**R2 DAY ONE: Brief update, Monday, 12 March**

**C Barton, WIMN**

A brief effort to share a few insights, which are not comprehensive.

1. EU is no longer negotiating as a block. They could not reach consensus with Hungary, so 27 countries (“the group”) are negotiating without Hungary.
2. Hungarian foreign minister came personally to lambast the Global Compact, the UN, and migration. Migration is bad. It can be stopped—we did it in Hungary. We plan to stay with the process and keep you from affirming migration as a positive thing. We are a Christian country for 1000 years and plan to stay that way. Hungary submitted a 12 point plan to co-facilitators.
3. African countries were the strongest today in affirming human rights framework and rights for all, regardless of status. This included labour rights. They engaged in dialogue, reminding countries of prior human rights commitments.
4. Not surprising, but a major dichotomization on regular/irregular migrants. Several NGOs noted later that this sets us back, as the NY Declaration recognized a continuum of status and focus on rights “regardless of status.” Also, that the focus on principles rather than practical, actionable commitments leads to greater polarization. Almost all countries reaffirmed NY Declaration commitment to human rights for migrants “regardless of status.” Many then went on to differentiate which rights given regular or irregular status. Much fear on the part of destination countries that any extension of rights and access to work would serve as an incentive for more migration and undermine citizen’s trust in state’s ability to control borders. Much reiteration of states’ sovereign rights to set migration policy and decide who does or does not enter. Restrictionist countries want to affirm only basic health, education services. Few mentioned other rights, particularly labour, access to justice.

 Line up:

Human rights, not dichotomizing regular/irregular except for purposes of protection

* Latin American countries and Canada, with Brazil as spokesperson
* African countries
* Luxemburg—group of friends of children Bulgaria, Jamaica, Luxemburg
* Holy See
* Bangladesh
* Tuvalu
* Philippines
* Eritrea
* Cuba
* Jamaica
* Mexico
* Nepal
* Guatemala
* Venezuela
* Libya

Want strong separation between regular and irregular. Only basic services for irregular migrants as humanitarian aid.

* Australia
* New Zealand
* Japan
* India
* South Africa
* Singapore
* Malaysia
* Indonesia
* EU 27
* Hungary
* Turkey (less adamant)
* China
* Lichtenstein
* Azerbaijan
* Iran

In between

* Thailand
* Switzerland

Belarus wants GCM to focus only on labour migration.

1. Labour was the big absent issue today.  We really need to pick it up.  All this focus on irregular migration without acknowledging that destination countries rely on irregular migrant labour.  Willing to provide basic services to irregular migrants but almost nothing said about access to justice when labour rights are violated.  Critical for us to push on this, including from a gender perspective.  Countries are trying to abandon precedent, even of NY Declaration, which itself was a roll back on rights.  We will need to show, as OHCHR docs do, where nations have already agreed to these rights.
2. Holy See was good on family unity and on calling countries out for willfully ignoring commitments to refugees, turning them back.
3. Afternoon discussion was weaker. Same general line up of countries—Human rights folks wanting to see synergy between the two compacts and address gaps of those who do not fall under refugee convention but cannot return home; non-refoulement for all; recognition of reality of mixed migration flows. Reference to NY Declaration annex which delineates common concerns for refugees and migrants.
4. Restrictionist countries want total separation between the two compacts. Want binding obligations ONLY for refugees. Want non-refoulment to apply ONLY to refugees, counteracting international human rights law (particularly Convention on Torture). Want all references to refugees deleted from text. Much concern that GCM cannot establish new definitions or new legal frameworks re a new group of “vulnerable” migrants from climate, gangs, environmental disasters, etc. Suggestion that nations can respond on case by case basis through humanitarian assistance.
5. Japan said some are hypocritical in not wanting to distinguish between regular/irregular and refugee/migrants. They said that the UN regularly singles out groups like women, children, people with disabilities as central to work of the agency. So why not these distinct groups? Brazil called them on it, saying, “Distinct categories of persons is ok. Yes, UN Addresses women, children, persons with disabilities. But in every instance where we categorize, it is to *strengthen* rights, not to reduce the level of protections. “
6. Brazil: Those who fall through crack of protections need to be included. Not create a third category of persons, but recognize need to address needs of vulnerable persons on the move. Those who are not refugees should not be left behind. (citing agenda 2030)

**GCM Negotiations, Session II, Day 2**

**Tuesday, 13 March**

**Brief Update**

**L Simeone, WIMN**

I’m following Carol’s lead in condensing some of the most salient points of the day’s negotiations from my notes. This is far from comprehensive.

