

COUNCIL

109th Session

REPORT ON THE

109TH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL *

Geneva

Tuesday, 27 November, to Friday, 30 November 2018

Rapporteur: Ms S. Flores Liera (Mexico)

* This report was approved by the Council at its 110th Session through the adoption of Resolution No. 1379 of 26 November 2019.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Attendance.....	1
Opening of the session and credentials of representatives and observers.....	2
Report of the Chairperson of the Council.....	2
Election of officers.....	2
Adoption of the agenda.....	2
Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget and Member State voting rights.....	3
Admission of new Members and observers.....	3
(a) Application for membership of the Organization.....	3
(b) Applications for representation by observers.....	3
Report of the Director General.....	4
Draft reports on the 108th Session and the Second Special Session of the Council.....	4
Report on matters discussed at the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance.....	4
(a) Reappointment of the External Auditor for the three-year period 2019–2021.....	4
(b) Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2018.....	4
(c) Programme and Budget for 2019.....	4
(d) Report on the privileges and immunities granted to the Organization by States.....	5
(e) Plans for the IOM Headquarters building.....	5
(f) Other items discussed at the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance.....	6
(g) Reports on the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance.....	7
Panel discussions.....	8
(a) United Nations Network on Migration: An overview.....	8
(b) Policy coherence for migration health: Challenges and opportunities.....	12
(c) Responding to internal displacement: Dialogue with States.....	15

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Migrants' voices	20
General debate.....	22
Date and place of the next sessions.....	25
Other business.....	26
Closure of the session	26

List of acronyms

DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus/Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IEDA Relief	International Emergency and Development Aid
ILO	International Labour Organization
INTERSOS	INTERSOS Humanitarian Aid Organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
OIC	Organization of Islamic Cooperation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

REPORT ON THE 109TH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

Introduction

1. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1360 of 1 December 2017, the Council convened for its 109th Session on Tuesday, 27 November 2018, at the Centre International de Conférences Genève (CICG). Seven meetings were held. The meetings were chaired by Mr N.K. Batora (Ethiopia) and Ms S. Flores Liera (Mexico).

Attendance¹

2. The following Member States were represented:

Albania	China	Holy See	Mexico	Slovenia
Algeria	Colombia	Honduras	Mongolia	South Africa
Angola	Congo	Hungary	Montenegro	Spain
Argentina	Costa Rica	India	Morocco	Sri Lanka
Armenia	Côte d'Ivoire	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mozambique	Sudan
Australia	Croatia	Ireland	Myanmar	Sweden
Austria	Cuba	Israel	Namibia	Switzerland
Azerbaijan	Cyprus	Italy	Nepal	Thailand
Bahamas	Czechia	Jamaica	Netherlands	Togo
Bangladesh	Denmark	Japan	New Zealand	Trinidad and Tobago
Belarus	Djibouti	Jordan	Nicaragua	Tunisia
Belgium	Dominican Republic	Kazakhstan	Niger	Turkey
Benin	Ecuador	Kenya	Nigeria	Turkmenistan
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Egypt	Kyrgyzstan	Norway	Uganda
Bosnia and Herzegovina	El Salvador	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Pakistan	Ukraine
Botswana	Estonia	Latvia	Panama	United Kingdom
Brazil	Eswatini	Lesotho	Paraguay	United Republic of Tanzania
Bulgaria	Ethiopia	Libya	Peru	United States of America
Burkina Faso	Finland	Lithuania	Philippines	Uruguay
Burundi	France	Luxembourg	Poland	Vanuatu
Cameroon	Gabon	Madagascar	Portugal	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Canada	Georgia	Malawi	Republic of Korea	
Central African Republic	Germany	Mali	Republic of Moldova	
Chad	Ghana	Malta	Romania	
Chile	Greece	Mauritania	Senegal	
	Guatemala	Mauritius	Serbia	
	Haiti		Sierra Leone	
			Slovakia	
				Zimbabwe

3. A representative of Uzbekistan,² which was an applicant for membership of the Organization, was also present.

4. Bhutan, Indonesia, Kuwait, Qatar, the Russian Federation, San Marino and Saudi Arabia were represented by observers.

¹ See List of participants (C/109/13).

² See paragraph 14.

5. FAO, OCHA, OHCHR, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, the United Nations, WFP, WHO and the World Bank Group were represented by observers.

6. The African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, the African Union, the Council of Europe, the Eurasian Economic Commission, the European Commission, the European Public Law Organization, the European Union, IEDA Relief, the International Centre for Migration Policy Development, the International Council of Voluntary Agencies, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the International Organization of La Francophonie, the League of Arab States, the OIC, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean and the Sovereign Order of Malta were represented by observers, as were the following entities: the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Caritas Internationalis, the GAVI Alliance, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the International Catholic Migration Commission, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, the International Institute of Humanitarian Law, the International Islamic Relief Organization, the International Rescue Committee, INTERSOS, the Jesuit Refugee Service, the Oxford University Refugee Studies Centre, Save the Children and the Young Men's Christian Association.

Opening of the session and credentials of representatives and observers

7. The outgoing Chairperson, Mr Juan Eduardo Eguiguren (Chile), opened the session on Tuesday, 27 November 2018, at 10.10 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 of Uzbekistan 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 4 to 6.

Report of the Chairperson of the Council

9. The outgoing Chairperson said that his time in office had taken place during an important and eventful year that had seen substantial progress made towards the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and the election of a new Director General.

Election of officers

10. The Council elected the following officers:

Chairperson:	Mr Negash Kebret Batora (Ethiopia)
First Vice-Chairperson:	Mr Morten Jespersen (Denmark)
Second Vice-Chairperson:	Mr Evan Garcia (Philippines)
Rapporteur:	Ms Socorro Flores Liera (Mexico)

Adoption of the agenda

11. The Council adopted the agenda as set out in document C/109/1/Rev.2.³

³ Unless otherwise specified, all documents and audiovisual presentations are accessible on the IOM website at www.iom.int.

Status report on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget and Member State voting rights

12. The Administration reported that, since document C/109/5/Rev.2 had been prepared, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Guatemala, Mozambique, Serbia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, the United States of America and Turkey had made payments. The payments from Cambodia, Fiji and Mozambique had removed those countries from the list of Member States subject to Article 4, thereby reducing the number of such countries to 14.

13. The Council took note of document C/109/5/Rev.2 and of the additional information provided by the Administration.

Admission of new Members and observers

(a) Application for membership of the Organization

14. The Council adopted by acclamation Resolution No. 1367 of 27 November 2018 admitting the Republic of Uzbekistan as a Member of the Organization subject to the completion by that country of its internal administrative formalities required to accept the IOM Constitution, and its notifying the Director General accordingly.

15. The representative of Uzbekistan said that his Government was committed to creating the legal frameworks required to address migration issues and was focusing on ensuring the safety of Uzbek migrants residing abroad. It would bring the IOM Constitution before parliament for ratification. Upon becoming a Member State, it would discharge its financial obligations to the Organization, in accordance with IOM administrative requirements.

16. The Director General expressed appreciation for the close cooperation between Uzbekistan and IOM on past migration projects. He looked forward to the Government completing the formalities required to ratify the IOM Constitution, thereby enabling the country to become a new Member State of the Organization.

(b) Applications for representation by observers

17. The Council had before it applications for representation by an observer from the International Monetary Fund and IEDA Relief.

18. The two organizations were granted observer status at meetings of the Council in accordance with the terms of Resolutions Nos. 1368 and 1369 of 27 November 2018.

19. The representative of IEDA Relief thanked the Council for having accepted his organization's application for observer status. He expressed appreciation for the support IEDA Relief had received from IOM to date and looked forward to further collaboration in important areas, such as diaspora engagement.

20. The Director General welcomed the new observers; their diverse mandates underscored IOM's willingness and ability to work with a wide range of stakeholders.

Report of the Director General

21. The Director General complemented his report to the Council (C/109/12) with a slide presentation.

Draft reports on the 108th Session and the Second Special Session of the Council

22. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1370 of 27 November 2018 approving the reports on its 108th Session (C/108/23) and Second Special Session (C/SP/2/7).

Report on matters discussed at the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

(a) Reappointment of the External Auditor for the three-year period 2019–2021

23. The Standing Committee Rapporteur said that, at its Twenty-second Session, the Standing Committee had been reminded that the mandate of the External Auditor would expire at the end of 2018. The Auditor-General of Ghana had indicated his willingness to serve a second term.

