after the program concludes.
- What the compact calls “global skills partnerships,” which invest in education and training systems in *countries of origin* for prospective migrants and their nonmigrant peers.

At the heart of this conversation lies the question of how to facilitate skilled migration in a way that ensures benefits for all parties involved: destination countries, countries of origin, and migrants. While partnerships have the potential to facilitate skilled migration and development, past experience suggests they can struggle to bear fruit in practice. As policymakers pursue deeper cooperation to achieve safer and more orderly migration, as set out in target 10.7 of the UN Sustainable Development Goals,⁴ this policy brief examines the two partnership models highlighted in the Global Compact for Migration, exploring the challenges programs face in encouraging mobility and promoting skills development, and drawing lessons from those undertaken to date.

II. Designing Partnerships to Promote Skilled Migration

Partnerships offer great potential as vehicles to test and expand legal migration pathways while fostering development in countries of origin. While, to date, most partnerships have focused on seasonal, low-skilled migration (e.g., in the agriculture or tourism industries),⁵ growing demand for middle- or high-skilled labor in

destination countries presents an incentive for creating programs focused on more skilled professions.

Thus far, these have most often been pilot projects that facilitate professional experience or training in destination countries, typically on a temporary basis. Examples include temporary work placements, training, or professional exchange programs; in some cases, participants who meet certain requirements, such as securing an employment offer or getting certified to practice, may be able to stay on a longer-term basis.⁶ Such programs tend to recruit workers who are already qualified in their profession, offering top-up professional training and language instruction to equip them to work in the destination country.

But, in practice, partnerships can struggle to meet their mobility and development objectives. Some bilateral partnerships—such as Germany’s Triple Win project, which recruits nurses from Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Philippines, and Serbia—have been running and successfully placing migrants for several years.⁷ But many programs yield disappointing outcomes and never make it past the pilot stage. Programs may overestimate demand from migrants or employers, or their political buy-in may collapse. For example, an evaluation of the Netherlands’ Blue Birds pilot project (which sought to place 160 Indonesians and South Africans in temporary roles in shipping, manufacturing, logistics, agribusiness, and the food industry) described a loss of political support under a new government as a key factor prompting the pilot’s premature end in 2011.⁸ Many programs also grapple with mounting operational costs, particularly among programs targeting middle- or high-skilled migrants, because of the costs involved in training people for skilled roles (including both specialized vocational training and advanced language tuition); such costs are much higher than for the more rudimentary training offered to participants in seasonal agriculture programs, for example.

In summary, the record of bilateral partnerships focused on skills development is mixed. Some programs provide migrants with opportunities to develop concrete skills, such as in geriatric care, or provide recent graduates in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields with professional experience. But other projects underemploy migrants, by placing skilled workers in lower-skilled roles with limited opportunities to use or build on their skills. The development benefits for countries of origin are closely linked to the outcomes of participants. This requires careful thinking about how migrants can put their new skills to good use when they return home, and how to foster skills transfer when migrants choose to stay on in a destination country on a longer-term basis.

An alternative approach, put forward in the Global Compact, is that of global skills partnerships. This new, largely untested approach would involve investing earlier in the migration cycle, in the origin-country education and training that prospective migrants and their peers receive before they become fully qualified in their professional field.⁹ Under this model, countries of destination and of origin would sign an agreement by which a destination-country government (and, potentially, its private-sector partners) would agree to finance training (usually delivered within the country of origin) to prepare beneficiaries for work abroad or in their own countries. The idea is that for the same cost as training one student in a typical destination country, several people could be trained in a country of origin, some of whom would move (the “away track”), while others would stay (the “home track”). For example, a 2014 study found that a three-year professional nursing program in schools in Casablanca, Morocco, and Sousse, Tunisia, cost less than USD 14,000, but an equivalent course in Witten, Germany, or in London would cost between USD 80,000 and 100,000.¹⁰

Table 1. A Comparison of Two Partnership Models

| | Traditional Model | New “Global Skills Partnership” Model |
|---|---|---|
| What does it offer? | Professional experience or training in the <i>destination country</i> | Education and training, usually delivered in a <i>country of origin</i> |
| Who does it target? | Qualified professionals or recent graduates | Students (both prospective migrants and their peers) |
| What are the key development benefits for countries of origin? | The skills developed by participating migrants as well as their remittances and potential trade, mentoring, and professional networks | The skills and resources developed by eventual migrants, as well as those of participants who receive subsidized training and stay in the country of origin |

Table 1 compares the key features of these two partnership models—the traditional one, and the approach envisioned by the Global Compact. Several elements distinguish these models:

- **Timeframe for investments.** Global skills partnerships employ a longer-term theory of change. Instead of recruiting people to move on a temporary basis and helping them develop skills that can be put to use upon their return, global skills partnerships invest in education and training in countries of origin, helping to train prospective migrants and their peers, and potentially build capacity to produce skilled workers in the longer term.
- **Narrow versus broad targeting.** Global skills partnerships target both migrants and nonmigrants. Traditional partnerships recruit people who are already qualified in their field to migrate and target services to them, including the training necessary for them to practice in the destination country. The global skills partnership approach focuses on students instead: investments target their education or training writ large, including of those who do not migrate. Training could take several

forms: for example, all participants might receive training to the standards of the destination country, or they might be separated into two tracks, with prospective migrants receiving specialized training, while the education of others—though fully funded—is left to regular institutions.

- **Development benefits.** Traditional partnerships offer development benefits derived from the skills, experiences, and earnings of migrants participating in the program. The global skills partnerships offer benefits derived from all participants who receive subsidized education and training, whether they move overseas or not. Considering that some traditional partnerships have faced criticism for underusing participants’ skills, and thus undermining their stated goal of encouraging skills development, this represents a notable departure.¹¹ Importantly, destination countries’ investments in education and training systems in countries of origin, and the process of aligning destination- and origin-country standards, may help raise the overall quality of the education provided.

The global skills partnership model offers a promising alternative for promoting skilled migration between destination and origin countries. By transferring the costs of training migrants to destination countries, skills partnerships may help assuage origin countries' concerns over "brain drain."¹² One of the few examples of a skills partnership that employs the approach proposed in the Global Compact—the Australia-Pacific Technical College, discussed in the next section—sheds light on how this model can work in practice.

