International Migration: Global Perspectives and Implications for Britain
The Report of the Global Commission on International Migration UK Launch Event

The Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) was launched by the United Nations Secretary-General in December 2003 in Geneva. Comprised of 19 Commissioners, it is independent and has the mandate to provide a framework for the formulation of a coherent, comprehensive and global response to the issue of international migration. The resulting document "*Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action*" was presented to the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, UN Members States and other stakeholders on the 5th of October 2005.

In its report, the Global Commission on International Migration says the international community has failed to realize the full potential of migration and has not risen to the many opportunities and challenges it presents. The Commission stresses the need for greater coherence, cooperation and capacity to achieve more effective governance of international migration. The 90-page report provides a comprehensive yet concise analysis of key global policy issues in the field of international migration, and presents six 'Principles for Action' and thirty-three related recommendations that can serve as a guide to the formulation of migration policies at the national, regional and global levels.

On the 9th of December 2005, an event was held to mark the UK launch of the report. Organised by the Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty (University of Sussex) and the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS at Oxford University) the conference "*International Migration: Global Perspectives and Implications for Britain*" was designed to stimulate public debate in the UK regarding the issue of international migration, bringing together both academic and policy perspectives.

The report was presented by two representatives of the Commission - Mr. Jan O. Karlsson, former Swedish Minister for Development Cooperation, Migration and Asylum Policy, and former President of the European Court of Auditors of the European Union and Commissioner Mary Robinson, Director of the Ethical Globalisation Initiative and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. A round table of senior government figures from the Home Office, Foreign Office and Department for International Development commented on the report and then academics in the field were joined by policy advisors for a discussion and questions from the audience.

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.

Welcome

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

Richard Black opened the conference and gave the welcome address. He highlighted the importance of the GCIM report to the UK. There are 4 million foreign-born people living in the UK. This means the UK interests also go beyond its national borders with 3.5-4 million British-born living overseas, and the UK has to recognise the impact of global migration on foreign policy and international development policy. Black highlighted the report's key theme which calls for greater coherence in policy making.

Jan Karlsson,
Co-Chair, Global Commission on International Migration

Key Discussion Points:

- **report of the GCIM: process and policy**
- **driving forces behind migration**
- **migrants as actors**

Jan Karlsson introduced the report and explained that the Commission was an independent group that was formally launched in Geneva in December 2003. Many observers believed that it would not be possible to produce a review in 18 months on such a large and conflict-laden area; therefore, the Commission was very pleased to produce a unanimous document with only one or two compromises.

Karlsson informed the delegates that the Commission was conscious of the dangers of producing a report resulting in no action; therefore, the Commission explicitly decided to produce a concise, clearly written report and had a policy of openness and 'no surprises'. The document does not contain new theory or innovation but simply aims to coherently bring together existing evidence regarding migration processes and policies. The Commission wanted to put forward ideas that would gain momentum over time.

Karlsson informed the delegates that the timing of the report is important as rates of international migration are increasing and it is becoming an ever wider issue, yet the understanding of the consequences of migration are developing at a slower rate. There are 200 million migrants in the world, the highest number in history, and equal to the fifth most populated nation in the world, Brazil. Migrants work and produce income and often send it home. They remit between $150 billion (World Bank estimate) and $300 billion (IOM estimate) a year, compared with the $60 billion given in international development aid each year. While this is private money and therefore spent differently to official aid, it can potentially have a large impact on development. Karlsson emphasised the report's belief that more could be made of this resource and the key message was that migration and development have close and interesting links.

The following driving forces for migration were outlined:
- demography;
- development; and
- democracy.

In demographic terms rich countries are people-poor, and will find this situation becomes more acute in the next couple of decades. However, these countries are surrounded by countries where people are unemployed or underemployed, therefore although migration will not suffice to solve the demographic problem, it can at least be part of the solution. Karlsson discussed the potential to increase productivity by managing migration better, and stressed the urgency of this matter for poverty reduction. In absolute numbers, there are as many people living in poverty now as there were 25 years ago. He underlined that governments have the main responsibility in this as they 'own' migration yet, to date, they have not been very successful; policies conflict and are incoherent, governments have been acting in isolation and debate has concentrated on enforcement and, in Europe at least, on asylum. The Commission does not call for an international body overseeing migration as it feels that governments are not ready for such a framework. He added that coherence begins at home; integration and other migration policy actually happen at the local level and not the national level.