24. The Standing Committee had recommended that the Council adopt the draft resolution contained in the annex to document S/22/3 (Reappointment of the External Auditor for the three-year period 2019–2021).

25. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1371 of 27 November 2018.

(b) Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2018

26. The Standing Committee Rapporteur said that, at its Twenty-third Session, the Standing Committee had examined the document entitled Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2018 (C/109/9). The Administrative Part of the Budget had increased from CHF 50,726,923 to CHF 50,728,318 thanks to the contributions of three States that had become Members of the Organization in June 2018. It had been proposed to use those additional funds for staff development and learning. The Operational Part of the Budget had increased from USD 1.491 billion to USD 1.806 billion, while the level of Operational Support Income had remained unchanged at USD 90 million.

27. The Standing Committee had recommended that the Council take note of the Summary update on the Programme and Budget for 2018.

28. The Council took note of document C/109/9.

(c) Programme and Budget for 2019

29. The Standing Committee Rapporteur said that, under the Programme and Budget for 2019 (C/109/6), considered at the Standing Committee's Twenty-third Session, the proposed Administrative Part of the Budget had been presented at CHF 52,229,662, which included CHF 1.5 million for the increase to the cost-sharing arrangement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Group in line with General Assembly resolution 72/279 of 31 May 2018. The Operational Part of the Budget had been projected at USD 1,011.7 million, which was higher than in the Programme and Budget for 2018. The budgeted level of Operational Support Income was USD 96 million, which had been calculated based on previous years' results and current and expected trends.

30. Following a discussion, the Standing Committee had taken note of the Programme and Budget for 2019 as set out in document C/109/6 and had recommended that the Council approve the amounts indicated therein.

31. Member States had commented on the prioritization of core resource allocations, in particular regarding the need to strengthen oversight within the Organization, particularly the investigative capacity of the Office of the Inspector General. The Administration had consulted with the Member States concerned and, based on the outcome of those discussions, had issued document C/109/6/Rev.1.

32. One representative thanked the Administration for the revised budget and its efforts to strengthen the Office of the Inspector General, which would be vital to ensure effective oversight and management of the Organization.

33. The Council approved document C/109/6/Rev.1 and adopted Resolution No. 1372 of 27 November 2018 on the Programme and Budget for 2019.

(d) Report on the privileges and immunities granted to the Organization by States

34. The Standing Committee Rapporteur, referring to the document entitled Fifth annual report of the Director General on improvements in the privileges and immunities granted to the Organization by States (S/23/9), said that it had been observed that IOM's status as a related organization within the United Nations system meant that it should benefit from the same privileges and immunities as all other organizations in the system. IOM had pursued negotiations with a number of States to that end. Of the three possible approaches to obtaining those privileges and immunities – multilateral agreements, a bilateral template and provisions in the Constitution – the Administration had expressed a preference for a standard bilateral template, but had explained that it had lacked the resources to pursue that approach during the previous year. It intended to pursue that option in parallel with the multilateral approach over the coming year.

35. The Standing Committee had taken note of document S/23/9 and had recommended that the Council remain seized of the matter and reiterate its call to Member States to grant the Organization privileges and immunities substantially similar to those enjoyed by the United Nations specialized agencies.

36. The Council endorsed the Standing Committee recommendation and again called on Member States to grant the Organization privileges and immunities substantially similar to those granted to the specialized agencies of the United Nations, particularly now that IOM was a related organization within the United Nations system.

(e) Plans for the IOM Headquarters building

37. The Standing Committee Rapporteur explained that, at its Twenty-second Session, the Standing Committee had reviewed document S/22/11 on proposed plans for the Headquarters building, in which it had been suggested that demolition of the existing building and construction of a new one was the most logical option. The Standing Committee had requested more detailed information, including time frames, cost estimates and a proposed governance structure for the project. The Administration had provided additional details during the Twenty-third Session of the Standing Committee and in document S/23/8. Member States had stressed the importance of consulting other organizations currently undertaking construction projects in Geneva and of ensuring that cost projections were sufficient; they had also made a number of suggestions regarding the governance structure proposed in that document. The draft resolution contained in Annex II of document S/23/8 had been amended to take into account Member States' concerns. The Standing Committee had recommended that the Council adopt the draft resolution, as amended.

38. The Administration explained that, in response to Member States' comments during the Twenty-third Session of the Standing Committee, it had revised document S/23/8 and reissued it as document C/109/10. It drew particular attention to the changes made to the proposed governance structure, Member State engagement in which would now take place through the Working Group on Budget Reform, as recommended. The Working Group could also choose to establish a smaller advisory group of Member States.

39. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1373 of 27 November 2018 on a plan for the Headquarters building.

(f) Other items discussed at the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

40. The Standing Committee Rapporteur briefed the Council on a number of other items discussed at the Standing Committee's Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions.

(i) Resolutions and decisions of the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

41. In pursuance of Council Resolution No. 1360 of 1 December 2017, the Standing Committee had adopted the following resolutions on 27 June 2018, at its Twenty-second Session: Resolution No. 15 taking note of the Annual Report for 2017, Resolution No. 16 approving the Financial Report for the year ended 31 December 2017, and Resolution No. 17 approving the Revision of the Programme and Budget for 2018.

42. During that session, the Standing Committee had also approved the IOM assessment scale for 2019, as illustrated in document S/22/5, and had agreed to review the assessment scale for 2020 during the first half of 2019.

43. Also during the Twenty-second Session of the Standing Committee, the Chairperson of the Working Group on Budget Reform had presented the report set out in document S/22/6. The Working Group, having continued its consideration of the proposed core budget indicators and the changes proposed by the Administration to the budget regulations, had recommended that the latter be submitted to the Standing Committee for adoption.

44. The Standing Committee had adopted Resolution No. 18 of 27 June 2018 on budget regulations and practices, which superseded Executive Committee Resolution No. 134 of 3 July 2012 on budget processes and mechanisms.

(ii) Exchange of views on items proposed by the membership

45. At the Standing Committee sessions, the Administration had introduced documents on the following topics selected by the Member States:

- Strengthening the global response to counter human trafficking
- Gender mainstreaming at IOM: Concrete achievements and identified gaps
- Assisting migrants in crisis contexts: Implementation of the Guidelines to Protect Migrants in Countries Experiencing Conflict or Natural Disaster
- A framework for assisted voluntary return and reintegration and indicators for measuring sustainable reintegration

46. The Standing Committee had taken note of the documents (S/22/7, S/22/8, S/23/5 and S/23/6, respectively) prepared by the Administration and of the comments made by the Member States in the ensuing discussions.

(iii) Statement by a representative of the Staff Association Committee

47. At the Twenty-second Session of the Standing Committee, a statement had been made by a representative of the Staff Association Committee which, among other things, had highlighted the establishment of the Global Staff Association Committee, the Chairperson and members of which had subsequently taken office on 3 July 2018.

48. The Standing Committee had taken note of the statement made by a representative of the Staff Association Committee.

(iv) Other reports and updates

49. At its sessions, the Standing Committee had also examined and taken note of the following reports and updates:

- Status reports on outstanding contributions to the Administrative Part of the Budget and Member State voting rights
- Statement and a report of the External Auditor
- IOM partnerships:
 - United Nations system, civil society organizations, academia and others
 - private sector
- IOM global initiatives funding status
- Report on IOM response to migration crises
- Implementation of the Global Compact for Migration:
 - IOM preparations to support implementation
 - Update on the new United Nations Network on Migration
- Update on the work of the Organization to assist States in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals
- Reports relating to the IOM Development Fund
- Progress report on the implementation of the External Auditor's recommendations
- Report on human resources management
- Update on risk management
- Report on the work of the Office of the Inspector General
- Report of the IOM Audit and Oversight Advisory Committee
- Report of the Chairperson of the Working Group on IOM–UN Relations and Related Issues
- Information concerning the election of a Director General
- Distribution, classification and numbering of governing body documents

50. The Council took note of the decisions and documents referred to in paragraphs 23 to 49 above.

(g) Reports on the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance

51. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1374 of 27 November 2018 approving the reports on the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance.