Implementation Challenges: Lessons from the Australia-Pacific Technical College

The Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC), which offers Australian-standard vocational training through several universities and colleges in the Pacific Islands has the dual goals of building skills and encouraging graduates to migrate to Australia. The APTC provides courses in subjects such as construction, engineering, and hospitality that are accredited with Australian qualifications.¹³

But while the quality of the APTC's training is highly rated by graduates and employers, very few graduates have moved overseas. As of December 2016, 257 graduates reported they had migrated to another country, comprising just 2 percent of all graduates since 2007; of these emigrant graduates, about two-thirds moved to Australia or New Zealand (1.5 percent of all graduates), with most of the others moving to other Pacific Island destinations (such as Fiji or Samoa).¹⁴ Barriers to migration included:¹⁵

- **Not meeting education or work experience requirements.** Around half of APTC graduates do not qualify for admission under Australia's skilled migration system because they do not have the qualifications or the relevant work experience. The APTC has not updated its courses to reflect changes in Australia's immigration requirements, such as those related to eligible occupations

(hospitality was recently removed from the list) and the changing allocation of points in the immigrant selection system to favor people with advanced degrees, skilled work experience, and strong English language skills.¹⁶ That said, revising course offerings to align more closely with Australia's current immigration priorities could come at the expense of courses that foster middle-level skills that prepare students for employment in high-demand sectors in the Pacific Islands, while frequent revisions to curricula, teaching materials, and even teaching staff could be very resource and time intensive for the APTC.

- **Australia's growing reliance on employer-sponsored pathways.** The fact that Australia has become more reliant on temporary employer-sponsored migration is another barrier, as APTC graduates based overseas can struggle to build their professional networks and find jobs with Australian employers that could qualify them for employer-sponsored visas.¹⁷
- **Challenges navigating the system.** APTC graduates also reported difficulties finding information about opportunities to migrate, or advice on navigating the complex immigration systems of Australia or other destination countries. The costs of applying for visas and relocating can also be prohibitive.

The APTC's poor record on facilitating migration to Australia—even as it provides subsidized, high-quality training—illustrates the challenge of balancing migration and development priorities. Proposed reforms to the APTC include introducing a two-track system: students in the "home track" would receive support in finding work or developing business ideas at home, while those in the "away track" would receive support navigating immigration processes and building connections with employers in Australia and New Zealand.¹⁸

To date, the APTC is one of the few examples of a global skills partnership, and questions remain about how this model may work in practice. One question is how to assign people to a “home” or “away” track. For example, does the home track consist of those who could not find jobs abroad, while the most promising candidates opt for the away track? Can people switch between the two? Another set of questions pertain to the content of training. How can programs deliver training that is relevant to labor markets and employers at both destination and origin? Otherwise, those who receive training but stay home and those who migrate and then return may not be able to put their new skills (including destination-country language skills) to use in a productive way. A related design question is how to align training standards so that someone can work in either country with minimal retraining or relicensing—and be assured that employers in both countries will recognize and accept their credentials. Finally, policymakers will need to address the question of how to distribute costs among different government and nongovernment actors (e.g., employers and migrants) so that programs remain competitive enough to sustain the participation of all parties.

III. How Can Partnerships Encourage Skilled Migration?

Facilitating mobility is a main goal of partnerships, which at their core aim to match qualified workers with employers abroad in need of their labor. But such partnerships have often struggled to accomplish this goal, regardless of what model policymakers select. To create cost-effective programs that encourage people to move, policymakers must consider: (1) which sectors to target, (2) how to bridge skill gaps, (3) how to share costs equitably, and (4) what length these initiatives should be. Answers to these questions carry potential tradeoffs but are needed to shape the type and scale of migration facilitated by programs.

A. Selecting the Right Sector

When selecting which sectors to prioritize, policymakers will need to strike a balance between the needs of destination and origin countries. On the one hand, destination-country funding and employer engagement rely on prioritizing demand in key sectors in destination countries. At the same time, it is important to select sectors that are strategically important for countries of origin, with opportunities for returning migrants to put their new skills to use—and, crucially, to avoid sectors experiencing shortages, so as to mitigate concerns about brain drain.

Getting employers’ input at an early stage on which sectors and needs should be the focus is key—both to ensure there are suitable work placements for participants in destination countries and to encourage employers in origin countries to hire program graduates. Government-led partnerships can gauge employer demand by convening stakeholder meetings to assess needs in different sectors and get employer perspectives on how to make programs accessible (for example, areas where bureaucratic requirements for an immigrant seeking to practice in a skilled profession could be reduced). In some cases, employers or destination-country recruitment agencies can even lead programs, reflecting demand in their sectors. For example, the Finnish recruitment agency Opteam leads a small-scale program to recruit nurses from the Philippines to work in nursing homes and other health facilities, and Germany’s Nursing Employers Association (Arbeitgeberverband-Pflege) has partnered with the Confederation of German Employers’ Associations (BDA), the German Federal Employment Agency’s International Placement Services (ZAV), and China’s Labor Ministry to recruit 150 Chinese nurses to work in nursing homes in Germany.¹⁹

Health care is a popular sector for partnerships. This reflects current and emerging shortages of doctors, nurses, and caregivers in many high-income countries with rapidly aging populations, as well as high unemployment rates among trained nurses and doctors in some develop-

ing countries.²⁰ Germany, for example, selected partner countries for its Triple Win project with large unemployed nursing workforces.²¹ To alleviate high unemployment rates among registered nurses at home, the Philippines has entered into both the Triple Win project and partnerships with several other countries, such as Finland and Japan.²² Other popular middle- or high-skilled sectors that have been the focus of partnerships include those related to STEM fields; Germany, for example, has run programs with Tunisia to train and place engineers on a temporary basis.²³

The global skills partnership model adopts a different approach, selecting sectors that are in high demand both in destination and origin countries, and that both need additional trained professionals. Because these partnerships provide long-term investments in education and training systems, it is important to focus on sectors that are—and will continue to be—long-term priorities. One of the flaws of the APTC was that it struggled to keep up with changes in the needs of the Australian labor market. As the APTC designed and delivered its courses, it did not incorporate new information about labor-market demands or immigration requirements in Australia, leaving many of its students ineligible to migrate there after graduation.

