



IOM International Organization for Migration  
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations  
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

MC/2361/Rev.1

Original: English  
9 December 2013

**COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL**

**CONSEJO**

**103RD SESSION**

**REPORT ON THE  
101ST SESSION OF THE COUNCIL**

**NOTE CONCERNING DOCUMENT MC/2361**

At its 103rd Session, the Council, by Resolution No. 1260 of 26 November 2013, approved the Report on its 101st Session without amendment.

To save the cost of reprinting the whole report, it is requested that this cover page be added to the original document MC/2361 dated 20 February 2013.

Geneva  
27 to 30 November 2012  
Rapporteur: Mr. Bertrand de Crombrughe (Belgium)





---

IOM International Organization for Migration  
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations  
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

MC/2361

**Original: English**  
**20 February 2013**

**COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL**

**CONSEJO**

---

**101ST SESSION**

---

**DRAFT REPORT ON THE  
101ST SESSION OF THE COUNCIL**

Geneva  
27 to 30 November 2012  
Rapporteur: Mr. Bertrand de Crombrughe (Belgium)

---

Draft reports of meetings of the governing bodies are subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the Meetings Secretariat, IOM, P.O. Box 71, CH-1211 Geneva 19, within one week of receiving the records in their working language; these will then be consolidated in a single corrigendum.



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ATTENDANCE .....	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION, CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES AND OBSERVERS .....	2
ELECTION OF OFFICERS .....	2
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA .....	3
ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS AND OBSERVERS .....	3
(a) Applications by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and Papua New Guinea for membership of the Organization .....	3
(b) Applications by the African and Black Diaspora Global Network on HIV and AIDS (ABDGN), World Vision International and the World Food Programme for representation by an observer .....	4
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL .....	5
OPENING REMARKS .....	5
IOM GOVERNANCE .....	5
(a) Draft report on the 100th Session of the Council .....	5
(b) Report on the 109th Session of the Executive Committee .....	6
(c) Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2012 .....	6
(d) Programme and Budget for 2013 .....	6
(e) Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget ...	7
(f) Other items arising from the Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance .....	7
(g) Draft resolution on IOM and the United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013 .....	10
(h) Draft resolution on the IOM Migration Crisis Operational Framework .....	10
(i) Date and place of the next session .....	11

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
KEYNOTE ADDRESS .....	11
AN INTERACTIVE EXCHANGE ORGANIZED AROUND CURRENT MIGRATION ISSUES .....	12
Managing migration in crisis situations .....	12
Migration and health .....	16
Migration and development .....	19
GENERAL DEBATE .....	23
CLOSURE OF THE SESSION .....	27

## DRAFT REPORT ON THE 101ST SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

### INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1232 of 5 December 2011, the Council convened for its 101st Session on Tuesday, 27 November 2012, at the Palais des Nations, Geneva. Seven meetings were held.

### ATTENDANCE<sup>1</sup>

2. The following Member States were represented:

Afghanistan	Democratic	Lesotho	Senegal
Albania	Republic of	Libya	Serbia
Algeria	the Congo	Lithuania	Sierra Leone
Angola	Denmark	Luxembourg	Slovakia
Argentina	Djibouti	Madagascar	Slovenia
Australia	Dominican Republic	Maldives	Somalia
Austria	Ecuador	Mali	South Africa
Azerbaijan	Egypt	Malta	South Sudan
Bahamas	El Salvador	Mauritania	Spain
Bangladesh	Estonia	Mexico	Sri Lanka
Belarus	Ethiopia	Montenegro	Sudan
Belgium	Finland	Morocco	Swaziland
Bolivia	France	Myanmar <sup>2</sup>	Sweden
(Plurinational	Gabon	Namibia	Switzerland
State of)	Gambia	Nepal	Tajikistan
Bosnia and	Georgia	Netherlands	Thailand
Herzegovina	Germany	New Zealand	Togo
Botswana	Ghana	Nicaragua	Tunisia
Brazil	Greece	Niger	Turkey
Bulgaria	Guatemala	Nigeria	Ukraine
Burkina Faso	Haiti	Norway	United Kingdom of
Burundi	Holy See	Pakistan	Great Britain
Cambodia	Honduras	Panama	and Northern
Canada	Hungary	Paraguay	Ireland
Cape Verde	India	Peru	United States of
Central African	Iran (Islamic	Philippines	America
Republic	Republic of)	Poland	Uruguay
Chile	Ireland	Portugal	Venezuela
Colombia	Israel	Republic of Korea	(Bolivarian
Congo	Italy	Republic of	Republic of)
Costa Rica	Jamaica	Moldova	Viet Nam
Côte d'Ivoire	Japan	Romania	Yemen
Croatia	Jordan	Rwanda	Zambia
Cyprus	Kenya	Saint Vincent and	Zimbabwe
Czech Republic	Latvia	the Grenadines <sup>2</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> See List of participants (MC/2360).

<sup>2</sup> See paragraph 12.

3. Bahrain, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Qatar, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were represented by observers.

4. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the UN Conference on Trade and Development, the African Union, the Council of Europe, the European Union, the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, the International Labour Organization, the League of Arab States, the Organisation internationale de la francophonie, the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation, the World Bank, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization and the Global Forum on Migration and Development were represented by observers.

5. The International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the Sovereign Order of Malta were represented by observers, as were the following international non-governmental organizations (NGOs): Africa Humanitarian Action, African and Black Diaspora Global Network on HIV/AIDS (ABDGN), Caritas internationalis, Femmes africa solidarité, the International Institute of Humanitarian Law, the International Islamic Relief Organization, the International Social Service, the Jesuit Refugee Service, the Lutheran World Federation, the Refugee Education Trust and World Vision International.

6. The participants attended two events organized in conjunction with the Council session: the launch of the publication *Foundations of International Migration Law*, and the launch of *Migration Initiatives 2013*.

## **OPENING OF THE SESSION, CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES AND OBSERVERS**

7. The outgoing Chairperson, Mr. Christian Strohal (Austria), opened the session on Tuesday, 27 November 2012, at 10.20 a.m.

8. The Council noted that the Director General had examined the credentials of the representatives of the Member States listed in paragraph 2 and found them to be in order, and that he had been advised of the names of the observers for the non-Member States, international governmental organizations and NGOs listed in paragraphs 3 to 5.

## **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

9. The Council elected the following officers:

Chairperson:	Mr. Abdul Hannan (Bangladesh)
First Vice-Chairperson:	Mrs. Alicia Arango (Colombia)
Second Vice-Chairperson:	Mr. James Manzou (Zimbabwe)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Bertrand de Crombrughe (Belgium)

10. Assuming the Chair, Mr. Hannan thanked Mr. Strohal and the outgoing Bureau for their valuable work, notably on budget reform and the Organization's engagement in the second United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. He looked forward to working with the Member States in a spirit of cooperation, transparency and openness.



IOM was well placed to address the multifaceted challenges of human mobility and to shape the future of migration for the benefit of the international community.

## **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

11. The Council adopted the agenda as set out in document MC/2344/Rev.1.

## **ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS AND OBSERVERS**

### **(a) Applications by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and Papua New Guinea for membership of the Organization**

12. The Council adopted by acclamation Resolutions Nos 1233, 1234 and 1235 admitting Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and Papua New Guinea, respectively, as members of IOM.

13. The representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines said that, while some 110,000 people lived in her country, the global diaspora numbered about half a million, giving those living abroad the opportunity to shape development through remittances, investment, skills and knowledge transfer. The Government was striving to develop policies that could leverage the potential of the diaspora to improve national development. Significant resources had to be allocated to migration-related challenges such as fighting human trafficking, promoting dignified treatment of migrant citizens abroad, reintegrating deportees into society and repatriating their assets. Some of those challenges were new to her Government, which was finding it difficult to mobilize the financial and technical resources to meet them and to adopt policies and train staff for their implementation. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines was grateful for the technical cooperation and assistance it had received from IOM through various partnerships and looked forward to increasing its capacity to work with the international community to address migration issues in an effective and humane manner, as a member of IOM.

14. The representative of Myanmar said that his country had learned much from the Organization through hosting an IOM office and was grateful for the assistance it had received in the form of the safe and orderly return of citizens from overseas. Since March 2011, the Government had implemented significant economic, social and other reforms which had done much to improve citizens' lives, particularly in the field of labour rights. Several national workers' and employers' organizations had emerged and steps were being taken to develop skilled labour and reduce poverty through employment. Since some 3 million migrants from Myanmar worked abroad, the Government was also striving to promote and protect their rights and foster understanding of the positive role of migration in host societies and countries of origin. In addition, the authorities would focus on capacity-building in national and regional migration institutions and enhanced international cooperation on irregular migration, human trafficking and smuggling.