Panel discussions

(a) United Nations Network on Migration: An overview

Panellists

Louise Arbour, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration, United Nations

Laura Thompson, Deputy Director General, IOM

Colin Rajah, IOM–Civil Society Liaison on the Global Compact for Migration

52. The Deputy Director General recalled that the United Nations Secretary-General had said, in his report of December 2017, *Making migration work for all*, that he would conduct internal consultations on how best to configure the United Nations system, including IOM, to coordinate United Nations action on migration following the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and that he placed a premium on existing expertise, efficiency and operational deliverables. He had stipulated that the outcome of the consultations would have to be aligned with work on the Sustainable Development Goals and noted that the 2016 agreement to bring IOM into the United Nations system as a related organization had created an opportunity to better integrate the competences of IOM into the broader United Nations system.

53. Following those consultations, the United Nations had decided to establish a network on migration and to designate IOM as its coordinator and secretariat. The Administration was fully committed to carrying out its new responsibilities and to working in collaboration with the many entities within the United Nations system with migration-relevant mandates, expertise and experience. It saw IOM's role as one of galvanizing the United Nations system, at national, regional and global level, to support Member States on migration and to better protect and assist migrants throughout the world.

54. Ms Arbour briefly recalled the events leading up to the agreement, on 13 July 2018, on the text of the Global Compact, which was not a legally binding document and therefore gave rise to no new legal obligations under domestic or international law for participating States. Its aim was neither to stop nor to encourage migration; rather, it was to facilitate safe, orderly and regular mobility.

55. Paragraph 45 of the Global Compact expressly welcomed the decision to establish a United Nations network on migration to succeed the Global Migration Group. Following months of intense collaboration among the members of a preparatory group made up of representatives of the United Nations entities listed in the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, the network's terms of reference had been finalized and adopted at a framing meeting held in October 2018, and the network formally activated.

56. The United Nations Network on Migration would draw on the technical expertise and experience of relevant entities within the United Nations system and steer away from the siloed approaches of the past. Its work would be grounded in the Global Compact, which was itself expressly anchored in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It would be guided by a set of principles reflecting the values and ideas expressed by Member States during the various rounds of negotiations: accountability, a human rights-based, gender-responsive, child-sensitive and results-oriented approach, and a focus on coherence, unity of purpose, efficiency and exclusivity.

57. The Network currently comprised United Nations agencies, funds, programmes and offices that had mandates for which migration was of relevance and wishing to be part of it. It also comprised coordination mechanisms such as the IASC secretariat, the Regional Commissions and the World Bank.

58. The Network's Executive Committee was tasked with providing overall guidance and setting strategic priorities to support Member States as they determined their migration priorities and next steps under the Global Compact. Its initial members were DESA, the ILO, OHCHR, UNICEF, UNDP, UNHCR, UNODC and IOM.

59. Some of the Network's most important work would be done by its working groups, which would focus on specific issues and deliverables and for which IOM would also serve as the secretariat. The Network would align its activities with existing coordination mechanisms and would not engage in work already being done by others. At the country level, it would support the work of United Nations country teams on a range of migration-related issues.

60. Pursuant to the Global Compact, the Network would have a three-part capacity-building mechanism: the start-up fund was intended to help start or pursue projects to help Member States implement the Global Compact; the connection hub would facilitate thematic, tailor-made and integrated solutions by identifying the main implementing partners within and outside the United Nations system and connecting them to similar initiatives and solutions; and the global knowledge platform would serve as an online, open repository of existing evidence, practices and initiatives, and facilitate access to knowledge and solution-sharing.

61. In the immediate future, the Executive Committee would focus on producing a workplan, including the preliminary formation of some working groups, and on developing and implementing the capacity-building mechanism. The Network's members were committed to ensuring that the Network was prepared to take on its responsibilities, meet challenges and pursue opportunities as the international community ushered in a cohesive and coherent system for handling migration issues.

62. Mr Rajah said that the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration, IOM and several other United Nations agencies had held a series of meetings and briefings with civil society partners and other stakeholders to discuss the implementation, follow-up and review of the Global Compact and the subsequent establishment of its attendant Network. Some main principles had emerged as part of those consultations, namely that the Network should be inclusive and transparent, promote partnership and a spirit of collaboration and advocate a common vision shared by both its United Nations members and civil society stakeholders.

63. Following the framing meeting held in October 2018, civil society representatives had issued a number of programmatic and practical recommendations, including that the Network should have a dedicated mechanism for proactive and direct stakeholder engagement. They had also called for a consultation meeting between the relevant United Nations and civil society representatives to be scheduled towards the end of the first quarter of 2019 so as to discuss the Network's functioning in greater detail.

64. It was vital that stakeholders had the opportunity to participate actively in the Network at all stages: the focal points and coordinators of different civil society organizations should be involved in the planning stages in particular. Similarly, the Network's members should take into account the wide range of national and regional experiences on the ground and strengthen partnerships with country teams, regional coordinators, the Regional Commissions and regional consultative processes on migration.

65. Moreover, civil society and other stakeholders should be consulted and kept up to date at all times about the Network and its workings. The various representatives attending the framing meeting had recognized the importance of harnessing the diverse skills of civil society and the importance of enabling some stakeholders to act as co-implementers of the Network's activities while allowing others to review and monitor its progress. The work conducted by the Civil Society Action Committee, which had undertaken a detailed assessment and review of civil society engagement on migration policy matters, would be extremely valuable in directing efforts to that end.

66. The Deputy Director General said that IOM, as an international organization, had an obligation to act, first and foremost, in the service of its Member States. While the Network would be composed solely of United Nations entities, Member States would ultimately be the judge of its effectiveness and the extent to which it had fulfilled its mandate. Given that IOM currently worked closely with Member States, migrants and other stakeholders on many of the areas covered by the Global Compact, the Organization's role as the Network coordinator and secretariat would not fundamentally alter the way in which IOM operated. It would continue to be a responsive, efficient and effective operational partner to governments and other partners, both at Headquarters and in the Regional Offices, and aimed to couple that operational effectiveness with an enhanced ability to leverage the existing expertise and capacities of the United Nations system and IOM's own extensive knowledge gained from its work on the ground and at the local, national, regional and international levels.

67. One representative, stressing the importance of adopting a whole-of-system approach to the Network, asked what efforts had been made to take into account the lessons learned from the functioning of the Global Migration Group when establishing the new Network.

68. Another representative wished to know whether developing countries willing to second staff to the Network secretariat would be enabled to do so.

69. One Member State, noting the importance of migrants' remittances to the sustainable development of their respective countries of origin, asked what steps had been taken to ensure that the Network adopted a comprehensive strategy aimed at promoting the use of remittances to tackle the root causes of migration.

70. Several delegates wished to know more about the terms of reference and the exact functions of the Network, including the envisaged monitoring and oversight of its work. Further information concerning IOM's role as the Network coordinator and secretariat would also be welcome, especially in respect of the projected costs and potential funding sources.

71. One delegate pointed out that the Global Forum on Migration and Development was furthering achievement of the migration-related Sustainable Development Goals and was in a position to make a substantive contribution to the Network's endeavours as well.

72. Another delegate asked what links would exist between the Network and the humanitarian network within the United Nations system, in particular with a view to avoiding duplication. She also asked why the Executive Committee had a limited composition. Why, for example, did it not include agencies such as WHO?

73. Ms Arbour said that the Network differed from the now defunct Global Migration Group in that its terms of reference had been conferred on it by the Member States through the Global Compact, and in the way that it would do business – it had deliverables, for example. Moreover, the Group, with its 22 members, had reached a critical mass that had made it difficult to operate. Although the Network would have an even larger membership, its dedicated executive capacity would make it much more agile. The Executive Committee had been limited to those agencies listed in the New York Declaration for that reason (the only addition being UNICEF); other relevant agencies might chair a working group.

74. The Network would not usurp the functions of the development and humanitarian sectors; rather, it would stay in contact with them, in particular thanks to the fact that the IASC was a member.

75. The start-up fund would require, like all United Nations trust funds, a governance structure composed of United Nations Member States and stakeholders; it would be administered by the

Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office and supported by the Network's secretariat. The fund would be designed to prioritize responsiveness to Member State needs at country and regional level. It would also prioritize initiatives that were based on partnerships, to maximize effectiveness.

76. She stressed that there was no suggestion that the Network should override the specific mandates of its individual member agencies; rather, the aim was to considerably reduce duplication of activities and therefore produce substantial efficiencies. The Network would also strive to identify the few areas where collective action was vastly preferable and would have a greater impact.