B. Bridging Skills Gaps

In the more regulated and specialized professions typically targeted by skilled migration partnerships, participants often need additional training to perform their work in line with destination-country standards or requirements. Migrants seeking employment in regulated professions, such as nursing or engineering, may be required to sit for licensing exams in the destination-country language, and this can take months or even years of preparation. More broadly, they may need training tailored to their new context. For example, qualified nurses from countries with relatively young populations may be less prepared for the requirements for caring for the elderly.²⁴

The APTC sidesteps some of these recognition issues by issuing Australian-standard qualifications. But teaching to destination-country specifications in countries of origin raises its own set of challenges. In the case of the APTC, for example, many of its graduates do not end up moving to Australia, creating a local workforce with Australian-standard qualifications. In some cases, this has meant that some returning migrants or people who decide not to move in the first place face problems receiving recognition for their qualifications in their origin countries. If local employers do not recognize or value their qualifications or experience, this leads to skills waste. Another consideration is that the cost of providing destination-country instruction in countries of origin, including relocating or training qualified teachers, can be very high. Future skills partnerships will need to weigh the pros and cons of (1) offering destination-country qualifications, with these caveats in mind, or (2) improving the quality of instruction in origin-country training systems while helping participants navigate credentialing issues in destination countries.

Many programs bridge the gap by allowing participants to work at a more junior level or under supervision in the destination country while they gain the training or experience necessary to qualify to practice. For example, Filipino nurses recruited by health-care providers in Finland are all registered nurses (i.e., they hold a four-year degree), but under the terms of the program they work as nursing assistants while they receive Finnish language instruction and vocational training. Only then may they take a licensing examination to become a practical nurse (which is still a more junior position than a registered one).²⁵ Similarly, under Japan's Economic Partnership Agreement with the Philippines (JPEPA), Filipino nurses work in junior roles (e.g., as nursing aides) for up to three years while they study for examinations that would license them to perform professional nursing duties.²⁶

Helping program participants work toward resuming (or advancing beyond) the professional responsibilities they previously enjoyed

in their country of origin is vital to keeping them motivated. This is the test of whether a program indeed presents legitimate opportunities for skills development.²⁷ The experience of working in a more junior role with reduced responsibilities can be frustrating for participants, especially if the odds of passing a licensing examination are low.²⁸ Participants in the JPEPA program, for example, described their frustration working in junior roles and with reduced responsibilities, coupled with difficult working conditions.²⁹ This points to the importance of providing opportunities for advancement, and if this is not possible, managing participants' expectations about their roles and responsibilities.

More broadly, middle- or high-skilled workers often need months of general and industry-specific language training to build sufficient fluency to work. While employers in seasonal labor programs can deploy translators to get around migrants' limited destination-country language skills, this approach is less feasible for programs targeting middle- or high-skilled roles, where a lack of fluency can impede migrants' ability to work or even create risks to public safety. For example, a health-care recipient's fundamental safety can hinge on a nurse's ability to communicate well with them. Proposed reforms to the APTC to encourage migration have highlighted the need to provide tailored English language instruction alongside broader support to help graduates navigate the Australian immigration system and understand what life in Australia is like.³⁰ Programs targeting middle- or high-skilled workers will need to include intensive language training over several months to bring workers up to the necessary fluency level.

C. Sharing Costs

While investments in language and vocational training offer a way to fill migrants' skills gaps, the costs can be very high. Many pilot programs do not get scaled up, and high costs can figure prominently in this decision. While few partnerships publish their full operational costs, factoring in training, travel and accommoda-

tion, wages, and other expenses, costs are likely to amount to tens of thousands of dollars per participant.³¹ Costs could mount up under the global skills partnership model, too, despite training being delivered in countries of origin. In the case of the APTC, the costs of bringing in teachers and curricula from Australia meant that training was not much cheaper than the equivalent delivered in Australia.³² The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade runs a scholarship program that covers some or all of the training costs of many APTC students, spending on average AUD 53,000 per student.³³

Partnerships vary in how they distribute costs among stakeholders. In most partnerships, those responsible for administering the project—whether development agencies or other actors—usually cover most of the up-front costs, such as for predeparture training, though migrants may be asked to contribute to some costs, such as their travel fare.³⁴ Eventually, destination-country employers typically assume the lion's share of costs, including for recruitment and training, and then pay market-level wages. In the Finnish program that recruits nurses from abroad, employers cover the costs of predeparture training, and migrants need cover only their living costs.³⁵

If costs get too high, employers may decide to withdraw from a scheme. In the JPEPA program, Japanese hospitals contribute to training and recruitment fees and are responsible for other costs (such as annual dues to the Japanese International Cooperation of Welfare Services). The high costs of investing in nurses who can rarely stay for more than a couple of years (since so few are able to pass the Japanese-language licensing exam) have deterred employers from participating.³⁶ In the case of the APTC, the small number of graduates to migrate makes it difficult to assign the costs of their training to destination-country employers, leaving Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to shoulder most of the costs in the form of its generous scholarship programs. Sharing more of the costs with local employers or students may not be viable since, as the Australian government has noted, "[Pacific Island] enterprises are

likely to find APTC costs too high compared with other training options.”³⁷

D. Temporary vs. Longer-Term Migration

During the course of these programs, employers invest resources in training and integrating migrant workers—but this investment seems less worthwhile if migrants depart after a few months or even a couple of years. Offering pathways to longer-term residence for qualifying migrants can bolster the participation of destination-country employers. Evaluations suggest that migrants, too, prefer to stay longer in destination countries.³⁸

But countries of origin can be reluctant to support long-term migration, given concerns that skilled emigration may deplete their human capital stocks and harm economic development.³⁹ Often, the benefits they expect from participating in partnership programs hinge on migrants returning and putting their skills to use when they do. But if some participants opt to stay away on a longer-term basis, policymakers can explore options to promote skills transfer (e.g., the sharing of new knowledge, practices, technologies, or networks derived from professional experience) and remittances.⁴⁰

IV. How Can Partnerships Ensure Development Benefits?

The second part of the puzzle for policymakers is how to ensure partnerships deliver tangible development benefits. The skills development component of partnerships can vary. While some programs deliver clear opportunities for migrants to develop new skills (such as offering on-the-job training to recent graduates, or training in a new specialty), in other programs these benefits are less clear cut. When migrants work in less advanced roles than their previous jobs, with limited opportunities to advance or develop new skills, there is a risk of underemployment and even deskilling.