Karlsson explained that the Commission advocates a rights-based approach that should be applied to all policy, and not selectively for 'legal/ illegal' migrants. This has consequences for how migrants are perceived. The Commission felt that migrants should be seen as actors rather than as victims; even if at one point a migrant is a victim, they will later become an actor. Migration has the potential to be an effective tool in development and can have benefits for receiving and sending countries as well as for the migrants themselves. In order to maximise these benefits, policy needs to have greater coherence with migrants treated as actors. In public debate, this would change how migrants are seen and lead to them being recognised as collaborators. This relates in particular to debates about integration where migrants themselves play an important role.

Karlsson concluded by talking about the hypocrisy in attitudes towards migration and the lack of acknowledgement of the enormous mobility that people now have. Governments feel there is a need to control migration, but in order to do this, migration policy needs to be linked up with other social goals. Better migration management and policy could maximise three layers of benefits; to the receiving country, to the sending country and to migrants themselves.

Mary Robinson,
Commissioner, Global Commission on International Migration

Key Discussion Points:

- **GCIM support for a rights-based approach to migration**
- **Conceptualising migration: the importance of language**
- **GCIM support for innovative migration policies**

Mary Robinson began her session by noting that the eve of human rights day is an appropriate time to be launching the GCIM report in the UK with its recommendation for a rights-based approach to migration policy. It is her hope that the report will spark a dialogue, getting away from the myths and contradictions that surround migration.

Adding to Jan Karlsson's comments on the compromises of the report she highlighted one key area where there had been much discussion. The report had to stop short of advocating ratification of the 1990 Convention on the Protection of the Rights of Migrants and the Family Members, but Robinson stressed that this was an important way forward, but one where the commission had ended up with a compromise.

In highlighting the importance of language, she pointed to chapter 3 of the report which discusses the challenge of "irregular" migration and went on to explain that from a human rights perspective individuals cannot be irregular or illegal. She also pointed to the increasing harshness of language regarding migrants and emphasised the report's warning against this.

Robinson felt that the criticism that the report is Euro-centric was perhaps warranted, however she emphasised that this is meant to be the beginning of a debate which is to be continued.

Robinson talked of the importance of diasporas, as discussed by the Shadow Commission on Africa, and the potential for involvement of these groups in more innovative policies, for example in addressing brain drain and increasing co-development.

In her concluding remarks, Robinson stated that there needs to be greater understanding that human mobility will increase drastically and that migration is the human face of globalisation. A positive approach is needed in order to maximise the potential benefits of this increased mobility.

Questions from the audience

A question was asked about the approach to reducing brain drain of medical staff, and why there was not more concentration on keeping British staff so as to reduce demand for foreign staff. Mary Robinson replied that she felt that there was an opportunity to

think about this in a more focussed way, from the point of view of co-development. She felt that there could be more imaginative policies that would allow medical professionals greater opportunities to migrate and use their skills (such as permitting short term but regular migration) but that she would not advocate a strategy that would place restrictions on the movement of individuals.

In response to a question about the protection of the rights of domestic workers, Mary Robinson said that there was an opportunity for the sending countries to work together to put pressure on receiving countries to establish greater access to rights and better working conditions for migrant workers, rather than undercutting one another.

There then followed a discussion on the terms "high-skilled" and "low-skilled", and the problems associated with making distinctions between migrants.

