



IOM International Organization for Migration

Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)

Bangkok, 4-5 June 2009

SUMMARY REPORT

This Summary Report has been prepared by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in close collaboration with the Thai Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Comments were solicited from the participants prior to finalization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
MEETING PARTICIPANTS	5
WELCOME REMARKS	6
INTRODUCTION OF THE RCPS TO ONE ANOTHER	6
<i>Composition and structure</i>	7
<i>Thematic focus</i>	9
<i>Objectives and goals</i>	10
<i>Challenges</i>	10
<i>Gaps in RCP coverage</i>	11
<i>Statements by observers</i>	12
THE ROLE OF RCPS IN PROMOTING MORE EFFECTIVE MIGRATION MANAGEMENT	12
<i>Facilitating inter-state cooperation</i>	13
<i>Building capacity to manage migration</i>	14
<i>Contributing to policy coherence</i>	15
MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN RCPS	17
<i>Migration and development – a complex issue</i>	17
<i>The place of migration and development within RCPs</i>	18
<i>The relationship between capacity building, migration and development</i>	18
STRENGTHENING COLLABORATION AMONG RCPS, IMPROVING CROSS-FERTILIZATION AMONG THEM, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	19
<i>Circumstances in which exchange between RCPs would be most valuable</i>	19
<i>Methods of facilitating exchange between RCPs</i>	20
LINKS TO THE GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT (GFMD), INCLUDING IMPROVING CROSS-FERTILIZATION BETWEEN RCPS AND THE GFMD, AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GFMD	21
BRIEFING ON A STUDY OF THE RCP APPROACH	22
CONCLUSION AND OUTCOMES	23
CLOSING STATEMENT OF THE ROYAL THAI GOVERNMENT	24

PREFACE

The Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs) took place in Bangkok on 4 and 5 June 2009. The meeting was hosted by the Royal Thai Government in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and would not have been possible without the generous contributions of the Governments of Australia and the United States of America.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of RCPs was to draw together representatives from the major RCPs around the world to share experiences and exchange views on the value and advantages of facilitating regional dialogue and cooperation on migration through RCPs. Representatives of the Royal Thai Government and IOM acted as the meeting's Co-Chairs. The discussions were dynamic and interactive, with the participants showing great interest in listening to and learning from one another.

The meeting began with an introduction to each RCP. It emerged that **while each RCP is unique, they share several common characteristics**, which can be summarized as follows:

Purpose

- They were formed specifically to address migration issues;
- they facilitate dialogue on migration, primarily among States but also involving regional and/or international organizations and in some cases civil society; and
- they promote sharing of information, experience and good practices in migration management.

Operating principles

- They operate as processes outside of formal institutional frameworks;
- they are owned and led by States;
- they respect the prerogative of each sovereign nation to manage migration;
- their discussions are confidential, informal and non-binding;
- their substantive focus is flexible, according to the participating Governments' priorities; and
- they operate according to a principle of equal footing for all participating States, regardless of factors such as size, influence and wealth.

Participants clearly expressed their **conviction in the value of RCPs**. Several **key contributions of RCPs to effective migration management** were identified, as follows:

- **facilitating inter-state cooperation** on migration-related issues, including by:

- fostering common understandings of migration realities,
- helping States identify common interests,
- building trust among participants and confidence in the feasibility of inter-state cooperation, and
- forming networks of counterparts;
- **building capacity** to manage migration, including through:
 - sharing, collecting and/or disseminating migration information,
 - sharing good practices and lessons learned in migration management,
 - providing a framework for research to support migration management efforts,
 - holding capacity building trainings and workshops, and
 - developing specific capacity building tools;
- **helping improve policy coherence** at the national level and tending to result in deliberate or *de facto* harmonization of migration and/or asylum policies across the participating States.

Participants examined the benefits of and means for interaction among RCPs. They showed strong **interest in increasing contact and information exchange among RCPs**. To this end, they:

- agreed that consideration should be given to inviting representatives of other RCPs to their respective RCP meetings in appropriate situations;
- agreed to hold meetings among the chairing governments and secretariats of the principal RCPs on a regular basis, i.e. approximately every two years; and
- agreed that the existing section of the IOM website dedicated to RCPs (www.iom.int/rcps) is a valuable tool and means of sharing information among RCPs, and asked that it be made more robust and include more information (while linking directly to RCPs' own websites where they exist).

In discussing **linkages between RCPs and the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)**, the participants:

- agreed that this meeting's discussions and outcomes should feed into Roundtable 3.2 of the Athens GFMD and that this Summary Report should be made available to GFMD participants;
- observed that the RCPs could share their expertise and lessons learned relating to informal, non-binding dialogue on migration at the GFMD, particularly with respect to translating dialogue to action;
- suggested that the Report of the GFMD be made available to the RCPs for their information and possible consideration; and
- expressed interest in having an upcoming study of the impacts and outputs of RCPs feed into Roundtable 3.2 of the Athens GFMD.¹

The agenda of the meeting is attached to this Summary Report as Annex I.

¹ Participants were briefed on this study during the meeting. A summary of the briefing appears later in this Summary Report.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Approximately 65 people attended the meeting, composed primarily of **representatives of the Chairing Governments and/or Secretariats of the principal RCPs around the world:**²

- the Söderköping Process (a/k/a the Cross-Border Cooperation Process) in Central Europe;
- the Budapest Process in Europe and Central Asia;
- the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM or Puebla Process) in North and Central America;
- the South American Conference on Migration (SACM);
- the Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM Dialogue) in Europe and North Africa;
- the Migration Dialogue in West Africa (MIDWA);
- the Migration Dialogue in Southern Africa (MIDSA);
- the Inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Regional Consultative Process on Migration (IGAD-RCP) in Eastern Africa/Horn of Africa;
- the Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants (APC);
- the Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin in Asia (Colombo Process);
- the Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin and Destination in Asia (Abu Dhabi Dialogue);
- the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime in the Asia-Pacific region;
- the Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) including countries in Europe and North America as well as Australia and New Zealand.

Some observers also attended. A list of participants appears in Annex II to this Summary Report.

² The only RCP that was invited but regrettably not represented at the meeting was the Regional Ministerial Conference on Migration in the Western Mediterranean, known as the 5+5 Dialogue on Migration.

WELCOME REMARKS

Participants were welcomed by **Mr. Panich Vikitsreth, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Royal Thai Government**. He began by observing that the creation of RCPs around the world reflects States' recognition of the value of regional cooperation on migration issues. He emphasized Thailand's participation in several RCPs and the important opportunities this had provided to build upon regional collaboration and strengthen bilateral partnerships on migration matters. Specifically, engagement in RCPs had helped Thailand support its overseas workers and tackle migration-related problems at home.

Given its appreciation of the contributions of RCPs to inter-state cooperation on migration, Thailand welcomed the possibility to bring the RCPs together at the global level. The Vice Minister hoped that the exchanges at this meeting would provide fresh insights from different regions facing similar migration challenges, which could help support national approaches to migration management and generate new ideas for inter-state cooperation in the migration realm.

Participants were then addressed by **IOM Director General William Lacy Swing**. He reflected on the challenges faced in managing migration in this new era of human mobility and the potential for RCPs to advance national, bilateral and regional cooperation to address them. In his view, this meeting provided a rare opportunity for RCP representatives from around the world to share perspectives and lessons learned. He hoped the meeting would deepen understanding of the achievements and potential of the RCPs and the benefits of future interaction among RCPs.

The Director General ended by noting that IOM has been an enthusiastic supporter of RCPs for almost 25 years – since the establishment of the first RCP in 1985 – with its support taking different forms depending on the wishes and requests of the RCPs' participating governments. He looked forward to hearing from the governments regarding how the Organization could further strengthen its assistance to RCPs, while fully respecting their State-led nature.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RCPs TO ONE ANOTHER

It was observed that the participants may not be familiar with all of the RCPs represented at the meeting. Only once before had the chairing governments and secretariats of the world's RCPs come together, in the framework of a meeting co-organized by IOM and the former Global Commission for International Migration (GCIM) in 2005. Since then, several of the chairing governments had changed and a few new RCPs had been formed.

Each RCP was introduced by its delegation, including with respect to its structure, thematic focus, objectives and goals, and challenges. An "Overview of Principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs), arranged by Region" (attached as Annex III to this Summary Report), was provided to the participants and

complemented the introductions. Several participants also provided additional materials for distribution.³

Composition and structure

The introductions showed that RCPs come in many forms, shapes and sizes. While certain RCPs have similar features and several elements are common to most RCPs, each RCP has a unique overall composition and structure.

RCP participants

As shown in Annex III, the **primary participants in each RCP are States**, ranging from six States in the RCP with the smallest number to almost 50 States in the largest. With respect to the **migration perspectives of the participating States**, most RCPs include a mix of States that are principally origin countries and States that are principally destination countries, and in many cases also include States that are principally transit countries. There are, however, a few RCPs that are composed exclusively of States that are principally origin countries, on the one hand, or exclusively of States that are principally destination countries, on the other hand. While the labels “origin”, “transit” and “destination” tend to oversimplify the complexity of migration flows in today’s world – with most countries having characteristics of all three types, albeit to different degrees – these broad categories can be useful in providing an indication of the diversity of perspectives reflected in most RCPs.

Regarding **levels of participation**, several RCPs meet at the Ministerial or Vice Ministerial level as well as at the Senior Officials or technical level. A few RCPs meet only at the Senior Officials or technical level.

Each RCP also has **partners or observers, which may include additional States, regional/sub-regional bodies, and/or international organizations**. As discussed in more detail below, in many cases international organizations provide secretariat-type services and substantive expert contributions. The degree to which RCPs engage with **civil society** differs. For instance, while the RCM has a parallel civil society network and the SACM routinely allows civil society representatives to attend certain sessions of its regular meetings, other RCPs tend to engage civil society on a more *ad hoc* basis, if at all. Some RCPs have invited civil society and/or private sector representatives to participate in selected workshops or activities on specific themes.

With respect to **geographic coverage**, it became evident that the word “regional” in the term “RCP” can be somewhat misleading, as several of the RCPs could be considered to be sub-regional or inter-regional in nature. Furthermore, the IGC brings together “like-minded states” rather than being organized along regional lines.

³ Many of the materials provided by the participants are available on the IOM website at <http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/rcps/2009-global-rcp-meeting>.

Organizational framework

A minority of RCPs have no chairing government (e.g. MIDSAs, MIDWAs, MTM Dialogue and Söderköping Process). Those RCPs that do have taken **various approaches to chairing**. Approximately half of the RCPs use a system of rotation, whereby a single government holds the chair for a set term, in most cases roughly one year. In the case of the IGC, the rotation system is complemented by a troika configuration, whereby the current, previous and next chairs consult regularly in order to provide continuity.

Two other RCPs have notable chairing structures. The Bali Process has fixed Co-Chairs – Australia and Indonesia – countries which have different migration perspectives, degrees of development and size. For the Budapest Process, Turkey is the Chair and Hungary is the Co-Chair; previously Hungary had held the Chair and Turkey the Co-Chair for a number of years.

Secretariat arrangements also vary by RCP. On one end of the spectrum, a few RCPs have an official Secretariat with a dedicated staff person(s) (e.g. APC, IGC, RCM and the Söderköping Process). Most RCPs fall rather in the middle of the spectrum, receiving varying degrees of support from one or more international organizations, namely IOM, the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) and/or the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (e.g. Bali Process, Budapest Process, Colombo Process, MTM Dialogue, MIDWA, SACM). These organizations may be considered as official or unofficial Secretariats for the RCPs they serve. Other types of secretariat arrangements also exist: for example, MIDSAs receive support jointly from IOM and the South African Migration Project (SAMP, a civil society organization focused on migration research and policy); in the case of the Abu Dhabi Dialogue the Secretariat is jointly held by the Ministry of Labour of the United Arab Emirates (the chairing government) and IOM; and for IGAD-RCP the Secretariat of IGAD acts as Secretariat, in consultation with the Commission of the African Union (AU) and IOM. Until it established a dedicated Secretariat in 2007, APC had relied on the government holding the rotating chair to provide the needed secretariat support.

Generally speaking, an RCP Secretariat (whether a dedicated Secretariat or organization acting in an official or unofficial secretariat role) takes direction from the Chair and the participating States. At a minimum, support provided by an RCP Secretariat includes providing administrative and logistical support to the RCP. In many cases it also includes providing substantive expert input and technical assistance. For instance, the Secretariat of certain RCPs plays a role in collecting data and facilitating information exchange. The Secretariat may also be tasked with helping ensure follow-up, including implementation of activities.