Estimating the development benefits of partnerships is made more challenging by a lack of effective or consistent evaluation, most often due to resource constraints. Some evaluations discuss short-term employment outcomes; few track migrants’ progress on a longer-term basis to explore whether they are putting their new skills to use, and those that do (such as the APTC) tend to rely on self-reported data.⁴¹

Ensuring that partnerships deliver concrete development benefits requires careful consideration of their three distinct stages: (1) investments in countries of origin, before people move; (2) the facilitation of skills transfer while people are overseas; and (3) assistance of returning migrants, including help putting their skills to good use. Development actors can also offer crucial insights on program design, drawing on their experience developing and implementing projects in partner countries and their knowledge of local labor-market conditions.

A. Predeparture Investments

The structure of traditional partnerships means that most of the benefits of participation accrue to countries of origin only once migrants return home. These partnerships usually offer some predeparture training to migrants before they leave their country of origin, but the degree of training can vary widely, ranging from basic services and orientation, to more detailed vocational or language instruction.

But knowing that some migrants opt not to return home, the proposed global skills partnership model offers development benefits that will accrue to countries of origin at a much earlier stage, and that do not hinge on the decisions of individual migrants. By investing in education and training systems in countries of origin, which are linked to economic growth,⁴² the model offers concrete development benefits at the predeparture stage. Within this framework, there are many options for how to deliver training: it could be delivered in sending countries or split between sending and destination countries, it could create curricula specifically for migrants

based on destination-country standards or focus instead on modifying existing origin-country curricula, and migrants may be separated into a different training track from nonmigrants, or not.⁴³ The APTC offers one example of how a skills partnership might invest in the provision of vocational education and training. By offering high-quality vocational training at well-regarded Australian standards, the APTC has helped both expand the capacity and improve the quality of vocational education in the Pacific Islands.⁴⁴ To date, the APTC has intentionally operated separately from national vocational training systems. While the Australian government plans to keep this structure in place, the APTC has plans to help improve systems in the region, for example, by offering support to national governments on vocational education reform and teacher training.

B. Engaging Overseas Migrants and Encouraging Skills Transfer

Some programs targeting middle- or high-skilled migrants offer pathways to long-term migration, though these generally hinge on migrants securing a job offer or passing licensing examinations. But if migrants do not return home, policymakers need to think creatively about how to ensure origin countries can benefit from their new skills nonetheless.

The most obvious example is through remittances, which far outstrip official development assistance in many countries and are associated with reduced poverty and better outcomes in health, education, gender equality, and other areas.⁴⁵ There are promising initiatives to make it easier to send and receive remittances, whether through reducing fees or improving access to financial services, particularly in rural areas.⁴⁶ Other initiatives have experimented with ways to increase returns on remittances, for example, by encouraging people to use their remittances to open savings accounts or access credit.⁴⁷ In addition to their benefits for individuals and households, remittance income helps support

the foreign exchange accounts of remittance-receiving countries, lowering their borrowing costs.

Migrants abroad can also provide access to their skills and overseas networks.⁴⁸ A number of destination and origin countries have sought to encourage diaspora members to contribute their expertise and mentor entrepreneurs in origin countries, while others have facilitated their temporary return to help build capacity in certain industries. For example, Indus Entrepreneurs (TiE), a nonprofit network founded by Indian diaspora members in Silicon Valley, offers networking events, workshops, and one-on-one mentoring for Indian entrepreneurs through its chapters around the world. Similarly, through ChileGlobal, business people of Chilean descent offer consulting services for the Chilean government, facilitate internships abroad for Chileans, and mentor Chilean entrepreneurs via an online platform.⁴⁹ And the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Netherlands' Migration for Development in Africa program in Ghana, which ran from 2005 to 2012, funded Ghanaian health specialists to return temporarily to Ghana and perform complex medical procedures, train staff in surgical procedures and nursing practices, and set up outpatient clinics.⁵⁰

Partnerships can do more to ensure that migrants abroad can contribute to development in their countries of origin, regardless of whether they decide to return. Some programs targeting low-skilled seasonal workers have offered advice on how to send and use remittances, and partnerships targeting middle- and high-skilled workers can learn from their example.⁵¹ In turn, partnerships could link their participants to a rich array of efforts to engage migrants abroad (such as mentoring initiatives) and thus encourage skills transfer.

C. Putting Migrants' New Skills to Use Upon Return

Migrants can struggle to put their new skills to use when they return home, resulting in un-

employment or underemployment and skills waste—or cycles of repeat migration. Partnerships have experimented with several ways to counter these issues, including:

- **Reintegration counseling.** Some programs offer predeparture information sessions for migrants returning to their origin countries to help them navigate the job market and develop a post-return game plan. In a 2013–16 German pilot program with Georgia to recruit nursing and hospitality professionals, participants could access information sessions on the Georgian job market, job fairs with Georgian diaspora organizations, a workshop on business opportunities in Georgia, and an hour of individual counseling before and after returning to Georgia.⁵²
- **Business development support.** Such assistance is more common among projects that target low-skilled workers. For example, the Temporary and Circular Labor Migration Project between Spain and Colombia offered a three-part training (two sessions in Spain and one in Colombia) to help migrants develop a business plan, while a 2011 pilot project that selected 20 Ghanaian subsistence farmers to harvest fruit in Italy offered participants supplies and equipment to help them move toward commercial farming.⁵³ New Zealand, meanwhile, is experimenting with investing in agricultural industries to help participants utilize the skills they have developed.
- **Helping participants find work.** This can be more of a challenge, since it relies on both the availability of jobs in origin countries, and professional networks to help returning migrants connect to them. Where there are jobs, migrants may struggle to market their foreign-acquired experience to domestic employers. Over the years, policy-

makers have experimented with several approaches to help returning migrants find work:

- **Fostering networking with diaspora members.** Doing so can help migrants who are planning their return learn about labor-market conditions and employment opportunities, as tried in the Germany-Georgia pilot.
- **Identifying job opportunities with destination-country employers with operations in the origin country.** In the Germany-Tunisia pilot, most Tunisian engineers wound up working either for German companies in Germany or German companies with operations in Tunisia⁵⁴—with the engineers’ experience in Germany potentially appealing to the latter.
- **Investing in targeted sectors in origin countries.** Another, more ambitious approach is to invest in the sectors targeted by partnerships—for example, health care or engineering—to help create jobs. New Zealand has employed this strategy by investing in pilot horticulture projects in countries of origin that enable participants in its seasonal work program to apply their new skills.⁵⁵