This day was dedicated to finishing the discussion on the refugee/migrant distinction; completed capacity building; and began implementation, follow-up and review.

Co-facilitator Gomez-Camacho opened the morning session by summarizing the main points to emerge at the end of the day Monday. States want a clear distinction maintained between refugees and migrants, and they want no new categories to be created. Yet then the problem of “mixed migration” remains unaddressed. What to do with migrants in vulnerable situations who don’t fit the definition of refugee? Are there cases where migrants need special protection, either because of vulnerabilities or special situations? There was also a divide between states that want to reserve the term non-refoulement (and in many cases even the word “protection”) for the GCR, and those who argue that it is an established concept of human rights law that belongs in the compact. Also, while there seems to be a universal agreement on the importance of complementarity between the compacts, that word can mean many things, and must be clarified. He urged states to address the question of mixed flows: “it is not a new category, of course, or a normative policy issue, but an operational one, a challenge of identifying who is who.”

A number of states emphasized that the two compacts were distinguished by levels of international obligation, asserting that fundamental human rights and complementary protection measures for migrants were a matter of state discretion “under humanitarian principles”, whereas refugee protection was a matter of international law. China “resists any effort to extend temporary or permanent protection to migrants.” In Armenia’s words: “for migrants, the same rights and responsibilities do not apply.” South Africa called the application of refugee standards to migrants “mandate creep” which encourages bogus asylum requests. From this perspective, “blurring the line” between categories compromises national sovereignty, by implying a more prescriptive standard of treatment for migrants than states are willing to accept. These states included: Cuba, Armenia, Austria (representing all EU countries except Hungary), Australia, China, Japan, India, and Guyana. South Africa and Lebanon strenuously objected to any mention of the principle of non-refoulement in the GCM.

Other states defended non-refoulement in the GCM, asserting that it was widely established as a principle of international law. They argued that international Human Rights instruments were also binding, and that it was critical for the GCM to identify a universal standard of protection for all migrants, regardless of status. Some argued that the distinction between migrants and refugee should only be made to enhance protection, and that the GCM should be a default instrument for ensuring international protection to those who are not covered under the definition of refugee. These included Tuvalu, Chile, the Holy See, Canada, Switzerland, Lichtenstein, Bangladesh, Brazil, Guatemala, New Zealand, and El Salvador.

Belarus argued that forced migrants should be covered under the GCM because the fit only one of the two criteria under the 51 Refugee Convention, being unable to avail themselves of the protection of their own countries. Mexico described its humanitarian visa program as a best practice for addressing the challenges of mixed flows through national law.

The Africa Group, represented by Comoros, had a rather more nuanced position in this regard. They were in support of Armenia’s argument about the sovereignty implications of overlap between the compacts about taking out reference to conflict in Objective 2, limiting the GCM drivers of migration to issues of international development. Yet they argued that the GCM should extend protection to migrants displaced by climate change and slow-onset disaster, and that the principle of non-refoulement should be applied prima facie when status is not well-defined. Ethiopia pushed this position a bit farther, arguing that mixed movements could be addressed in both compacts, and that a basic standard of protection is necessary for all migrants, regardless of status, before status determination. We need to ensure that the compacts allow states and service providers to work in a coordinated matter with respect to people with special needs.

Switzerland argued that the conventions will inevitably have overlap, but that this does not in any way compromise state sovereignty. He pointed out that various instruments can be applied together: for example, each woman and child has a certain set of human rights across the board, but are also protected by CEDAW and the CRC, respectively. Deciding which instrument applies to each category is work that must go into both compacts. Migrants in vulnerable situations may need protection that derives from multiple sources and both compacts. Mixed migration is an operational challenge, and the sequencing is important. When humanitarian actors are faced with emergencies, the first consideration is a person’s need, not their legal differentiation. This is when humanitarian principles must be applied regardless of status. The distinctions become more important when it’s no longer an emergency. The objective of the GCM is to recognize a minimum standard that must be applied according to international human rights law, leaving each government to build on top of that. We can’t abandon that aspiration without betraying the goals of the NYD.