Some RCPs have developed “**governance**” **bodies or sub-groups**. For instance, for the Bali Process, a Steering Group monitors and implements the RCPs’ activities and initiatives; this Group is composed of representatives of the Co-Chairing governments (Australia and Indonesia), the two governments leading follow-up on specific thematic issues (Thailand and New Zealand), and two supporting international organizations (IOM and UNHCR). For the Söderköping Process, a Steering Committee made up of the government and two international organizations

responsible for launching the process (i.e. Sweden, UNHCR and IOM) plus the donor (European Commission) formulates the process' strategies and supervises the Secretariat. The Söderköping Process also has an Advisory Board composed of all members of the Steering Committee plus three of the process' ten participating governments.

Some RCPs have established **working groups organized around a migration theme or geographic sub-region**, which can contribute to ensuring regular contact among participants and consequently maintaining networks and momentum in the time that passes between the RCP's major meetings. A government is often designated to chair or lead the working group. For example, the IGC has ongoing thematic working groups on a range of issues that are chaired by different governments. Furthermore, the Bali Process has identified two countries to act as "**country coordinators**", each tasked with leading the process' follow-up on a specific migration theme.

Funding

The RCPs **each have different funding arrangements**. For example, one RCP is financed by the participating States – exclusively developed countries – in equal cash shares. Another RCP, in which both developed and developing countries participate, employs a specific formula for calculating the cash contribution that each country pays; the contribution varies by country depending on its individual financial capacity. For both of these RCPs, the participating countries also make in-kind contributions, for instance in connection with hosting meetings.

Other RCPs are also financed by a combination of cash and/or in-kind contributions by the participating States, but the cash contributions are not calculated according to any formula and some States do not make cash contributions but rather exclusively in-kind contributions. These same RCPs may or may not seek external donor funding for specific activities.

Some RCPs rely largely or entirely on external donor funding, which tends to be earmarked for a specific meeting or activity. The Söderköping Process has been a European Commission-funded project since its inception and is in the process of finding an alternative funding arrangement, which is expected to involve some contributions from the participating States (both cash and in-kind).

As discussed in more detail below, some RCPs have a comfortable level of funding vis-à-vis their desired level of dialogue and activities, while others lack sufficient funding.

Thematic focus

As can be seen in Annex III, **most RCPs deal with a variety of migration topics**. In a few RCPs, the chairing government chooses an issue to receive special emphasis during its term (e.g. Budapest Process, IGC and RCM). While sometimes perceived by outside observers as primarily focused on a control agenda, the reality of thematic focus belies this. Issues such as facilitating labour migration, human rights of migrants, migration and development, capacity building, and policy coherence are as

likely to form part of the agendas of the various RCPs as more control-oriented themes.

During the meeting, most of the participants referred to evolution in the agendas of their RCPs over time. This evolution – generally involving inclusion of additional migration issues – tended to occur in response to changing migration patterns, new migration challenges and/or the shifting interests and priorities of the participating States. One timely example raised by several participants was that their RCPs were concerned by the impact of the current global financial and economic crisis on migration policies and trends, labour market dynamics and migrants themselves, and thus were adding the crisis to their agendas.

Objectives and goals

Each RCP has unique objectives and goals that are based on the interests of the participating States and that reflect that RCP's thematic focus. IGAD-RCP and MIDWA are notable in that they looked to the migration-related positions of the AU and relevant regional economic community in defining their priorities and objectives.

One general objective common to all RCPs is to engage in constructive informal, non-binding dialogue and information exchange concerning the migration issues on their respective agendas. As discussed in more detail below, most RCPs also aim to build capacity to manage migration and some have additional goals, such as engaging in joint operational activities or eventual harmonization of migration policies within the region.

Challenges

During the introductory session and over the course of the meeting, a number of challenges faced by RCPs were identified.

Several participants mentioned the difficulty of **ensuring that the right people are present** for the RCP discussions. Ideally, the attendees should have both (i) responsibility for the issues at hand (e.g. come from the right Ministry or Ministries), and (ii) some practical experience with these issues. With respect to the latter, participants noted that the value of having someone with hands-on expertise must be balanced with a need for political will and support to the RCP, which can be lacking if there is no opportunity for participation at the political level.

It was mentioned that **some migration issues and situations can be more difficult to address in a multi-lateral setting than others**. An example given of a particularly challenging issue is significant irregular migration flows that are driven by conflicts in the region and thus surrounded by related political sensitivities. In contrast, counter-trafficking was offered as an example of an issue that tends to be relatively less politically sensitive and thus to lend itself more readily to constructive inter-state dialogue and cooperation.

A challenge faced by many RCPs is how to **avoid duplication with other fora**. This can refer to duplication of the efforts of other RCPs, for instance in a region with two RCPs that have some overlap in terms of “membership” and perhaps also topics

of discussion. Duplication of the work of regional organizations and regional trade/integration regimes that are not primarily focused on migration yet have included this topic in their agendas, as well as duplication of the work of inter-regional fora addressing migration issues, can also be concerns. In addition to avoiding potential duplications, participants also mentioned possibilities for **enhancing appropriate linkages and synergies between RCPs and other fora**. For instance, as discussed further below, some participants suggested that RCPs could help advance the migration-related aspects of broader regional and sub-regional integration efforts.

One challenge mentioned by representatives of several RCPs was how to ensure that their RCP **remains relevant, effective and practically-oriented**. This challenge could often be addressed at least to some degree through the flexible, evolving nature of RCP agendas. In addition, several RCPs had undergone or were undergoing what their representatives referred to as periods of reflection, reorientation, and/or revitalization, which included changes in priorities, objectives and/or organizational frameworks. Many participants remarked that the knowledge they had acquired during this meeting regarding the approaches, structures, experiences and lessons learned of other RCPs would assist the efforts of their own RCP to improve and evolve.

Some RCPs struggled with issues of **sustainability linked to funding challenges**. As a general rule, RCPs with developed country participants are more financially secure than those without. Representatives of RCPs that depend in whole or in part on donor funding expressed frustration with the general unwillingness of donors to fund dialogue as such, preferring instead to fund “concrete” activities. Several participants felt this overlooked the importance of RCPs as platforms for sharing information, good practices and lessons learned and the significance of the strong networks of counterparts built through RCPs. It was suggested that donors might see things differently if they better understood the value of RCPs, and participants hoped that the discussions at this meeting as well as the forthcoming study of RCPs’ impacts and outputs (described in more detail below) would be helpful to this end.

A few RCP representatives indicated that their RCP faces **sustainability challenges linked to insufficient State ownership and leadership**, which the participants generally agreed is required for an RCP to be successful. It was recognized that a Secretariat plays an important and legitimate role in providing support and continuity, particularly in the context of a rotating chair; indeed, some participants opined that their RCPs might not survive without their Secretariat. Yet having a Secretariat provide the principal driving force behind an RCP was believed to be a recipe for failure.

A few representatives identified a need for their RCP to establish **mechanisms for follow-up** on meetings and/or the RCP’s declarations and recommendations. Lack of follow-up was often, but not always, linked to a lack of financial resources.

Gaps in RCP coverage

Following the RCP introductions, it was observed that RCPs cover virtually the entire globe, with the exception of a notable **gap in the Caribbean**. The IOM Director

General informed the participants that IOM was discussing the possibility of an RCP in the Caribbean with representatives of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). In addition, other new dialogues are starting to emerge; for example, one participant mentioned that a meeting had recently taken place among States along the route from the East and Horn of Africa towards Southern Africa where considerable irregular migration was taking place, and that as a result there had been interest in starting an RCP comprised of these same States. It was recognized that the 14 RCPs invited to this meeting were the principal ones at the time of the meeting, and participants welcomed the development of other migration dialogue fora that might be considered as RCPs in the future.

Statements by observers

The observers were invited to briefly introduce themselves. The representative of the **European Commission (EC)** referred to the participation of many European Union Member States in RCPs and the EC's role as an important co-funder of many RCPs. He described the European Council's "Global Approach to Migration", which strives to address the broad migration agenda in a comprehensive and balanced way, in partnership with third countries. He said that the starting point for EU migration policy was dialogue and gave examples of migration dialogue activities and other projects. He closed with an assurance that the EC was committed to following the RCPs closely and contributing to their success.

A representative of the **United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)** followed, noting that ESCAP currently serves as the coordinator of the United Nations Regional Economic Commissions (UN-RECs), which are interested in the work of the RCPs, and represents the UN-RECs in the Global Migration Group. She assured the participants of the support of the UN family to the RCPs.

Lastly, a representative of **UNHCR** referred to the prevalence of mixed migration flows – meaning migration flows involving a variety of people moving for different reasons – and the special protection needs of the refugees and asylum seekers within those flows. He remarked that RCPs could support the international community's efforts to respond to mixed flows. He referred to UNHCR's role in several RCPs, including administrative support and expert advice. In closing, he mentioned the importance of finding mechanisms for civil society to provide input to migration discussions.

THE ROLE OF RCPs IN PROMOTING MORE EFFECTIVE MIGRATION MANAGEMENT

Following the introductions, the discussions turned to the **contributions of RCPs to more effective migration management**. Themes receiving special emphasis included the role of RCPs in facilitating inter-state cooperation on migration; building capacity to manage migration; and contributing to policy coherence at the national and regional levels.

Facilitating inter-state cooperation

Underlying the discussions was a premise noted by several participants, namely that RCPs reflected the recognition that national efforts to manage migration are most effective when supplemented with inter-state dialogue and cooperation.

Participants referred to the **role of RCPs in helping to facilitate inter-state cooperation** – both within and outside of the RCP framework – including by:

- fostering common understandings of migration realities;
- helping States identify common interests;
- building trust among participants and confidence in the feasibility of inter-state cooperation; and
- forming networks of counterparts.

These achievements were attributed in large part to the confidential, informal and non-binding nature of RCPs and the recurring interactions among RCP participants.

It was clear that the **type of inter-state cooperation sought through participation in the process depends on the RCP**. It may be limited to exchange of information on migration legislation, policy and practice and sharing of good practices and lessons learned. In the case of some RCPs, there is also an intention for the RCP to facilitate policy coordination and/or operational cooperation. Examples included the signing of a binding Memorandum of Understanding among several of the RCM's participating States setting forth administrative procedures for safe and orderly repatriation of migrants, which had led to changes in national operational procedures having positive benefits for the treatment of migrants; and the creation and financing within the RCM framework of a regional fund for the return of migrants in difficult situations (elderly persons, children, pregnant women).

Participants observed that RCPs **provide a framework that can be used to mobilize inter-state consultations when pressing migration-related issues arise**. For example, the global economic and financial crisis would be discussed at the Colombo Process' upcoming Senior Officials Meeting, and the SACM was looking at developments outside the region that have impacts for South American governments and migrants (e.g. return of South American migrants from Europe and guest worker laws in the United States of America). An RCP can also provide a framework for its participating States to collectively approach States outside of the RCP for migration dialogue and perhaps collaboration, including States in different regions. For instance, the States participating in the Colombo Process have employed it as a structure to engage with Asian countries of destination as well as with the European Union. Furthermore, one explicit goal of IGAD-RCP is for its participating States to engage in dialogue and cooperation with States in other regions.

Building capacity to manage migration

Virtually all of the participants emphasized the important **role that RCPs play in building capacity to manage migration**. Representatives of several RCPs confirmed that their RCPs have identified capacity building as a specific objective. Significantly, it was observed and generally agreed that RCPs contribute not only to building the capacity of developing countries, but also that of developed countries.

There are a number of **ways in which RCPs help build migration management capacities**. One participant remarked that in a broad sense, the increased awareness of and engagement on migration issues that results from participation in RCPs can be thought to contribute to migration management capacity at individual, institutional and multi-lateral levels.

RCPs also build capacity by facilitating the **sharing, collection and/or dissemination of migration information** (e.g. on migration legislation and policies and their implementation) **and migration data** (such as migration routes and statistics on migrant stocks, immigration, naturalization, return, asylum, etc.). Furthermore, they facilitate the **sharing of good practices and lessons learned** in migration management. While dialogue is the primary mechanism for such sharing and exchange, a number of RCPs have also developed other means, most notably through websites that are often partially or entirely restricted for use by RCP participants only.