Session 1: UK Policymakers Comments and Discussion

Chair: Sarah Spencer, Associate Director, ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy & Society, University of Oxford

Panellists: Georgina Simpson, Team Leader for Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) and Global Migration, Foreign and Commonwealth Office

          Tony Venables, Chief Economist, Department for International Development

          Emma Haddad, Assistant Director, International Delivery, Immigration and Nationality Directorate, Home Office

Georgina Simpson,
Team Leader for Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) and Global Migration, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)

Key Discussion Points:

- **FCO response to GCIM report**
- **FCO support for the need for increased international and regional cooperation on issues related to migration**
- **FCO efforts to minimise the negative impacts of migration**

Georgina Simpson began the session by noting that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) welcomes the Global Commission on International Migration Report as

representative of the views of the Foreign Office, DFID and the Home Office on issues relating to migration, and commends its clear and coherent structure.

She pointed out that the FCO recognises the need for improved international and regional cooperation in issues relating to migration, and is beginning to implement this through various methods such as: increasingly integrated immigration controls overseas through, issuing of UK visas abroad and so on. International cooperation being improved through involvement in more effective dialogue and regional cooperation. She pointed out that the FCO will be taking part in the High Level dialogue in New York in 2006, and is facilitating in the negotiation of the EU position in this dialogue.

Simpson told delegates that the FCO aims to minimise the negative impacts of migration through ensuring that people migrate out of choice, rather than coercion. This involves focusing on migration in a wider context and recognising its links with development. Reduction of poverty in source countries should ensure that fewer people feel pressured into migration as a route out of poverty. The FCO believes that this needs to be addressed in an internationally coordinated and coherent manner, bilaterally with involvement regionally in the UK and internationally within the EU. The UK should strike a balance between attracting migrants that the economy needs and deterring those who would abuse the system, especially the asylum system. Immigration can be maximised through effective management, which involves; the introduction of a Managed Migration System, working with a 5 year strategy, consolidating the systems of the Home Office, DFID and the FCO, and working closely with other authorities, such as embassies and High Commissions.

The FCO acknowledges that it has moral and legal obligations towards migrants, especially towards refugees. Simpson stated that such obligations include the need to provide more information on migrants' rights, and the provision of proper protection of migrants. The FCO is working with partners to try and ensure these rights are upheld. The protection of migrants is also closely linked with the ability of migrants to integrate into the host society; thus the introduction of citizenship ceremonies is promoted as a way in which migrants can feel more integrated into UK society.

In her concluding remarks Simpston pointed out that irregular entry into the UK undermines the national laws on migration, and leads to exploitation as well as putting legal migrants at risk. An effective returns policy must therefore be enforced, through the conviction and/or deportation of irregular migrants, traffickers and smugglers. This will not only uphold the national law, but also will boost public confidence in the migration policies of the country.

Tony Venables,
Chief Economist, Department for International Development (DFID)

Key Discussion Points:

- **Remittances as a channel for development**
- **DFID efforts to decrease brain drain in developing countries**
- **DFID support for GATS (Mode 4)**

Tony Venables began his speech by noting that DFID commends the Global Commission on International Migration Report for its consultative and participatory process of research, and congratulates the Commission on writing a clear, lucid and short overview. He thanked the Commission for the input the paper has added to the debate on international migration.

Like the Commission, DFID recognises the important role that remittances play in acting as a channel for development and are actively promoting safe and viable methods to transfer remittance money. Global remittance flows are considerably larger than official development aid and anti-cyclical, generally increasing during an economic crisis. Venables informed the delegates that DFID is working with other countries to try and facilitate the flow of remittances through the use of new technologies, by providing new information for migrants about remittances (see new website initiative: http://www.sendmoneyhome.org), by reducing entry barriers for money transfers, and by creating a regulatory environment surrounding remittance flows.

On the issue of brain drain, Venables stated that DFID recognises the need for limits. In the long term, plans to train and retain should be implemented in order to increase the supply of skilled workers. This is recognised as the responsibility of the wealthier and the poorer nations. Reducing push factors in the country of origin through improving pay and working conditions should also reduce brain drain. Venables relayed that in the short term, DFID is supporting and promoting fast-track training programmes, for example in Malawi where they aim to double the number of health care workers in six years.