Gender did not have a very prominent role in today’s negotiation. Austria, on behalf of the European Group, did mention the human rights of vulnerable persons such as women and children, mainstreaming a gender perspective, along with combatting violence against women, trafficking and smuggling, drivers of migration, and integration and inclusion as the issues common to both compacts. However, she stressed that the GCM should avoid any language that extends international protection to migrants who are not entitled to it, and that migrants need concrete support, and best practices on how to provide it. Thus, addressing these issues with respect to migrants must be left up to the states. Canada stressed a gender-responsive approach: “women’s empowerment and agency are key to providing support on the ground.”

A number of states were particularly concerned about climate migration: Tuvalu, the African Group, Belarus, Ethiopia, Turkey, and Canada, which – along with New Zealand - suggested that climate change and environmental factors should be reflected in the guiding principles.

In the discussion on capacity-building, states seemed to agree that a new mechanism may be necessary, particularly to support states with significant resource constraints, though financing is a contentious issue. Austria emphasized that every state has a responsibility to take back its nationals: the text must include the possibility of forced return, for dealing with migrants that do not cooperate with voluntary return. There is also a universal agreement that new frameworks should not be established, and that participation should be voluntary. The Africa Group (Comoros) emphasized that a a separate paragraph on international cooperation must establish a mechanism that could support partners in designing projects that further development-based solutions in origin countries. She pointed out that many countries are falling behind on their commitments for development assistance, and that multisectoral coordination at all levels – capacity-building, partnership, dialogue and cooperation, financing - is critical. A fund should be set up to assist countries in developing tailored projects. Also, since most migrants are labor migrants, ILO should also have an important role in the implementation phase. She mentioned the need to harness the capacities of migrant and diaspora associations. Other states also stressed the contributions of civil society, including: Austria, Australia, Guatemala, Brazil, Bangladesh, Switzerland, El Salvador, the Holy See (with an emphasis on faith-based organizations),

SRSG Louise Arbour briefed states after lunch on plans to conduct internal consultations within the UN System to aid in the implementation process, as indicated in her report. Consultations will prioritize avoiding unnecessary new structures, ensuring alignments with work on SDGs. They will be sensitive to the increasingly important role of IOM in the UN system, and seek out ways to achieve effective complementarity in two processes, ensuring robust health of legal protection regime for refugees. As a first step, they are canvassing 22 members of the GMG, co-chaired by IOM and FAO, to assess strengths and capacities on a range of migration issues. The SG sees the leadership of IOM as central to the implementation process. Then a set of proposals will be developed by a consultant (being recruited) to develop a set of proposals for the SG. Original intent was to have internal recommendations ready for the SG by the end of April, but there is a question of what capacities will be needed, which in turn depends on the process of the negotiations. The two processes imply and depend on each other, they go hand-in-hand. She stressed that they seek to go beyond the conventional 20th century model of superficial coordination. They want to be more ambitious, more coherent, more focused, more geared towards delivery, not only in terms of the role of UN in headquarters, but also regional and country configurations.

The Philippines requested clarification on the expectations built into the structure of the Zero Draft, and co-facilitator Lauber replied that the objectives identified areas where member states wanted the GCM to go, based on the thematic consultations. Then the actionable commitments pushed beyond the commitments in the NYD without being specific about actions. The lists of very specific actions follow, with the understanding that it would not be appropriate for all states to do everything, since the specificities of each states are different, and require a customized response. These actions are a collection of best practices, models, etc. They are only suggestions, which the co-facilitators are still collecting to complement the catalogue of possible actions to implement the objectives.

The capacity, implementation, follow-up and review discussions were overlapping. The central role of the IOM was repeated emphasized by every speaker, in both this discussion and with respect to implementation, follow-up and review. Nevertheless, states asked for more clarity regarding what this role would entail, and how it would interact with other UN agencies. Japan shared the example of UN Habitat in its role as focal point on sustainable urbanization and human settlement for the new urban agenda. Australia used the metaphor of a “hub and spoke model”: “if you’re a spoke, that doesn’t mean you’re not important, because you need spokes for a wheel to work.” Most of the states emphasized that implementation should be a state-led process; some argued that follow-up and review should be as well. There was disagreement about regional mechanisms; most resisted the idea of the Regional Economic Forums, with the exception of Argentina. Argentina and Guatemala thought the review process should take place every 2 years instead of 4. Belarus expressed concerns regarding the procedural problems associated with expending funding from an existing resolution, and there seemed to be a fair amount of confusion regarding the relationship of the Global Compact to the HLD and 2030 Agenda.

