

**Global or International Governance for Migration?
Building up Co-operation and Enhancing Multilateralism from Regional to Global Level**
Frédérique Channac¹ Sciences Po Bordeaux and University Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV
GARNET Working Paper: No 19/07
June 2007

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the application of a distinction introduced by Brühl and Rittberger (2001) between *international* and *global* governance to the recent evolutions and trends in international migration management at the regional and global levels. The main thesis is that the governance for international migration is today at the cusp of two eras: *international* governance remains embryonic, fledgling, whereas *global* governance is still at the stage of a mere concept. Thus, *international* governance as much as *global* governance remains to be defined, and that explains the oscillation and hesitations, even sometimes the conflicts and tensions, among the proponents of each of these two different types of governance. Therefore, this paper proposes an analysis of recent developments at the regional and global levels. Even if the choice between the two types of governance is still not definitively settled, these recent initiatives promoting cooperation and multilateralism do not, for the moment, suggest a trend towards a “deceased salience of States” in favour of an “increased involvement of non-state actors” in multilateral decision-making processes. As a concluding part, this paper also develops some suggestions as regards the role and influence of the European Union in this debate.

Keywords: International governance, Global governance, Regionalisation, Multilateralism, International migration

Address for correspondence
f.channac@sciencespobordeaux.fr

¹ Frédérique Channac is a PhD Student at Sciences Po Bordeaux and University Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV. This paper was written during a Research Mobility at UNU-CRIS, with the support of the GARNET programme, and was presented at the GARNET Workshop “*Theoretical Issues on the EU, UN, Global Governance and Political Multilateralism*” (UNU-CRIS and ULB, 21-22 September 2006, Bruges), GARNET (JERP 5.2.3).

In their collective study on global governance and the United Nations system, Volker Rittberger et Tanja Brühl argue that today governance, at the global level, must address three challenges – a revolution of information and communication technologies; an accelerated process of globalization; and the end of the Cold War and bipolarisation – leading to “serious governance gaps”: the system of international governance which prevailed until now not being able to resolve efficiently these deficits, the shift towards a system of global governance seems thus unavoidable (Rittberger, 2001: ix-x).

In this context, the authors introduce a distinction between a *global* and an *international* governance: the *international* governance is “the output of a non-hierarchical network of interlocking international (mostly, but not exclusively, governmental) institutions which regulate the behaviour of states and other international actors in different issue areas of world politics”, whereas the *global* governance is “the output of a non-hierarchical network of international and transnational institutions” in which “not only IGOs and international regimes are regulating actors’ behaviour”. Furthermore, global governance “is characterized by the decreased salience of states and the increased involvement of non-state actors in norm- and rule-setting processes and compliance monitoring”. In addition, a multi-level dimension characterizes global governance, “meaning that governance takes place not only at the national and international level [...], but also at the subnational, regional, and local levels”.

Thus, “whereas, in international governance, the addressees and the makers of norms and rules are states and other intergovernmental institutions, non-state actors (in addition to states and intergovernmental institutions) are both the addressees and the makers of norms and rules in global governance” (Brühl, Rittberger, 2001: 2-3).

Hence, following this approach, two conclusions can be drawn: first, regional actors can have some influence or some leverage on the decision-making processes at the global level, and, for instance, on the modalities and orientation of political multilateralism at the global level; and second, an opportunity could have arisen for a new kind of multilateralism, not restricted to intergovernmental actors, but widened and extended to other actors, besides States and the intergovernmental organizations

Nevertheless, as regards international migration, the report seems much less clear-cut, and, currently, at the cusp of two eras, one seems rather to oscillate between, on the one hand, a

persistence, or a remanence, of *international* governance, and, on the other hand, *global* governance – whose actors, modalities and aims remain to be defined.

Doubtlessly, these oscillations and hesitations are largely due to the very nature of international migration. As an inherently and intrinsically cross-border, transnational phenomenon, indeed accelerated and altered by the general process of globalization, international migration rank high on the international agenda since the end of the Cold War and the fall of Iron and Bamboo curtains. Accordingly, they are actually well connected with the three categories of challenges identified by Brühl and Rittberger as facing international governance today. For all that, until now, migration management has remained essentially in the realm of state sovereignty, and migration policies have mainly been determined unilaterally or bilaterally.

Only recently, during the last decade, did States really become aware of the necessity to develop intergovernmental cooperation for a more effective management of international migration, but also begin to set up policies acknowledging the complex and multi-dimensional aspects of migration and their linkages with other political areas such as security, development, health or environment. This revived awareness derives mainly from the increase and the diversification in international migration routes; all States being henceforth concerned by migration, that they are countries of origin, transit and destination (United Nations, 2002, 2006; IOM, 2000).

This belated consciousness also partially explains why the ambits of international organizations have not been strictly defined, hence giving way to overlaps over competences and mandates, fragmentation of initiatives, and duplications in efforts and programs, all these shortcomings characterizing the current international system for international migration (GCIM, 2005).