77. In her view, the working groups should be limited in number and not duplicate existing silos. They should be practical, time-limited, focused on results and closely monitored; if they were not delivering, they should be set aside in favour of other initiatives. For example, it was true that there was currently no single United Nations agency dealing with the issue of remittances; a working group could bolster the system's capacity to come up with initiatives for increasing the development potential of what was an important stream of income for developing countries.

78. The Deputy Director General said that IOM intended to appoint a small group of secretariat staff at IOM Headquarters and would encourage other members of the Network's Executive Committee to consider seconding staff to support its work and to facilitate operation of the connection hub and the global knowledge platform. In addition, it planned to set up a small policy hub within the Office of the Director General, so as to strengthen the sharing of information, expertise and best practices at the national, regional and international levels and better support collective efforts to manage migration more effectively and humanely.

79. IOM's coordinator and secretariat role would entail additional costs, not only at Headquarters but also in the field. Future budgets would certainly need to address that issue once the Organization's exact functions had been more clearly defined. IOM would keep Member States informed of progress made in that regard and would provide regular updates regarding the establishment and operation of the Network in general.

(b) Policy coherence for migration health: Challenges and opportunities

Panellists

Naoko Yamamoto, Assistant Director-General for Universal Health Coverage and Health Systems, WHO

António Guilherme Mujovo, General Surgeon, Adviser to the Minister of Health for Health Insurance, Mozambique

Rapeepong Suphanchaimat, Medical officer and researcher, International Health Policy Program, Bureau of Epidemiology, Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand

Pascal Barollier, Managing Director of Public Engagement and Information Services, GAVI Alliance

Jacqueline Weekers, Director, Migration Health, IOM

Moderator

Laura Thompson, Deputy Director General, IOM

80. The Deputy Director General observed that the migration process exposed many migrants to health-related risks, such as psychosocial stressors, abuse, diseases, harsh working and living conditions, interrupted care and limited access to essential health services. Barriers to accessing health services included irregular migration status, language-related challenges, a lack of migrant-inclusive

health policies and administrative hurdles; such barriers affected the well-being of migrants and host communities and undermined the achievement of global health-related goals. Addressing migration health was a cross-cutting issue and the health sector alone could not offer solutions.

81. Dr Yamamoto said that, in terms of ensuring inclusiveness, it was essential to continue discussions about migrant health issues in the run-up to the planned United Nations high-level meeting on universal health coverage. Migration health should also be included in any declaration emanating from that meeting, and more needed to be done at country level. The main challenges related to migration health were ensuring a strong voice for migrants, working with migrants at country level to address their particular health needs, and collecting more data. It was important to ensure that multiple sectors, and migrants themselves, were included in discussions regarding universal health coverage. In addition, she noted that migrants could help to populate the strong workforces needed to provide universal health coverage. Responding to a question from the moderator, she acknowledged that there was no specific mention of migrants in the 2018 Astana Declaration on Primary Health Care; however, the development of the WHO draft global action plan to promote the health of refugees and migrants was an extremely positive step forward. Civil society organizations had a key role to play, and she drew attention to a multi-stakeholder platform, the International Health Partnership for UHC2030, that enabled all stakeholders to discuss different health issues; any interested organizations working in the migration sphere were welcome to join. Lastly, she underscored the importance of solidarity.

82. Dr Mujovo explained that Mozambique attracted migrants seeking work in the extractive industries and that diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis posed a particular threat to mineworkers, their families and local communities. The Ministry of Health had launched a national programme to tackle HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, focusing on four areas: the improvement of working conditions in mines; sexual education; coordination among stakeholders to optimize efforts; and research to inform policymaking in the region. Other measures included regular screening to ensure early diagnosis and treatment for workers. Social protection was mandatory for everyone in Mozambique, including in rural areas, and health care was provided for a nominal fee. Primary health-care facilities made up the vast majority of facilities available, and infrastructure and human resources were being strengthened with a view to achieving universal health coverage. Settled migrants were able to access local health-care facilities, but the quality of care required improvement. Another challenge was balancing the costs of coverage with the needs of the population to ensure that everyone could afford health care.

83. Mr Barollier, outlining the mandate of the GAVI Alliance, said that the main driver of its engagement in migration-related activities was the reality on the ground. The latest data from UNHCR showed that a large proportion of countries receiving asylum seekers were GAVI-eligible countries, where the GAVI Alliance endeavoured to reach the most vulnerable sectors of the population. One in five children around the world continued to miss out on basic immunizations and those children predominantly lived in fragile countries. Sixteen of the 70 GAVI-eligible countries were deemed fragile and 50 per cent of unvaccinated or under-vaccinated children lived in those countries. Immunization was one of the building blocks of public health care and should therefore be a priority area for action. Training was also a priority. The discussions on the two global compacts had brought migrant and refugee health into the spotlight and had underscored the importance of data.

84. The GAVI Alliance had updated its Fragility, emergencies and refugees policy to make it more flexible and adaptable to realities, enabling it to provide support in the Syrian Arab Republic, which at the time was not – although it was now – a GAVI-eligible country. It had further reviewed and updated the policy to enable it to provide support to Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh, for example. In the case of the Rohingya, the Government of Bangladesh had requested funding to vaccinate the refugees against cholera, but had also been able to tap into other vaccine stockpiles and provide basic vaccinations to children living in the refugee camps.

85. Dr Suphanchaimat said that Thailand hosted significant numbers of migrants from neighbouring countries and that the authorities operated on the explicit principle of including them in the health-care system. Thailand had achieved universal health coverage in 2002, starting with the native population, and was gradually expanding coverage to migrants. Local health workers were tasked with facilitating access to care among local populations, while migrant health volunteers performed a similar function for migrant populations, bridging cultural differences between health-care professionals and service users. A key aim was to ensure that the packages offered to beneficiaries were broadly similar and covered all levels of care. The Thai population and regular migrants working in the formal sector had access to the same social security scheme, which was based on payroll contributions. For migrants working in the informal sector and undocumented migrants, the Ministry of Public Health had introduced a premium-based health insurance scheme that any migrants could join on the condition that they registered with the Government; that insurance scheme also formed part of broader efforts to regularize undocumented migrants, expand health-care coverage and improve social inclusion. Another insurance scheme was being introduced to cover stateless persons, which included members of the country's population.

86. Future challenges would include managing the potential increase in the number of migrants with the advent of free movement within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Economic Community. There was also a need to align policies both within Thailand and with neighbouring countries, in relation to residency and work permits as well as health care and social inclusion.

87. One representative, noting the additional challenges to achievement of universal health coverage in the context of migration, asked what financial resources WHO allocated to operations in that area. He also asked WHO for further details regarding the volume of data it had on migration health.

88. A number of speakers stressed that including migrants in health systems was essential for development and to meet the health needs of society as a whole. International migration was a social determinant that impacted the health of both individuals and receiving communities. One observer organization also pointed out that access to health care for migrants in countries of destination varied widely. In addition, the health needs of migrants could differ significantly from those of the general population, particularly given that issues such as hunger, famine and lack of access to potable water – which were both causes and effects of mass movements of people – took their toll on the health status of those affected. Health care for people on the move should therefore be a key priority for States. According to one speaker, protecting the health and well-being of migrants meant guaranteeing essential services as a minimum, notably in relation to sexual and reproductive health and rights, maternal and child health, and mental health, without imposing high costs on beneficiaries. It was also important to build the capacity of States to address the social determinants of health, including access to water, sanitation, housing and education. Achieving universal health coverage and upholding the right of migrants to the best possible physical and mental health would create fairer and more inclusive societies, in line with the aims of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

89. One delegate, highlighting the need for a multisectoral approach covering health, protection and education, commended the efforts made by the Governments of Mozambique and Thailand to ensure that migrants could access health care, noting that discontinuity of care could be a serious problem for those with chronic or communicable diseases. In addition, migrants were at risk of experiencing mental health problems, yet the relevant services were often poorly integrated into the support they received. A further delegate welcomed the measures taken in Mozambique to protect the health of migrant workers in the mining sector and provide sexual education and screening for tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS. She asked Mr Barollier which other countries the GAVI Alliance provided with vaccines.

