The following notes are not full transcriptions of proceedings but summaries of the discussions held at the UK launch event. Readers should note that speakers have not had the opportunity to check or comment on this record of proceedings.

Session 2: Academics and Advisors Panel Debate

Chair: Richard Black, Director, Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty

Panellists: Ron Skeldon, Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty

                Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie, African Foundation for Development

                Martin Ruhs, Centre on Migration, Policy & Society (COMPAS)

                Heaven Crawley, Senior Research Associate, COMPAS, and AMRE Consulting

Ron Skeldon,
Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty

'*Migration and Development*'

Key Discussion Points:

- **Migration as an integral part of development**
- **Skilled migration and the brain drain**
- **Beyond the GCIM mandate: internal migration**

Ron Skeldon opened the panel debate by discussing the relationship between migration and development. He noted that migration is an integral part of development; as economies develop, new opportunities are generated and people can be expected to move to take advantage of these opportunities. Thus, migration and development are positively related. Skeldon cautioned that if policy makers believe that by promoting development in the developing world they will be acting to stop or slow migration, they are likely to be wrong, at least over the short to medium term. The GCIM report provides a road map to deal with the increased migration that is the direct consequence of globalisation.

Three themes relating to migration and development were outlined:
1. the impact of remittances;

GLOBAL COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION (GCIM)

COMMISSION MONDIALE SUR LES MIGRATIONS INTERNATIONALES (CMMI)
COMISIÓN MUNDIAL SOBRE LAS MIGRACIONES INTERNCIONALES (CMMI)

COMPAS

CENTRE ON MIGRATION, POLICY & SOCIETY

Development Research Centre on
Migration,
Globalisation
& Poverty

2. the role of diasporas (although Skeldon did not discuss diasporas in detail, he noted that 'diasporas' are highly heterogeneous and must not be essentialised into a homogenous, one-size-fits-all category. In the context of skilled migration, diasporas should not be seen as a pool that can be tapped for the development of origin areas); and
3. the impact of skilled migration.

Prof. Skeldon focused upon the latter theme, skilled migration. He noted that skilled migration is much more complex than the concept of 'brain drain' allows. Contrary to popular opinion, it is not simply a case of the loss of skilled migrants to the developing world and skill gain for the developed world. Complex systems of interchange of skilled migrants exist primarily within the developed world, with a relatively small number of middle-income developing countries (e.g., India, China, RoK, Taiwan). Skeldon emphasized that we are not dealing with simple one-way flows.

Skeldon chose to focus in particular on the migration of health personnel, but pointed out that these are not the only types of skilled professionals that are required to improve the health status of a population. He argued that research and policy must also consider the impact of the migration of other types of personnel such water engineers, sanitation engineers and agronomists.

Skeldon discussed some of the current strategies that have been implemented to address the migration of health personnel. He agreed with the Commission that any policy that restricts migration is likely to be counter-productive. He cautioned that such a restrictive approach may force migrants to choose irregular channels of migration, thereby preventing migrants from employing their skills. Skeldon also noted that ethical recruitment policies are likely to be unsuccessful for similar reasons.

One solution that Skeldon outlined addressed training of medical personnel within developing settings.

He set out the critical questions regarding training as:
• What type of training is required?
• Where should training be carried out? (outsourcing?)
• Who should pay for the training?

Skeldon introduced the idea that within developing economies, there are certain types of skills which simply cannot be absorbed; for example, there is a limit to the number of highly-trained health personnel that a developing country can absorb. Furthermore, high-level training is not the only training that is required; within developing settings, there is a demand for various types of medical personnel. Skeldon suggested that training of medical personnel should reflect the differences in demand at local and global levels. According to Skeldon, it is essential to train medical personnel for either the local market or the global market. Those medical personnel that are highly-trained to the global level may choose to migrate, while those who remain are often concentrated in urban centres, and may be inaccessible to the poor. Training personnel to meet local

demands (e.g. training to the paramedic level) would mean that peripheral areas would have increased access to health services.

Finally, Skeldon suggested regional centres of excellence be established in developing countries that have experienced the migration of highly-trained health personnel. These centres could be funded by official development assistance, or alternatively, by the private sector. These centres would act as training institutions and would serve the peripheral areas of a country. In regards to return, Skeldon noted that migrants will return to their country of origin when there is something for them to return to (e.g. as in East Asia).

To conclude, Skeldon encouraged delegates to look beyond the mandate of the GCIM. The majority of the world's migrants rarely move internationally, but instead move internally. The poorest of migrants move internally, often for short distances and durations. Skeldon pointed out that to fully understand the complex interrelationship between migration and development we need to extend the focus to internal migration.

Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie,
African Foundation for Development

'*Maximizing the Beneficial Impact of Remittances for Development – AFFORD's Response to the Global Commission for International Migration Report*'

Key Discussion Points:

- **Integrating migration within developing country development strategies**
- **Supporting transnational enterprise**
- **Tax relief on remittances**

Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie opened his presentation by noting that no efforts to maximize the benefits of remittances for development, a key focus of the GCIM report, will succeed unless migrants and diasporas are involved. He emphasized that 'involved' must mean involvement at the stages of conceptualisation, design, implementation and evaluation. The tendency to involve diasporas at a late stage, he noted, has predictable and unfortunate consequences.

The GCIM report rightly points out that remittances flowing back to the developing world are a major issue of growing significance. Remittances are likely to rise in volume as the rate of international migration increases. It is therefore important to consider how we can maximize the developmental benefits from remittances.

Chikezie outlined three areas:
1. supporting African governments to mainstream migration and diaspora issues within their development strategies;

GLOBAL COMMISSION ON
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION (GCIM)

COMMISSION MONDIALE SUR LES MIGRATIONS INTERNATIONALES (CMMI)
COMISIÓN MUNDIAL SOBRE LAS MIGRACIONES INTERNCIONALES (CMMI)

COMPAS

Development Research Centre on
Migration,
Globalisation
& Poverty

2. supporting transnational migrant/ diaspora entrepreneurs in business ventures that help to regenerate local economies in Britain and also jobs in the source countries; and
3. tax relief on remittances

Chikezie acknowledged the importance of integrating migration within developing countries' development strategies, and noted that the GCIM report correctly makes a great deal of the issues of capacity, coherence and cooperation in the policy arena around international development.

Using the example of Ghana, Chikezie pointed out that African governments do acknowledge the importance of the overseas diaspora. President Kufuor has called the Ghanaian diaspora his government's most important overseas development partner; however, according to Chikezie, the Ghanaian government's poverty reduction strategy does not fully factor in ways of harnessing the benefits of international migration.

Many African governments choose to pursue two parallel tracks. On the one hand, they pursue a poverty reduction strategy, which revolves around aid flows, limited investment flows, and bilateral and multilateral relations. On the other hand, there are special presidential initiatives around diaspora, brain drain and the like. According to Chikezie, this is not a viable strategy for countries that lack state capacity as it dissipates energy and proves ineffective.

On the issue of UK governmental engagement with migrant and diaspora communities, Chikezie pointed out that DFID has had a policy of engagement with diaspora communities since the first White Paper in 1997. However, to date most of DFID's efforts around this area have been sporadic and ad hoc. One of the main reasons for this is the absence of 'international migration' as an issue on the Country Assistance Plans (CAP) of DFID's southern partners.

Chikezie used UK-Ghanaian examples to highlight the importance of transnational enterprise that is driven by diaspora/migrants entrepreneurs to both the local host environment and the source environment. He emphasized the urgent need for more research in this area.

On the issue of tax relief and remittances, Chikezie pointed out the overwhelming attention that has been given to aid and debt within the past year and suggested that if G8 countries want to facilitate flows of money into the developing world, a more effective way would be to provide tax relief on remittances. This issue is particularly relevant in light of the Commission's strong endorsement of temporary migration schemes.

According to Chikezie, providing tax relief on remittances would create a solid base for meaningful engagement with the developing world's biggest "aid donors and investors" (migrants and diasporas). Tax relief would also create stronger incentives for people to channel their remittances through formal rather than informal channels.

To conclude Chikezie noted that migration is by and large, an act of human agency (albeit sometimes an act of deviant agency). The people who will give policy makers the greatest insight into how to maximise the benefits of migration are migrants themselves. It is therefore vital to involve migrants at each and every stage of the policy process, beginning with conceptualisation.

Martin Ruhs,
Centre on Migration, Policy & Society (COMPAS)

'*Temporary Migration Schemes: the Return of the Guest-Worker?*'

Key Discussion Points:

- **Re-emergence of discussions about temporary migration programmes (TMPs)**
- **The UK's Sector Based Scheme (SBS)**
- **Theory and practice: can new temporary migration programmes work?**

Martin Ruhs discussed the recent re-emergence of discussions about temporary migration programmes (TMPs) as one of the possible policy tools to help manage labour migration. He pointed out that the GCIM report suggests that *"…states and the private sector should consider the option of introducing carefully designed temporary migration programmes as a means of addressing the economic needs of both countries or origin and destination"*.

Ruhs discussed the feasibility of temporary migration programmes using the example of the UK's Sector Based Scheme (SBS). The temporary migration scheme was launched in May 2003 and allows UK based employers to recruit workers from outside the European Economic Area to fill selected low skill jobs in the hospitality and food manufacturing sectors. The SBS limits the employment of non-EEA workers to a maximum period of 12 months. At the end of this period, SBS permit holders must leave and spend at least 2 months outside the UK before they become eligible to re-enter on another SBS permit.