Thus, among the studies of multilateralism and global governance, international migration epitomize an extreme case, bringing together governmental actors setting great store by their sovereignty and having only a recent experience of intergovernmental cooperation in this area; intergovernmental institutions whose mandates and programmes overlap and duplicate, none of which covering migration issues in an exhaustive and comprehensive manner and every one of which trying to ascertain one's legitimacy; and trans-national civil actors more varied but also more organized and more responsive than previously to changes, alterations and adaptations in migration policies.

Thus, as regards migration – with the exception of the international system for refugees –, *international* governance remains embryonic, fledgling, whereas *global* governance is still at the stage of a mere concept. *International* governance as much as *global* governance remains to be defined: even if the final goal is common – maximizing the positive effects of international migration while minimizing their negative effects –, that explains this oscillation and these hesitations, even sometimes the conflicts and tensions, among the proponents of each of these two different types of governance.

Therefore, this paper proposes an analysis of recent developments indicating that the governance for international migration is still at an elaboration stage. Nonetheless, even if the choice between the two types of governance is still not definitively settled, recent initiatives promoting cooperation and multilateralism in this domain do not, for the moment, suggest a trend towards a “deceased salience of States” in favour of an “increased involvement of non-state actors” in multilateral decision-making processes. Conversely, the unfolding scheme seems rather pertaining to a trend towards the clarification and consolidation of the role of States in international migration management, with a tentative, faltering and controlled opening in the participation of non governmental actors.

Beyond the mere question of the enlargement of participation in decision-making and implementation processes to other actors, enhancing governance also implies redefining the linkages between various decision levels – national, regional and global. Hence, elements of this multilevel governance should be considered, horizontally –i.e. interregional initiatives, the decompartmentalization of national institutions and policy-making processes, or the interagency cooperation at the global level–, and vertically –i.e. linkages between actors, policies and programmes from the global to national level.

First, recent global initiatives enhancing this trend towards a new governance for international migration will be presented. Then, we’ll explain how this global debate on governance is fed and fostered by the concomitant development of regional intergovernmental multilateral processes. Finally, the role and influence of the European Union in this debate will be discussed.

1. POLITICAL CONTEXT AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES: AN INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM IN WANT OF UNITY AND COORDINATION.

The appearance of migration as a high priority issue on the international agenda corresponded to a renewal of the debate around the legitimacy and capacity of multilateral international institutions to efficiently address the new issues raised by international migration. The international system set up at the end of the Second World War is indeed a fragmented system that, if it answered the political context and needs of the past, does not seem any more capable of responding to the States' expectations – or at least of certain States' expectations. Nonetheless, at the global level, the current debate on governance remains hindered, and the capacities of reform or reorganization of international institutions impeded, by these former institutional arrangements. At the same time, during the last twenty years, consultative processes, aiming at promoting and strengthening intergovernmental cooperation developed in practically all the regions of the world.

A myriad of international organizations exercises competence in the field of the international migration. They are, among others, the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Refugees (UNHCR), the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Human Rights (UNHCHR), the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), or even the World Health Organisation (WHO), the United Nations Education, Science and the Communication Organisation (UNESCO), or still the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The genesis of these institutions or the extension of their programmes in the field of international migration cannot be disconnected from the international events of the second half of the 20th century. Over this period, to every evolution of the international context entailing a change in international migration issues, corresponded an alteration in the definition and the aims of political multilateralism and intergovernmental cooperation for international migration².

Most of these intergovernmental agencies and programmes develop only sector-based activities in the field of international migration³. At the global level, only two institutions have a mandate really

² See: CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Vers une gouvernance globale des migrations internationales? Genèse et évolution des institutions et de la coopération intergouvernementales dans le domaine des migrations internationales*, Thèse pour le Doctorat de Sciences Politiques et Relations internationales, Sciences Po Bordeaux & Université Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV (forthcoming).

³ Since its creation, the ILO has been playing a crucial role even if its activities are focused mostly on economic migrants. See: MARRUS, Michael R., *The Unwanted. European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1985; SIMPSON, John Hope, Sir, *The Refugee Problem. Report of a Survey*, London, Oxford University Press, issued under auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939; THOMPSON, Dorothy, *Refugees: Anarchy or Organization?*, New York, Random House, 1938. Some important ILO standards are directly and

centred and focused on international migration: in the United Nations system, the UNHCR for the protection of the refugees and forced movements, and, outside the UN system, the IOM for the management and transportation of the labour migration. The mandates of these two organisations and the nature and the orientation of their programmes are different, even if a certain competition – even sometimes a latent hostility – always existed between these two institutions, notably as regards the organization of the transportation of refugees and the offers for resettlement opportunities, and this is linked to the political context prevailing at the time of their creation⁴.

In an attempt to tackle this fragmentation and this lack of unity, some trends of internal reforms have been implemented latterly as well as experiences of coordination between international agencies.