90. One regional group and one Member State welcomed the efforts made regarding migration health by IOM and WHO. IOM should continue to engage with WHO in its global and regional efforts, notably through the WHO draft global action plan to promote the health of refugees and migrants. Another Member State asked how the global action plan was intended to link with efforts to achieve universal health coverage. Two speakers asked how WHO and IOM could work together and with Member States on the health of migrants in the context of the global action plan, with a further speaker observing that the action plan should not create new responsibilities for countries of destination; the workload should be shared to reduce pressures on those countries. IOM, in its new role as the secretariat of the United Nations Network on Migration, should improve its coordination with United Nations agencies to take advantage of their expertise and make the most effective use of human, technical and financial resources. Another speaker welcomed the development of the global action plan, but stressed the need to avoid duplication of initiatives mentioned in the Global Compact, while at the same time maintaining coherence with that instrument. Moreover, implementation of such plans was often hindered by budgetary challenges. The tendency to earmark contributions for specific topics reduced the capacity of organizations to act in other important areas.

91. Ms Weekers, noting that the Member States of WHO had requested it to address migrants' and refugees' health as part of its work, said that IOM and WHO had endeavoured to ensure that the topic was mainstreamed into both global compacts. Mental health and psychosocial support had been a core part of IOM health-related services for migrants for many years, whether before departure, during transit, on arrival in a new country or when they returned home. As mentioned by several speakers, universal health coverage was not possible unless migrants were included. Ensuring migrants' access to health care made sense not only from the human rights and public health viewpoints, but also from the development and economic perspectives. Healthy migrants contributed to development in both their home and host countries. IOM migration health projects included providing vaccinations, carrying out health assessments for refugees and migrants, and ensuring access to mental health care and psychosocial support in crisis situations.

92. Dr Yamamoto said that universal health coverage was one of the main priorities of the WHO Five-year action plan for health employment and inclusive economic growth (2017–2021). As WHO was mainly a normative organization, it worked with partners, including IOM, to address relevant issues. She added that different countries faced different challenges, meaning diverse solutions were needed. Nevertheless, dialogue at regional and global level was also important. WHO was not a humanitarian or funding organization; rather than providing financial resources, it provided technical support to Member States to help them create strong health systems. Efforts were under way to improve cooperation and dialogue between IOM and WHO, and her organization recognized the need to do more to promote migrants' health.

93. Dr Mujovo highlighted the importance of including local governments in partnerships in order to maximize resources and avoid fragmentation.

94. Mr Barollier said that the GAVI Alliance supported almost all countries in sub-Saharan Africa, supplying vaccines, taking initiatives in other related areas, such as health system strengthening, and providing equipment for the cold chain to ensure proper vaccine storage.

95. Dr Suphanchaimat said that the implementation of migration health policies required a multisectoral approach and concerted efforts from all parties, including from across the international community.

(c) Responding to internal displacement: Dialogue with States

Panellists

Mitiku Kassa, Commissioner, National Disaster Risk Management Commission, Ethiopia

Filippo Grandi, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Christos Stylianides, Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management, European Commission

Jos Verbeek, Manager and Special Representative to the United Nations and World Trade Organization in Geneva, World Bank

Alexandra Bilak, Director, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre

Moderator

António Vitorino, Director General, IOM

96. The Director General, noting that 2018 marked 20 years since the adoption of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, observed that, during the negotiations processes, it had been recognized that internal displacement did not belong in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration or the Global Compact on Refugees, and that the moment had come to have frank discussions on the issue. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had received a letter from Member States raising the issue, and had directed OCHA to coordinate the response. IOM and other organizations stood ready to provide support where required. Internally displaced persons were the responsibility of States; however, with 40 million people currently displaced internally, there was an international dimension to the topic. Addressing internal displacement was a priority for IOM. In 2017, IOM had reached 28.9 million crisis-affected beneficiaries, of which two thirds were internally displaced persons

97. Mr Kassa, underscoring the importance of disaster risk preparedness and the leading role of governments in that regard, observed that internal displacement could lead to increased international migration. Multilateral dialogue, mechanisms to facilitate dialogue and collaboration between relevant partners, and financial support were needed to ensure that responses to climate- and conflict-induced internal displacement were effective and durable. States should focus on addressing the root causes of internal displacement and migration, such as poverty, unemployment, climate change and conflict, including through implementation of three international instruments: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. There was an urgent need for long-term, predictable and flexible funding for such activities, and political commitment was key.

98. Turning to the situation in his country, he explained that Ethiopia currently had a large number of internally displaced persons in its territory, as a result of both conflict and natural disaster. In response, the Government had, for example, provided emergency supplies of food and non-food items to relevant sites and communities; involved a wide range of ministries in activities related to internally displaced persons; established the National Disaster Risk Management Commission and an emergency coordination centre; deployed security forces to conflict areas to protect the internally displaced; and undertaken peace and reconciliation activities. Outlining the government structures established to improve the prevention of and response to disasters, he added that the IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix was used to monitor levels of internal displacement in the country. The data emanating from those activities were used by a wide range of stakeholders to inform response planning and the allocation of resources.

99. Mr Grandi said that IOM and UNHCR were being prompted by modern circumstances to work closely together in a number of situations and to find synergies in their work. Internally displaced

persons were not directly covered by the two global compacts currently before the community of States, but both compacts had developed instruments that might also serve to improve the response to internal displacement.

100. UNHCR strongly believed that protection had to be at the heart of any response to an internal displacement crisis, which was inevitably the result of a failure of protection. Emergency elements of any response must be coupled with awareness of other aspects. In the case of the Syrian Arab Republic, for example, many of the internally displaced persons currently returning to their places of origin were having not only to rebuild their homes, but also to address issues of property ownership, documentation, and so forth.

101. In many instances, there was a link between internal displacement and refugee flows. In the case of the Rohingya community in Myanmar, for instance, the 2017 mass exodus might have been prevented at least in part if action had been taken to help the 100,000 people who had been displaced within the country for almost seven years. Also, returns, to name but one such solution, could still occur in difficult circumstances, and there must therefore be a strong emphasis on area-based approaches for reintegration. Such an approach highlighted the interface between the humanitarian and development spheres.

102. The panel discussion on internally displaced persons provided a timely reminder to both sides in the Grand Bargain on humanitarian financing of their respective commitments: the humanitarian agencies to improve coordination and efficiency, the donors to provide flexible funding. Internal displacement was a sensitive issue in many places, and dialogue with the national authorities bearing ultimate responsibility for the response was important: it had to be apolitical and focus on humanitarian questions so as to dispel any notion that engagement on internal displacement issues at global level diminished State sovereignty. In fact, the very opposite was true; it strengthened the sovereignty of States to deal with the populations affected by tragedy.

103. Mr Stylianides noted that, although internally displaced persons were among the most vulnerable in the world and far outnumbered refugees, their plight did not make the headlines. They remained in countries often convulsed by conflict or violence, unable to enjoy their rights to education, employment, safe accommodation and so on, and adding to the burden on countries already struggling with man-made or natural disasters. Internal displacement was also a tragedy at the individual level, as he had witnessed first-hand in his own country. Fortunately, he had also witnessed individual stories of hope, courage and dignity, and gestures of touching solidarity, in particular from host communities.

104. The European Union was fully engaged in protecting and supporting internally displaced persons. Indeed, approximately 40 per cent of its humanitarian aid went to the internally displaced every year, notably, at present, in Nigeria, South Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic. There was room for improvement, however, and for greater efficiency. To that end, he encouraged the humanitarian and development communities to work more closely together, to leverage their respective strengths and to break down the silos that had separated them in the past. Sustainability was another key concern, given that the average period of displacement was currently 17 years. That longer period should inform thinking and problem-solving, and lead to the adoption of a long-term approach that would also build self-reliance.

105. All internally displaced persons had the right to return, but not all chose to do so. For those who did not, lasting solutions in the form of settlement and urbanization programmes should be considered. In that respect, the internally displaced had to be engaged in building peace, developing laws, and drawing up local and national development plans to ensure that solutions met their needs, as opposed to the agencies' concepts thereof.

106. Mr Verbeek said that there were currently 40 million people around the world displaced internally as a result of conflicts, a figure which could only be expected to increase given the steady rise in the number of conflicts. In protracted crises, development actors often waited for the situation to improve before reactivating their programmes, even though their continued engagement was desperately needed. In addition, 19 million had been displaced by natural disasters during 2017, although that figure did not include those displaced by slow-onset disasters such as drought or sea-level rises. In the light of that situation, global financial institutions, such as the World Bank, could not stay on the sidelines, particularly given that a large proportion of internally displaced persons were located in client developing countries. Poverty rates among the internally displaced were often higher than those among the general population.