Ruhs discussed the motivating factors behind the SBS. The introduction of the SBS stemmed from the government's recognition that labour shortages exist at both the high and low-skill end of the UK's labour market; and that a labour immigration policy that purports to manage migration effectively thus needs to include polices for legally employing migrant workers in low-skilled occupations. A related rationale of the SBS has been to reduce the number of migrant workers who are illegally employed in the hospitality and food manufacturing sectors through the opening up of legal channels of employment.

Ruhs outlined the findings of a June 2005 government review of the SBS. The scheme was subsequently closed for the hospitality sector but was maintained for the food

processing sector. The two major reasons given for the closure of the scheme for the hospitality sector were the expectation that workers from the new EU countries are now able and willing to fill all vacancies in low-skill hospitality jobs, thus making the need for non-EEA workers redundant, and concerns about misuse of the SBS in the hospitality sector.

Ruhs briefly discussed the elements of, or potential for, misuse that the Home Office review of the SBD identified. He also suggested that one of the key mistakes made in the UK's SBS programme was the overly short duration of the work permits (maximum one year). For some migrants (e.g. Bangladeshis), a one-year period of work is unlikely to be long enough to allow individuals to earn enough money to recover migration and recruitment costs, therefore potentially incentivising migrants to overstay their temporary visas.

The UK's ongoing experimentation with the SBS raises broader questions about the feasibility and desirability of temporary migration programmes. The latter part of Ruhs' session endeavoured to answer the question, 'Can temporary migration programmes be desirable policies for helping to manage international migration in a way that is both practical and sensitive to the interests of the receiving country, migrants and their countries of origin?'

Ruhs explained that, in theory, temporary migration programmes may generate net benefits for all sides involved. TMPs could help receiving countries to meet their labour market needs including the alleviation of labour shortages in specific sectors at both the low skill end and the high skill end of the labour market. In particular, TMPs could enable host countries to minimise the potentially adverse impacts of employing migrant workers on the wages and employment opportunities of local workers. Sending countries may benefit from the higher rates of remittances that temporary migration is usually associated with when compared to permanent migration and, even though the evidence is less clear, remittances from irregular migration. Furthermore, Ruhs added, the return of migrant workers to their home countries could help avoid or reduce the costs that are sometimes associated with the permanent loss of human capital. Finally, the introduction of expanded TMPs could offer workers in low-income countries – especially low skilled workers – improved legal access to labour markets in higher income countries.

However, Ruhs cautioned that the international experiences with TMPs suggest that their theoretical benefits tend to be difficult to achieve in practice. Critics of TMPs point out that many of the past guest worker programmes failed to meet their stated policy objectives and instead generated a number of unanticipated consequences:
- the exploitation of migrant workers in both recruitment and employment;
- the emergence of labour market distortions, and the growth of a structural dependence by certain industries on the continued employment of migrant workers; and
- the non-return and eventual settlement of some "guest workers".

Ruhs stated that new temporary migration policies must avoid past policy failures and suggested five policies that are needed to help make TMPs work:

1. enforcement of employment laws to protect all workers;
2. granting migrants the right to change employers within certain occupations/sectors;
3. enforcement of immigration laws including employer sanctions;
4. 'correct' assessment and management of the demand for migrant labour; and
5. measures to facilitate/ enforce return.

To conclude, Ruhs noted that there is as yet no evidence to suggest that it is possible to effectively implement all of the policies needed to make TMPs work. Any attempt to re-introduce new and expanded TMPs would therefore need to start with experimental pilot programmes, such as the SBS introduced in the UK.

Ruhs cautioned that even if TMPs turn out to be feasible, it is important to recognise that the introduction of new and expanded TMPs raises important ethical questions. TMPs necessarily create a pool of workers whose rights are more restricted than those of permanent immigrants (and citizens). In answer to his question, 'can a TMP be a desirable policy in a liberal democracy', Ruhs pointed out that, at a practical level, it can be argued that, at least as far as managing the international migration of low-skilled workers is concerned, effective TMPs could better the alternatives currently available; irregular immigration or permanent immigration programmes.

Heaven Crawley,
Senior Research Associate, Centre on Migration, Policy & Society (COMPAS) & AMRE Consulting

'*UK Policy Conundrums*'

Key Discussion Points:

- **Fundamental conceptual problems on the ground**
- **Migration dichotomies in the UK context**
- **Recommendations to resolve policy conundrums**

Heaven Crawley began her session with the qualification that policy conundrums are not unique to the area of migration. It is due to the cross-cutting impact of migration on all areas of society, from economic development to social cohesion to identity concerns, that conundrums are more enhanced in regards to this particular issue.