RCPs can also provide a framework for **research to support migration management efforts**, such as analysis of data on return, asylum, readmission and exclusion; assessment of irregular migration flows in the region; regulatory frameworks for recruitment of migrant workers; and assessment of technical gaps in border management systems.

Many RCPs have held **trainings and workshops specifically aimed at building capacity** to manage migration, involving a range of topics. Through workshops or other methods of consultation, some RCPs have **developed capacity building tools**, many of which can also facilitate and support inter-state cooperation. Notable examples include:

- databases containing migration-related information (e.g. Bali Process, IGC, Söderköping Process);
- matrixes comparing national legislation on specific migration-related issues (e.g. trafficking and smuggling; asylum, enforcement, and immigration systems);
- an interactive map allowing the RCP's participants to exchange information on the migratory situation in States in that region (MTM);
- model legislation on criminalizing people smuggling and trafficking in persons (Bali Process);
- sets of good practice guidelines for (i) special protection in cases of repatriation of child victims of trafficking (RCM), (ii) the initial establishment of identity of irregular migrants (Bali Process), and (iii) voluntary return of irregular migrants (RCM);

- a training curriculum for labour attachés and overseas employment administrators (Colombo Process); and
- a checklist of issues to be addressed in the return of irregular migrants (Bali Process).

In several cases, the **adoption or pending adoption by States of new or improved national migration and/or asylum legislation** was attributed primarily to those States' participation in an RCP.

RCPs can also reach beyond the context of the RCP and its participants to **offer expertise that bolsters the capacity of other regional groups** to develop migration-related objectives and policies. For example, MIDWA held expert meetings to define a “Common Approach on Migration” for the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), which was presented to the ECOWAS Heads of State. Similarly, IGAD-RCP participants formulated policy recommendations to be considered by the IGAD States relating to the development of a protocol for free movement of persons within the region and a strategy for intra-regional labour movement of professionals and technicians. Furthermore, a representative of the SACM believed that the creation of two formal migration-related structures within the Common Market of the Southern Cone (MERCOSUR) was the direct result of the SACM process.

In addition, RCPs can provide a framework for facilitating other types of technical assistance on migration, such as donor-funded **secondments of migration experts from international organizations to Secretariats of regional economic communities** in order to help improve their capacities related to migration (as in the case of IGAD-RCP and MIDWA).

A striking example of an RCP building capacity and the impact that resulted was the reduction in human trafficking and smuggling in the Asia-Pacific region as a result of developments directly attributable to the Bali Process, including improvements in national anti-trafficking and smuggling legislative frameworks; the formulation of national action plans on counter-trafficking; and cooperation to track down and prosecute criminals.

Contributing to policy coherence

Participants also discussed the extent to which RCPs contribute to policy coherence at the national and regional levels. Differing views emerged, depending largely on which RCP the participant represented.

At the national level

There is a generally recognized need to ensure **coherence between policies on different aspects of migration**. For example, policies to control migration and policies to facilitate migration should be complementary rather than contradictory. This type of coherence can be particularly challenging where responsibility for migration rests with multiple ministries. Furthermore, it is widely thought that **migration policies should be coherent with the policies of other domains** that

address, touch on, or are affected by migration in order to prevent policies in one domain from inadvertently negatively impacting policies in other domains.⁴

Some RCPs have explored policy coherence as a specific topic of discussion and have looked at the need for a “whole of government approach” in migration policy making. In addition, **several RCPs bring together multiple ministries and government agencies** dealing with different aspects of migration and related issues (e.g. the ministries of interior, foreign affairs, labour and/or justice; and in some cases border officials, general police, etc.). While this drives a degree of interaction and coordination among these national bodies that might not otherwise occur, the extent to which this contributes to improved national level policy coherence is not easily quantified.

One participant referred to the concept of “political influence”, stating that the regular meetings and consultations taking place in his RCP help to prepare and influence political decisions at the national level on migration policy matters.

At the regional level

In certain regions, States hope to achieve harmonization or coherence in migration policies across the countries in that region. One example of this involves regional groupings that seek free or liberalized movement of people within the region, usually in connection with initiatives for regional economic integration, which in turn implies that the States in the region adopt coherent policies on intra-regional migration. Coherence may also be sought among the policies of countries in a region regarding immigration of nationals of countries outside of the region.

Some RCPs identify regional migration policy harmonization or coherence as a specific objective. Representatives of several RCPs pointed to examples where they believed that the adoption or pending adoption by many countries of a region of similar migration and/or asylum legislation could be attributed entirely or in significant part to participation in the RCP.

Of those RCPs that have or have had policy coherence as an objective, several linked it with the migration-related aspects of broader regional integration efforts and frameworks. For example, the Budapest Process and Söderköping Process both supported the efforts of their participating States to align their national migration laws, policies and practices with the European Union *acquis*. Furthermore, IGAD-RCP and MIDWA have linked their policy coherence objectives with, and helped contribute to, the migration positions and policies developed by the AU and/or relevant regional economic community.⁵

In some cases, RCPs were used as frameworks to develop a regional statement or position for presentation at a global forum; for example, MIDSAs, the SACM, the

⁴ Examples of policy domains related to migration identified by the participants include development, labour, health, environment, social welfare and education, security and trade.

⁵ Examples include the “Migration Policy Framework for Africa” and the “African Common Position on Migration and Development” adopted by the African Union (AU); and the “Common Approach on Migration” adopted by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), into which MIDWA provided input.

RCM and the Bali Process each developed contributions to the 2006 United Nations High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

It was noted **that even where policy coherence is not a specific identified goal, a degree of *de facto* policy harmonization can often be observed** as a result of the sharing of information, good practices and lessons learned that takes place in RCPs.

Several participants said that regional policy coherence is more easily achieved on some issues than on others – with counter-trafficking provided as an example of an issue for which coherence could be more easily achieved – perhaps because States tend to find it easier to identify common perspectives, objectives and priorities with respect to such issues.

MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN RCPs

Following the discussion of contributions of RCPs to more effective migration management, the discussion turned to migration and development issues.

Migration and development – a complex issue

The discussion on this topic began with **several interventions that called attention to the complexity of the links between migration and development**, including questions such as: On the whole, does migration have a positive or negative impact on development? What type of development is referred to? Development for whom – countries of origin, countries of destination, migrants themselves? Is a “win, win, win” scenario possible? How can development players become engaged on migration issues, and *vice versa*?

Several participants explained their respective **countries’ national perspectives and initiatives** on migration and development issues. For example, Mexico believed in the importance of creating opportunities for nationals at home so that migration was a matter of choice rather than necessity; Uruguay was undertaking innovative programmes to encourage members of diasporas to contribute to national development; and Switzerland sought to establish true migration partnerships with countries of origin that would benefit the governments and nationals of both countries.

Another participant spoke about a **regional initiative to establish “migration profiles”** for several countries in West Africa – funded by the EC and implemented by IOM in close collaboration with the relevant governments – which enabled ECOWAS and its constituent governments to gather data on migration flows and diasporas; this could in turn facilitate both migration policy development and the incorporation of migration considerations into poverty reduction strategies.

The place of migration and development within RCPs

Recognizing that it can be difficult for States to find common interests on migration and development issues and to identify forms of mutually-beneficial collaboration in this area – particularly where the States have different migratory profiles, needs and challenges – a few participants stated or implied that **addressing migration and development in the RCP framework could be challenging**. One participant countered this view in opining that the informal and non-binding nature of RCPs and the trust and confidence they build among States may in fact mean that they are relatively well-suited to explore this topic.

The discussions confirmed that **some RCPs have defined migration and development as a priority area; other RCPs have held discussions on this topic on a more *ad hoc* basis; and some RCPs have not yet dealt with it**. A few participants believed that their RCPs might focus more on this issue in the future. It was noted, however, that challenges to integrating migration and development into RCP agendas persist, including because of the complex nature of the migration and development linkages and because historically ministries with responsibility for development have not participated in RCPs. Furthermore, several participants expressed the view that most RCPs were not formed specifically to address migration and development, and that this topic should not artificially be forced onto the agendas of RCPs. It would be a decision for the participating States in each RCP to determine whether and when migration and development might be a priority.

In terms of activities, many RCPs have held **seminars or workshops** on migration and development-related themes. In some cases, these fell within the RCP's core work plan. In other cases, these meetings were not within the core mandate but were held in large part to prepare participating governments for, and to send a coordinated statement to, newly-established fora such as the 2006 United Nations High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development and/or the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD).

A question remains regarding the extent to which migration and development is addressed by RCPs at a practical level. Some participants pointed to **migration and development-related operational activities** undertaken in the RCP framework. For instance, the Abu Dhabi Dialogue has led to pilot projects in the form of bilateral labour arrangements to manage the full cycle of temporary labour, based on the mutual interests of labour origin and destination countries and with a particular focus on development of these countries and promotion of the welfare and well-being of workers. In another example, the MTM Dialogue has a project under its migration and development focus area to inventory national institutional capacities and practices regarding links to diaspora communities.

The relationship between capacity building, migration and development

Reflecting back on the discussions earlier in the day on the role of RCPs in capacity building, it was suggested that the need to improve capacity to manage migration could be thought of as development issue. When well-managed, migration can contribute positively to development factors such as economic and political stability and human and social security. Thus, **in contributing to building migration**

management capacities, RCP were contributing to development. Some opined that the development community's agenda should better incorporate investment in resources for migration management, including training of personnel and improvements to migration-related institutions, infrastructure and equipment.

As discussed above, many **RCPs lend support and expertise to build capacity for developing and implementing the migration-related aspects of regional integration efforts**, in particular schemes for liberalized or free movement in the region, which are viewed as key tools for regional development.

STRENGTHENING COLLABORATION AMONG RCPs, IMPROVING CROSS-FERTILIZATION AMONG THEM, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Several participants commented that this meeting had further convinced them of the value of increased interaction among RCPs, both on an individual RCP-to-RCP level and at the global level.

Circumstances in which exchange between RCPs would be most valuable

It was suggested that RCPs with **geographical composition along common migration routes** would be most interested in interacting with one another, as it was assumed that this would suit the purposes of those RCPs. It was also noted that RCPs having some degree of overlapping "membership" might have a particular interest in remaining aware of each others' discussions and activities to avoid duplication and identify synergies.

It was also suggested that RCPs could find value in exchanges on **shared migration topics**, including in cases where the common topic was not a primary focus of either or both RCPs. Exchange could take place on an *ad hoc* basis when it was of interest, for example when an RCP held a workshop on the topic. For example, in the past MDSA had invited representatives of other RCPs to certain of its thematic workshops depending on the subject matter (e.g. the Colombo Process for labour migration; the Bali Process for human trafficking; and the 5+5 Dialogue for the migration situation in the Mediterranean). A few RCPs had held joint workshops on migration issues of common interest (e.g. Bali Process/Budapest Process; IGC/Budapest Process, IGC/APC).

Furthermore, RCPs could **provide a framework for two regions to consult with one another** as specific migration situations arise that involve both regions, or on a more regular basis. One participant referred to a past situation where return policy in one region had led to tensions with another region, and suggested that the RCPs in those regions might have provided fora for the regions to address one another and explain their perspectives and concerns. In addition, the Colombo Process was put forward as an example of an RCP providing a structure for its participating States to engage in dialogue with other regions. Specifically, the Colombo Process States as such had come together for consultations with several countries of destination in Asia (resulting in the Abu Dhabi Dialogue); they had also had migration-related discussions with European Union States.

Participants gave examples of **valuable insights or ideas gained from this global gathering of RCPs**. For example, one participant said that the discussions had helped him to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the RCP he was representing. Furthermore, he had been interested to learn about the **experiences of the other RCPs regarding methods of organizing themselves, carrying out their work and achieving their goals**, and believed that these could inform the efforts of his RCP and make it stronger. In another example, a participant commented that after learning that one RCP meets at the Vice Ministerial level, he would reflect on whether meeting at such a level would be of interest to the RCP he represented.

One participant noted that in addition to RCPs, there are other regional bodies with which RCPs might be interested in interacting. Which RCPs or other bodies an RCP would choose to engage with would be a question of priorities and resources.

Methods of facilitating exchange between RCPs

A number of **means of facilitating cross-fertilization and interaction were suggested and received favourably** by the participants.