107. The World Bank was currently engaged in four areas, namely data, financing, implementation and prevention. In the face of an extreme shortage of accurate data on the social and economic conditions of internally displaced persons, the World Bank had, among other things, developed a project with UNHCR to use that organization's data to analyse the socioeconomic implications of internal displacement. With regard to financing, the World Bank had doubled the resources available to tackle internal displacement and support areas affected by violent conflict through the eighteenth replenishment of the International Development Association (IDA18). An innovative instrument had been developed and used in Jordan and Lebanon to lower the interest rates for such middle-income countries when they borrowed money from the World Bank; ordinarily, standard market interest rates applied in such cases, and it could be difficult for governments to justify to the general public taking out relatively high-interest loans to spend on helping refugees. The World Bank had also stepped up its engagement on climate change, with one third of its portfolio now related to climate change adaptation and mitigation.

108. Turning to implementation, he outlined the World Bank's work with partners, for example cooperation with UNICEF and WFP in Yemen. Regarding prevention, the World Bank's work with the United Nations to study the root causes of crisis situations had resulted in *Pathways for Peace*, a report that outlined the importance of ensuring inclusivity and eliminating poverty as ways to prevent conflict.

109. Ms Bilak explained that there were now many more sources of data on internal displacement, which made it possible to showcase the diversity and severity of the phenomenon around the world, from displacement resulting from climate change and natural disasters, to that caused by development projects, criminal violence or conflict. The Displacement Tracking Matrix developed by IOM, together with site monitoring by UNHCR, government databases, civil society assessments and media reports, among others, provided an increasingly clear picture of the situation on the ground. Accurate data on internal displacement were important for a number of reasons: to facilitate decision-making and resource allocation; to aid understanding and forecasting of broader migratory trends; and to shine a light on the cost and impact of such displacement on individuals, communities and countries, the last of which showed that internal displacement was as much a development challenge as a humanitarian one and made it possible to pinpoint the linkages between internal displacement and other global challenges, such as political instability, poverty, food insecurity, climate change and urban risk.

110. Data were also needed to set global baselines and targets and to measure the success of collective efforts to reduce internal displacement over time. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre was increasingly being requested by governments, donors and partners to assess the effectiveness of their interventions, to develop ways to gauge the risk and drivers of future displacement, and to provide data on how the needs and vulnerabilities of internally displaced persons evolved over time and how those needs compared with the needs of other communities within a country. Meeting those requests required more sophisticated data systems than those currently being used. In addition, the wide range of players currently collecting data – and the diverse methods

employed – created a number of challenges, particularly in terms of coordination, common standards and definitions, and interoperability.

111. The Expert Group on Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons Statistics established by the United Nations Statistical Commission was one entity that was beginning to consider those challenges. The Expert Group intended to publish its recommendations in 2020, which would be a valuable resource for governments. Moreover, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre had also produced a framework to develop predictive analytics and had worked with partners, such as IOM, UNHCR and other relevant organizations, to address data collection gaps. Nevertheless, more remained to be done, for example by incorporating internal displacement data into existing reporting mechanisms under frameworks such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre was keen to work with States experiencing internal displacement to develop relevant data systems, enabling them both to track the numbers of internally displaced persons in their territory and to monitor progress.

112. During the ensuing discussion, several representatives gave examples of effective activities for internally displaced persons in their countries: the provision of mobile clinics by IOM; cash-transfer programmes carried out by UNHCR and other agencies; national initiatives carried out with the help of IOM and other partners to provide shelters and promote recovery in natural disasters; peacebuilding and lasting solutions that linked humanitarian and development work, in line with what the United Nations encouraged.

113. One representative mentioned the challenges facing the internally displaced: the lack of real protection and the vulnerability to various forms of abuse; post-traumatic stress disorder, especially among women and children; and other psychosocial issues. Another representative spoke of the importance of strengthening the resilience of communities in the face of difficult situations.

114. One representative stressed the importance of the multi-stakeholder approach when it came to promoting and supporting social initiatives aimed at integrating the internally displaced into host communities. He also suggested that a mechanism be established enabling Member States to exchange experiences relating to the integration of internally displaced persons and social cohesion. Another representative suggested that Member States should reflect on the application of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in domestic legislation and policies. A vision based on shared responsibility should comprise measures for tackling and preventing internal displacement and meeting the immediate protection needs of those displaced. He and another delegate considered that, without timely protection, the internally displaced would become refugees, asylum seekers or migrants.

115. Several delegates asked how IOM and UNHCR planned to coordinate their efforts to help States develop or strengthen their plans for preventing or responding to the challenges inherent in internal displacement and to meet the growing needs of the internally displaced. How could they use the information collected in the field for that purpose and to deal with prolonged situations of displacement?

116. Several delegates agreed that internal displacement was a development as well as a humanitarian challenge; it required solutions aimed at easing the transition from assistance to development (including of host communities) and facilitating sustainable social integration of the displaced. Given the international community's commitment to leave no one behind, the internally displaced would require a great deal more attention from it. They would also require a whole-of-system approach from the United Nations and its partners, one that encompassed all agencies with humanitarian, protection and development mandates; that was why some Member States had proposed that the United Nations Secretary-General, as part of the events marking the twentieth

anniversary of the Guiding Principles, appoint a high-level panel on internal displacement. Another delegate, noting that all of the panellists were bound to be interviewed by that high-level panel, asked what they considered would be a “game changer” in terms of how the international community dealt with internally displaced persons.

117. Two delegates commended the work of IOM, UNHCR, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and the World Bank, and expressed the hope that the partnerships between them would be deepened and lead to a revitalized international approach to internal displacement in 2019, as the international community marked the tenth anniversary of the milestone African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa. Another expressed appreciation for the Centre’s offer to help Member States collect data and monitor internally displaced persons.

118. Responding to comments from the floor, Ms Bilak explained that the data showed that even though the majority of internally displaced persons eventually returned to their homes after a disaster or conflict, not all did. Internal displacement was a cross-cutting issue and should therefore be addressed as such. Integrating the topic into national sustainable development plans was crucial in that regard. Political leadership was also essential given that internal displacement was a sensitive topic. National governments should be encouraged to take the lead and be given the space to do so and to find solutions that worked for them. Nevertheless, efforts at global level were also needed. In terms of climate-related displacement modelling, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre had developed a global model to estimate the risk of population displacement as a result of climate events. The model required further data to refine it and needed to be adapted for national and regional contexts. Negotiations were ongoing with Pacific countries to adapt the model for use in that region. The resulting data would help governments to better anticipate and prepare for displacement in the future. It was hoped that the model could be extended to include political factors, such as governance, to also enable its use in conflict zones. It was important to consider not only the current situation, but also the outlook for the future.

119. Mr Stylianides added that a political solution was vital to address the humanitarian situation in Yemen and that stakeholders should seize the current window of opportunity before it closed. The European Union had recently announced a further aid package for Yemen, bringing the total funding provided in 2018 to EUR 180 million, but it was a race against time to prevent a famine in the country. In terms of natural disasters, he agreed that it was important to act on disaster prevention and preparedness. To that end, the European Union had recently agreed to upgrade its civil protection mechanism and focus on implementation of the Paris Agreement. In terms of a “game changer”, innovative solutions were needed to the challenges posed by internal displacement, perhaps through a global agreement or compact.

120. Mr Verbeek, welcoming the comments made recognizing the importance of collaboration, coordination, prevention and data, underscored that prevention activities and the collection of better data would be key “game changers”. The World Bank supported internally displaced persons through funding for projects at country level. Through the IDA18 replenishment cycle, USD 50 billion of unearmarked contributions had been received, which were being used based on States’ needs.

121. Mr Grandi stressed that, in Yemen and other countries, access was the biggest obstacle to supporting internally displaced persons, who often ended up in conflict areas. If military needs prevailed over political and social approaches, access to such groups could be limited. In addition, in protracted situations, different approaches were needed to help the internally displaced to return to their homes once the crisis was over. In terms of prevention, international cooperation was vital and inward-looking efforts were counterproductive. He agreed that it was the duty of governments to include internally displaced persons in development plans. Therefore, any financial instruments that

could be developed to support those efforts would be useful. The World Bank had been a pioneer in that area, but bilateral support was needed to build on that work.