Some destination countries also offer placement services for returning migrants, which pilot programs could refer people to or build on. Germany’s Center for International Migration and Development has run a returning experts’ program since 1980 that helps place returning migrants who work in a development-related field in jobs in their origin countries, offering salary top-ups, subsidies for relocation costs, training grants, and ongoing career support.⁵⁶ Several destination countries have also offered programs to help returning migrants start up

their own business. France ran a pilot program, the Program for the Creation of Innovative Companies in the Mediterranean, from 2010 to 2015 that offered up to 35,000 euros in start-up capital and mentoring for North Africans who held a French graduate degree in science or technology and were looking to start up a business in their country of origin.⁵⁷

V. Conclusion: Lessons for Future Partnerships

Policymakers are revisiting partnerships as a way to encourage mobility that carries clear benefits for sending and receiving countries, and migrants. But, to date, the record on partnerships has been mixed, with many struggling to make it beyond the pilot stage. Evaluations of such programs are of varying quality. Many of the partnerships studied here have unclear goals or metrics that make it difficult to measure their “success” or compare outcomes. While evaluations may reference outcomes such as building capacity or linking stakeholders, few offer concrete data—on participants’ employment outcomes, for example—likely reflecting limited resources for monitoring and evaluation. In turn, with costs especially high for programs targeting middle- or high-skilled migrants, there is often little sense of what constitutes value for money.

With these limitations in mind, this study offers several lessons for future partnerships. Elements of success include:

- **Sharing costs with employers.** While destination-country governments usually assume most of the initial costs of partnerships, it is important to move toward a cost-sharing model so that programs can weather the reduction or ending of government funding. While employers tend to eventually assume the lion’s share of costs, such as for recruitment, training, and wages, they may be reluctant to invest large sums in

workers that will only stay for a year or two. Partnerships could offer avenues for longer-term migration for high-performing workers to keep employers engaged. A two-track approach would allow migrants to stay on a longer-term basis and help recoup employers’ investments, while providing clear development benefits for origin countries by producing other skilled workers who will remain at home.

- **Supporting migrants in destination countries.** Offering migrants support as they relocate and settle into the destination country is crucial. Most programs offer cultural orientation and instruction in the destination-country language to aid migrants’ integration and reduce their potential isolation. But evaluations point to the importance of setting realistic expectations for migrants about their work and day-to-day lives in destination countries.⁵⁸ Providing migrants with clear information about working conditions (and avenues to seek assistance, should they need it) can help ensure that they don’t fall prey to exploitation. For example, it would help migrants working in regulated professions to understand that they will likely work in a junior role until they are eligible for a licensing examination that would allow them to resume their full responsibilities.
- **Supporting migrants upon their return.** For those who do return home, questions remain about how to ensure they can put their new skills to use. Reintegration support ranges from information sessions to individual counseling to help accessing professional networks and developing a business plan. Placing migrants in jobs upon their return remains a challenge. Some programs connect participants with diaspora members before their return; another option could be to connect returnees with destination-country

employers that have operations in their origin country and that recognize and value their overseas experience. Forging closer ties to origin-country labor markets (or capitalizing on the connections of partners, such as origin-country recruitment agencies), and focusing on sectors that are also in demand in origin countries and are likely to remain so in the medium to long term, could help avoid cycles of repeat migration or skills waste.

If partnerships are to foster more skilled mobility and development, policymakers will need to consider several factors that could make them more sustainable and easier to scale, including:

- **Sustained demand for migrant workers in the target sector(s).** A common reason for pilot projects' discontinuation is a lack of demand from employers. High costs, limited access to longer-term migration opportunities, bureaucracy, and economic downturns have all been linked to drops in employer interest. Selecting sectors where demand is likely to remain high and ensuring strong employer buy-in are both important for long-term success.
- **Equitable distribution of costs.** Programs' operational costs can be high, especially in middle- or high-skilled sectors. An ongoing challenge is thus distributing these costs in a way that does not deter any of the partners (employers, migrants, or destination- or origin-country governments) from participating. A study of the JPEPA program, for example, revealed that Japanese hospitals were ending their participation because of the high costs of training and low prospects of securing a long-term employee.⁵⁹
- **Continued political support.** Most of these programs rely on destination-country governments to cover the upfront costs of training, placement, and orientation, rendering political support crucial. A loss of such support can be fatal, as evidenced by the termination of the Netherlands' Blue Birds pilot project after a new government withdrew support.
- **Good outcomes for migrants and employers alike.** Programs are only sustainable if participating employers and migrants feel their participation is a good return on their investment. Employers need to see the added value of recruiting workers through the skills partnership, compared to other avenues for recruiting domestic or foreign workers. Migrants need to see benefits both in terms of higher wages and the positive experience of working in the destination country—including, for example, decent work conditions and the building of new skills.

Partnerships offer a promising opportunity to facilitate skilled migration in a responsible way that can benefit migrants, destination countries, and countries of origin alike. But despite continuing policy experimentation and innovation, including, most recently, through the global skills partnership model, such programs still regularly face barriers to achieve their mobility and development goals. Examination of these programs reveals lessons that could lead to higher rates of success in the future, including facilitating longer-term labor migration opportunities and bridging skills gaps on the one hand, and ensuring skills transfer and development benefits for countries of origin on the other. Accomplishing these tasks, coupled with strong political and employer buy-in, promise to help expand legal migration opportunities in a development-friendly way.