15. No representative of Papua New Guinea was available at the meeting to speak following the country's admission.

**(b) Applications by the African and Black Diaspora Global Network on HIV and AIDS (ABDGN), World Vision International and the World Food Programme for representation by an observer**

16. The ABDGN, World Vision International and the World Food Programme were granted observer status at meetings of the Council, in accordance with the terms of Resolutions Nos 1236 to 1238, respectively.

17. The representative of the ABDGN said that the network had increased its cooperation with IOM over the previous four years, particularly in order to increase knowledge and strengthen understanding of the links between HIV and migration. It would continue to engage with IOM to implement the recommendations of the Sixty-first World Health Assembly resolution on the health of migrants.

18. The representative of World Vision International said that her organization had a long history of cooperation with IOM in many parts of the world. In the current context of increasing human mobility and particular vulnerability for children, amid growing uncertainty and deepening humanitarian need, World Vision International pledged to cooperate even more closely with IOM in the future.

19. The representative of the World Food Programme said that, in 2011, her organization had cooperated with IOM in the field in 23 countries worldwide. As the number, scale and complexity of humanitarian crises continued to grow, a more coordinated and predictable partnership between the two organizations was increasingly important. Becoming an observer to the Council would facilitate that by enhancing mutual understanding at the organizational level.

20. The Director General, welcoming the three new members, said that IOM would help Saint Vincent and the Grenadines design policies to develop the potential of its large diaspora and hoped it would participate in the Diaspora Ministerial Conference. IOM would also continue to assist the Government in its fight against human trafficking and its efforts to reintegrate returnees. IOM had developed a solid foundation for cooperation with Myanmar on a wide range of migration issues, particularly health and programmes for returnees from Thailand and Bangladesh. Membership would enable IOM to provide more support on the welfare and rights of migrant workers and their families through training and capacity-building at the national and regional levels. IOM hoped to build on the work it had carried out in the capital of Papua New Guinea and increase the support it provided nationwide.

21. Welcoming the observers, he said he looked forward to working with the ABDGN on migrant health, particularly in the light of the memorandum of understanding IOM had signed with UNAIDS in January 2011 pledging to give migrant workers access to information and services concerning HIV/AIDS. World Vision International had a larger global footprint than many international organizations and the World Food Programme was closer in its operational style to IOM than almost any other UN agency. IOM had worked with both for many years and welcomed the opportunity to strengthen that cooperation in the future.

## REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

22. The Director General gave a slide presentation summing up his report to the Council.<sup>3</sup>

### OPENING REMARKS

- **Teresa-Paraskevi Angelatou**, Diplomatic Adviser to the Minister, addressing the Council on behalf of Nikolaos Dendias, Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection of Greece

23. Ms. Angelatou said that, in spite of the difficulties and challenges that her country was currently facing, Greece was determined to reverse negative trends and achieve its goals.

24. Given Greece's geographical position, the Government was acutely aware of common security issues. Measures to strengthen security also needed to focus on ensuring stability beyond national borders, and multilateral engagement was necessary to overcome current migration challenges. Greece had been working with IOM on a range of migration policies and programmes, including a grant agreement relating to the voluntary return of migrants and measures to promote and expand cooperation with regard to vulnerable migrants, including the creation of a network of stakeholders to support the establishment of two new reception centres. The Greek asylum and migration strategy included an action plan on strengthening the country's external borders, measures to combat illegal migration and human trafficking – including strategic cooperation to secure the country's maritime borders, security operations in Athens and Patras, efforts to increase the capacity of pre-removal centres – in order to expedite the return of irregular migrants, and the establishment of a new, independent asylum service and initial reception centre. All relevant measures had been implemented in line with EU legislation and IOM best practice.

25. In order to address the problem of racism and dangerous attitudes in Greek society, the Government had set up special police departments in Athens and Thessaloniki, tasked with tackling and preventing racist violence, and immediately investigating complaints.

26. Although the Greek Government was determined to succeed, it was also aware that success could be achieved only through joint efforts. It was therefore vital for all partners to work together to create a safe, secure and equal society.

### IOM GOVERNANCE

#### (a) **Draft report on the 100th Session of the Council**

27. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1239 of 27 November 2012 approving the report on its 100th Session (MC/2342).

---

<sup>3</sup> The full text of the Director General's Report to the 101st Session of the Council (MICEM/3/2012) and the slide presentation are accessible on the IOM website at [www.iom.int](http://www.iom.int).

**(b) Report on the 109th Session of the Executive Committee**

28. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1240 of 27 November 2012 taking note, with appreciation, of the Report on the 109th Session of the Executive Committee (MC/2347) and Resolution No. 1241 of 27 November 2012 on the appointment of the External Auditors.

**(c) Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2012**

29. The Rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance said that the Administrative Part of the Budget remained unchanged at CHF 39,769,500,<sup>4</sup> while the Operational Part of the Budget had increased from USD 993.6 million to USD 1.2 billion, as a result of additional funding received and new activities undertaken since the Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2012 (MC/EX/717) had been approved by the Executive Committee in July 2012. At its Eleventh Session, the Standing Committee had recommended that the Council take note of the document entitled Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2012 (MC/2348).

30. Several representatives welcomed the efficiency measures that had been introduced by the Administration but expressed concern over how zero nominal growth in the Administrative Part of the Budget could be maintained in the face of ever-increasing migration challenges. They urged all Member States to honour their financial obligations to the Organization so that it could continue to deliver the necessary humanitarian services to migrants.

31. The Council took note of document MC/2348.

**(d) Programme and Budget for 2013**

32. The Standing Committee Rapporteur said that the Administrative Part of the Budget for 2013 had been held to zero nominal growth and amounted to CHF 39,398,792, but would require the adoption of a number of efficiency measures and structural adjustments to absorb yearly statutory increases. Several delegations had expressed appreciation for the efforts to maintain the budget at the same level in the face of the difficult global economic situation but also their concerns about the constraints that zero nominal growth placed on the Organization. In response, the Administration had indicated areas where savings had been made so as to balance that part of the budget. The Operational Part of the Budget, estimated at USD 642.7 million, would be revised when additional funding was received to reflect the level of activity undertaken by the Organization. Operational Support Income, established at USD 52.2 million based on the three-year average formula, had been supplemented by the reserve mechanism in the amount of USD 1.7 million, bringing total Operational Support Income for 2013 to USD 53.9 million.

33. The Standing Committee had expressed no objection to the proposal by the Administration to designate the IOM Country Office with Coordinating Functions in Nairobi, Kenya, as a Regional Office, given the increasingly complex migration challenges in the Horn of Africa.

34. The Standing Committee had taken note of the Programme and Budget for 2013 (MC/2349) and recommended that the Council approve the Administrative and Operational Parts of the Budget (CHF 39,398,792 and USD 642,722,000, respectively).

---

<sup>4</sup> This figure includes the one-time surplus of CHF 370,708, which was carried forward from the 2010 budget.

35. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1242 of 27 November 2012 approving the Programme and Budget for 2013.

**(e) Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget**

36. The Standing Committee Rapporteur said that, according to document SCPF/91, entitled Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget, there had been an increase in total outstanding assessed contributions compared with the previous year and 15 Member States remained subject to Article 4 of the Constitution. The Standing Committee had taken note of the situation and urged Member States in arrears to make every effort to pay their contributions as soon as possible or to agree to a payment plan with the Administration.

37. The Administration said that since document SCPF/91 had been issued, three Member States had paid their contributions for the current year, bringing the total amount owed down slightly, from CHF 6,541,274 to CHF 6,458,318.

38. The Director General commended those Member States that had settled their arrears and said that the Administration would do what it could to support those that still owed contributions. He outlined the simple payment plan that was available, which enabled payments to be made over 5, 10, or 15 years and in local currency, and reminded Member States that payment of arrears would also give some of them access to two lines of funding for projects up to USD 100,000 or USD 200,000, as provided for by the IOM Development Fund.

**(f) Other items arising from the Report of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance**

39. The Standing Committee Rapporteur reported on a number of other items discussed by the Committee at its Eleventh Session.

**• Chairperson's report on the Working Group on Budget Reform**

40. The Chairperson of the Working Group on Budget Reform had reported that, although the Working Group had made significant progress, much remained to be done regarding the financing of the core budget. The Working Group's discussions had recently focused on alternative funding sources, raising the visibility of the Organization and making the best use of host country agreements. Several delegations had welcomed the report and the changes that had been initiated by the Working Group in 2012 and reflected in the 2013 Programme and Budget.