There are widespread concerns from all sectors of society about the current direction of migration policy in the UK. Various stakeholders take issue with various aspects of current migration policy for a variety of reasons – no one is happy, but for very different reasons. Migrants and asylum seekers especially are critical about the direction of UK migration policy.

Crawley suggested that one of the reasons why policy conundrums seem so pronounced in the area of migration is the dichotomies that UK policy creates: 'good' versus 'bad' migration, 'temporary' versus 'permanent', and 'legal' versus 'illegal'. The public then connects 'bad' migration with those seeking asylum, those with refugee status and those seeking family reunification. Additionally, there are multiple layers of legislation that focus on migration issues, but very little analysis of the impact of previous legislation before new legislation is implemented. In this way, the government has created, or at the very least exacerbated, policy conundrums. There is a belief that the government must be seen as being 'tough' on migration, while at the same time promoting 'managed migration' to the public.

Crawley noted that asylum was not central to the concerns of the Commission, however, when discussing UK migration policy it is impossible to separate out 'asylum' from 'migration'. Although the UK government often uses the language that is contained within the report, policy is actually driven by perceptions of abuse and control. This is because of the way in which the UK government frames or conceptualises migration; that is, in terms of 'control' rather than in terms of 'facilitating' and 'managing'.

The Commission correctly emphasises the need to conceptualise migration policy in terms of 'facilitating' and 'managing', however, this is not happening on the ground. Crawley states that policy making in the UK context is driven by 'control'; for example an overwhelming amount of money and energy goes into border control. Within the UK context, the human right of protection is becoming lost.

According to Crawley, there is a vital need to create a policy space to resolve conundrums. The following recommendations were outlined:
1. positive and progressive leadership at all levels (government, business, etc.), with recognition that the government is not alone in setting the tone of the debate on migration ;
2. the asylum system must be driven by the belief that 'protection' is a human right, rather than by concerns over 'control'. Crawley suggested that asylum seekers be allowed access to the labour market as this is a key method of integration. She also noted the need for a large scale resettlement;
3. evidenced-based policies. Although there has been some improvement in this area, there is still a critical need to use evidence and analysis to support policy concerning migration; and
4. invert energy levels so that there is greater emphasis on 'facilitation' and less on 'control'. This concept needs to be sold to the public. The public needs to understand that migration does not pose a threat.

To conclude, Crawley noted that there is a vicious cycle whereby policy making and current discourse feed off of one another: the negative discourse on migration supports the policy direction of framing migration in terms of security and a need to control the abuse of the system, and ensuing policy thereby perpetuates public perceptions of 'good' versus 'bad' migration and so on. The rights-based approach that the Commission advocates is not happening on the ground in the UK. Crawley cautions that

one consequence of the current environment in the United Kingdom is that those migrants with high skills will choose to migrate elsewhere.

Questions from the audience

One particular question which arose from the audience concerning the recruitment of low-skilled labour forces and their effect on the mechanisation of production. In response the panel stated that production plants were not limited to the hiring of migrant labour forces to supply labour demand, but could also produce offshore, mechanise or close down labour-intensive production commodities. It might not always be in a government's best interests to promote the hiring of migrants to fill a labour demand. In terms of mechanisation, the panel gave the example of tomato processing in the USA as an example of how the availability of a large and cheap supply of low-skilled labour can discourage a move towards mechanisation.

Concluding Remarks
Khalid Koser,
Senior Research Analyst, Global Commission on International Migration

Khalid Koser brought the conference to a close with a short presentation on the reactions to the report and the next steps of the Commission. He noted that the key areas identified by commentators were the stress on the links between migration and other global issues, emphasis on regional variations and the importance of the role of the private sector. People had remarked that they felt that the strengths of the report were in its process of data collection and its solid base of evidence, the genuine effort to look at migration at a global level and the high level backing that the report received.

Koser said that the report had been criticised for being a consensus report which at times had led to agreement at the level of the lowest common denominator. He commented on how there had been a large amount of discussion which concentrated on just one of the 33 recommendations, around the proposal for institutional change and the development of a global organisation for migration. The Commissioners themselves felt that the report was disseminated too late and that future commissions should publish half-way through the commission's period to leave more time for dissemination.

Koser continued that since the report was published, the Secretary General is to appoint a new head of migration and the Geneva Migration Group is to be reconstituted to become a more active group. There is also to be a combined group of states to act on the recommendations of the report.

Khalid concluded the day by thanking the organisers of the conference and added that the body of evidence collected by the commission could be accessed at www.gcim.org.