Endnotes

- 1 This policy brief, originally published in September 2018, has been revised to more accurately characterize the relationships between the European Commission and third countries. The strategic thinking described in this paragraph was also reflected in the proposal's choice of partner countries, which include some countries in North Africa with longstanding cooperation on migration management (Morocco, Tunisia, and Egypt); several that are cooperating on returns (Ethiopia, Guinea, Niger, and The Gambia); and other priority sending countries (Ghana, Nigeria, and Senegal). See European Commission, "Pilot Projects Legal Migration" (concept note, European Commission, Brussels, 2018), www.icmpd.org/fileadmin/user_upload/DOC6_Concept_Note.pdf; European Commission, "Global Approach to Migration and Mobility," updated February 22, 2019, https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/global-approach-to-migration_en.
- 2 Employers in high-growth industries (such as digital technologies) report challenges in recruiting the skilled workers they need and can be vocal proponents of skilled immigration to facilitate and sustain economic growth. Meanwhile, policymakers and employers in many Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries are concerned about current and emerging shortages in critical sectors such as health care, as populations age and more people leave the workforce. Although the number of doctors and nurses in OECD countries has increased over time (their share of OECD populations rose by 15–20 percent between 2000 and 2013), shortages remain a key concern, both in terms of geographic distribution (there are too few doctors and nurses in rural areas) and compared to the growing health-care needs of aging populations. See OECD, *Health Workforce Policies in OECD Countries: Right Jobs, Right Skills, Right Places* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2016), www.oecd.org/health/health-systems/Health-workforce-policies-in-oecd-countries-Policy-brief.pdf.
- 3 United Nations, "Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration: Final Draft," July 11, 2018, https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/180711_final_draft_0.pdf.
- 4 The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals envision key targets for global efforts to further the well-being of all people, to be met by 2030. Target 10.7 is: "facilitate orderly, safe, regular, and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies." See United Nations, "Sustainable Development Goal 10: Reduce Inequality within and among Countries—Targets and Indicators," accessed September 5, 2018, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg10>.
- 5 Australia and New Zealand, for example, both run seasonal worker programs that recruit people from the Pacific Islands to work in agriculture and horticulture roles, while Canada operates a Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program for workers from Mexico or Caribbean countries. Australia also runs two temporary work visa programs (the Microstate Visa Program and the Pacific Labour Scheme) that allow low- and middle-skilled workers from Kiribati, Nauru, and Tuvalu to work in rural Australia on a two- or three-year visa. Other countries have experimented with seasonal work programs, introducing pilot schemes to recruit low-skilled workers from certain countries; Spain, for example, ran pilot programs that recruited seasonal workers from Colombia and Morocco to help harvest fruit, although the economic crisis brought these efforts to a close.
- 6 The Global Compact for Migration's Objective 18 reads: "Invest in skills development and facilitate mutual recognition of skills, qualifications, and competences." See United Nations, "Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration."
- 7 In July 2017, Germany's Triple Win project placed its one-thousandth nurse. See Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), "Attracting Qualified Nurses to Germany: Federal Employment Agency and GIZ Recruit One-Thousandth Nurse from Partner Countries" (press release, July 31, 2017), www.giz.de/en/press/55916.html.
- 8 The evaluation found that the new government was more focused on addressing domestic unemployment and saw labor-migration programs as potentially politically sensitive. See Melissa Siegel and Vivianne van der Vorst, *Evaluation of the "Blue Birds" Circular Migration Pilot in the Netherlands* (Maastricht, Netherlands: Maastricht University, 2012), www.merit.unu.edu/publications/uploads/1344262652.pdf.

- 9 Objective 18 of the Global Compact describes global skills partnerships between countries as a way to “strengthen training capacities of national authorities and relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and trade unions, and foster skills development of workers in countries of origin and migrants in countries of destination with a view to preparing trainees for employability in the labour markets of all participating countries.” See United Nations, “Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration.”
- 10 Michael A. Clemens, “Global Skills Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World,” *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* 4, no. 2 (2015): 10, <https://izajolp.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40173-014-0028-z>.
- 11 See, for example, criticisms of Japan’s Economic Partnership Agreement with the Philippines, the JPEPA program, discussed later in this brief.
- 12 Kate Hooper and Madeleine Sumption, *Reaching a “Fair Deal” on Talent: Emigration, Circulation, and Human Capital in Countries of Origin* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2016), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/reaching-fair-deal-talent-emigration-circulation-and-human-capital-countries-origin.
- 13 Courses all award postsecondary qualifications, ranging from Certificate III to Diploma level in the Australian system.
- 14 As of December 2016, 10,600 people had graduated from the Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC), but only 257 reported migrating overseas. Of this number, New Zealand was the most popular destination, receiving 90 graduates, followed by Australia (72), Fiji (16), Samoa (11), and the United States (10). A 2014 independent review conducted for the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) notes that these data conflate graduates of all skill levels, some of whom don’t qualify for skilled migration pathways to Australia; revised data for 2007–14 found that 6.9 percent of qualifying graduates migrated. See APTC and Australian Aid, *APTC Annual Report and Plan 2016–2017* (Suva, Fiji: APTC Regional Head Office, 2017), www.aptc.edu.au/docs/default-source/reports/annual-reports/aptc-annual-report-2016-2017.pdf?sfvrsn=c6f7e44b_2; Richard Johanson, Richard Curtain, Peter Moock, and Virginia Simmons, *Independent Review of the Australia-Pacific Technical College: Full Report* (Canberra: Education Resource Facility, 2014), 17–18, <http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/aptc-independent-review.pdf>.
- 15 Johanson, Curtain, Moock, and Simmons, *Independent Review of the Australia-Pacific Technical College*, 16–21.
- 16 Since the college was launched in 2007, Australia reformed its points system to favor more skilled immigrants with advanced English language proficiency skills. Under the current system, points are awarded for age, English language skills, skilled employment in the past decade in or outside of Australia, ties to Australia (e.g., study or a professional year in the country), and education. Most points under the education category are awarded for tertiary education, with a doctorate scoring the highest, although ten points are awarded for an occupational award or qualification that is recognized by the relevant assessing authority. Many APTC graduates would struggle to meet the cut-off score of 65 points to file an expression of interest for a points-tested visa, while visas that rely on employer or regional sponsorship are largely inaccessible because most have limited ties to Australia. See Amanda Alampi et al., *Creating Valuable Skills: A New Framework for Migration as Development* (New York: New York University, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, 2013), 29–39, <https://wagner.nyu.edu/files/faculty/publications/Creating-Valuable-Skills-A-New-Framework-for-Migration-as-Development-Policy-May-2013-SecureJune23.pdf>; Johanson, Curtain, Moock, and Simmons, *Independent Review of the Australia-Pacific Technical College*; Australian Department of Home Affairs, “The Points Table,” accessed September 4, 2018, www.homeaffairs.gov.au/visas/supporting/Pages/skilled/The-points-table.aspx.
- 17 Michael Clemens, Colum Graham, and Stephen Howes, “Skill Development and Regional Mobility: Lessons from the Australia-Pacific Technical College” (working paper no. 370, Center for Global Development, Washington, DC, June 2014), www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/skill-development-regional-mobility.pdf.
- 18 DFAT, “Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC)—Stage 3” (investment concept note, DFAT, Barton, Australia, n.d.).