41. The Administration had suggested that, as a cost efficiency measure, consideration be given to streamlining the project audit process by having a single auditor instead of a number of auditors designated by donors.

42. The Director General added that the Working Group had addressed a problem that had existed for a long time, namely the existence of various budget-related resolutions. The newly consolidated budget resolution represented a significant achievement, as did the Working Group's proposal to reduce the reserve mechanism for Operational Support Income to USD 5 million, which would give the Organization additional reserve resources that could be used for any urgent situations that arose.

- **Report on the Friends of the Chair meetings on preparations for the second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development**

43. During the reporting period there had been two Friends of the Chair meetings on preparations for the second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. The group had reported that IOM would be co-chairing a working group of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, which had been tasked with preparing the report of the Secretary-General to the High-level Dialogue. It was via that channel that IOM would provide input to the process. Regarding the form of the input, one option under consideration was a statement from the IOM Council to the United Nations General Assembly. The Standing Committee had taken note of the report and had agreed that the Friends of the Chair should meet again to further consider how input from the Council should be formalized.

44. The Director General added that the Organization would be holding briefing sessions in early 2013 on the High-level Dialogue, outlining IOM's position with regard to the Dialogue and how Member States could support it. IOM was a member of the United Nations System Task Team on the post-2015 Development Agenda, which allowed it to keep the issue of migration and development in the minds of those preparing that agenda.

- **Exchange of views on items proposed by the membership**

(i) The smuggling of migrants and the role of IOM

45. The Administration had introduced the document entitled The smuggling of migrants and the role of IOM (SCPF/86), which outlined the differences between smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons and the key policy-related challenges facing States when addressing the issue of migrant smuggling. Member States were urged to adopt a balanced approach to the issue, one that criminalized smuggling groups, provided assistance to those who had been smuggled, kept open regular channels of migration and addressed the root causes of forced migration. Member States had underscored the importance of strengthening partnerships to combat the phenomenon.

(ii) Assisting and protecting migrants caught in crisis situations

46. The Administration had introduced the document entitled Assisting and protecting migrants caught in crisis situations (SCPF/87) and outlined the various ways migrants were affected by crisis, including vulnerability to violence and human rights violations. It was noted that migrants were often not sufficiently covered by frameworks for crisis preparedness and responses. IOM could improve its assistance to migrants during crises by providing strategic guidance to Member States, training for migrants and capacity-building for embassies.

- **IOM Development Fund**

47. The Administration had presented the document entitled IOM Development Fund (Status report: 1 January to 30 September 2012) (SCPF/88). Funding in 2012 had amounted to USD 8.4 million, or roughly USD 2 million more than the previous year. Project funding requests had exceeded available resources and all funds would have been allocated by the end of the year. A new fund-raising campaign had been launched to attract donors other than Member States. Several representatives had thanked the Member States that had contributed to the Fund, and the

Director General had encouraged all Member States to make at least a small contribution to it. The Standing Committee had taken note of document SCPF/88.

- **Statement by a representative of the Staff Association**

48. The Chairperson of the Staff Association Committee had outlined the Association's main priorities – investment in staff development; representation for all staff; transparency, fairness and consistency in the treatment of all staff – and a number of areas which the Committee thought needed urgent attention. Owing to its increasing workload, the Staff Association Committee had requested that the Administration should consider covering the cost of the Committee's elected Chair in addition to the Secretary. The Standing Committee had taken note of the statement made by the Chairperson of the Staff Association Committee.

- **Report on human resources management and the Human Resources Strategy**

49. The Administration had introduced the document entitled Report on human resources management (MC/INF/308), which provided an update on human resources activities between 1 July 2011 and 30 June 2012. It had also provided information on the Human Resources Strategy for the period 2012 to 2015. A staff survey carried out preparatory to the Strategy's formulation had revealed that attitudes towards transactional services were positive but that several areas required improvement, namely management processes, the daily work environment and long-term career development. The Human Resources Strategy addressed those concerns through three pillars: talent management, an enabling environment and alignment of human resource policies and practices. It would enable the Administration to focus on the issues raised and to monitor the results achieved. The Standing Committee had taken note of document MC/INF/308.

- **Progress report on the implementation of the External Auditor's recommendations**

50. The Administration had introduced the document entitled Report on the implementation of the External Auditor's recommendations (SCPF/90), which outlined the action being taken to implement the recommendations of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India following the audit of the Financial Report for 2011 and reported on implementation of the recommendations made following the audit of the Financial Report for 2010. While IOM remained fully committed to implementing the recommendations, the pace of implementation was at times slower than the Organization would have wished, as it depended on the level of resources available. The Standing Committee had taken note of document SCPF/90.

- **Update on the implementation of IPSAS**

51. In presenting the document entitled Update on the implementation of IPSAS (SCPF/89), the Administration had reported that three standards remained to be implemented by IOM before it was fully IPSAS-compliant, namely property, plant and equipment, employee benefits and intangible assets. IOM was on schedule to produce fully IPSAS-compliant financial statements for the 2012 reporting period. The Standing Committee had taken note of document SCPF/89.

- **Report of the IOM Audit Advisory Committee (February 2011 to June 2012)**

52. A representative of the Audit Advisory Committee had introduced the document entitled Report of the IOM Audit Advisory Committee – Activities from February 2011 to June 2012 (CRP/38). The Committee had held five sessions and visited several Field Offices since its

establishment in February 2011. It had issued an annual report on its activities in 2011 and made recommendations. The Director General had thanked the Audit Advisory Committee for its work to date and affirmed the Administration's commitment to greater transparency and accountability. The Standing Committee had taken note of document CRP/38.

53. The Council took note of the report by the Standing Committee Rapporteur on the other items discussed by the Committee.

**(g) Draft resolution on IOM and the United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013**

54. The outgoing Chairperson said that, since the Standing Committee's Eleventh Session, the Friends of the Chair group had reflected further on the input IOM should provide for the preparatory process for the High-level Dialogue. The outcome was the draft resolution currently before the Council. It underscored the Member States' support for IOM and the Organization's role in the High-level Dialogue. It requested the Organization to keep the Member States fully informed and called on the Member States to convey the Geneva perspective to the preparatory process in New York.

55. The Director General emphasized the importance of conveying the Geneva perspective on migration and development to the diplomatic corps in New York, which was more accustomed to dealing with matters of peace and security.

56. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1244 of 27 November 2012 on IOM and the United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2013.

**(h) Draft resolution on the IOM Migration Crisis Operational Framework**

57. At the request of one representative, the Administration facilitated informal consultations between interested parties, with a view to reaching a consensus on outstanding concerns relating to the draft resolution on the IOM Migration Crisis Operational Framework. The Rapporteur chaired the informal consultations.

58. After the consultations, the Rapporteur stated that consensus had been achieved on two proposed amendments to the draft resolution. In order to include a reference to national legislation, the fifth preambular paragraph had been amended to read: "Reaffirming that States bear the primary responsibility to protect and assist crisis-affected persons residing on their territory in accordance with national law and in conformity with international humanitarian and human rights law".

59. In order to highlight the fact that implementation of the Migration Crisis Operational Framework would not require new sources of funding, the third operational paragraph had been amended to read: "Requests the Director General to apply the Migration Crisis Operational Framework in implementing IOM's activities on the basis of the existing funding mechanisms of IOM in cooperation with its partners".

60. The Rapporteur also said that a number of other points had been discussed during the consultations: the addition of a reference to General Assembly resolution 46/182 of 19 December 1991, on the issue of national unity, in the fourth preambular paragraph; the need to address the question of technical assistance, a matter which a number of delegations thought should be raised



in the near future; and the need to clarify that the Framework's implementation would not involve a new mandate or new set of activities.

61. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1243 of 27 November 2012, as amended.

**(i) Date and place of the next session**

62. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1245 of 27 November 2012, concerning its next regular sessions and inviting the Executive Committee to meet in June 2013. The tentative dates were: 26-29 November for the Council and 13 June for the Executive Committee. Provisional dates for the Twelfth and Thirteenth Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance were 13 and 14 May 2013, and 5 and 6 November,<sup>5</sup> respectively.

63. The Council further adopted Resolution No. 1246 of 27 November 2012 on the 102nd (Special) Session of the Council. The tentative dates for that session, at which the Member States would elect a Director General, were 13 and 14 June 2013.