Co-facilitator Gomez-Camacho explained that they wrote the final section with the explicit intention of avoiding the creation of something new. They wanted to keep it simple, with a “light-touch”, clear and effective. The High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development already exists, but modalities have to be negotiated each time. It currently has an ad hoc agenda, without a long-term approach to migration. Their assumption is that the GCM should be the most embracing, holistic, integrated policy approach to migration, the famous 360 degree approach. If this is the spine of their discussion within the UN, they could take that ad hoc existing structure and repurpose it, not to displace it, but embrace it, expand it. “Our colleague from Belarus is right, we must decide how to do it procedurally, but perhaps we must decide if it’s a good idea first.” They tried to make very clear the linkages between the NYD and 2030 Agenda as the parents of the compacts. The High Level Political Forum is already overcrowded – voluntary reports from countries have reduced themselves to presentations of 10 minutes – and it didn’t make sense to crowd it further. The GCM deserved a proper space in the UN, rather than 1 of 10 minutes during the HLPF. Their hope is that a repurposed HLD would provide a more meaningful, well-designed space for states to talk about migration. Since this happens every four years, they also thought it was important to introduce a regional forum. Maybe the Regional Economic Commission idea will work better in some regions than others. The GFMD also makes sense; and then we have national level reviews.

I am paying short shrift to the afternoon discussion, but have much more complete notes which I would be happy to share with you if you are interested.

**Day THREE: March 14th 2018**

**Leah Sullivan**

Again a brief overview of what happened today.

Day three of the second round of negotiations was shorter, ending around noon, and was a session in which the co-facilitators invited states to come back with any additional comments on issues of followup and review which they had not mentioned the day before, and moved on to invite states to make general comments on the Zero Plus Draft, including the small technical changes the Co-Facilitators had made between the Zero and the Zero Plus.

States making interventions in relation to Review and Follow Up were: El Salvador, Iran, Switzerland, South Africa, Cuba. Comoros on behalf of the AG spoke only to say that they were discussing comments within the group still and may have comments on this later or tomorrow.

Those making general comments on the Zero Draft Plus (which included for some states revisiting issues discussed the previous days like the migrant/refugee distinction) were: Austria on behalf of 27 countries, Japan, Syria, Norway, Australia, Armenia, Micronesia, Turkey, Brazil, Guyana, Bangladesh, India, Jamaica, Russia, Norway, Costa Rica, Bahamas, Mozambique, UAE, Guatemala, El Salvador

The day largely followed the dichotomy of the same states saying things that aren't great; Russia, India, UAE, with Japan, EU, Norway, Australia generally finding themselves in agreement with each other, and others saying more positive things from Pacific, African, Latin American and Carribbean and some Asian countries, including, surprisingly (for me, at least) Turkey, to some degree Bangladesh, who reminded us of their desire for the partially binding compact. The Co-facilitators continued their efforts to have an interactive conversation and the Swiss Amb for Migration Pietro Mona making some useful contributions in this regard.

**Review and Follow** **up**

**More/less formal review process:** Some states emphasising the need to focus on identifying the purpose of the Review Forum, rather than getting bogged down in what it might be named. To this end there a difference between states who wanted to have a more formal review process, including monitoring and those (India, Australia, Japan) that discouraged the any mention of monitoring, reviewing, ( Australia saying that the GCM should be clear about framework of reviewability: must be voluntary and non-binding, avoiding the word “monitor”, preferrring “track” )and others preferring the words used to describe these processes as “debate”. India generally wanted to avoid language similar to that in legally binding language as did Australia who want to “pull back on normative language/agenda”. (didnt quite catch last word).

**GA/non GA-based Review Forum:** Some states more than others emphasizing the link between migration and development, and to that end emphasizing the mainstreaming of the GCM with the 2030 agenda, and supporting the Co-Facs suggestion to have the **HLD** as the main Review Forum for the Compact. Switzerland sees having the point of anchorage in the Gen Assembly as important.