- 19 Päivi Vartiainen et al., “From the Philippines to Finland: Nurses’ Expectations and Finnish Realities,” *Journal of Population and Social Studies* 24, no. 1 (2016): 30–46, www.jpss.mahidol.ac.th/PDF/JPSS-v24n1_Vartiainen_Filipino_nurses.pdf; Arbeitgeberverband-Pflege, “Pilotprojekt mit Pflegefachkräften aus China nun trägerübergreifend” (press release, May 28, 2013), www.arbeitgeberverband-pflege.de/das-haben-wir-zu-sagen/pilotprojekt-mit-pflegefachkraeften-aus-china-nun-traegeruebergreifend/.
- 20 See, for example, the stated objective of GIZ’s Triple Win pilot project: “The recruitment of qualified foreign nurses is alleviating the nursing shortage in Germany and reducing unemployment in the nurses’ countries of origin”; GIZ, “Sustainable Recruitment of Nurses (Triple Win),” accessed March 15, 2018, www.giz.de/en/worldwide/41533.html.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 In May 2016, the Philippines Nurses Association estimated more than 200,000 registered nurses were unable to find work in their profession. See *The Manila Times*, “200,000 Registered Nurses Are Jobless,” *The Manila Times*, May 15, 2016, www.manilatimes.net/200000-registered-nurses-are-jobless/262211/.
- 23 Germany’s GIZ and International Placement Service (ZAV) ran a pilot project with the Tunisian National Employment Agency (ANETI) in Tunisia from 2012 to 2013 that provided 100 unemployed Tunisian engineers with five months of language training and cultural orientation before providing six-month work placements with 56 companies in Germany. The pilot project was followed shortly by the German-Tunisian Mobility Pact (2014–16), which offered training and three-month internships to 150 Tunisian engineers in Germany and helped develop ANETI’s employment services. See GIZ, “German-Tunisian Mobility Pact: Gain Capacities, Create Perspectives” (brief, GIZ, Eschborn, Germany, 2015), www.giz.de/en/downloads/giz2015-en-german-tunisian-mobility-pact.pdf.
- 24 In the Philippines, for example, there was no standalone course on geriatric care as of the mid-2000s. See Allan B. de Guzman et al., “The Filipino Nursing Students’ Dilemmas in Geriatric Care,” *Educational Gerontology* 35, no. 8 (2009): 673–86.
- 25 Vartiainen et al., “From the Philippines to Finland.”
- 26 Nozomi Yagi, Tim K. Mackey, Bryan A. Liang, and Lorna Gerlt, “Policy Review: Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA)—Analysis of a Failed Nurse Migration Policy,” *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 51, no. 2 (2014): 243–50.
- 27 Participants in the JPEPA program complained of being underutilized in Japan (e.g., working as a nursing assistant, despite being qualified as a nurse), and this reportedly inspired some to return to the Philippines.
- 28 In the case of JPEPA, most participants failed the Japanese-language licensing examination, which meant they had to return to the Philippines after three years (rather than qualify for renewable residence visas). Between 2010 and 2012, 209 nurses took the examination, but only 15 (or 7 percent) passed. As of 2017, passing rates had improved somewhat, to 15 percent. See Yagi, Mackey, Liang, and Gerlt, “Policy Review: Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA)”; Marie Rose C. Escalada, *Snapshot of Labor Market Information* (Tokyo: Philippines Overseas Labor Office Labor Attaché, 2018), <http://polotokyo.dole.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/LMI-Snapshot-2018-1.pdf>.
- 29 Hirano Yūko, “Foreign Care Workers in Japan: A Policy Without a Vision,” *Nippon*, February 13, 2017, www.nippon.com/en/currents/d00288/; Ohno Sun, “Southeast Asian Nurses and Caregiving Workers Transcending the National Boundaries: An Overview of Indonesian and Filipino Workers in Japan and Abroad,” *Southeast Asian Studies* 49, no. 4 (2012): 541–69.
- 30 DFAT, “Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC)—Stage 3.”

- 31 For example, as of 2016, the cost for employers to participate in the Triple Win pilot project was 4,000 euros, plus additional costs for travel to Germany, recognition of qualifications, and wages for workers. In Japan, under the terms of JPEPA, employers are to cover the costs (600,000 yen, or about USD 5,600 per person) of six months of language and skills training for Filipino nurses. The Japanese government now funds the Philippines' Technical Education Skills Development Authority (TESDA) to provide an additional six months of predeparture language training, since JPEPA participants have been seen to struggle to meet Japanese language requirements. See GIZ, "Projekt Triple Win: Gewinnung von Pflegekräften aus dem Ausland—unser nachhaltiger Ansatz" (fact sheet, GIZ, Eschborn, Germany, July 2016), www.triple-win-pflegekraefte.de/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/ZAV_A5_Triple_Win_Pflegekraefte_Juli_2016_web.pdf; Sun, "Southeast Asian Nurses and Caregiving Workers."
- 32 OECD, "What Would Make Global Skills Partnerships Work in Practice?" (Migration Policy Debates brief no. 15, OECD Publishing, Paris, May 2018), www.oecd.org/els/mig/migration-policy-debate-15.pdf.
- 33 Alampi et al., *Creating Valuable Skills*.
- 34 Australia's Seasonal Worker Programme requires migrants to cover their own airfare; New Zealand's Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme requires individual employers to cover half the costs of airfare.
- 35 Vartiainen et al., "From the Philippines to Finland."
- 36 Yagi et al., "Policy Review: Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA)."
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 See, for example, Anna Goos, *Manual on Circular Migration Scheme* (N.p.: German Public Service Development Agency, Center for International Migration and Development, and GIZ, 2016), http://migration.commission.ge/files/pcms_en_final.pdf.
- 39 Hooper and Sumption, *Reaching a "Fair Deal" on Talent*.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 The APTC conducts a graduate tracker survey that asks recent students to describe the impact of APTC training on their career and community. See APTC, "Surveys," accessed September 5, 2018, www.aptc.edu.au/events/surveys.
- 42 Economist Gary Becker's theory of human capital posited that investments in human capital are linked to higher incomes. See, for example, Gary S. Becker, "Human Capital," accessed September 4, 2018, www.econlib.org/library/Enc/HumanCapital.html.
- 43 Clemens, "Global Skills Partnerships."
- 44 Research points to the limited capacity and quality of vocational education and training systems in the region, with low employer confidence in its outcomes. See DFAT, "Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC)—Stage 3."
- 45 While remittances cannot overcome structural or political obstacles to development, they can cushion people from their effects. For a full discussion, see Dilip Ratha, *The Impact of Remittances on Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2013), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/impact-remittances-economic-growth-and-poverty-reduction.
- 46 Over the past few years, companies and projects have experimented with alternative modes of delivering remittances, ranging from working with postal networks to deliver remittances in rural areas, to investing in electronic transfer systems or prepaid cards. A number of recently launched money transfer start-ups have focused on using financial technology to make transfers quicker and easier. For example, TransferWise links and redirects similar-sized payments going in different directions, avoiding international money transfer fees. WorldRemit and Xoom offer different ways to receive money: WorldRemit's options include prepaid cards, mobile money, and cash withdrawal, alongside bank transfers, while Xoom offers ways to top up prepaid mobile phones or pay utility bills in other countries.