## **KEYNOTE ADDRESS**

- **H.E. Hassan Sheikh Mahamud**, President of the Somali Republic

64. In a recorded message, President Hassan Sheikh Mahamud said that Somalia had suffered many years of civil war, famine and natural disasters, resulting in a large internally displaced population and over one million Somali refugees living in other countries in the Horn of Africa, with around half of those living in refugee camps in Kenya. Somalia was, however, looking to the future. With the assistance of international partners, many extremist elements in the country that posed a threat to peace and security, such as the militant Al-Shabaab, had been weakened, but not yet eliminated. Much remained to be done, and the Government was seeking to improve the situation in Somalia through measures to create stability, accelerate economic recovery, build peace and remove the main drivers of conflict, improve its capacity to respond to the needs of the people, strengthen international partnerships and ties with neighbouring countries, and promote unity.

65. Political, economic and environmental factors had for many years resulted in protracted, complex crises in the country that had driven various forms of migration. Somalia needed IOM and other international partners to support institutions such as the Somali Disaster Management Agency so that an effective disaster management and mitigation mechanism could be established. The Government was grateful to IOM for its recent work with the Agency to increase the national capacity for disaster response.

66. His administration needed to prepare for the eventual return of many Somali refugees to their communities of origin. As more areas of the country once again became accessible, a coordinated approach would be needed, with open lines of communication to United Nations agencies, other international organizations, and the governments of Kenya and other countries that had hosted Somali refugees for so long. Effective national security would require effective border management, including countering piracy and stopping those with malicious intent from moving freely across Somalia's currently very porous borders. He welcomed the support that

---

<sup>5</sup> The date for the second SCPF was subsequently changed from 5 and 6 November 2013 to 29 and 30 October 2013.

IOM had provided in training immigration officers and installing the necessary equipment to collect migration data and ensure oversight of borders.

67. With 70 per cent of its population under the age of 30, Somalia needed to ensure, as a matter of priority, that its peoples' needs, including education and food security, were met so that the youth of the country would choose not to migrate but to stay and build a future for themselves in Somalia. Action was also needed to help former combatants reintegrate into Somali society, which would be a key area of work for the Government, in collaboration with IOM, the United Nations Political Office for Somalia and other agencies. He welcomed IOM's ongoing involvement in some programmes in Somalia, such as the Transition Initiatives for Stabilization, through which IOM provided guidance to District Commissioners and a forum for discussion on what action could be taken in each district. He hoped to see the United Nations and IOM increase their activities in Somalia to address all aspects of migration and to see the country and its people further along the path to peace and security.

68. Mr. Yusuf Mohamed Ismail "Bari-Bari", Permanent Representative of the Somali Republic to the United Nations Office in Geneva, underscored the Somali Government's determination to address the root causes of instability in the country, in particular by improving access to resources and political representation at grass-roots level, despite the many challenges it would face in the process. The international community, and especially IOM, should take the opportunity to support the new Government in its efforts to bring about sustainable peace, stability and socio-economic development. He echoed his President's thanks to all countries that had hosted Somali refugees for many years, especially Kenya.

69. The representative of Kenya expressed appreciation for the Somali President's recognition of Kenya's efforts to provide the necessary resources and security for the many Somali refugees it has hosted for over 20 years. He welcomed the President's call to encourage the voluntary repatriation of refugees, so that they could return to their communities and take part in Somalia's development. The international community should encourage refugees to return by providing the necessary resources and drawing on the expertise and assistance that IOM could offer. Development in Somalia depended on its people and would not progress unless refugees chose to return and migration out of the country was stemmed. The Kenyan Government was committed to aiding that development and the country's defence forces were doing what they could to help eliminate Al-Shabaab. He hoped other agencies would follow IOM's lead by establishing offices in Somalia and working from within the country to help strengthen security and development.

70. In the light of the points raised, he said it would be beneficial to hold a summit on migration at which heads of State could discuss reform initiatives and ensure that the Organization was working effectively and efficiently to fulfil its mandate.

## **AN INTERACTIVE EXCHANGE ORGANIZED AROUND CURRENT MIGRATION ISSUES<sup>6</sup>**

### **Managing migration in crisis situations**

#### **Panellists:**

- **Yacoub El Hillo**, Director, Bureau for the Middle East and North Africa, UNHCR

---

<sup>6</sup> The panellists' presentations, when available, may be downloaded from the IOM website ([www.iom.int](http://www.iom.int)).

- **Evan P. Garcia**, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Philippines, Geneva
- **Rashid Khalikov**, Director, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Geneva

**Moderator:**

- **William Lacy Swing**, Director General, IOM

71. Mr. Garcia said that the Philippines' approach to managing migration in crisis situations was predicated on the three Ps: preparedness, partnership and political will. In terms of preparedness, the Philippines acknowledged that the country of origin bore primary responsibility for migrant workers. It was therefore Philippine policy to provide migrants with a pre-departure orientation seminar, to have their contracts verified by the embassy concerned and the Department of Labour, and to ensure that each contract had a repatriation clause under which the employer was obliged to pay for the worker's safe return in the event of an emergency. Preparedness also meant organization. The Philippines had learned much from its first major migration crisis, the first Gulf war, and since that time each embassy had drawn up a contingency plan which it regularly updated and which set out predetermined command structures, evacuation exit routes and logistical plans. Wherever there were large concentrations of Filipino migrant workers, a system of wardens had been set up whereby the workers and their associations were empowered to organize and to act as channels of communication with the Philippine authorities through the embassies. In addition, inter-agency rapid response teams could be sent to a capital to beef up the embassy, to border areas to act as reception committees, or to neighbouring countries, especially ones in which the Philippines had no embassy, to help move migrants across borders. Such teams were usually made up of people who had been previously deployed, who were familiar with the language, or who had otherwise obtained experience of evacuations. They were assembled and deployed as needed.

72. There were two kinds of partnership: national and international. In the case of Libya, for example, partnerships at national level had included two dedicated crisis centres in Manila, one at the Department of Foreign Affairs, which had handled repatriations, the other at the Department of Labour, which had carried out support activities, especially after the workers had returned. The authorities had also remained in close contact with the private recruitment agencies and employers concerned. Many Filipino workers in Libya had been employed by large multi-national corporations with their own evacuation plans, which the authorities were able to monitor. Lastly, the authorities had worked very closely with the media and the Philippines' very active civil society, especially in order to provide information to families at home about events overseas. Internationally, the authorities had worked round-the-clock with IOM and UNHCR on the ground, and the Permanent Mission in Geneva with the joint operation cell the two organizations had set up there. They had taken advantage of existing institutional linkages of cooperation and shared historical memory, which were of immense value whenever a major crisis occurred. On the diplomatic front, all Philippine Foreign Service posts in the Middle East, Africa and Europe had been placed on alert. The Philippines had therefore had people at the "front", in neighbouring countries and in countries through which the returning migrants might transit. It had also cooperated with countries that were providing clearance for overflights, and had worked very closely with whatever authorities could be reached in the crisis country, without taking sides, and with neighbouring governments. Looking beyond Libya, the Philippines and its partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations had an agreement to help each other's nationals in

places where one country had an embassy and another did not, thereby extending the reach of assistance.

73. The third P, political will, was no less important in a migration crisis than the other two, especially given that the 10 million or so Filipinos working overseas, roughly 10 per cent of the country's total population, sent back remittances that totalled more on an annual basis than the country's total foreign direct investment or tourism receipts. The political will for action was generated by all the families who were dependent on remittances and by the long-term impact of so many overseas Filipinos for the country's economic well-being. In the particular case of Libya, and in all other major emergencies, political will had emanated from the top, the Office of the President itself, which, in a crisis, monitored and was in close contact with the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Labour and received daily, if not hourly, updates on the situation.

74. The Philippines had learned a number of other things from its experience of migration crises. First, it was important to adopt a one-emergency concept that put safety first and discussion of mandates second. At the end of the day, the people caught up in a humanitarian emergency, whether migrant workers, internally displaced persons or refugees, were all human beings with rights who needed to be helped. Second, the private sector employed many migrant workers. Governments had to maintain contact with the companies concerned, ask them about their plans and remind them of their obligations and the sanctions they incurred for failing to meet them. Third, it was key to adopt an approach based on human rights; assisting migrant workers should be no different from assisting any other vulnerable population, and a human rights-based approach would allow all stakeholders to work together using the same language.