**Role of Regional Comissions, IDM and GFMD:** Re the potential role of the IDM and the GFMD in the Review process, El Salvador said that the GFMD is good but this requires “more than just an exchange of ideas”...IDM was said by CH to be open to civil society. The idea that the regional level events should be decided on the basis of regional and national priorities was again mentioned, with other for a mentioned today from Switzerland and others.

**Role of the IOM** – again almost all states who mentioned the IOM, recalled their expertise, global presence, and said that they should lead the implementation of the compact. Norway welcomed Australia's earlier analogy of the IOM as a hub and other UN bodies as spokes. South Africa also very strongly supporting the role of the IOM, saying that this is specifically why they were brought into the UN System, Austria (EU) also, again the “leading and coordinating” language, echoed by Australia, Slightly less enthusiasm from El Salvador (or perhaps just my wishful interpretation), and Guyana.

**Multistakeholder participation:** Some states made welcome reference to the need to include civil society organisations in implementation, review and follow up (El Salvador, Switzerland) as well as references to the involvement of the private sector (El Salvador , Switzerland ), diaspora (El Salvador, Bahamas, Guyana , who want a “diaspora engagement plan” ) and academia.

**Migrants/Refugees:** Emphasizing their desire to distinguish clearly between migrants and refugees, and for the GCM and the GCR not overlap each other, today were India, Iran. “no new categories” said Syria, “avoid new legal categories” EU27. Saying that the 1951 definition is not fit for purpose given climate change was Micronesia, and that there is a necessary overlap betweent hte GCR and the GCM.

**Regular/Irregular:** Importance of distinctions reiterated by some including EU27, Japan, others. Access to services regardless of status/limited services on basis of status “not the same level of status” - Norways, “some services” - EU27. “primary education, emergency health care are provided to all migrants, regardless of status, but we cannot secure all social services for them” said Japan. Norway explictly stated they could not accept firewalls. EU27 only integration for “legall staying migrants”. India: “irregular migrants should be treated with due process of law, but cannot receive equal entitlements”

**Other General Comments, and comments on amendments in the Zero Plus:**Many states reiteration calls for more clarity, detail on distinctions, terminology and on implementation, follow up and review including on financing.

**International Instuments;** Calls for the CMW and the ICPD (Bangaldesh). Armenia wanted the language This global compact rests on t*he purposes* and principles of the UN Charter” in the preamble.

**Gender:** A few states mentioned the importance of gender, some in the context of GBV,( Norway, Austria on behalf of 27, “gender-specific vulnerabilities” Turkey). El Salvador “strengthen in througout the text”.

**Labour:** Some states called for the inclusion of other international agreements in the preamble including the CMW (Bangaldesh, Turkey?),Turkey mentioned that the GCM should “avoid implication that migrants are only valuable for their immediate labor to host countries”. Jamaica said that CODs must acknowledge that an element of cooperation and partnership is the recognition that CODs require the labour of COOs, that that skill demand must be recognised. UAE extolled benefits of temporary labour migration.

**Women:** Norway, Austria on behalf of 27, mentioned women, EU using the dreaded “women and children and vulnerable populations”. El salvador mentioned women migrants.

**Return and Readmission** – mentioned by Norway and strongly by EU27, who said that the new draft must include possibility of forced returns for uncooperative migrants, implemented with full response for HR, non-refoulement, ensuring access to justice, and whenever possible in the framework of readmission agreements.

Others..

* Creation of pull factors, legitmising migration, taking into account not only migrants but host societies, other wise this would be (Australia) “lethal to public opinion”
* States mentioning the importance of State soveireigty (and “discretion” - Australia), Japan, Syria, among others.
* Japan found detention “as a last resort” to infringe upon their state sovereignty.
* The importance of data privacy was mentioned by Syria and Brazil.
* Russia find the Zero Draft inconsistent with the SoM Protocol, in particular the proposed noncriminalisation of smuggled migrants. UAE took issue with the critique of tied visas

**Issues states brought up with regard to the small changes that had been made between the Zero and the Zero Plus included:**

* EU 27 found inconsistent terminology of “child”, “minor”, “adolescent” – “fundamental human rights” should read “human rights and fundamental freedoms” – objecting to change of “migrants” to “workers” – include peoples with disability, older persons, women, gender-based violence. The inclusion of people with disabilities was also mentioned by Armenia.
* Guatemala wanted language of “girls, boys and adolescents”
* Bangladesh want in Objective 13: more clarity is necessary for non-native speakers, it seems to be saying that detention is lawful, perhaps edited to say “detention should be based on lawful measures”
* Micronesia also said that language on climate change as a driver of migration should mention slow as well as sudden onset event, particularly intense storms.