One method of exchange would be for **an RCP to invite the chairing government of another RCP and/or representatives of another RCP's Secretariat** to attend a meeting or meetings, where desirable and appropriate. It was pointed out that in some cases the participation of RCP Secretariat representatives in other RCPs' meetings already takes place on a regular or *ad hoc* basis. These Secretariat representatives act as observers, informing their own RCPs of the discussions and activities of the other RCP, and at times have been asked to provide information on their RCP's treatment of substantive migration issues and/or its organizational arrangements.

In line with these suggestions, **representatives of some RCPs expressed their intention to invite representatives of other RCPs to future meetings, and others committed to consider this** in circumstances where it could be beneficial.

In support of future exchange among RCPs at the global level, participants **agreed to hold meetings among the chairing governments and secretariats of the principal RCPs every two years**. At that time, participation could be reviewed to determine whether new RCPs have come into being that should be included.

Furthermore, participants **asked IOM to expand and make more robust the existing section of the IOM website dedicated to RCPs** (www.iom.int/rcps), maintaining its direct links to RCPs' own websites where they exist. This section of the IOM website was seen to be a valuable tool and means of sharing information among RCPs that should be capitalized upon, and it could be most useful if additional input and materials were provided by RCP representatives.

LINKS TO THE GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT (GFMD), INCLUDING IMPROVING CROSS-FERTILIZATION BETWEEN RCPs AND THE GFMD, AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GFMD

Participants were reminded by the Co-Chairs that the first two GFMD meetings in Brussels in 2007 and Manila in 2008 each held a roundtable session on regional consultations on migration, as will the third GFMD meeting to be held in Athens in November 2009. **This yearly emphasis by the GFMD on RCPs was seen as recognition of their important role** in facilitating inter-state dialogue and cooperation on migration. Participants were also provided with a list of the recommendations and proposed follow-up actions related to RCPs coming out of the first and second meetings of the GFMD.

The Co-Chairs pointed out that **this meeting was the first time that the RCPs had come together since the GFMD had been established in 2007**. Thus, it provided the first opportunity for the RCPs as a group to reflect on the current and future relationship between the GFMD and the RCPs and to provide input and feedback to the GFMD.

Participants **discussed how the work of RCPs could be properly represented at the Athens GFMD**, particularly in Roundtable 3.2 on “Regional and Inter-regional Processes and Fora”. It was **agreed that the results of this meeting should be presented at Roundtable 3.2**, given the significant development that the meeting represented in the RCP realm. Likewise, participants agreed that this Summary Report should be made available to GFMD participants.

Furthermore, participants were interested in having the **results of a study of the outputs and impacts of RCPs** – which was being undertaken by a professor at the University of Toronto with the support of IOM and funding from the MacArthur Foundation – **feed into the Roundtable 3.2 discussions**. A briefing on this study had been provided to participants on the first day of the meeting and is summarized below.

It was observed that as an informal, non-binding dialogue on migration matters outside of any institutional framework, the **GFMD is effectively modelled after RCPs**. In light of this, several participants thought that **the GFMD could learn from RCPs about good practices and lessons learned** in pursuing this type of dialogue. In particular, many RCPs could share their **experience with translating non-binding dialogue to action** at the national, bilateral and/or regional levels. “Action” in this context did not necessarily mean “projects” – in fact, some RCPs do not have an operational element. It could mean for instance the direct or indirect impacts on laws, policy or practice that result from participation in an RCP. Participants agreed that this was an appropriate topic of discussion at RT 3.2.

While several participants emphasized that RCPs provide valuable mechanisms for regional cooperation and that they do not want them to be coordinated by or subsumed into a global process, a two-way information flow between the RCPs (on the one hand) and the GFMD (on the other hand) was generally seen to be beneficial. It was noted that **RCPs could be better informed of the discussions at the GFMD**, for instance through dissemination of the Report of the GFMD proceedings. One

participant suggested that RCPs might be able to help implement certain GFMD recommendations.

Some participants noted that their RCPs had discussed the GFMD in the past, or planned to have the GFMD on the agenda of a future meeting. In a few RCPs, certain participants hoped to establish through those discussions a **common position of the participants that could be put forward at the GFMD**. In certain regions, RCPs had expressed an interest in making a political statement at the GFMD on behalf of their region to other regions, with a view to having their perspectives heard at the global level.

The Government of Greece, in its capacity as Chair of the November 2009 GFMD, provided a statement. This statement recognized that as a result of their achievements, RCPs paved the way for the creation of the GFMD. It called attention to the overarching theme for the November 2009 GFMD in Athens – “Integrating Migration Policies into Development Strategies for the Benefit of All.” Moreover, it confirmed that the Athens GFMD would offer a space for governments to discuss work and achievements in various regional fora. Lastly, it commended the convening of this meeting and welcomed its contributions to the Athens GFMD.

BRIEFING ON A STUDY OF THE RCP APPROACH

Participants were briefed on an **upcoming study of RCPs** to be undertaken by Professor Randall Hansen (University of Toronto, Canada) with the support of IOM and funding provided by the MacArthur Foundation.

Professor Hansen and research assistant Karoline Popp of IOM’s Migration Policy and Research Department explained that the **study will look at the outputs and impacts of RCPs, based primarily on each RCP’s own purposes and objectives**. Furthermore, the study will consider the extent to which RCPs more generally contribute to, and are successful in:

- creating networks of individuals involved with migration matters;
- building trust among participants and confidence in the possibilities for inter-state cooperation on migration;
- increasing understanding of migration phenomena;
- building capacity to manage migration; and
- shaping migration governance (understood as the national, regional and international policies and practices that govern migration).

Recognizing the differences in migration circumstances and challenges between the regions, as well as the unique character of each RCP, the researchers indicated that the **study was not intended to measure the RCPs against one another or to identify a “model” RCP**.

The study will involve review of RCP documentation such as Declarations, Action Plans, meeting reports, and similar texts. It will also include interviews with selected RCP stakeholders and other experts, which will be conducted on a confidential basis.

Participants showed great interest in the study and expressed their desire to have the results feed into the discussions on RCPs at the GFMD in Athens in November 2009.

CONCLUSION AND OUTCOMES

Throughout the course of the meeting, it became clear that **while each RCP is unique, they share several common characteristics**, which can be summarized as follows:

Purpose

- They were formed specifically to address migration issues;
- they facilitate dialogue on migration, primarily among States but also involving regional and/or international organizations and in some cases civil society; and
- they promote sharing of information, experience and good practices in migration management.

Operating principles

- They operate as processes outside of formal institutional frameworks;
- they are owned and led by States;
- they respect the prerogative of each sovereign nation to manage migration;
- their discussions are confidential, informal and non-binding;
- their substantive focus is flexible, according to the participating Governments' priorities; and
- they operate according to a principle of equal footing for all participating States, regardless of factors such as size, influence and wealth.

Participants clearly expressed their **conviction in the value of RCPs**. Several **key contributions of RCPs to effective migration management** were identified, as follows:

- facilitating inter-state cooperation on migration-related issues;
- building capacity to manage migration; and
- helping improve policy coherence at the national level and tending to result in deliberate or *de facto* harmonization of migration and/or asylum policies across the participating States.

Participants showed strong **interest in increasing interaction and information exchange among RCPs**. To this end, they:

- agreed that consideration should be given to inviting representatives of other RCPs to their respective RCPs' meetings in appropriate situations;

- agreed to hold meetings among the chairing governments and secretariats of the principal RCPs on a regular basis, e.g. approximately every two years; and
- agreed that the existing section of the IOM website dedicated to RCPs (www.iom.int/rcps) is a valuable tool and means of sharing information among RCPs, and asked that it be made more robust and include more information (while linking directly to RCPs' own websites where they exist).

With respect to **linkages between RCPs and the GFMD**, the participants:

- agreed that this meeting's discussions and outcomes should feed into Roundtable 3.2 of the Athens GFMD and that this Summary Report should be made available to GFMD participants;
- observed that the RCPs could share their expertise and lessons learned relating to informal, non-binding dialogue on migration at the GFMD, particularly with respect to translating dialogue to action;
- suggested that the Report of the GFMD be made available to the RCPs for their information and possible consideration; and
- expressed interest in having the upcoming study of the impacts and outputs of RCPs feed into Roundtable 3.2 of the Athens GFMD.

CLOSING STATEMENT OF THE ROYAL THAI GOVERNMENT

The meeting was closed by **Mr. Ittiporn Boonpracong, Deputy Director General of the Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Royal Thai Government**. He emphasized that only through regional cooperation and partnerships, both among governments and also involving international organizations and civil society such as NGOs and communities at large, could regular and safe migration be achieved. He hoped that the discussions at this meeting would lead to the strengthening and increased effectiveness of individual RCPs.

The Deputy Director General referenced the importance of the migration and development linkage and of keeping people at the centre of that debate. He hoped that more RCPs would explore this complex issue in the future. He ended by expressing his desire that the fruitful and constructive discussions at this meeting be further developed and expanded into productive partnerships, and assured of the Royal Thai Government's support to this end.

Annex I: Agenda



IOM International Organization for Migration

Programme

Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)

Pullman Hotel
Bangkok, Thailand
4-5 June 2009

Day 1 4 June 2009

07.30 – 8.45 hrs. Registration

09.00 – 9.30 **Welcome Addresses**
Mr. Panich Vikitsreth
Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Thailand

Mr. William Lacy Swing
Director General, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

09.30 – 9.45 **Group Photo**

09.45 – 10.00 **Coffee Break**

10:00 – 12.00 **Introduction of RCPs: Thematic
Focus/Membership/Goals/Challenges**

12.00 – 13.30 **Lunch**

13.30 – 15.00 **Introduction of RCPs, Continued**

15.00 – 15.30 **Coffee Break**

15.30 – 16.00 **“The Role of RCPs” – Briefing on IOM Assessment of the RCP
Approach**

16.00 – 17.30 **Plenary Discussion – *Promoting More Effective Migration Management***

Topics:

- RCPs and their Roles in Capacity Building, Policy Coherence and Governance
- Rationalizing Migration and Development within RCPs

17.30 – 18.00 **Wrap-up**

19.00 – 20.30 **Cocktail Reception Hosted by the Royal Thai Government**
Déjà Vu Restaurant

Day 2 5 June 2009

09.00 – 10.45 **Plenary Discussion – *Promoting More Effective Migration Management, Continued***

Topics:

- RCPs and their Roles in Capacity Building, Policy Coherence and Governance
- Rationalizing Migration and Development within RCPs

10.45 – 11.00 **Coffee Break**

11.00 – 12.30 **Plenary Discussion – *Strengthening Collaboration among RCPs, Improving Cross-Fertilization among Them, and Future Directions***

12.30 – 14.00 **Lunch**

14.00 – 15.30 **Plenary Discussion – *Links to the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) Including Improving Cross-Fertilization between RCPs and the GFMD, and Recommendations to the GFMD***

15.30 – 16.00 **Coffee Break**

16.00 – 17.00 **Concluding Remarks, Co-Chairs' Summary**



IOM International Organization for Migration

**Global Meeting of Chairs and Secretariats of
Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs)
Bangkok, Thailand, 4-5 June 2009**

Participants List

Region: Europe and the former Soviet Union

Cross Border Cooperation Process (Söderköping Process or CBCP) Le Processus de coopération transfrontalière (CBCP), aussi appelé “Processus de Söderköping” El Proceso de cooperación transfronteriza (CBCP, por sus siglas en inglés, también conocido como el “Proceso Söderköping”)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Sweden</u> Mr. Sten Ulrik Olof Åshuvud Chief of Staff Division for European and International Cooperation The Swedish Migration Board (SMB) Tel : +46 10 4855704 Fax : +46 8 209833 ulrik.ashuvud@migrationsverket.se	<u>Ukraine</u> Ms. Viktoriia Shmidt Head Division on Cooperation with International Organisations, NGOs and Human Rights Organisations Department for Refugees and Asylum State Committee on Nationalities and Religion of Ukraine Tel: +380 67 5045640 shmidt_v@ukr.net	<u>Söderköping Process Secretariat</u> Ms. Ruth Krcmar Programme Officer Kyiv, Ukraine Tel: +380 50 3807796 Fax: +380 44 2889850 rkrcmar@iom.int