- 47 See, for example, the work supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)'s Financing Facility for Remittances to link remittances with microfinance institutions. See IFAD, *The FFR Brief: Five Years of the Financing Facility for Remittances and the Road Ahead* (Rome: IFAD, 2013), <https://maintenance.ifad.org/documents/38714170/40187440/FFR+Brief+-+Five+years+of+the+Financing+Facility+for+Remittances.pdf/b2f0430e-009e-4207-b839-934ad3c6b696>.
- 48 Hooper and Sumption, *Reaching a "Fair Deal" on Talent*; Dovelyn Rannveig Agunias and Kathleen Newland, *Developing A Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development: A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries* (Washington, DC and Geneva: Migration Policy Institute and International Organization for Migration, 2012); Kathleen Newland and Sonia Plaza, *What We Know About Diasporas and Economic Development* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2013), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/what-we-know-about-diasporas-and-economic-development.
- 49 TIE Global, "About," accessed March 20, 2018, <https://tie.org/about/>; Kingsley Aikins and Nicola White, *Global Diaspora Strategies Toolkit* (Dublin: Diaspora Matters, 2011); Agunias and Newland, *Developing A Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development*.
- 50 International Organization for Migration (IOM), *MIDA Ghana Health Project* (The Hague: IOM, 2012), www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/Country/docs/MIDA-Ghana-Health-Project-2012.pdf.
- 51 For example, IOM Colombia and Pagesos Union (the Farmers Union of Catalonia) ran a project between 2006 and 2008 that placed Colombian migrants in seasonal fruit-picking jobs in Catalonia, Spain. The project offered predeparture training on issues such as workplace rights and health and safety, and the language and culture of Catalonia. IOM Colombia has also provided training for families in Colombia on how to use remittances productively, and helped returning migrants develop business plans. See IOM Colombia and Unió de Pagesos, *Temporary and Circular Labour Migration: Experiences, Challenges, and Opportunities* (Bogota: IOM, 2009); IOM, "IOM Signs Labour Migration Agreement with the Usaquen District (Bogota)" (press release, December 31, 2007), www.iom.int/news/iom-signs-labour-migration-agreement-usaquen-district-bogota.
- 52 Goos, *Manual on Circular Migration Scheme*.
- 53 IOM Mission to Ghana, "Focus on Migration" (newsletter, IOM Mission to Ghana, Accra, December 2011).
- 54 Steffen Angenendt, Jessica Bither, and Astrid Ziebarth, *Creating a Triple-Win through Labor Migration Policy? Lessons from Germany* (Washington, DC and Berlin: German Marshall Fund of the United States and Robert Bosch Stiftung, 2015), 18, www.gmfus.org/publications/creating-triple-win-through-labor-migration-policy-lessons-germany.
- 55 Clear Horizon Consulting, *Strengthening Pacific Partnership and Vakameasina Evaluation: Final Report* (Cremorne, Australia: Clear Horizon Consulting, 2016), www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/SPP-Vak-Evaluation-Final-Report2016.pdf.
- 56 The program, operated jointly by GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency, targets people working in a field that can contribute to the development of their country of origin. The partner economies are Afghanistan, Albania, Cameroon, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kosovo, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, the Palestinian Territories, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Tunisia, Ukraine, and Vietnam. See Centre for International Migration and Development, "Apply Now and Help Bring about Change in Your Home Country," accessed June 28, 2018, www.cimonline.de/en/html/returning-experts.html.
- 57 The Program for the Creation of Innovative Companies in the Mediterranean (PACEIM) was a pilot program between France's Institut de recherche pour le développement (IRD) and government ministries in Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco, and Tunisia that ran from 2010 to 2015. See LiNEXIO, *Extending PACEIM to Mobilise Mediterranean Diaspora Entrepreneurs in Europe* (Luxembourg: European Investment Bank, March 2015), www.eib.org/attachments/country/femip_study_extending_paceim_en.pdf.
- 58 See, for example, the following evaluations of a German pilot project in Georgia and a project to recruit Filipino nurses to Finland: Goos, *Manual on Circular Migration Scheme*; Vartiainen et al., "From the Philippines to Finland."
- 59 Yagi et al., "Policy Review—Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA)."

About the Author



Kate Hooper is an Associate Policy Analyst with the Migration Policy Institute's International Program, where her research areas include forced migration, refugee and immigrant integration policies, and economic migration.

She holds a master's degree with honors from the University of Chicago's Committee on International Relations, and a bachelor of the arts degree in history from the University of Oxford. She also holds a certificate in international political economy from the London School of Economics.

Acknowledgments

This publication results from a partnership between the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, supported by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). It is part of the series "Towards the Global Compact for Migration: A Development Perspective," which aims to enrich the conversation around migration and development in the context of the ongoing discussions on the Global Compact for Migration.

The authors are grateful to GIZ and BMZ for their support for this brief. The brief benefitted from input from MPI and GIZ colleagues, including the excellent research assistance of Tessa Coggio, reviews from Melanie Axiotis and Tina Mahler, the advice of Michelle Mittelstadt, the skillful editing of Lauren Shaw, and the layout expertise of Sara Staedicke.

© 2019 Migration Policy Institute.
All Rights Reserved.

Cover Design and Layout: Sara Staedicke, MPI

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the Migration Policy Institute. A full-text PDF of this document is available for free download from www.migrationpolicy.org.

Information for reproducing excerpts from this publication can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy. Inquiries can also be directed to: communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Hooper, Kate. 2019 Revised. *Reimagining Skilled Migration Partnerships to Support Development*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

The Migration Policy Institute (MPI) is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank dedicated to the study of the movement of people worldwide. The Institute provides analysis, development, and evaluation of migration and refugee policies at the local, national, and international levels. It aims to meet the rising demand for pragmatic responses to the challenges and opportunities that migration presents in an ever more integrated world.

[BIT.LY/GLOBALCOMPACT](https://bit.ly/globalcompact)