75. The Director General agreed on the importance of communication with the private sector, which in Libya had in many cases been given a free pass. A standard provision in every contract should stipulate that the private sector company was responsible for taking care of the workers it brought to the country and making sure they were able to return home safely. The same applied to recruitment agencies, which required government surveillance.

76. Mr. Khalikov thanked the Council for approving the Migration Crisis Operational Framework, which was an important contribution to the Transformative Agenda developed by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). Any comprehensive humanitarian response involved coordination with authorities and States, international organizations, armed forces, transportation and border officials, and financial representatives. Migrant workers were particularly vulnerable in such situations, not only because they were living outside their country of origin, but also because their freedom of movement might be restricted by the security situation, a matter that had to be addressed by everyone working together, or by funding problems – moving migrants was an expensive undertaking. The capacity of countries of origin to absorb returning migrants and the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse were other issues that had to be addressed as an integral part of the response to the needs of affected populations. In that regard, the UN agencies and IOM could learn a great deal from the national and international NGOs they worked with, which were much closer to the affected communities. The international organizations were clearly accountable to their donors, but they also had to be accountable to the affected population.

77. Referring to the experience of Libya, Mr. Khalikov commended UNHCR and IOM for their outstanding cooperation and mentioned a number of lessons that had been learned. First, when it came to preparedness, it was very important to have prior information on the capacities of the countries the migrants had to leave and the countries to which they were returning, and to be familiar with the legal requirements for their movements; a big operation involving hundreds or

thousands of people would nevertheless most probably overwhelm all national and international capacity. Second, the international community had to invest in better coordination mechanisms with players with which it was not used to working, such as transportation officials, local authorities and the private sector. With regard to the latter, he agreed that labour contracts should stipulate responsibility for repatriation in times of crisis.

78. The magnitude of the humanitarian problems encountered when managing migration in crisis situations, including those related to stranded migrants, was reflected in a few figures: IOM had received about USD 140 million from the United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund since the Fund had been established in 2006, or about 5 per cent of the funds allocated.

79. Mr. El Hillo said that leadership mattered. UNHCR and IOM had demonstrated visionary leadership when the Libya crisis first broke out, in March 2011, by joining forces and doing whatever was needed to help people go home and preserve their safety, dignity and physical integrity. IOM, UNHCR and the governments concerned had moved tens of thousands of people to countries of transit and from there to their countries of origin. In so doing, they had eased the pressure on neighbouring countries such as Tunisia and Egypt and allowed UNHCR to create the protection space needed for those who were unable to return home. In fact, about 4,000 people were still at the border today, unable to return home or to Libya.

80. Partnership also mattered. It had once been standard operating procedure at UNHCR for there to be tension with IOM; in those days, the name of the game had been competition. It had now been recognized that no one agency working on its own could do the job, and the name of the game had changed to complementarity. The agencies were no longer dealing with one crisis at a time, but with several mega crises all occurring at the same time.

81. The IASC Transformative Agenda reflected the determined efforts of the humanitarian community to hone its skills, to be better prepared and provide more timely responses, and to make efficient use of scarce resources. Was similar determination being demonstrated on the political front to prevent situations from becoming complex humanitarian crises? It did not appear so, especially in the light of current events in, for example, Somalia and the Horn of Africa. The ability to address the root causes of crises was apparently becoming very limited, and that was why people were left with no choice but to move. It was when they moved that they became vulnerable and required assistance. Would it not save on time and resources to prevent certain situations from becoming calamities? To take another example, the crisis in the Syrian Arab Republic had already generated over 450,000 refugees registered in Turkey, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon, and no fewer than 2.5 million internally displaced persons inside Syria. No matter how effective and timely the humanitarian response, it would, sadly, not resolve the political issue. The challenge for the governing bodies of both IOM and UNHCR was to prompt action that would nip such calamities in the bud and prevent the kind of human misery being seen at present.

82. Lastly, no matter how well-intentioned and well-planned the humanitarian response, it would amount to very little if not backed by resources. The crises with which agencies like UNHCR and IOM were trying to cope were profound and costly. Obviously, every effort was being made to ensure that every dollar given was used to deliver the goods to the people who needed them, but even that did not suffice. The Member States and other stakeholders, such as the private sector, had to show greater generosity in helping not only IOM and UNHCR, but also all their partner organizations working at the front line and the local communities receiving the masses of people flooding across their borders and sharing the very little they had.

83. One representative, referring to the need for preparedness and contingency plans, pointed to the difficulty of drawing up a contingency plan for a specific country. Who could have foreseen the need for a contingency plan for Libya even one year earlier? In short, how should the question of contingency plans and preparedness be handled in respect of countries in which there was no indication of a budding crisis?

84. Mr. Garcia replied that the Philippines focused on places in which there were large populations of migrant Filipino workers. Its contingency planning also involved keeping track of veterans of migration crises, people who had served in the region before, who spoke the language, who had contacts there, so that they could be brought together as needed. It was also crucial that there be appreciation right up the chain of command that such contingency plans were important.

85. Mr. Khalikov said that contingency planning had to be approached subtly. The best approach was to introduce a standard procedure for all migrants to follow in an emergency.

86. Another representative asked whether UNHCR and OCHA had been consulted about the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and what they considered was IOM's value added with respect to their organizations. When it came to the Framework's implementation, how would it be made to fit in with other processes like the Transformative Agenda and how could it be ensured that the spirit of complementarity was maintained?

87. Mr. Khalikov said that OCHA had been extensively consulted. The Framework was to be discussed at the forthcoming IASC meeting and would play a major role in bringing migration crises onto the agenda.

88. Mr. de Hillo replied that the Framework had been discussed by UNHCR and IOM. Overall there was agreement on the need for the determined efforts he had mentioned earlier and for frameworks within which to situate responses.

89. The Director General recalled that the question of the Framework had first come up at the annual UNHCR/IOM retreat. The two organizations were also in close contact on the Nansen Initiative to Protect People Displaced by Natural Disasters, which had been launched at the 63rd Session of the UNHCR Executive Committee, and were determined that their relations with regard to both the Framework and the Initiative would be marked by cooperation rather than competition.

## **Migration and health**

### **Panellists:**

- **Dr. Martin S. Cetron**, MD, Captain, US Public Health Service, Director, Global Migration and Quarantine, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta
- **Dr. Daniel Lopez-Acuña**, MD, Adviser to the Director-General, WHO
- **Dr. Lisa Rotz**, MD, Chief, Epidemiology, Surveillance and Response Branch, Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Program, National Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC, Atlanta

### **Moderator:**

- **William Lacy Swing**, Director General, IOM

90. Dr. Cetron gave a presentation on the recently developed Bio-Mosaic project, which was a collaboration between the CDC, Harvard University and the University of Toronto. The project looked at the relationship between demography, migration and health and how visual representations of that relationship could help identify public health challenges.

91. Human migration had always opened pathways for movement of disease, and in a number of countries immigration still carried a stigma because of its association with import of disease. In the last century there had been a fundamental change in the speed and volume of international travel and the public health sector had not yet caught up with the risks that that posed. With close to two billion people now crossing international borders each year, the concept of global health had changed dramatically, as all people around the world were now connected in a way that they had not been before. From an infectious disease perspective, such levels of global travel meant that pathogens were able to spread much further and more quickly than in the past, as demonstrated by the H1N1 influenza pandemic of 2009, which had spread to 122 countries in just six weeks.

92. Dr. Kamran Khan, an Associate Professor of Medicine with the Division of Infectious Diseases at the University of Toronto, had developed the project Bio.Diaspora, which, in part, mapped air transportation patterns and used the data to facilitate risk assessments for infectious disease movements. Two websites, [www.worldmapper.org](http://www.worldmapper.org) and [www.migrationsmap.net](http://www.migrationsmap.net), both provided additional valuable information on migrant inflows and outflows by country. Using such data, a vulnerability index had been developed under the Bio-Mosaic project, allowing the user to identify hotspots in a given country that would be particularly vulnerable if an infectious disease outbreak occurred. The aim was to increase the capacity for public health interventions for surveillance and treatment.

93. Dr. Lopez-Acuña said that health specialists and epidemiologists agreed that most migrants were healthy young people – the “healthy migrant effect” – but that the conditions surrounding the migration process could increase vulnerability to ill health. Risk factors included poverty, social exclusion, discrimination, stigmatization, cultural, linguistic, legal and administrative barriers, and, most importantly, unequal access to health services and substandard quality of care in many countries of transit and destination.