Budapest Process Le Processus de Budapest El Proceso de Budapest		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Turkey</u> Mr. Melih Ulueren Minister Plenipotentiary – Deputy Director General for Migration, Asylum, Visa Ministry of Foreign Affairs Tel: +90 312 292 2056 Fax: +90 312 292 2721 mulueren@mfa.gov.tr	<u>Hungary</u> Dr. Klára Petrovics Legal Expert Department of Cooperation in Justice and Home Affairs and Migration Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement Tel: +361 4413939 Fax: +361 4413599 petrovicsk@irm.gov.hu	<u>International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)</u> Mr. Gottfried Zürcher Director General Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 504 4677 Fax: +43 1 504 4677 75 Gottfried.Zuercher@icmpd.org icmpd@icmpd.org

Region: The Americas and the Caribbean

Regional Conference on Migration (RCM or Puebla Process) La Conférence régionale sur les migrations (CRM, aussi appelée “Processus de Puebla”) La Conferencia Regional sobre Migraciones (CRM) (también conocida como el “Proceso de Puebla”)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<p><u>Guatemala</u> Dr. Estuardo Roberto Solórzano Elias Vice-Minister of Security Ministry of Interior (Viceministro de Seguridad, Ministerio de Gobernación) Tel: +502 24138667 / 24138668 Fax: +502 24138675 rsolorzano@mingob.gob.gt</p>	<p><u>Mexico</u> Mr. Rolando García Alonso Coordinator of International and Inter-Institutional Affairs National Institute of Migration (Coordinador de Relaciones Internacionales e Interinstitucionales, Instituto Nacional de Migración) Tel.: +52 55 5387 2492 Fax: +52 55 5557 9860 rgalonso@inami.gob.mx</p> <p>Mr. Alfonso Ascencio Herrera Deputy Head of Mission Embassy of Mexico , Bangkok Tel:+66 2 285 0995 Fax: +66 2 285 0667 alfonso@micanembassythailand.com</p>	<p><u>RCM Technical Secretariat</u> Mr. Jorge Peraza Breedy Coordinator San Pedro, Costa Rica Tel: +506 2221 5348 ext 124 Fax: +506 2222 0590 jperaza@iom.int</p>

South American Conference on Migration (SACM) La Conférence sud-américaine sur les migrations (SACM) La Conferencia Sudamericana sobre Migraciones (CSM)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Uruguay</u> Amb. Carlos Flanagan Director of Consular Affairs Directorate of Consular Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Director de Asuntos Consulares Dirección de Asuntos Consulares, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores) Tel: + 598 2 908 9449 carlos.flanagan@mrree.gub.uy Dgcv8@mrree.gub.uy	<u>Ecuador</u> Mr. Jacques Paúl Ramírez Gallegos Vice Secretary for Consular Services Ministry of Foreign Relations, Commerce and Integration (Subsecretario de Servicios Consulares Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio e Integración) Tel: + 299 3224-5 Fax: + 299 3226 subsercon@mmrree.gov.ec	<u>SACM Technical Secretariat / IOM</u> Dr. Eugenio Ambrosi Coordinator, SACM Technical Secretariat IOM Regional Representative Southern Cone of South America Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel: +541 4 815 5481 Fax: + 541 4 816 6323 eambrosi@iom.int MRFBuenosAires@iom.int

Region: Western Mediterranean

Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue (MTM) Le Dialogue sur la migration de transit en Méditerranée (MTM) El Diálogo sobre las Migraciones de Tránsito en el Mediterráneo (MTM)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Lebanon</u> Brigadier General Siham Harake Head of Nationality, Passports and Foreigners Bureau Directorate General of the General Security of Lebanon Tel: +961 3 750 558 Fax: +961 01 612 731 Gen.harakeh@hotmail.com		<u>International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)</u> Mr. Julien Simon Programme Manager Dialogue on Mediterranean Transit Migration (MTM) Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 504 46 77 47 Fax: +43 1 504 46 77 75 Julien.Simon@icmpd.org

Region: Africa

Migration Dialogue for West Africa (MIDWA) Le Dialogue sur la migration pour l’Afrique de l’Ouest (MIDWA) El Diálogo sobre la Migración para África Occidental (MIDWA, por sus siglas en inglés)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Niger</u> Ms. Hadiza Ali Director Ministry of African and Integration and Nigerian of Exterior (Directrice au Ministère des Nigériens de l’Extérieur) Tel: +227 2072 3258 Mobile: +227 96 59 5131 +227 94 75 4218 hsalifou2004@yahoo.fr	<u>Côte D’Ivoire</u> Ms. Christine Goore Bi Director General (Directrice Générale de la Direction Générale de la Population et du renforcement des capacités au Ministère d’Etat, Ministère du Plan et du Développement) Tel : +225 2021 1057 Fax : +225 2021 2064 yessohgoorebi@yahoo.fr	<u>IOM</u> Mr. Abye Makonnen Regional Representative, ECOWAS countries IOM Dakar-Fann, Senegal Tel: +221 33 869 6200 Fax: + 221 33 869 6233 amakonnen@iom.int

Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA)

Le Dialogue sur la migration pour l'Afrique australe (MIDSA)

El Diálogo sobre la Migración en el África Meridional (MIDSA, por sus siglas en inglés)

Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<p><u>Tanzania</u> Mr. Piniel Mgonja Commissioner Immigration Department Ministry of Home Affairs Tel: +255 2 211 8640/8645 Fax: +255 2 211 2174 pinielmgonja2008@live.com</p>		<p><u>SAMP (Southern African Migration Project)</u> Mr. Vincent Williams Project Manager IDASA (Institute for Democracy in South Africa) - SAMP Cape Town, Republic of South Africa Tel: +27 21 467 7600 Fax: +27 86 633 3136 vwilliams@idasa.org.za</p> <p><u>IOM</u> Mr. Hans-Petter Boe Regional Representative, Southern Africa Arcadia, Republic of South Africa Tel: + 27 12 342 2789 Fax: +27 12 342 0932 hpboe@iom.int cc: mpienaar@iom.int</p>

Inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Regional Consultative Process on migration (IGAD-RCP)
L’Autorité intergouvernementale pour le développement (IGAD) Le Processus consultatif régional de l’IGAD pour la migration (IGAD-RCP)
El Proceso Consultivo Regional sobre Migración IGAD (Autoridad Intergubernamental para el Desarrollo) (RCP IGAD)

Government	Government	Secretariat / other
		<p><u>Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Secretariat</u> Ms. Lily Sanya Technical Advisor on Migration to IGAD Djibouti, Djibouti lsanya@iom.int</p> <p><u>IOM</u> Mr. Charles Kwenin Head of Office IOM Special Liaison Mission Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Tel: +251 11 550 4028 Fax: +251 11 515 4119 ckwenin@iom.int</p>

Region: Asia and Oceania

Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime (Bali Process) Le Processus de Bali sur le trafic de migrants, la traite des êtres humains et la criminalité internationale qui s'y rapporte (Processus de Bali) La Conferencia sobre el contrabando y la trata de personas y el crimen transnacional conexo (Proceso de Bali)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<p><u>Indonesia</u> Mr. Desra Percaya Director Directorate of Security and Disarmament Department of Foreign Affairs Tel: +62 2 1 384 9350</p> <p><u>Australia</u> Mr. Peter Hughes Deputy Secretary Migration, Refugee, Citizenship and Compliance Group Department of Immigration and Citizenship Tel: +61 2 6264 1234 Fax: +61 2 6264 2670 peter.hughes@immi.gov.au</p> <p>Mr. Richard Rodgers Executive Officer People Smuggling, Refugees and Immigration Section International Organisations and Legal Division Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Tel: +61 2 6261 9067 Fax: +61 2 6261 2272 richard.rodgers@dfat.gov.au</p> <p>Ms. Irene Pellegrino Executive Officer, Bali Process International Cooperation Branch Department of Immigration and Citizenship Tel: +61 2 6264 3469 irene.pellegrino@immi.gov.au</p>	<p><u>New Zealand</u> Mr. Peter Rider Director United Nations, Human Rights and Commonwealth Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade Tel: +64 4 439 8106 Fax: +644 439 8517 Peter.rider@mfat.govt.nz</p> <p><u>Thailand</u> Dr. Chatchom Akapin Senior Expert State Attorney International Affairs Division 3 International Affairs Department Office of the Attorney General Tel: +66 (02) 515 4669 c_akapin@hotmail.com</p>	<p><u>IOM</u> Mr. Lance Bonneau Senior Regional Programme Development Officer Canberra, Australia Tel: + 61 2 62 67 66 00 lbonneau@iom.int</p>

Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants (APC) Les Consultations intergouvernementales Asie-Pacifique sur les réfugiés, les personnes déplacées et les migrants (APC) Las Consultas intergubernamentales de Asia y el Pacífico sobre refugiados, desplazados y migrantes (APC, por sus siglas en inglés)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Samoa</u> Mr. Fata Uili Kapeteni Assistant Chief Executive Officer Corporate Service Department Ministry of Prime Minister and Cabinet Tel: +685 22922 Fax: +685 21339 ukap@lesamoa.net		(APC Secretariat not available)

Ministerial Consultation on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin in Asia (Colombo Process)
La Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'oeuvre contractuelle pour les pays d'origine en Asie (Processus de Colombo)
Las Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen en Asia (Proceso de Colombo)

Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<p><u>Indonesia Delegation</u> Dr. Arifien Habibie Senior Advisor of the Coordinating Minister for Economic Affairs Tel: +62 21 352 1942 Fax: +62 21 352 1946 arifien@ekon.go.id</p> <p>Ms. Iga Mai Sukariyati Head Bureau for Public Relation and Conference Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs Tel: +62 21 352 1835 Fax: +62 21 351 1643 sukariyati@ekon.go.id, igams@cbn.net.id</p> <p>Ms. Roostiawati Deputy Director of International Cooperation Directorate Overseas Manpower Placement Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration Tel: +62 21 525 0992 Fax: +62 21 529 2045 roostiawati@nakertrans.go.id</p>	<p><u>Indonesia Delegation</u> Andre Omer Siregar Head of International Financial Institution Section Directorate for Economic Development & Environment Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia Tel: +62 21 384 8626 Fax: +62 21 385 7315 Aosny04@yahoo.com</p> <p>Agnes Okvanni Staff of Development Cooperation of Section Directorate for Economic Development & Environment Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia Tel: +62 21 384 8626 Fax: +62 21 385 7315 Anges_okvanni@yahoo.com</p>	<p><u>IOM</u> Mr. William Barriga Head, Labour and Facilitated Migration Division, Migration Management Services Department Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 717 9401 Fax: +41 22 798 6150 wbarriga@iom.int</p>

Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin and Destination in Asia (Abu Dhabi Dialogue)

La Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'oeuvre contractuelle intéressant les pays d'origine et de destination en Asie (Dialogue d'Abou Dhabi)

Las Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen y destino en Asia (Diálogo de Abu Dhabi)

Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<p><u>Indonesia</u> Dr. Arifien Habibie Senior Advisor of the Coordinating Minister for Economic Affairs Tel: +62 21 352 1942 Fax: +62 21 352 1946 arifien@ekon.go.id</p> <p>Ms. Iga Mai Sukariyati Head Bureau for Public Relation and Conference Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs Tel: +62 21 352 1835 Fax: +62 21 351 1643 sukariyati@ekon.go.id, igams@cbn.net.id</p> <p>Ms. Roostiawati Deputy Director of International Cooperation Directorate Overseas Manpower Placement Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration. Tel: +62 21 525 0992 Fax: +62 21 529 2045 roostiawati@nakertrans.go.id</p>		<p><u>IOM</u> Ms. Michele Klein Solomon Director Migration Policy and Research Department Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 717 9438 Fax: +41 22 798 6150 mkleinsolomon@iom.int</p>

Like-minded States (not organized geographically):

Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) Les Consultations intergouvernementales sur les politiques concernant l'asile, les réfugiés et la migration (IGC) Las Consultas Intergubernamentales sobre Asilo, Refugiados y Políticas de Migración (IGC, por sus siglas en inglés)		
Government	Government	Secretariat / other
<u>Switzerland</u> Mr. Eduard Gnesa Director Federal Office for Migration Federal Department of Justice and Police Tel: +417 9218 7961 eduard.gnesa@bfm.admin.ch		(IGC Secretariat not available)

Observers:

<p>Australia (funder of this meeting and of several RCPs)</p>	<p>Mr. John Matthews Minister-Counsellor (Immigration) Department of Immigration and Citizenship Australian Permanent Mission to the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 799 9115 Fax:+ 41 22 799 9175 John.matthews@dfat.gov.au</p>	<p>Ms. Armaity Isaacs Desk Officer People Smuggling, Refugees and Immigration Section International Organisations and Legal Division Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Tel: +61 2 6261 3280 Fax:+ 61 2 6261 2272 armaity.isaacs@dfat.gov.au</p>
<p>European Commission (EC) (funder of several RCPs)</p>	<p>H.E. Mr. Eckart Guth Ambassador Head of the Permanent Delegation of the European Commission to International Organizations in Geneva, Switzerland Tel : +41 22 918 22 77 Fax : +41 22 734 22 36 Eckart.guth@ec.europa.eu</p> <p>Mr. Nuno Caldeira da Silva Political Counsellor Delegation of the European Commission Bangkok, Thailand Tel: +66 2 3052641 Fax: +66 2 2559113</p>	<p>Mr. Jean-François Cautain Political Counsellor Head of Political Section Delegation of the European Commission Bangkok, Thailand Tel: +66 2 3052641 Fax: +66 2 2559113 Jean-francois.cautain@ec.europa.eu</p>

<p>United States of America Department of State Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) (funder of this meeting and several RCPs)</p>	<p>Mr. Adam Zerbinopoulos Deputy Refugee Coordinator Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration U.S. Embassy Bangkok, Thailand Tel: +66 2 205 4865 Zerbinopoulosa@state.gov</p>	<p>Ms. Christy Milliken Assistant Refugee Coordinator Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration U.S. Embassy Bangkok, Thailand Tel: +66 2 205 4865 christy.milliken@gmail.com</p>
<p>Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD): 2009 Hosting Government of Greece</p>	<p>Mr. George Partheniou Counsellor Embassy of Greece Bangkok, Thailand</p>	
<p>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</p>	<p>Mr. Thomas Vargas Head UNHCR Regional Protection Hub for the Asia-Pacific Bangkok, Thailand Tel: +662 288 1986 Fax: +662 280 0555 vargasth@unhcr.org</p>	

**Expert,
RCP Research Study**

Prof. Randall Hansen
Associate Professor & Canada Research Chair in
Political Science
Acting Director, Centre for European, Russian
and Eurasian Studies
Munk Centre
University of Toronto, Canada
Tel: +1 416 978 4160
Fax: +1 416 978 8915
r.hansen@utoronto.ca

Thailand
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
(Hosts of this meeting)

Mr. Panich Vikitsreth
Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Sri Ayutthaya Rd., Bangkok, Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000

Mr. Ittiporn Boonpracong
Deputy Director General
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Sri Ayutthaya Rd., Bangkok, Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000

Mr. Puttaporn Ewtoksan
Counsellor
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2202
Email: puttaporne@mfa.go.th

Ms. Piyaporn Putanapan
Third Secretary
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2243
Email: piyapornp@mfa.go.th

Mr. Nattachai Powcharoen
Attache
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2210
Email: nattachaip@mfa.go.th

Mr. Norachit Sinhaseni
Deputy Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Sri Ayutthaya Rd., Bangkok, Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000

Mr. Nadhavathna Krishnamra
Director
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2200
Email: nadhavathnak@mfa.go.th

Ms. Krongkwan Traitongyoo
Second Secretary
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2221
Email: krongkwant@mfa.go.th

Mr. Sarun Haetanurak
Third Secretary
Social Division, Department of International
Organisations, MFA, Bangkok Thailand
Tel: +66 2 643 5000 ext. 2207
Email: sarunh@mfa.go.th

**International Organization for Migration
(IOM)**

Mr. William Lacy Swing
Director-General
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 717 9383
Fax: +41 22 798 6150
wswing@iom.int

Ms. Michele Klein Solomon
Director
Migration Policy and Research Department
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 717 9438
Fax: +41 22 798 6150
mkleinsolomon@iom.int

Mr. Lance Bonneau
Senior Regional Programme Development
Officer
Canberra, Australia
lbonneau@iom.int

Ms. Karoline Popp
Associate Migration Policy Officer
Migration Policy and Research Department
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: + 41 22 717 9402
Fax: + 41 22 798 6150
kpopp@iom.int

Ms. Irena Vojackova-Sollorano
Regional Representative for Southeast Asia
IOM Regional Office for Southeast Asia
Bangkok, Thailand
Tel : +662 343 9301
Fax : +662 286 0630
Vojackova-Sollorano@iom.int

Mr. Federico Soda
Regional Programme Development Officer
IOM Regional Office for Southeast Asia
Bangkok, Thailand
Tel : +662 343 9331
Fax : +662 286 0630
fsoda@iom.int

Ms. Cynthia Bryant
Migration Policy Officer
Migration Policy and Research Department
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: + 41 22 717 9511
Fax: + 41 22 798 6150
cbryant@iom.int

* Other IOM staff members participating in their capacities as supporters of RCPs are listed above with the relevant RCP.

Interpreters	Mr. Jean-Pierre Allain Mr. Luigi Luccarelli Ms. Jenny Collier Ms. Margaux Zerbato Conference Interpreters Asia Pacific Consultant Interpreter Mobile : +66 8 1833 2513 E-mail : allain@ciap.net
---------------------	---

Annex III:

Overview of Principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration (RCPs), arranged by Regionⁱ