DFID recognises and is supportive of the GATS (Mode 4) negotiations towards freedom of movement for people providing services. However, discussions have proved unpromising, especially in regard to the movement of less-skilled labour forces, and are therefore unlikely to be implemented at least in the short term.

Temporary migration is seen as beneficial, but difficult to implement. DFID recognises the importance of consultation and cooperation at the regional level, as well as at the international level. Venables discussed the EU Strategy for Africa as an example of a collaborative approach that requires international cooperation. To conclude he noted that in its year of EU presidency, the UK has highlighted the importance of dialogue on temporary migration, and DFID is working to strengthen joint action on this matter.

Emma Haddad,
Assistant Director, International Delivery, Immigration and Nationality Directorate,
Home Office

Key Discussion Points:

- **Strengthening border security**
- **Stronger EU engagement in managing migration internationally**
- **Strengthening dialogue between the EU and Africa**
- **Home Office position in relation to GCIM**

Emma Haddad informed the delegates that the Home Office welcomes the report of the Global Commission on International Migration as a comprehensive contribution to the national, regional and international debate on migration.

She noted that increased international cooperation is needed in dealing with issues relating to international migration. This includes cooperation on maintaining border security and border control, and dealing with organised immigration crime, and acting strongly to avoid illegal migration. The Home Office recognises the Commission's statement that border control alone does not manage migration, and that there is a need for dialogue and working in partnership.

During the UK's year of presidency of the EU, Haddad reported that it has actively promoted the strengthening of the EU's engagement with managing migration internationally. She discussed mandates such as the HLWG for Asylum and Migration, and the introduction of pilot Regional Protection Programmes (RPPs) as examples of the UK promoting international dialogue, integration and cooperation within the EU concerning international migration issues. She noted that the EU is also concerned with promoting migration and development, and recommends action in four areas:

1. remittance transfers and increasing their development impact;
2. helping diaspora groups interested in contributing to the development of their countries of origin;
3. promoting circular and temporary migration; and
4. alleviating the adverse impacts of brain drain.

Haddad highlighted the strengthening of dialogue between the EU and Africa through the meeting of the Justice and Home Affairs Council in October. Enhanced EU cooperation efforts with countries in Africa was highlighted as a means of tackling the problem of illegal migration from Africa, and addressing development needs in source countries was emphasised as a solution to reducing migratory pressures. In their year of presidency, the Home Office ensured that issues of migration featured strongly on the agenda of EU-Africa Ministerial Troika in November, where a holistic approach on human rights, social cohesion, economic integration and development was included in the migration debate. The European Council are currently drafting a Strategy for Africa which will provide a framework for action by the EU until 2015 to accelerate the progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.

In her concluding remarks Haddad noted that the GCIM report stresses the need to address migration issues in an integrated and interconnected manner. She noted that the Home Office is actively working with other EU member states and third countries in

response to this need. The report mentions the need to recognise and reinforce the role that migrants play in promoting development and poverty reduction in their countries of origin, and work is being done at EU level to reflect this. The UK government is working towards a more comprehensive, cooperative and integrated approach towards migration policies at regional, national and international levels.

Questions from the audience

A key area of concern raised by the audience to the panel of UK policymakers was the points based entry system into the UK and its preference for EEA nationals being unrealistic but also discriminatory towards other groups of low skilled migrants.

In response, Georgina Simpson pointed out that the system was being introduced in order to promote a better managed system to meet the UK's needs, and to provide an effective way for migrants to see whether they can come to the UK. Another Home Office representative from the audience stated that the points system was being introduced to maximise the benefits of migration for Britain, and emphasised the introduction of the Tier 3 recruitment process as a means of employing migrants to fill low-skilled labour shortages. Tony Venables emphasised that while in the long run EEA nationals will fill most labour shortages, this recruitment method will not result in all of the UK's labour needs being met, and there will be a need to recruit from further afield.

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;
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;
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.