122. Mr Kassa observed that the main areas of focus should be prevention and finding durable solutions to displacement situations. Although political commitment was essential, internal displacement could not be the responsibility of individual States alone; international cooperation was also needed. As previously mentioned, in Ethiopia, there were large numbers of internally displaced persons, but the country was also host to a significant number of refugees from neighbouring countries. If Ethiopia did not respond to the needs of both groups, increased international migration might be the result.

123. The Director General said that one of the key messages from the panel was that political commitment and leadership were crucial. The international community would support States and respond to their needs, but, ultimately, internal displacement was a State responsibility. The number of internally displaced persons, which was already high, would be on the rise, and the need for cooperation was mounting. The United Nations system was prepared to act, but States' political commitment and leadership were vital. In addition, a multisectoral approach was needed: it was not only a humanitarian issue, but one involving development, protection, peacebuilding, transition and recovery, among others. Resources were needed in those areas to meet the challenges. Internal displacement was not a static picture, but a cycle that had a before, a during and an after. Also, where returns were not possible – particularly in the case of disaster-related displacement – a major challenge would be helping those displaced to build a new life elsewhere.

124. The Council viewed a short video on the IOM Holding On campaign on internal displacement.

Migrants' voices

Tolu Olubunmi, global advocate for migrants, refugees and internally displaced persons, Adviser to the United Nations Department of Public Information

Sherif Zenuni, architect, President of the Gruyère Albanian Association, Member of the "Bulle sympa" Commission and of the Commission for Migrant Integration and the Prevention of Racism of the Canton of Fribourg

Moderator

Leonard Doyle, Director, Media and Communications, IOM

125. The moderator highlighted the major changes in the media landscape over the past ten years. The advent of social media had altered public discourse, with echo chambers and fake news creating a more troubling environment. At a time when information was increasingly distorted, it was particularly important to consider how IOM could advocate the benefits of migration.

126. Ms Olubunmi said that she had left the city of Lagos, in Nigeria, as a teenager and moved to the United States of America to pursue her dream of becoming an engineer. She had worked hard at school and earned her way to a top university, where she had graduated with a degree in chemical engineering. However, she had inadvertently become an undocumented migrant, meaning she had been unable to work in her chosen profession and was forced to spend many years "living in the grey", limited by her status as an irregular migrant.

127. After consulting several immigration attorneys, she had realized that she was one of millions of migrants who had also come to the United States as children, and that her position could best be addressed by a change in migration law. Her frustration had pushed her to volunteer as an advocate for the Dream Act, which aimed to grant legal status to young migrants who had grown up in the

United States, but lacked the correct paperwork. The resulting “Dreamer” movement had allowed those directly affected by the immigration system to tell their stories and challenge the false, negative narrative surrounding migration. Together, those stories had empowered policymakers to make arguments for reform. Given that the politics of migration was volatile and often divorced from reality, it was vital to raise awareness about the struggles and triumphs of migrants, refugees and displaced persons. Humanity could win only when all people were free from the negative misperceptions and attitudes that led to ineffective, inhumane and divisive policies.

128. Mr Zenuni said that his father had come to Switzerland from the former Yugoslavia in the late 1970s – a period when Switzerland had needed construction workers – on a seasonal visa, which barred the workers from bringing their families with them. He had been a child at the time; the fact that he had therefore spent his formative years without his father had left a lasting mark.

129. His father, like many migrants, had initially planned to return to his country of origin and rebuild his life there, but events in the Balkans in the late 1980s and early 1990s would quash that dream. The family had instead been reunited in Switzerland, when he was 12 years old – an age at which it could be particularly distressing to leave one’s home and culture. His initial joy at what he had thought was just a vacation had soon turned to distress at the realization that the move was permanent. He had had to adapt. Going to school had been a challenge – he had had to learn a whole new language – but had ultimately resulted in his integration. As was the case for many others, the education system had almost automatically slated him to follow in his father’s footsteps and he had been apprenticed in the construction industry. He had worked hard, however, and had in the end earned a master’s degree in architecture.

130. As a product of migration and of the system of integration in Switzerland, he considered that he had a duty to become involved in associations and local government institutions working to foster understanding about the migrant experience.

131. The moderator said that the two accounts showed that the story of migration was as much about loneliness and struggle as it was about starting a new life, which countered the common claim that all migrants were desperate to reach their new country. Given the challenge of holding a rational discourse about migration, he asked what could be done to make discussions more balanced.

132. Ms Olunmi said that migration was a complex issue, with both benefits and drawbacks. It was important to recognize that it had always been, and would continue to be, a necessary part of human existence. However, change could not be brought about with a top-down approach, particularly if that was not politically expedient. Although she had started by wanting to change policy, she had realized that change needed to come from the grass roots, through directly working with people. Breaking down barriers and understanding hopes and fears could help connect communities, paving the way for policy and legislation at a later stage.

133. The moderator drew attention to the importance of providing host communities with sufficient resources to avoid generating resentment. He asked Mr Zenuni whether migrants had a responsibility to integrate into society.

134. Mr Zenuni said that the danger lay in seeing other people as “the Other”, especially when, thanks to media misrepresentation of a situation, an entire community was judged by the acts of a tiny minority of its members. In his experience, people were tired of lofty proclamations; they wanted tangible projects enabling them to work and build something together and to get to know each other. Hence the importance of setting up concrete initiatives of the kind in which he was active in the Swiss canton of Fribourg, and which had made considerable progress.

135. The moderator wondered how best to respond to media misrepresentations, which had become commonplace in the current era of clickbait. How could individual migrants deal with people who had a completely negative perception of migrants, and turn that around into a more productive conversation?

136. For Ms Olubunmi, the answer was to communicate. Far too many people did not investigate or filter the information available via the media, or obtained it from a single source, and yet there were many sides to every story. As Mr Zenuni was doing on the local level and she on a more global level, the focus should be on creating safe spaces for those on all sides to engage in dialogue. Once people became aware of the lies they were being fed in sound bites, they became empowered to seek the truth.

137. Mr Zenuni said that it had been liberating to realize that he could free himself from negative perceptions by working with society to promote integration, and use his own experience of prejudice to make that contribution. He nonetheless warned that a positive image built up over years could be destroyed in seconds.

138. The moderator asked how people could be brought around and engaged with constructively in a landscape where politics were changing perceptions.

139. Ms Olubunmi said that the world had to move away from thinking in terms of “us versus them”. It had to understand the need for migrants and migration, and to recognize that, while migration had positive aspects, it also involved challenges.

140. Mr Zenuni said that change had to come from the bottom up. For example, “Bulle sympa”, the commission to which he belonged, was a grass-roots initiative that acted as an intermediary between the local political authorities and the population for the good of society. It brought everyone to the table to discuss even the most basic of projects, such as changing a street lamp, for submission to the authorities.

141. The moderator concluded by noting one lesson that he had learned from the debate: that a single missed step could lead to irreparable damage. It was crucial for migrants not to be deterred by defeat, but to see success in small steps.

General debate⁴

142. Statements were made by the following Member States listed in alphabetical order: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala (also on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States), Guyana, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libya, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of the African Group), Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. The Permanent Observer for the European Union delivered a statement on behalf of the Union’s members.

⁴ Texts of statements, as and if received from Member States and observers, are available on the IOM website at www.iom.int.

143. Statements were made by one observer State, the Russian Federation, and by the following observers: the African Union, the OIC, Save the Children, the Sovereign Order of Malta, UNDP and WFP.

144. The Council extended a warm welcome to Uzbekistan, soon to be the newest member of the IOM family, and to the new observers. It paid tribute to the work of IOM personnel, who displayed unwavering commitment in providing assistance to millions of people in serious crises. Indeed, IOM's strength lay in the devotion of its staff members, who performed their tasks in what were often difficult and dangerous conditions. It was important to ensure their safety on the ground.

145. The Council also warmly welcomed the Director General and wished him well in his endeavours at the head of the Organization. His election left IOM in capable hands at a challenging time. Council members pledged to work closely with him to develop a new strategy and strengthen internal control processes.

146. Several Council members referred to IOM activities in their countries, notably in respect of the regional response to the humanitarian and migratory crisis affecting millions of Venezuelan citizens, the absence of funding in the Programme and Budget for 2019 for the ongoing project to repatriate Burundian refugees currently living in the United Republic of Tanzania, and the work being done by IOM and its partners in Libya to evacuate vulnerable migrants and improve conditions in detention centres.