94. In 2008, the Sixty-first World Health Assembly had adopted a resolution on the health of migrants. The resolution stressed the need for migrant-sensitive health policies that afforded migrant populations more equitable access to health services, for more capacity-building among health service providers and professionals and for greater bilateral and multilateral cooperation coupled with intersectoral action. Pursuant to the resolution, WHO, IOM and the Government of Spain had convened the multi-stakeholder Global Consultation on Migrant Health in Madrid in 2010.

95. Both the resolution and the Global Consultation reflected a paradigm shift in the thinking on migrant health. For years, the traditional approach to migrant health had been exclusion: migrants were seen as a health threat calling for nationally focused disease control efforts. The new approach approved in the resolution and debated at the Global Consultation was one of inclusion, a rights-based approach that sought to reduce inequities in access to health care by developing social protection and expanding multi-country and intersectoral policy development. The public health objective was to minimize the negative impact of the migration process by influencing some of the social, economic and environmental determinants of health, thereby reducing mortality and morbidity among migrants.

96. The Global Consultation established four priorities for work on migrant health. Those priorities constituted an operational framework for collaboration between organizations like IOM and WHO and the Member States. The first priority was to improve the ability to monitor migrant health so as to improve understanding of migrant health issues globally. That implied a need for standardized data on migrant health so as to document the diseases migrants brought to countries of destination and to monitor health-seeking behaviours and patterns of access to health care among migrants. It would require much more work in terms of mapping, or monitoring, the health of migrants.

97. The second priority was policy and legal frameworks with regard not only to the health sector but also in the form of what were known as health-in-all policies, which integrated health considerations into the policies developed for other sectors, such as social protection. Consideration had to be given to the international standards on protection of migrants and to the development of national health policies that incorporated a public health approach to the health of migrants. The Global Consultation had determined that there was a need for a repository of information on national migrant health policies that had had positive outcomes and could therefore influence future legislative frameworks, policies and strategies, and help promote greater coherence between policy in different sectors. It had underscored the need to improve social protection for all migrants, regardless of their status.

98. The third priority was migrant-sensitive health systems, which covered everything from creating capacity for health care delivery for migrants to enabling them to navigate easily within health care systems. The cultural, linguistic and religious barriers that sometimes constituted a major hindrance to the ability of migrants to access health care had to be overcome, and the capacity of health workers to deal with the issues associated with the delivery of health care to migrant populations had to be bolstered.

99. The fourth and final priority identified was partnerships, networks and multi-country frameworks. It was important to establish migration dialogues and cooperation across sectors and to support ongoing processes. Migrant health matters had to be incorporated into global and regional consultative processes on migration and economic development, and the capacity of existing networks harnessed to promote the migrant health agenda. Migrant health had been discussed by the Global Migration Group, which WHO had joined two years previously. It had been debated at the 2010 Global Forum on Migration and Development, in Mexico. It was essential that it feature in the 2013 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development. Migrant health was also being discussed by a number of regional platforms.

100. In conclusion, it was important for all sectors to have a clear understanding that migrant health was a dimension of the migration issue overall and a component of all migration solutions.

101. Responding to a question from one representative, who had asked how IOM and WHO intended to develop their cooperation in future, Dr. Lopez-Acuña said that in terms of discussions on the post-2015 Development Agenda, WHO and UNICEF would be co-chairing consultations on the health component which would include consideration of migrant health. IOM had already submitted a position paper ahead of that consultation which would provide valuable input to the discussion. WHO and IOM were in the process of reviewing their memorandum of understanding, so as to enhance future collaboration. Member States should, however, be mindful of the need to provide adequate resources to support their growing collaboration in the area of migrant health.



102. The Director General said the issue of migrant health was integral to the wider matter of migration and development. He hoped that migration would be placed high on the post-2015 Development Agenda, especially as there had been no reference to it in the Millennium Development Goals.

103. Dr. Cetron added that, at present, many in the international community were unaware of the significant disparity between migrant and non-migrant populations in terms of risk of exposure to disease and access to health care. It was therefore essential for IOM and others to push for migration to be placed high on the post-2015 Development Agenda.

## **Migration and development**

### **Panellists:**

- **Michele Klein-Solomon**, Permanent Observer to the United Nations in New York, IOM
- **Peter Sutherland**, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on International Migration and Development

### **Moderator:**

- **William Lacy Swing**, Director General, IOM

104. Ms. Klein-Solomon recalled that, prior to the 1980s, migration had been regarded primarily as a national concern. Since then, awareness had grown that the world was increasingly globalized and that people and societies were more interdependent. Significant changes, especially in communications and transport, had made migration relevant to all regions and countries, thus necessitating regional and global dialogue and cooperation. Official milestones in that process had included the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Plan of Action adopted by the 1994 Cairo International Conference on Population and Development, chapter ten of which, on international migration, remained of particular relevance. That same year, the United Nations General Assembly had started taking up migration issues on a periodic basis. One of the most significant developments had been the regional consultative processes on migration that had started to emerge across the globe from 1996; most governments were now members of at least one such forum. In 2001, IOM had launched the International Dialogue on Migration, and the Swiss Government had instigated the Berne Initiative to examine common themes emerging from the regional consultative processes and formulate the international agenda for migration management. In 2003, IOM and UNHCR had founded the Geneva Migration Group to facilitate inter-agency consultation, and the Global Commission on International Migration had begun work, producing its report, *Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action*, in 2005.

105. During that period, governments had increasingly recognized the extent to which migration was intrinsically linked to social and economic development, environmental issues, peace and security. That had laid the groundwork for the first High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2006 – a watershed moment that had brought together governments with radically different perspectives in constructive discussion on migration. Prior to that, the United Nations Secretary-General had expanded the Geneva Migration Group to form the Global Migration Group, and had appointed a Special

Representative on International Migration and Development. The main outcome of the first High-level Dialogue had been the creation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, a State-led, informal, non-binding process which focused on sharing experiences and lessons learned and included a significant civil society component. From the outset, IOM had hosted the Global Forum support unit, seconded a senior migration official to support the Forum chair, prepared background papers and provided experts on request. It had also followed up on many of the recommendations, co-producing several handbooks and developing migration profiles.

106. The second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development was an opportunity to shape global dialogue and action on migration. The proposed overall theme was enhancing the benefits of international migration and its links to development. Delegations currently remained divided, mostly concerning the role of the United Nations in the field of migration. How those divisions were resolved would affect whether subsequent high-level dialogues on international migration and development were held and if so, at what interval, and what form the outcomes of the second Dialogue would take. In that regard, delegations in Geneva should ensure that they coordinated carefully with their representatives in New York to ensure that government views were communicated consistently.

107. IOM had a formal mandate to coordinate and cooperate in the preparations for the High-level Dialogue under both its Constitution and General Assembly resolution A/RES/65/170 (2010). To that end, it was focusing on promoting the integration of migration into the development process at the national, regional and global levels; promoting and protecting the human rights of all migrants, regardless of their status; and supporting multi-stakeholder and inter-State consultation and cooperation on migration, particularly through its knowledge and expertise. In addition, the United Nations Chief Executives Board had asked IOM and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) to work with the Global Migration Group to prepare draft recommendations and outcomes for the High-level Dialogue. The contributions currently under review centred on mainstreaming migration into international development-related processes and national sectoral policies and plans, ensuring migrant protection, strengthening data, research and knowledge bases, and improving multi-stakeholder coordination and capacity. As Chair of the Group in the second half of 2013, IOM would strive to garner the support of partners for the preparations and proceedings, and was already coordinating with the United Nations Regional Commissions, which would chair the Group in the first half of 2013. Other possible preparations were a joint publication of the work on migration and development of the Group's agencies and a statement by the Group at the opening plenary of the High-level Dialogue.

108. IOM had aligned its programme of work in 2013 to feed into the High-level Dialogue. The Friends of the Chair initiative aimed to keep members informed of preparations for the High-level Dialogue and feed their views back into it. In addition, a series of round tables would be held by IOM, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs and UNFPA to ensure that delegations in New York were well informed. Other preparations would include working with the regional consultative processes and holding or co-hosting additional preparatory meetings. The goal of IOM was to ensure constructive debate, continued progress in inter-State and multi-stakeholder cooperation and better outcomes for migrants and societies.

109. Mr. Sutherland said that, prior to the 2006 High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, there had been deep ideological divisions among the member States of the United Nations on how to address the issue of migration. Some had argued that migration policy was strictly a matter of national sovereignty, while others had been eager to integrate the institutional development of migration and dialogue on migration into existing UN structures.