Annex
Delegate List

Name	Organisation

Chris Attwood	Home Office
Hazel Baird	CRE
Oliver Bakewell	Intrac
Catherine Barber	DTI
Ann Barber	Home Office
Hayley Barrett	Coventry Refugee Centre
Paul Bentall	FCO
Rhian Beynon	JCWI
Nalu Binaisa	University of Sussex, SCMR
Richard Black	Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty
Alice Bloch	City University
Teresa Casey	UCL/LSE
Lucie Cerna	Oxford University
Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie	African Foundation for Development
Marius Claudy	Cross Cutting Strategy Unit - DWP
Liz Clery	Home Office
Carla Clifton	Home Office
Heaven Crawley	AMRE Consulting
Joe Dancy	Privy Council Office
Liz Davidson	HM Treasury
John Davies	University of Sussex
Jan de Wilde	IOM
Seema Desai	Foreign Policy Centre
Anna Downs	Home Office
Katherine Drew	IPPR
Alf Dubs	House of Lords
Macha Farrant	IPPR
Emily Fletcher	University of Sussex
Ana Fonseca	IOM
Jean Foster	DFID
Alan Gamlen	University of Oxford
Yun Gao	ILO
Alan Gemmell	Home Office
Saskia Gent	Migration DRC
Nicola Gilpin	DWP
Lourdes Gordolan	COMPAS
Andrew Graves	DWP
Lyndy Griffin	ESRC
Phoebe Griffith	Barrow Cadbury
Emma Haddad	Home Office, IND
James Hampshire	University of Sussex
David Harding	Home Office

Jon Hargreaves	DFID
Charlotte Heath	DFID
Elizabeth Hurley	Cross Cutting Strategy Unit - DWP
Malcolm James	Runnymead Trust
Vaughan Jones	Praxis
Jan Karlsson	GCIM
Jeremy Kempton	Home Office
Samia Khaleeli	
Eleanor Kofman	Middlesex University
Khalid Koser	GCIM
Rahel Kunz	University of Oxford
Kadara Kursum	Centre for Inter-African Relations
Clare Lombardelli	HM Treasury
Christine Lumb	Executive Director, Concordia
Anna MacDonald	IPPR
Mike Mahony	IND Home Office
Sonia McKay	Working Lives Institute
Tracey McLelland	FCO
Darren Middleton	
Jane Millar	UCL
Gloria Mills	Unison
Gina Naguib	HM Treasury
Rebecca Napier-Moore	University of Sussex
Marianne Neinhuis	JCWI
Emma Newcombe	COMPAS
Sharon Oakley	University of Sussex
Clara Odofin	Oxfam
Christina Oelgemoller	Migration DRC
Ceri Oeppen	University of Sussex
Robert Orr	Canadian High Commission
Christina Pantiru	University of Sussex
Tauhid Pasha	JCWI
Edison Patino	Migrants Resource Centre
Lisa Phillips	DFID
John Philpott	Chartered Institute for Personnel & Development
Richard Pickering	Home Office
Cinzia Polese	UCL
Mike Power	DFID
Amy Prior	University of Sussex
Caroline Pritchard	FCO
Beryl Randall	Employability Forum
Mary Robinson	GCIM
Martin Ruhs	COMPAS

Shamit Saggar	University of Sussex
Helen Sakho	
Jan Shaw	Amnesty International
Areti Sianni	Amnesty International
Georgina Simpson	FCO, Justice and Home Affairs and Global Migration
Ron Skeldon	Migration DRC
Will Sommerville	CRE
Sarah Spencer	COMPAS
Tony Spencer	FCO
Richard Stanton	GLA
Andrew Storey	RHUL
Cecilia Tacoli	IIED
Tracy Tasker	DFID
Yuvi Thangarajah	University of Sussex
Zandra Van der Brocque	Home Office
Tony Venables	DFID
Nadine Voelkner	University of Sussex
Bettina von Hornhardt	Home Office
Olsi Vullnetari	University opf Sussex
Meera Warrier	University of Sussex
Ann Whitehead	University of Sussex
Almuth Wietholtz	COMPAS
Tony Wilson	DWP