147. The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration was a subject of keen interest. There was broad agreement that no country, however great its capacity, could single-handedly manage the challenges and opportunities that migration presented, and that cooperation was therefore key. As the Global Compact had been drafted by all Member States, it would help them all to meet those challenges and seize those opportunities collectively. Numerous representatives called on all Member States to adopt the Global Compact, in a spirit of multilateral cooperation and on the basis of the consensus reached by all parties. They considered that it constituted a balanced, evidence-based and sustainable policy response to migration issues thanks to its human rights-based, child-sensitive, gender-responsive and multi-stakeholder approach. They were confident that its "360°" view of migration governance would serve to guide national action on migration without compromising national security or undermining State sovereignty, and that it offered a unique opportunity for the global community to build partnerships and address the toxic narrative on migration. While it was true that the Global Compact was non-binding, it nonetheless provided a strong framework for cooperation and support in addressing common challenges and working to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the improved migration management it would foster had the potential to contribute substantively to achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

148. Other representatives, while committed to achieving a successful outcome at the upcoming Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, nevertheless cautioned that successful implementation of the Global Compact rested on developed countries taking concrete steps and providing resources to relieve the pressures facing developing countries. They remained optimistic that the Global Compact enjoyed near-universal support and that those countries that were not yet ready to commit to it nevertheless recognized the clear need to strengthen migration governance processes at national, regional and international level.

149. It was also pointed out that the Global Compact, together with the United Nations Network on Migration, would require IOM to change. The Organization should nevertheless continue doing what it did best – assist Member States in their daily activities to manage international migration, assist migrants themselves, and be a major partner and player in the international humanitarian system –

while upgrading its performance management systems and policy capabilities, increasing its internal coordination and cooperating more closely with other relevant United Nations organizations.

150. A small number of representatives expressed strong opposition to the Global Compact, which they believed failed to consider the hugely destabilizing effects and security risks of massive, illegal migratory flows. They had significant doubts about the content and balance of the final text, particularly with regard to sovereignty and the distinction between regular and irregular migrants.

151. Numerous Member States welcomed the establishment of the United Nations Network on Migration and endorsed the decision of the United Nations Secretary-General to appoint IOM as the Network coordinator and secretariat, in recognition of its role as the lead migration agency. Indeed, IOM's independence, operational capacities, flexibility and strategic expertise made it best able to coordinate the Global Compact's implementation and follow-up. Some Member States stressed the need to strengthen the Organization's institutional, managerial and functional capacities as a result, while others, noting that more human and financial resources would be required, called for dialogue in that regard and emphasized the importance of avoiding new layers of bureaucracy. Clear channels would be needed for communicating the implementation process to Member States, and it was suggested that the Working Group on IOM–UN Relations and Related Issues might be an appropriate space for that purpose.

152. The importance of building a more positive narrative on migration, one based on data and facts rather than perceptions and opinions, was underscored by several participants. To that end, it was essential to increase the availability of good-quality disaggregated data; IOM's World Migration Report, the Global Migration Data Analysis Centre and the Migration Data Portal were all important tools for policymakers, researchers and the media.

153. With regard to the Organization's administration, Member States stressed the need to maintain gender and geographical balance among IOM staff. They welcomed the Director General's intention to conduct an internal review of the Organization's priorities, structure, and procurement and internal justice systems, with a view to heightening accountability and transparency. The Administration should ensure that any revised policies included provisions to maintain sufficient independent capacity to investigate any claims of fraud and abuse. Potential internal reforms should not, however, be to the detriment of IOM's characteristic efficient and independent action.

154. Several Member States announced contributions during the general debate: the Republic of Korea would contribute to the IOM Private Sector Partnership Strategy in 2019; Norway pledged an unearmarked contribution of Nkr 15 million in 2018, to support IOM's role to coordinate implementation of the Global Compact; the Netherlands announced a contribution of EUR 6.6 million for 2018 and 2019, to enable IOM to strengthen its institutional capacity to play a strategic coordinating role in migration; and Denmark announced an unearmarked contribution of USD 4 million for 2018.

155. One Member State exercised its right of reply in response to the statements of two other Member States, which thereafter also exercised their right of reply. In addition, one observer State exercised its right of reply in response to the statement of a Member State, which thereafter also exercised its right of reply.

156. The Director General gratefully acknowledged the words of appreciation for IOM staff members. He assured the Council that IOM would not have to make major changes to how it worked in order to carry out its new tasks in respect of the Global Compact and the Network. Its values would remain the same; it would simply use its rich experience in the field to build policy capacity, which should translate to a clearer strategic purpose for the Organization.

157. He thanked those Member States that had announced or confirmed specific financial support, expressing particular appreciation for the contribution to the Private Sector Partnership Strategy. Indeed, the private sector was a missing piece in the migration puzzle.

158. He agreed that the Global Compact represented an excellent opportunity to highlight the positive aspects of migration, a tool to help build mutual trust between countries of origin and destination. It would not impose specific migration policies on countries, as the text stated that adoption of migration policy was the sovereign right of each State. He recognized that some Member States had expected more from the Global Compact, but encouraged them to share their views at the upcoming Intergovernmental Conference as part of the first step towards implementation. Regarding the financial implications, he recalled that the Global Compact would be implemented by States. For the funding of its Network-related activities, IOM would count on support from Member States and would report transparently to them.

159. He also agreed that illegal migration had to be tackled and that the root causes of forced migration should be addressed. Assisted voluntary returns and reintegration were one approach to those problems, and remained a key component of the Organization's work. He did not, however, subscribe to the idea of a link between migration and terrorism – the matter was more complex. Some of the security concerns expressed during the general debate had been addressed in the Global Compact, which took a 360° view of migration governance. IOM, as a non-partisan, non-political international organization, stood ready to assist all its Member States on migration matters.

160. Turning to the situation on the ground, he cited the Latin American regional response to Venezuelans leaving their country as an example of regional solidarity that should be replicated elsewhere. The situation in the Mediterranean required constant monitoring. In Libya, in particular, IOM remained committed to addressing the root causes of migration, supporting border controls and voluntary returns, and improving the human rights of migrants held in detention centres. That being said, the European Union and the African Union had a shared responsibility to find a political solution – there were limits to what humanitarian agencies could do.

161. In conclusion, he agreed that IOM had to adapt in the face of new challenges. In 2019, the Administration would be implementing internal reforms in the short term, focusing on procurement, oversight and the internal justice system. It would strive to ensure gender and geographical balance among IOM staff, but realized that the situation could not be completely righted overnight. It would also examine the IOM project-driven business model, which had its limits: some emergency responses could not be project-driven. The case of Burundian refugees in the United Republic of Tanzania illustrated the lack of flexibility that could arise as a result of the projectized approach to budgeting: sometimes IOM had a window of opportunity, but insufficient funds to act.

Date and place of the next sessions

162. The Council adopted Resolution No. 1375 of 30 November 2018 on its next regular session, which was tentatively scheduled for November 2019, and Resolution No. 1376 of 30 November 2018 on convening a special session of the Council in June 2019 to elect a new Deputy Director General. The Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Sessions of the Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance were provisionally scheduled for June 2019 and October 2019, respectively.

Other business

163. With regard to the election of the Deputy Director General, the Council had before it document C/108/INF/1 of 28 September 2017, entitled Note on rules and procedures for the election of the Director General and Deputy Director General.

164. The Legal Counsel reminded the Council that candidates had to be nominated by Member States and the nominations sent to the Chairperson of the Council no later than two months before the date of the Third Special Session of the Council, which was planned for the end of June 2019. The Bureau would inform Member States of each candidature as soon as it was received and would circulate the official list of candidates eight weeks before the Special Session. The elections would be held in private session and conducted by secret ballot. Member States that had lost the right to vote would not be entitled to vote in the election of the Deputy Director General.

165. The representatives of Sudan and Ethiopia announced that they would nominate Mr Ashraf El Nour and Mr Negash Kebret Batora, respectively, for election to the post of Deputy Director General.

Closure of the session

166. The Director General thanked the Member States and observers for their participation in what was his first session of the Council. The productive deliberations had provided him with many insights and IOM with the guidance it needed to discharge the commitments it had made.

167. The Chairperson declared the 109th Session of the Council closed on Friday, 30 November 2018, at 12.10 p.m.