The compromise solution had been to create the Global Forum, a platform for continued dialogue on migration and development that was directly linked to the United Nations. It had been set up at the end of the 2006 High-level Dialogue with a minimal structure and had grown into the resounding success witnessed at the recent meeting in Mauritius, with participants from over 130 countries and numerous NGOs. The Forum had led to some excellent cooperation and specific projects.

110. The links between the Forum and the United Nations had been maintained through the participation in every Forum meeting of the United Nations Secretary-General and the Special Representative on International Migration and Development. He had also participated in all the meetings of the steering committee and the Friends of the Forum. Another link had been the notion that, within the Global Migration Group, the United Nations agencies and IOM would prefer a support mechanism that could evolve into something akin to a secretariat in order to provide an institutional memory of the discussions that took place.

111. While the differences between the constituencies remained evident, they were now framed within a much more cooperative context thanks to the discussions within the Global Forum. The High-level Dialogue should welcome the progress made by the Global Forum and the Global Migration Group. Politicization should be avoided, and there was a need in some States to bridge the significant gap between the capital, Geneva and New York, where there was little familiarity with the Global Forum.

112. The 2013 High-level Dialogue would be an excellent opportunity to generate consensus on the issue of migrants in acute crisis situations, such as the immediate aftermath of civil conflict and natural disasters. A possible outcome would be a series of guiding principles on the obligations of countries of origin, such as developing contingency plans, establishing electronic registers of migrants, deploying early warning systems and rapid response mechanisms, and providing legal support for migrants. In countries of destination, there was a need for emergency policies that did not discriminate against migrants by issuing visas that included the right to return. The High-level Dialogue should also examine how to include migration in the post-2015 Development Agenda. Many members of the development community continued to view migration as an impediment to development rather than seeing the positive benefits it had to offer. It was necessary to raise awareness among development stakeholders that migration furthered development and was relevant to their goals. The second High-level Dialogue would also provide an opportunity to begin forging a longer-term agenda for the governance of international migration. That called for a series of specific goals, such as focusing on migrants in acute crises and those who were stuck in camps or in transit countries and were unable to move forwards or backwards.

113. In the ensuing discussion, the speaker for the European Union said that the EU, for its part, had developed a global approach to migration and mobility that aimed to promote legal migration, combat irregular migration, promote migration and development, protect migrants and strengthen the external dimension of the EU asylum policy. That approach was open-ended and could lead to tools such as migration profiles, mobility partnerships and common migration agendas. It laid the groundwork for partnerships with other countries and regions to develop regional and global migration agendas in the future. How might regional cooperation evolve within the context of global migration governance?

114. Two representatives said that effective migration management was impossible in the twenty-first century without effective international cooperation. The participation of IOM and

other agencies in the Global Forum was crucial in that regard, as the Forum provided a source of international expertise on which States could rely to develop their migration policies.

115. Several representatives addressed the matter of migration being incorporated into the post-2015 Development Agenda and the role governments might play in that process. It was important for migration to be clearly integrated into United Nations programming, along with human rights and cooperation. That integration would be part of a political process, but should not be politicized. The Millennium Development Goals had been negotiated by development experts who were not necessarily experts on migration. It was therefore vital to encourage governments to ensure that migration experts were also involved in those discussions.

116. Another representative agreed that the preparations for the High-level Dialogue should not be politicized and that migrants in crisis was a timely issue on which to focus. Other topical issues for discussion were gender and migration, identifying the principles of managed migration, managing mixed migration flows to prevent crises and maximize development and economic benefits, ensuring the mobility of talent in the context of diasporas, building the evidence base for migration, and intercultural dialogue.

117. One Member State asked how the Global Migration Group could be improved and whether it was appropriate to foster links between the Group and intergovernmental discussions.

118. Two Member States underscored the importance of considering the contribution of the diaspora, in terms of knowledge and expertise. It was also important to consider pooling resources relating to migration, including input from the diaspora, to examine the role of migration in all areas of development, and to review the extent to which migrants who were fully integrated into their host communities could help forge real dialogue between countries of origin and host countries.

119. Mr. Sutherland said that the Global Forum had first been established in light of the fact that there were many regional negotiations on migration, but no global approach. Labour and migration flows had underlined the need for such a global approach. The Global Forum did not have the resources to focus on regional cooperation. The issue of a dialogue between cultures was closely linked to integration policies at national level, and had therefore not been a high priority for the Global Forum in the past. The original plan for the Global Forum had been to create a focal point in each country by appointing a specific person responsible for drawing together the various strands of administrative action in the fields of migration and development, in order to improve coordination and cooperation at national level. Rather than remaining solely the domain of departments of foreign affairs, action in those areas also needed to involve other key players, such as departments of justice, homeland security and development. Reintroducing the above-mentioned focal point would provide the key to achieving integrated development.

120. Turning to ways of improving the Global Migration Group, he said that while several of the individual members, including IOM, had made great efforts to integrate the Group into emerging debates, different members engaged to different degrees. Some saw migration as a fundamental part of their policy responsibility while others regarded it as a peripheral issue. In order to truly improve the Group, there was a need for all the members to work together more effectively. A secretariat was also now urgently required.

121. He agreed that the politicization of the High-level Dialogue should be avoided at all costs. He hoped that the positive momentum that had built up in Geneva would carry forward into

a constructive debate which avoided ideological conflicts in New York. If tangible results were to be achieved, it was vital to focus and prioritize. He warned against placing too many issues on the agenda.

122. In conclusion, the High-level Dialogue might confirm the value and importance of the Global Forum, and take into consideration its funding and budgetary resources. He expected the Forum to continue along its current trajectory, rather than moving in an entirely new direction. As for the Development Agenda, there was clear evidence that policies and programmes could enhance the benefits and mitigate the negative impact of migration. It was therefore necessary to ensure that all development stakeholders were aware of that evidence and its relevance.

123. With regard to establishing new development goals, specific proposals would be made in the first half of the year. A high-level meeting was planned for September. It was vital for migration stakeholders to actively participate in that process.

124. Ms. Klein-Solomon expressed her appreciation for the constructive debate. She indicated that a forum for intercultural dialogue already existed in the form of the Alliance of Civilizations, hosted by the United Nations Secretary-General. One of the core issues that the Alliance addressed was migration in the context of intercultural dialogue. IOM worked closely with the Alliance, and could provide more information on its efforts. She agreed that, to date, integration had not figured high on the agenda of the High-level Dialogue, and that steps could be taken to look into the matter.

125. There was a strong feeling that care should be taken to avoid politicizing the High-level Dialogue, and that it needed to focus on achieving tangible results. The Special Representative had suggested that priority issues should include migrants caught in crisis situations and measures to integrate migration into the post-2015 Development Agenda. It was important to take a long-term view, adopting bold measures while managing expectations. Efforts were required to ensure coordination and cooperation between New York, Geneva and the various national ministries and government departments. Moreover, it was vital for all stakeholders, including civil society, migrant associations and employers, to participate in the process.

126. The Director General said that IOM had long supported regional consultative processes and global dialogue, and would continue to do so. The Organization intended to play a key role in the preparations for the 2013 High-level Dialogue and in the post-2015 Development Agenda. In that respect, IOM's members had an important coordinating role, and should disseminate the recently adopted resolution on the High-level Dialogue, highlighting the key role of IOM as an international migration agency.

## **GENERAL DEBATE<sup>7</sup>**

127. Statements were made by the following Member States listed in alphabetical order: Afghanistan, Algeria (for the African Group and in its own name), Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro,

---

<sup>7</sup> Texts of statements, as and if received from the members and observers, and of the Director General's concluding remarks are accessible to Member States on the IOM website at [www.iom.int](http://www.iom.int).

Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru (for the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States), Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

128. Statements were made or submitted by the following observers: China, European Union, Qatar, the Russian Federation, the Sovereign Order of Malta, UNHCR and World Vision International.

129. A warm welcome was extended by numerous speakers to the new Member States and observers, and three speakers thanked IOM's national and expatriate staff for their commitment, in sometimes difficult and dangerous contexts.

130. The second United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, it was hoped, would focus on timely and relevant issues that would advance the Member States' collective ability to achieve practical outcomes and assist them in addressing the migration challenges they faced. In the view of several Member States, it provided a unique opportunity for IOM to assert its position as the principal agency specializing in migration issues. Indeed, IOM had much to contribute to the ongoing preparatory process in the way of expertise and know-how in migration crisis management, and the Council resolution clearly framed its role in that regard. The outgoing Chairperson was thanked for his initiative in establishing the Friends of the Chair group that had drawn up the resolution and for the strategic orientation adopted. The thematic discussions IOM had organized in New York in the context of the International Dialogue on Migration had encouraged dialogue with Member States, international organizations, civil society organizations and migration experts, and would allow the permanent missions there to develop a shared understanding of shifts in the global debate on migration and development; moreover, the importance of synergy between New York and Geneva was stressed by several participants, as was the need to integrate migration into the post-2015 Development Agenda. It was also felt that the High-level Dialogue provided an opportunity to review IOM-UN relations.