(As of April 2009)ⁱⁱ

N.B. The following information has been compiled and updated thanks to the assistance of the RCP secretariats where they exist and/or staff of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) involved in supporting the RCPs. As an overview, by its nature it is not intended to be exhaustive. However, it would benefit from additional input and further review in order to make it more complete and accurate. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and encouraged, and should be sent to Karoline Popp at IOM (by e-mail to kpoppp@iom.int or by fax to +41 22 798 61 50), to be incorporated into future versions.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Region: Europe and the Former Soviet Union / Europe et ex-Union soviétique / Europa y la ex Unión Soviética :						
<p>Söderköping Process or CBCP (Cross Border Cooperation Process)</p> <p>Processus de Söderköping ou CBCP (Processus de coopération transfrontalière)</p> <p>Proceso Söderköping o CBCP (Proceso de cooperación transfronteriza)</p>	2001	Belarus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine (Total: 10)	<p>European Commission (EC), International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Swedish Migration Board (SMB).</p> <p>There are no official observers, though other governments and the EU Presidency participate in various activities of the Process on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis.</p> <p>The Process cooperates on a regular basis with the Finnish Ministry of Interior, UK Home Office, European Network of Asylum Reception Organizations (ENARO) and Odysseus Academic Network.</p> <p>Researchers and NGOs are invited to take part on occasion, and governments recently explored further involvement of NGOs in the Process. In 2007 a regional NGO network was established.</p>	Cross-Border Cooperation Process (CBCP) Secretariat, staffed by UNHCR and IOM.	The Söderköping Process was launched in 2001 by the Swedish Migration Board, UNHCR and IOM to promote dialogue on asylum and irregular migration issues. Since 2004, the Process has focused on transferring experiences, best practices and lessons learned of seven recently acceded EU Member States to Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine in aligning their migration and asylum related legislation, policies and practices with the EU Acquis and international standards.	<p>The objective of the Söderköping Process is to support Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine to strengthen their migration and border management as well as refugee protection capacity through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) strengthening asylum systems; 2) facilitating a structured open dialogue between involved migration authorities and EU member states in the interests of creating a regional network for managing migration and asylum; 3) building government capacity in the region to manage migration; 4) transferring of experience of recently acceded EU Members on adapting to the EU migration Acquis and international standards; 5) enhancing information sharing mechanisms between Governments on migration statistics and trends, policy developments, legislation etc.; and 6) supporting migration research in the region. <p>The Söderköping Process is currently funded by the EU (UNHCR is the contracting agency, with IOM and the SMB as implementing partners). Based on the strong support and interest of all participating Governments for the Process to continue beyond the current implementation phase ending in June 2009, UNHCR, IOM and SMB have proposed a Strategy for the Future of the Process, which foresees the transition into a government-led Process with rotating chairmanship and stronger involvement of the National Coordinators. The Strategy has been endorsed by all ten participating governments.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p><i>Budapest Process</i></p> <p><i>Processus de Budapest</i></p> <p><i>Proceso de Budapest</i></p>	1991	<p>Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (FYR), Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom and Uzbekistan</p> <p>(Total: 49)</p> <p>Chair: Turkey Co-Chair: Hungary</p>	<p>Australia, Canada and the USA</p> <p>EC, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC), IOM, UNHCR, UNODC, Council of Europe, Centre for International Crime Prevention (UN-CICP), SECI Centre, INTERPOL, Regional Centre of the Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative (MARRI), International Labour Office (ILO), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Executive Committee, Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organisation (BSEC), Europol and FRONTEX</p>	<p>Hosted by ICMPD</p>	<p>The Budapest Process is an inter-governmental dialogue engaging close to 50 Governments and more than 10 international organisations, aiming at developing comprehensive and sustainable systems for orderly migration. It provides for information sharing, exchange of experience and discussion on relevant topics.</p> <p>On the basis of recommendations from Ministerial Conferences (1991 Berlin, 1993 Budapest, 1997 Prague and 2003 Rhodes) topics of common concern are identified by the senior officials meeting (annual or bi-annual) as well as geographic and thematic priorities. The Secretariat organises working group meetings on identified topics.</p> <p>The following thematic and geographic working groups are currently active:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group on Irregular Movements and Asylum, chaired by the Czech Republic • Working Group on Immigration and Admission Policies, chaired by Hungary, co-chaired by Slovakia • Working Group on the Development of Migration Management Systems, chaired by Bulgaria • Working Group on Irregular Transit Migration through the South East European Region, chaired by Croatia • Working Group on Return and Readmission chaired by Poland, co-chaired by the UK • Working Group on the Black Sea Region, chaired by Bulgaria • Working group on the Approximation of Penalty Scales for smuggling of migrants and trafficking of human beings, chaired by Belgium 	<p>The fourth Ministerial Conference (Rhodes, 2003) emphasized a more comprehensive approach in promoting migration co-operation between countries of origin, transit and destination - especially with the CIS countries (Commonwealth of Independent States). This shift in focus was implemented through the 2005 project "Re-direction of the Budapest Process towards the CIS region" which included in the consultative framework of the Process the twelve countries Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.</p> <p>Since Turkey took over the Chair in 2006, the emphasis has been on continuity and bringing in broadened ideas with regard to the areas examined. These include, in addition to the traditional areas of interest for the Budapest Process (return and readmission, border management and asylum), an increased focus on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • managing labour migration • integration policies • re-integration • how to maximise the development impact of migration <p>The broadening of the thematic focus of the Budapest Process was confirmed in a senior officials meeting in Trabzon, Turkey, in May 2008.</p> <p>It is furthermore expected the results of the Ministerial Conference "Building Migration Partnerships" organised by the Czech Republic during its EU presidency will have an important impact on the work of the Budapest Process. Topics include "Return and Readmission", "Fight against illegal migration", "Legal migration", "Integration", and "Migration and Development".</p> <p>The geographical focus of activities will remain the CIS region, however at the Senior Officials meeting in Trabzon a discussion started to expand the scope of interest of the Budapest Process to include the Black Sea Region and countries of origin and transit relevant for the migration routes in Black Sea region.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Region: Americas and Caribbean / Amériques et Caraïbes / América y el Caribe:						
<p><i>Puebla Process</i> (Regional Conference on Migration (RCM))</p> <p><i>Processus de Puebla</i> (Conférence régionale sur les migrations (CRM))</p> <p><i>Proceso de Puebla</i> (Conferencia Regional sobre Migraciones (CRM))</p>	1996	<p>Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and the USA (Total: 11)</p> <p>Current Presidency Pro-Tempore: Guatemala</p>	<p>Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Peru.</p> <p>Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), IOM, UNHCR, Central American Integration System (SICA), Inter-American Commission for Human Rights (ICHR), Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB), UNHCR, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants.</p> <p>The Regional Network for Civil Organizations on Migration (RNCOM) is a coalition of civil society organizations (CSOs) from all 11 RCM member States. It is neither a member of nor an observer to the RCM but participates in many aspects of the RCM including seminars, workshops, and conferences.</p>	<p>RCM Technical Secretariat (TS)</p> <p>IOM provides the TS with technical cooperation and administrative support.</p>	<p>Three main areas of discussion: migration policy and management; human rights of migrants; and migration and development.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) study the possibility of establishing links with other cooperation processes in the area of migration and development; 2) social development policies linked to migration processes; 3) enhance border cooperation; 4) promote better understanding of the regional migration phenomenon through a long term comprehensive approach; 5) guidelines for the return of unaccompanied migrant minors; 6) migration and health activities; 7) strengthen respect for the human rights of migrants regardless of status with special attention to vulnerable groups such as women and children; 8) ensure international protection of refugees; 9) cooperation in the return and reintegration of repatriated migrants; 10) cooperation to combat migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons; 11) share best practices in the facilitation of remittance flows; 12) undertake activities in the area of "Integration and Insertion of Migrants".
<p><i>SACM</i> (South American Conference on Migration)</p> <p><i>SACM</i> (Conférence sud-américaine sur les migrations)</p> <p><i>CSM</i> (Conferencia Sudamericana sobre Migraciones)</p>	1999	<p>Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay and Venezuela (Total: 12)</p> <p>Current Presidency Pro-Tempore: Uruguay</p> <p>(Presidency Pro-Tempore alternates every year between sub-regions, i.e. Southern Cone and Andean)</p>	<p>Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland and the USA</p> <p>Andean Community of Nations (CAN), ECLAC, ILO, IOM, Latin American Economic System, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UNHCR, groups affiliated with the Catholic Church or defending human rights.</p>	<p>IOM serves as the Technical Secretariat, providing technical cooperation and logistical support.</p>	<p>Governments hold meetings to share views and information on topics including development, diasporas, rights of migrants, integration, information exchange, migration statistics and trafficking and smuggling.</p> <p>Depending on needs, a technical preparatory meeting for the Annual Conference takes place two or three months before the Conference.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) respect for human rights of migrants regardless of their status (rejection of the criminalization of irregular status); 2) view the issue of migration in relation to development; 3) strengthen dialogue and political coordination among States; 4) value contributions made by migrants to development in destination countries both in labour and production; 5) value contributions of migrants to the welfare and cultural enrichment of host societies; 6) promote representatives from civil society to help in the formulation, implementation and supervision of programmes on migration matters.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Region: Western Mediterranean / Méditerranée occidentale / Mediterráneo Occidental						
<p>5 + 5 Dialogue (Regional Ministerial Conference on Migration in the Western Mediterranean)</p> <p><i>Dialogue 5+5 (Conférence ministérielle régionale sur la migration en Europe occidentale)</i></p> <p><i>Diálogo 5 + 5 (Conferencia Ministerial del Mediterráneo Occidental sobre Migración)</i></p>	2002	<p>Algeria, France, Italy, Libya, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Portugal, Spain and Tunisia (Total: 10)</p> <p>Current President: transitioning from Portugal to Libya</p>	IOM, ILO and ICMPD	<p>No official secretariat</p> <p>In the past, IOM has provided technical cooperation and logistical support whenever requested by the relevant Presidency.</p>	<p>Informal dialogue in which governments cooperate and exchange information and analysis on topics such as migration trends; irregular migration and trafficking in human beings; migration and co-development (the role of diaspora); migrants' rights and obligations; integration; movement of people and regular migration flow management; labour migration and vocational training; migration and health; local cooperation; and gender equality in the context of migration.</p>	<p>2008 Evora/Portugal Conference highlighted the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) importance of the need to try to establish a coherent and complementary strategy with other regional and international fora; 2) need to facilitate legal mobility for labour purposes; 3) request for the introduction of measures aiming at improving migration impact in development of the countries of origin; 4) need to establish integration models grounded on the principles of promoting and respecting fundamental rights. <p>Pursuant to the recommendations adopted at the Evora Conference, Portugal and Tunisia jointly-organized an expert workshop on circular migration held in Tunis in February 2009.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p>MTM (Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue)</p> <p>MTM (Dialogue sur la migration de transit en Méditerranée)</p> <p>MTM (Diálogo sobre las Migraciones de Tránsito en el Mediterráneo)</p>	2003	<p>Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia otherwise referred to as the Arab Partner States (APS); the 27 EU Member States; and Norway, Switzerland and Turkey, called European Partner States (EPS) (Total: 37)</p> <p>New Partner States for specific activities: Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal</p>	<p>The MTM Dialogue is currently in its fourth phase, entitled "A Dialogue in Action".</p> <p>Partners on ongoing projects being implemented within the framework of the MTM Dialogue include Caritas, Europol, Frontex, Interpol, IOM, UNHCR, and UNODC.</p> <p>Observers are Australia, Community of Sahel and Saharan States (CEN-SAD), Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), Eurojust, General Secretariat of the European Council, IGC, IOM, International Organisation for Peace, Care and Relief (IOPCR), League of Arab States, MARRI, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UNESCWA).</p>	Hosted by ICMPD	<p>Four Phases:</p> <p>2002-2003: Exploratory Phase 2004-2005: Consolidation Phase 2006-2008: Project Phase 2009-ongoing: A Dialogue In Action</p> <p>The aim of the fourth phase is to implement capacity-building and operational projects encompassing a dialogue component to facilitate dissemination of results at regional level and provide a solid platform to discuss and build-up spin-off projects.</p> <p>The MTM Dialogue is organised along two pillars: <i>Pillar I</i> aims at enhancing operational co-operation to combat irregular migration. Areas of discussion are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interception and apprehension of irregular migrants; - combating smuggling and trafficking, including the protection of victims; - reception and detention of irregular migrants; - asylum and refugee protection; as well as - return and readmission. <p><i>Pillar II</i> addresses medium and long-term issues such as the root causes of irregular flows. Areas of discussion are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the mapping of remittances and development in countries of origin; - deepening links with diasporas to foster development; and - labour and circular migration. <p>Through ICMPD, the MTM participates in conferences such as the 5+5 Dialogue, the Rabat Process, the AU-EU Tripoli Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, et al. The orientation and action plans of these major events are subsequently reflected in MTM activities.</p>	<p>Under Pillar I, a national project on <i>Strengthening Reception and Detention Capacities of Lebanon (STREDECA)</i> is implemented in partnership with Caritas and UNHCR.</p> <p>In line with the jointly endorsed Arab and European Partner States Working Document on the Management of Mixed Migration Flows (2008), the conclusions of the MTM Project Closing Conference held in Geneva in January 2008, Pillar II of the MTM Dialogue – migration and development – is a key target of the MTM’s strategic planning for the short to medium term. Under Pillar II, ICMPD and IOM are currently implementing the project <i>Links to Emigrant Communities – Inventory of National Institutional Capacities and Practices</i>.</p> <p>With regard to cross-pillar activities, the current priority is to deepen knowledge and understanding of irregular migration in the broader Mediterranean region, including its evolution and impact on the Partner States. In this respect, ICMPD, in partnership with Europol, Frontex, INTERPOL, UNHCR and UNODC, is implementing a project consisting in developing and maintaining an <i>Interactive map on irregular migration routes and flows in Africa, the Middle East and the Mediterranean region (MTM i-Map)</i>.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Region: Africa / Afrique / África						
<p>MIDWA (Migration Dialogue for West Africa)</p> <p>MIDWA (Dialogue sur la migration pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest)</p> <p>MIDWA (Diálogo sobre la Migración para África Occidental)</p>	2000	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo (Total: 15)	France and Switzerland. Conseil des Organisations Non Gouvernementales d'Appui au Développement (CONGAD), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), International Labour Office (ILO), IOM, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Organisation of African Unity (OAU), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA), UNAIDS, UNHCR, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and World Food Programme (WFP)	No official secretariat Based on the Memorandum of Understanding between IOM and ECOWAS signed in July 2002, IOM provides support to capacity-building activities targeting both ECOWAS institutions and Member States.	In December 2000, in cooperation with IOM, the ECOWAS inaugurated a regional consultative process with the major aim of accelerating the regional integration process and addressing problematic migration issues in regional fora. The MIDWA process was specifically designed to encourage the ECOWAS Member States to discuss common migration issues and concerns in a regional context for which immediate solutions may not be forthcoming on a national level. MIDWA addresses five key areas: 1) promotion of peace and stability in West Africa and protection of migrant's rights; 2) contribution of men and women migrants to the development of their country of origin; 3) alleviating poverty in emigration areas; 4) information, sensitization and research into the different aspects of West African international migration; and 5) intra-regional and inter-regional co-operation.	On January 18, 2008 ECOWAS adopted a Common Approach on Migration, which should serve as the general framework for MIDWA initiatives. It identifies six key areas: 1) free movement of persons within the ECOWAS zone; 2) management of regular migration; 3) combating human trafficking; 4) harmonizing policies; 5) protection of the rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees; and 6) recognizing the gender dimension of migration. ECOWAS Department of Free Movement is currently coordinating the implementation of the ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p>MIDSA (Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa)</p> <p>MIDSA (Dialogue sur la migration pour l'Afrique australe)</p> <p>MIDSA (Diálogo sobre la Migración en el África Meridional)</p>	2000	Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. (Total: 16)	<p>Partners: Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) and IOM</p> <p>Observers: Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat, SADC Parliamentary Forum, Immigration and Labour, the African Union (AU) Commission, interested diplomatic missions and relevant UN agencies such as UNHCR, UNDP and WHO (depending on the themes of the workshop)</p> <p>Academics, humanitarian NGOs, legal advocacy groups, faith-based organizations and regional associations are invited to its workshops on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis.</p>	<p>No official secretariat</p> <p>IOM provides support in consultation with SAMP.</p>	<p>MIDSA focuses on 7 main themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) irregular migration; 2) migration and development; 3) migration and health; 4) capacity building in migration management; 5) forced migration; 6) labour migration; and 7) migration policies, legislation & data collection. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) counter-trafficking/smuggling; 2) migration management/capacity building; and 3) migration and development.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p>IGAD-RCP (Inter-governmental Authority on Development - Regional Consultative Process on Migration)</p> <p>IGAD-RCP (Processus consultatif régional de l'Autorité intergouvernementale pour le développement pour la migration)</p> <p>RCP IGAD (Proceso Consultivo Regional sobre Migración IGAD (Autoridad Intergubernamental para el Desarrollo))</p>	2008	<p>Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda (i.e. IGAD Member States) (Total: 6)</p> <p>(Eritrea temporarily suspended its membership)</p>	<p>African Union (AU) Commission, IOM and the members of the IGAD Partners Forum (Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK, USA, EC, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank), and other partners, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transit countries: Chad, Egypt, Libya, Niger, Tunisia and Yemen. • other Regional Economic Communities (RECs) including ECOWAS, EAC, SADC, ECCAS, CENSAD. • relevant NGOs, UN Agencies and IGOs on <i>ad hoc</i> basis (depending on the themes of the Consultations) 	IGAD Secretariat in collaboration with the AU Commission and IOM	<p>IGAD-RCP aims to facilitate dialogue and regional co-operation in migration management amongst IGAD Member States by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) fostering greater understanding and policy coherence in migration; 2) strengthening regional institutional and technical capacities to implement the Migration Policy Framework for Africa; and 3) improving inter-state and intra-regional cooperation on migration management among countries of origin, transit and destination. <p>14 priority areas identified by experts which the IGAD-RCP will be responsible for are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) migration and development, 2) labour migration, 3) social integration of migrants, 4) protection of migrants' rights, 5) smuggling and trafficking in persons, 6) migration data and research, 7) migration and health, 8) migration and trade, 9) migration and environment, 10) migration and security, 11) voluntary return of migrants, 12) mixed migratory flows and protection of refugees, 13) movement of pastoralist communities, and 14) brain drain and unethical recruitment. 	<p>In addition to the establishment of mechanisms for continuous dialogue and co-operation among IGAD Member States on migration and related issues, the identified priority areas include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) technical cooperation and capacity building; 2) information collection, dissemination and sharing; 3) enhance dialogue and cooperation between the IGAD Member States and countries of other regions; and 4) progress toward formulation and harmonization at the national and IGAD level of legislation, policies and practices in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o legal/labour migration management; o irregular migration, trafficking and smuggling, o border management; and o migration and development matters.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Region: Asia and Oceania / Asie et Océanie / Asia y Oceanía						
<p>Bali Process (Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime)</p> <p>Processus de Bali (Processus de Bali sur le trafic de migrants, la traite des êtres humains et la criminalité internationale qui s'y rapporte)</p> <p>Proceso de Bali (Conferencia sobre el contrabando y la trata de personas y el crimen transnacional conexo)</p>	2002	<p>Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, DPR of Korea, Fiji, Hong Kong SAR*, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Laos PDR, Macau SAR*, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Caledonia (France), New Zealand, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Vanuatu, Viet Nam</p> <p>(Total: 41 + Hong Kong SAR and Macau SAR)</p> <p>* Special Administrative Region of China</p> <p>Co-Chairs: Australia and Indonesia</p> <p>Thematic coordinators: (i) Policy Issues and Legal Frameworks: New Zealand; (ii) Policy Issues and Law Enforcement: Thailand</p> <p>IOM and UNHCR have participant status.</p>	<p>Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and the USA; Asian Development Bank (ADB), APC Secretariat, EC, ICMPD, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), IGC Secretariat, ILO, INTERPOL, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and World Bank</p>	<p>Monitoring and implementation of related activities and initiatives of the Process are guided by a steering group composed of the governments of Australia, Indonesia, New Zealand, Thailand as well as IOM and UNHCR.</p>	<p>The following were the specific objectives agreed to by the Member Country Ministers at the two Ministerial Conferences and reaffirmed at the third Ministerial Conference held in April 2009:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development of more effective information and intelligence sharing; 2) improved cooperation among regional law enforcement agencies to deter/ combat people smuggling and trafficking networks; 3) enhanced cooperation on border and visa systems to detect and prevent illegal movements; 4) increased public awareness in order to discourage these activities and warn those susceptible; 5) enhanced effectiveness of return as a strategy to deter people smuggling and trafficking; 6) cooperation in verifying the identity and nationality of illegal migrants and trafficking victims; 7) the enactment of national legislation to criminalize people smuggling and trafficking in persons; 8) provision of appropriate protection and assistance to the victims of trafficking, particularly women and children; 9) enhanced focus on tackling the root causes of illegal migration; 10) assisting countries to adopt best practices in asylum management, in accordance with the principles of the Refugee Convention. 	<p>The current thematic priorities remain the strengthening of regional policy and law enforcement cooperation to combat trafficking and smuggling in all its forms, including maritime ventures, which put the lives of those being smuggled or trafficked at very considerable risk. At the most recent Ministerial Conference, ministers noted that people smuggling and trafficking in persons was only one side of the multi-dimensional aspects of migration and that these forms of irregular migration had to be viewed in the bigger context of migration and development. Noting the persistence of current situations concerning the irregular movement of people in the Asia-Pacific region, it was agreed that the Ad Hoc Group (AHG) mechanisms used during the establishment of the Bali Process be retasked to develop regional responses. These groups would seek to address comprehensively particular situations on a case-by-case basis upon the request of affected countries.</p> <p>It was also recognized that improving the availability of comprehensive and sustainable solutions for refugees might reduce the pressure for onward secondary movement and thereby complement the international community's efforts comprehensively to combat people smuggling, trafficking in persons and related transnational crime.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p>APC (Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants)</p> <p>APC (Consultations intergouvernementales Asie-Pacifique sur les réfugiés, les personnes déplacées et les migrants)</p> <p>APC (Consultas intergubernamentales de Asia y el Pacifico sobre refugiados, desplazados y migrantes)</p>	1996	<p>Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Fiji, Hong Kong SAR*, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Laos, Macau SAR*, Malaysia, Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, New Caledonia (France), New Zealand (until 2003), Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu and Viet Nam (Total: 32 + Hong Kong SAR and Macau SAR)</p> <p>*Special Administrative Region of China</p> <p>Current Chair: Samoa</p>	<p>IOM, UNHCR, Pacific Immigration Directors' Conference (PIDC) Secretariat</p> <p>(The United Nations Inter-agency Project on Human Trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (UNIAP) participated in the 8th Plenary of the APC in 2003 based on the agreement of that plenary)</p>	<p>A permanent Secretariat established in January 2007 offers operational and administrative support to the Coordinator appointed by the Chair.</p>	<p>APC was established in 1996 to provide a forum for the discussion of issues relating to population movements, including refugees, displaced or trafficked persons and migrants. Its aim is to promote dialogue and explore opportunities for greater regional cooperation.</p>	<p>Recent APC activities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a sub-regional workshop on the implementation of refugee legislation in the Pacific (20-21 November 2008); 2) a regional workshop on refugee status determination (10 March 2009).