**GCM Negotiations, Session II, Day 4**

**Thursday, 15 March**

**Brief Update**

**L Simeone, WIMN**

These are some of the most salient points of the day’s negotiations from my notes. This is far from comprehensive.

The last day in the second round of negotiations was only one two-hour session. The blocs used this opportunity to provide summary statements of their positions on the zero plus draft. These included the Africa Group, represented by Comoros, the EU-27 Group, represented by Austria, and for the first time, an inter-regional group represented by the Philippines which included: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Philippines. (Rumor has it that civil society was involved in brokering this collaboration.)

Summaries of group statements, in order of presentation, are as follows:

* The African Group, represented by the Comoros, began by reiterating the expertise and leading role of IOM, as well as specific competencies of ILO, UNDESA, and UNODC. She argued that a robust mechanism for review should exist at the national level, and that regional processes should be oriented towards sharing best practices. She envisioned an important role for both the regional economic commissions and the African Union. At the international level, follow-up and review should have three aspects: 1) building on existing mechanisms, like GFMD and HLD; 2) allowing for annual intergovernmental forums to evaluate progress on objectives; 3) and supporting a HLPF to provide guidance on implementation and identifying emerging challenges. She supported repurposing the HLD, and emphasized voluntary national reporting mechanisms and the importance of collecting reliable data.

Revisions on the zero draft plus included: a paragraph on the distinction between migrants and refugees; a need to address the regular/irregular by mentioning fragmentation of migrant protection; mentioning xenophobia and discrimination; and reiterated previous statements that Objective 2 on structural causes should focus on migration-specific issues related to development, with the goal of galvanizing partners to honor their ODA commitments. She mentioned specific vulnerabilities of certain categories of migrants, especially climate change displacement, the abolition of migrant holding camps, access to justice in detention, and the elimination of multiple forms of discrimination, including by addressing public narratives that stigmatize migrants. She welcomes language strengthening diaspora engagement in destination and origin countries, and proposes a separate objective on international cooperation, which would support possible mechanisms to assist developing countries in addressing the structural causes of migration. She expressed concern about data collection, requesting clarity the baseline statistical definition of “international migrant” and the global migration portal. “We do not see the necessity of using the term “legally binding” in the text.”

* On behalf of a group of countries, including Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and the Philippines, the delegate from the Philippines spoke of the compact in very positive terms, as a vehicle to revitalize public confidence, build partnerships, and change narratives about migrants. He reiterated that “we must reaffirm that states have the obligation to protect the HR of all individuals.” Services and programs offered by states may differentiate between regular and irregular, but it is critical to reaffirm a commitment to protect the safety, dignity, HR, and fundamental rights of all migrants, regardless of status in a particular member state. He cautioned against undermining the standard established by the New York Declaration, and mention the CRC, CDAW, and Torture Convention as binding commitments that should be cited in the GCM. It should make a direct link between migration and development, as articulated in the 2030 Agenda, with the goal of stabilizing all communities throughout the migration cycle.
* On behalf of the Europe-27 Group, the delegate from Austria began by stating that HR and fundamental freedoms of migrants everywhere must be protected, regardless of status. “We will always support this, as well as gender-sensitivity, inclusion of civil society, and elimination of discrimination.” She said that migrants are returned only after due process, and that the group opposes expulsions, or return to places where lives are threatened. Development is important, but the compact should retain its 360 approach; the SDGs also include peace, justice, and good governance. They oppose the proposal to limit Objective 2 to development, and think it should include climate change and the elimination of corruption. They support Norway’s proposal to include a principle on the regular/irregular distinction. They are open to repurposing the HLD, as long the leading and coordinating role of IOM is ensured. They would like to get a briefing from IOM on how they to ensure follow-up, and support delegations arguing for flexibility at the regional level, including the involvement of regional economic commissions if desired by states.

Iceland and Qatar presented remarks for the first time. The former represented a group of countries, not named individually, identified as “friends on desertification, land degradation and drought”, which proposed that these climate-related drivers of migration be inserted into the text wherever climate change is mentioned. Iceland’s remarks also recommended the following language: “lack of livelihood means”, “when onsite adaptation is not suitable”, and “needs of communities to which migrants return by addressing structural factors that compel migrants to leave.” Qatar emphasized the positive contributions of migrants to sustainable development and “women and girls empowered as agents of change”, staying silent on the issues of tied visas and the explicit protection of domestic workers.