131. The growing demands placed on IOM and their budget impact were mentioned by several Member States, with many commending the Administration for having maintained zero nominal growth at a time when the global economic outlook was bleak. The problems posed by rising costs and their possible negative impact on IOM's work were not to be overlooked, however, and it might be advisable to conduct a risk assessment and share the results with the membership. The annex to the Report of the Director General describing the cost-cutting measures adopted by IOM provided useful information in that respect. The Organization would need to expand its donor base to private and non-traditional donors so as to ensure the stable financing that was critical to maintaining its capacity to act, but it also had to assess the merits and viability of doing so and define criteria for private-sector donations. Current budget arrangements risked undermining IOM's capacity to manage core functions, and several Member States therefore welcomed the ongoing deliberations of the Working Group on Budget Reform and the new ideas that had emerged from them.

132. The Africa Group expressed support for the process of institutional reform implemented by the Director General, particularly the transformation of the Nairobi Country Office into a Regional Office. It hoped that the necessary funding would be put in place to ensure that the Regional Office came into operation as soon as possible. That point of view was endorsed by a number of Member States.

133. Overwhelming support was expressed for the Migration Crisis Operational Framework, which would allow IOM to strengthen links and synergies between different sectors, minimize gaps and improve its response capacity in emergency situations, and which would enhance the promotion and protection of migrant rights. The Framework should be a user-friendly tool that was widely disseminated, including to government policymakers. Some Member States cautioned that IOM had to ensure that the Framework was not implemented at the cost of the Organization's core mandate and involved no additional costs or human resources and no duplication of efforts. Implementation was in all cases contingent on the consent of the State concerned and due regard for its sovereignty. It should be the subject of annual review, including by the External Auditors or in the Report of the Director General, and should be coordinated with the core UN-led mechanism. It should not lose sight of work on the Nansen Initiative. One Member State cautioned that providing migrants with good quality protection required highly qualified and specially trained staff and respect for the fundamental principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence.

134. One observer, noting that the Migration Crisis Operational Framework was intended to complement and not supplant existing response systems such as the cluster approach, the refugee protection system, and peacebuilding and development frameworks in crisis and post-crisis settings, felt it would be useful to clarify which new categories of persons it covered and to distinguish between forced displacement and voluntary migration, external and internal displacement, asylum-seekers and refugees, and so on. Failure to do so would dilute the important distinction between forced and voluntary movements and sow confusion. It might also be important to distinguish between "migration management approaches and tools" and "humanitarian responses".

135. Several Member States expressed keen interest in the Diaspora Ministerial Conference, which IOM planned to hold in the first half of 2013. The diaspora played an important part in absorbing new experience and knowledge, contributed to the economies and development of home and destination countries, maintained ties with compatriots and helped to preserve national identity and language. The conference's conclusions were expected to contribute to the High-level Dialogue.

136. One Member State expressed support for the suggestion made by the representative of Kenya to hold a world summit on migration. Three Member States noted changing trends with regard to migration flows, moving from a North-South to a South-South pattern.

137. A number of Member States took the opportunity of the General Debate to make announcements. Australia announced that it would contribute A\$ 100,000 to the World Migration Report and the International Dialogue on Migration in what would be an important year for migration and development policy. The representative of Belgium announced that his country would double its unearmarked contribution to the IOM Development Fund in 2013, to EUR 1,600,000. Zimbabwe announced that it would shortly be notifying the Organization of its ratification of the amendments to the Constitution.

138. Several representatives expressed support for the IOM Development Fund and thanked those Member States that had contributed to it, with one expressing particular gratitude to Belgium for doubling its unearmarked contribution in 2013. All Member States were urged to contribute to the Fund. One Member State welcomed efforts to broaden the donor base for the Development Fund and explore fund-raising possibilities beyond the Member States.

139. Several other representatives expressed support for the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism, which would be vital in ensuring IOM could act quickly and effectively. One suggested that private financial institutions be invited to support the Mechanism.

140. The Director General was gratified to note the support expressed for a number of matters of great importance to the Organization. With regard to the Migration Crisis Operational Framework, which would have provided useful guidance during the 2011 Libya crisis had it already existed then, IOM would continue to consult closely with the Member States and its partners in the UN system and would report regularly on the Framework's implementation. It would ensure the Framework was widely distributed and would continue working with those involved to advance the Nansen Initiative. With regard to IOM's contribution to the High-level Dialogue, one good outcome would be greater recognition of IOM's work. As part of its efforts to keep the membership informed about developments in that respect, IOM intended to brief regional groups on preparations for the High-level Dialogue in early 2013. It encouraged all Member States to follow the lead of Mexico and Hungary in supporting IOM's role.

141. Noting that the Diaspora Ministerial Conference had also received widespread support, the Director General expressed the hope that the participating countries would play an active part in it and would see it as an opportunity to enhance their efforts relating to issues such as remittances.

142. The Director General expressed gratitude to those countries that had raised the matter of unearmarked contributions, and thanked those that regularly made such contributions and thereby supported the IOM Development Fund. The Administration was determined to build up the Development Fund and would do its utmost to ensure that the Nairobi Regional Office was fully operational as soon as possible. IOM was facing increasing risks and missing potential opportunities as migration became more complex and the zero nominal growth policy was maintained. Until the Member States decided how to address that situation, voluntary contributions were the best solution.

143. The Director General looked forward to hearing the views of other Member States on the intriguing idea of a world summit of heads of State on migration. He trusted that others would follow Zimbabwe's lead and announce plans to ratify the amendments to the Constitution, and follow in the footsteps of Burkina Faso and Benin in paying their assessed contributions years in advance. He repeated his suggestion that IOM could act as the Global Migration Group secretariat at no cost by following the model of the regional consultative processes.

144. In conclusion, the Director General said that the Council had achieved a number of things: it had adopted the resolutions on the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and on IOM and the United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development; it had approved the Programme and Budget for 2013; it had admitted three new Member States and three new observers (another six countries whose respective application processes had not been completed in time for this Council Session would most likely become members at the June 2013 Special Session of the Council).

145. In addition to those achievements, the Council had noted new partnership possibilities emerge with regard to IOM's co-chairmanship of the Chief Executives Board's working group on the High-level Dialogue, and with the arrival of the new ILO Director-General. Some delegations had expressed interest in the suggestion that, parallel to the High-level Dialogue preparations, the time had come to review the IOM/UN relationship, the last such review having taken place five



years previously. Others had urged IOM to emphasize an approach based on the rights and well-being of migrants in migration management; a rights-based approach was an integral part of all of IOM activities, with particular attention given to gender issues and vulnerabilities in programme design and implementation. A number of delegations had expressed understanding for the impact of the zero nominal growth policy on the Organization and had called for risk assessment, which would be reported on at the next session of the Standing Committee.

146. The Director General suggested that the Member States might wish to consider follow-up action in the following areas:

- (a) Help ensure a key role for IOM at the High-level Dialogue on the basis of the resolution adopted at the Council;
- (b) Coordinate closely to fill any gaps in High-level Dialogue information or engagement between Geneva and New York Missions, on the one hand, and between the Missions and their respective capitals, on the other;
- (c) Work actively to help ensure that the issue of migration and development was included on the post-2015 Development Agenda;
- (d) Support IOM as the leading migration agency;
- (e) Share ideas concerning the novel proposal to hold a world summit on migration, possibly as an outcome or deliverable of the High-level Dialogue;
- (f) If they had not already done so, clear any outstanding arrears of assessed contributions, ratify the constitutional amendments, and consider making voluntary contributions to IOM special funding facilities, including the IOM Development Fund and the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism.

147. The Director General, for his part, pledged to:

- (a) Work closely with the Council Chairperson to ensure implementation of the High-level Dialogue resolution, including the request to send the resolution to the President of the United Nations General Assembly and to Member State delegations both in Geneva and New York;
- (b) Report on the implementation status of the Migration Crisis Operational Framework and ensure that comments made by Member State delegations and UNHCR were taken into consideration.

## **CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

148. The Chairperson declared the 101st Session of the Council closed on Friday, 30 November 2012, at 1 p.m.