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p><i>Colombo Process</i> (Ministerial Consultation on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin in Asia)</p> <p><i>Processus de Colombo</i> (Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'œuvre contractuelle pour les pays d'origine en Asie)</p> <p><i>Proceso de Colombo</i> (Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen en Asia)</p>	2003	<p>Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam (Total: 11)</p> <p>Current Chair: Indonesia</p>	<p>The 2003 Ministerial Consultations had no observers. In 2004, the only observer was Afghanistan (which subsequently officially joined the grouping in 2005).</p> <p>In 2005, the following countries were invited as observers: Bahrain, Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Several organizations were also invited as observers: Asian Development Bank (ADB); Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); Department for International Development UK (DFID); EC; Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC); ILO; United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the World Bank</p>	<p>IOM provides technical support to the process since its inception in 2003 and serves as its Secretariat.</p>	<p>The Colombo Process has three thematic foci:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Protection of and Provision of Services to Overseas Temporary Contractual Workers</i>. In particular, protecting these workers from abusive practices in recruitment and employment, and providing them appropriate services in terms of pre-departure information and orientation and welfare provisions; 2) <i>Optimizing Benefits of Organized Labour Mobility</i>. This includes the development of new overseas employment markets, increasing remittance flows through formal channels and enhancing the development impact of remittances; and 3) <i>Capacity Building, Data Collection and Inter-State Cooperation</i>. This includes institutional capacity building and information exchange to meet labour mobility challenges; increasing cooperation with destination countries in the protection of overseas temporary contractual workers and access to labour markets; and enhancing cooperation among countries of origin. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) share experiences, lessons learned and best practices on overseas employment programmes; 2) consult on issues faced by overseas temporary contractual workers, countries of origin and destination, and propose practical solutions for the well being of vulnerable overseas temporary contractual workers; 3) optimize development benefits from organized overseas employment, and enhance dialogue with countries of destination; and 4) review and monitor the implementation of the recommendations and identify further steps for action. <p>The Ministerial Consultations in Bali in 2005 set forth action-oriented recommendations in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) welfare of overseas workers and support services, and (ii) optimizing the benefits of organized overseas employment and cooperation on managed labour mobility between countries of origin and destination. <p>Pursuant to these recommendations and with funding from the European Commission's AENEAS programme, the Colombo Process has undertaken activities in three broad areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) working with governments and private institutions to enhance national capacity – for instance, introducing a labour market research unit in each Colombo Process country to monitor manpower requirements in major countries of destination in order to meet demand with matching skills – and to establish linkages among countries to better facilitate legal labour mobility; (ii) disseminating information to potential overseas temporary contractual workers regarding legal labour opportunities and procedures and the risks of irregular mobility in order to ensure that these potential workers make informed decisions; and (iii) fostering regional cooperation efforts among major Asian labour source countries and with major countries of destination in promoting legal labour mobility channels and opportunities and thus reducing irregular movements.

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
<p><i>Abu Dhabi Dialogue</i> (Ministerial Consultations on Overseas Employment and Contractual Labour for Countries of Origin and Destination in Asia)</p> <p><i>Dialogue d'Abou Dhabi</i> (Consultation ministérielle sur l'emploi outremer et la main-d'œuvre contractuelle intéressant les pays d'origine et de destination en Asie)</p> <p><i>Diálogo de Abu Dhabi</i> (Consultas ministeriales sobre empleo en ultramar y mano de obra para trabajos por contrata para países de origen y destino en Asia)</p>	2008	<p>11 Colombo Process countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam)</p> <p>9 Asian destination countries (Bahrain, Kuwait, Malaysia, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, United Arab Emirates and Yemen)</p> <p>(Total: 20)</p> <p>Current Chair: United Arab Emirates</p>	France, Germany, Japan, US, Mauritius, Republic of Korea, Poland and EC	<p>Joint Secretariat provided by the Ministry of Labour of the State of the United Arab Emirates and IOM.</p> <p>IOM provides support at technical and expert level.</p>	<p>The concrete output of the Abu Dhabi Dialogue is the Abu Dhabi Declaration, which defines a new collaborative approach, forward-looking and action-oriented, to better address issues of temporary contractual labour mobility and to optimize its benefits for the development of both countries of origin and destination as well as the workers themselves.</p> <p>Participating States identified the following four key partnerships through which they wish to foster information sharing, promote capacity building, technical cooperation and interstate cooperation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>enhancing</i> knowledge in the areas of: labour market trends, skills profiles, temporary contractual workers and remittances policies and flows and their interplay with development in the region; 2) <i>building capacity</i> for effective matching of labour demand and supply; 3) preventing illegal recruitment practices and <i>promoting</i> welfare and protection measures for contractual workers, supportive of their well being and preventing their exploitation at origin and destination; and 4) developing a <i>framework</i> for a comprehensive approach to managing the entire cycle of temporary contractual mobility that fosters the mutual interests of countries of origin and destination. 	<p>Identification of the roles and responsibilities of all actors (governmental and private) at each stage of the contractual work cycle (from recruitment to preparation to movement to work in a host country to return and reintegration) to ensure safe, protected and beneficial labour mobility.</p> <p>Elaboration of concrete projects activities ("practical outcomes" and related plan of action) to give realize these partnerships.</p> <p>Elaboration of a regional multilateral framework on temporary contractual labour mobility.</p> <p>The ministerial consultation is intended to take place every two years, the next one being in 2010.</p>

RCP	Year	Governments	Observers, Partners	Secretariat	Main Areas of Discussion	Current Priorities
Like-minded States / Etats de même sensibilité / Estados afines						
<p>IGC (Inter-Governmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees)</p> <p>IGC (Consultations intergouvernementales sur les politiques concernant l’asile, les réfugiés et la migration)</p> <p>IGC (Consultas Intergubernamentales sobre Asilo, Refugiados y Políticas de Migración)</p>	1985	<p>Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and the USA</p> <p>(Total: 17)</p> <p>Current Chair: Switzerland</p>	IOM, UNHCR and EC	IGC Secretariat	<p>The major focus of discussions in the IGC from 1985-1992 was asylum; from 1992 the focus shifted to enforcement: inter alia, return, smuggling, and technology.</p> <p>In 2001, the IGC held its first meeting on immigration and since has also focused on specific aspects of immigration and integration, including security and migration, legal and illegal migration, labour migration, and circular migration.</p>	<p>Since 2005, following a strategic review, IGC has three core activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) asylum/refugees; 2) admission, control and enforcement; and 3) immigration and integration. <p>There is a growing emphasis in IGC States on immigration and integration following a reduction in asylum numbers and the rising importance of these other topics.</p> <p>IGC currently has standing working groups on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Asylum/Refugees, (ii) Immigration, (iii) Integration, and (iv) Admission, Control and Enforcement <p>with crosscutting working groups on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (v) Technology and (vi) Country of Origin Information. <p>Another crosscutting working group on Data meets on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis, as required.</p> <p>Each Chair identifies a theme for the duration of its year-long Chair and holds a specific workshop on it; Ireland identified “Designing Effective Immigration Systems” as its theme for 2006/2007, which reflects the growing interest among IGC States in immigration/integration issues. Sweden’s theme for its Chair (2007/2008) was “Circular Migration”, and the theme of current Chair Switzerland (2008/2009) is “Skilled Labour Migration: Opportunities for National and International Cooperation”.</p>

ⁱ One RCP covered in this matrix is not organized geographically and thus appears at the end of this matrix. Although not included in this matrix, other regional groups on migration exist, of various types. Examples include the Cluster Process, the MARRI (Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative) Regional Forum, the Central American Commission of Migration Directors - Comisión Centroamericana de Directores de Migración (OCAM), the Pacific Immigration Directors Conference (PIDC) and the Joint Consultations on Migration (JCMs). This matrix is based on a matrix prepared by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Global Commission for International Migration (GCIM) in connection with a joint IOM-GCIM workshop on Regional Consultative Processes on Migration, held in Geneva from 14-15 April 2005. It has been updated by IOM for the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Brussels on 9-11 July 2007, for the GFMD in Manila on 27-30 October 2008, and for IOM’s Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (SCPF) session on 11-12 May 2009, based on the IOM Member States’ decision to discuss IOM’s role in supporting RCPs at this session.

ⁱⁱ Reflects minor corrections made in July 2009 and October 2009.