A few other states also made statements, including Jamaica, Brazil, the Holy See, the Philippines (on its own behalf), Guyana, Mexico, and Australia. Jamaica proposed a comprehensive framework of research and analysis on the intersection between migration and social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development. They stressed the influence of push and pull factors, demographic aging, changing labor market needs, and an emphasis on the linkages between national policies and regional initiatives. Jamaica also expressed concern about the sharing of biometric data, insisting that confidentiality should be guaranteed. Brazil and the Holy See focused on non-refoulement, and humanitarian assistance to forced migrants not recognized as refugees; the Philippines and Mexico were particularly concerned with labor mobility and regularization. Both were strong on gender; according to the Philippines, the draft was already strong at “mainstreaming a gender perspective, promoting gender equality, and empowering all women and girls, but we need clear language on women as agents and not just as victims.” The Holy See supported the call for clearer distinctions between regular/irregular and migrant/refugee, yet advocates for a minimum standard of protection that includes access to health care, education, access to justice and housing. All four mentioned the importance of civil society stakeholders in implementation, follow-up and review. Australia joined the EU-27 in challenging the Africa Group’s exclusive emphasis on development. “National interests can support development efforts,” he argued. “We haven’t engaged in bilateral schemes just to further development, but there have been strong multi-dimensional outcomes.”

When requests for the floor were exhausted, Co-Facilitator Gomez-Camacho offered a brief reflection on an understanding of sustainable development as “the spirit of the compact.” As one of its founding sources, he said, the 2030 Agenda encompasses not only economy, but also rule of law, reduction of poverty, and every other priority expressed in the 17 goals. He then invited Michelle Klein-Solomon to give a briefing to the states on IOM’s preparations for their role in facilitating implementation, follow-up and review.

Klein-Solomon began her remarks by affirming IOM’s commitment to capacity-building and partnerships. Implementation, follow-up and review are state responsibilities within a state-led process, supported by a coordinated UN system that is inclusive of non-governmental stakeholders at every level. IOM supports whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to governance, she said, Depending on outcomes of internal UN measures, they would propose a dialogue and review forum, on a periodic basis like the repurposed HLD, as well as more annual dialogues to continue the discussions. This mechanism would be matched and supported by national level assessments to address barriers and gaps to implementation. UN working groups, involving non-governmental stakeholders, should also feed into regional level forums, which will vary depending on what works best for states. Depending on UN system reforms, these processes should bring all elements of the system together. A leadership role of the IOM would in no way detract from the mandates and contributions of UN agencies; the spoke and hub analogy may be an apt one. “We have tools and dialogue forums that can be utilized as necessary to facilitate the dialogue, and coordinate capacity-building.

Eritrea asked her to follow up on the Africa Group’s question regarding the Global Migration Data Portal. How is IOM collecting this data? What steps does IOM take? How does it consult with states and deal with inaccuracies?

Klein-Solomon replied that the Global Migration Portal, based on Berlin, Germany, draws from public available sources, such as the census and other government databases. They are working with DESA, UNEDC, World Bank. They are aware of variations in state capacity, and have programs to help improve data collection and improvement.

Ethiopia asked what IOM doing to develop data collection and address data protection issues?

Klein-Solomon described the IOM as an institution in a process of evolution, with a decentralized, small headquarters and large field presence. “We need to provide consistent policy guidance and information to states across regions,” she admitted, “especially with respect to human rights and protection.” She described internal and external mechanisms through which a new human rights-based approach to programming is manifested within the organization and through relationships with states. There is now a protection policy in place to ensure all employers observe international and national legal standards, as well as key external tools such as the migration governance framework, which looks at the elements of well-managed migration governance, endorsed by all member states two years ago. This framework includes labor standards, combatting transnational crime, social inclusion, etc. The IOM’s economic intelligence unit has also produced migration governance indicators to evaluate whether policy and practices meet the standards of the governance framework. This comprehensive system of evaluation can be adapted to operate as a tool to assist governments in assessing their implementation of the GCM, and ensuring migrants are not left behind with respect to all the SDG goals.