First, at the internal level, every institution has engaged in an evaluation process of their programs, political decision-making processes and orientations. For instance, since its creation in 1951, the IOM changed twice its name and amended once its constitution ; these changes reflecting an evolution in its approach to migration policy, but also an important extension of its membership and programmes⁵. Since its creation, but especially from the 1980s, the UNHCR also launched internal reforms⁶, and, today, its programs do not only cover refugees and asylum-seekers, but also, in certain cases, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other categories of persons forced to move⁷. Finally, the ILO also reassessed and reconsidered its programmes concerning economic migration⁸.

specifically pertaining to migrant workers : Convention n°97, Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949; Recommendation n°86, Migration for Employment Recommendation (Revised), 1949; Convention n°118, Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962; Convention n°143, Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975; Recommendation n°151, Migrant Workers Recommendation, 1975; Convention n°157, Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention, 1982; Recommendation n°167, Maintenance of Social Security Rights Recommendation, 1983. Furthermore, other relevant ILO standards, even if they are not specific to migrant workers, also contribute to develop their rights. See: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/index.htm>.

⁴ See: STOESSINGER, John George, *The Refugee and the World Community*, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1956; PROUDFOOT, Malcolm J., *European Refugees: 1939-1952. A Study in Forced Population Movement*, London, Faber and Faber, 1957; VERNANT, Jacques, *The Refugee in the Post-War World*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.

⁵ DUCASSE-ROGIER, Marianne, *The International Organization for Migration, 1951-2001*, Geneva, IOM, 2001.

⁶ LOESCHER, Gil, *The UNHCR and World Politics. A Perilous Path*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001.

⁷ From now on, the stateless persons are not any more included in the category of “Other people of concern”, which also reflects this evolution of the programmes and orientations of the organisation. Also, the share of refugees among the total persons of concern for UNHCR is declining, concurring to engaging the UN institution in new programmes, as explained in the 2005 statistical report of the UNHCR: “The recent years [...] have witnessed a gradual downward trend in the number of refugees worldwide while simultaneously seeing an upward trend in the overall population of concern. As a consequence, the proportion of refugees among the total population of concern started to decline, reaching its lowest level at the end of 2005 with only four out of ten persons being refugees. While in absolute and relative terms still the largest group under the Office’s mandate, the current trend indicates that in future possibly only three (or less) out of ten persons will be a refugee. This scenario looks particularly likely, taking into account the expectation that UNHCR’s involvement with internally displaced persons will expand in the coming years.” UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, *2005 Global Refugee Trends. Statistical Overview of Populations of Refugees, Asylum-Seekers, Internally Displaced Persons, and Other Persons of Concern to UNHCR*, Field Information and Coordination Support Section, Division of Operational Services, UNHCR Geneva, 9 June 2006, p.3.

⁸ In 2004, the International Labour Conference led a General Discussion on Migrant Workers. This discussion

Furthermore, more recently, experiences of coordination between international organisations and programmes were developed. Two examples are particularly interesting: the Geneva Migration Group – renamed recently the Global Migration Group – and the International Programme for Migration Policy Development (IMP).

In early 2006, the Global Migration Group succeeded to a first initiative of inter-agency coordination, the Geneva Migration Group, which, since April 2003, regularly gathered the Heads of international institutions interested in migration issues and being based in Geneva. The Global Migration Group increases the number of participating agencies. According to its Terms of Reference⁹, the GMG “aims to promote the wider application of all relevant international and regional instruments and norms relating to migration, and the provision of more coherent and stronger leadership to improve the overall effectiveness of the United Nations and the international community's policy and operational response to the opportunities and challenges presented by international migration”. Several paragraphs in these Terms of Reference point to the concrete aim to enhance coordination between existing international institutions, toward the establishment of a more coherent and rational system: “Establishing a comprehensive and coherent approach in the overall institutional response to international migration” or even “Exchanging information and expertise to improve understanding, inter-agency cooperation and collaboration, to promote synergies and avoid duplication”. Other points relate to the dialogue and interactions between international institutions, and concern explicitly the issues of governance at the international level: “Providing direction and leadership in a system-wide context and promoting interest, dialogue and debate on migration-related issues, including trade and development aspects, with governments, employers’ and workers’ organizations and civil society”; “Enhancing the efforts of individual states, regional bodies, regional and global consultative processes” and “Finding appropriate mechanisms to interact with states”. All these aims and purposes finally points to enhancing and promoting a dialogue towards the definition of a global – or an international – governance for

resulted in the adoption of a “Resolution concerning a fair deal for migrant workers in a global economy”. In particular, this resolution calls upon the ILO to carry out a Plan of Action and to develop partnerships with other organisations. The main point of the Action Plan of the ILO consists in developing “a non-binding multilateral framework for a rights-based approach to labour migration which takes account of labour market needs, proposing guidelines and principles for policies based on best practices and international standards”. See: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION, ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration, TMMFLM/2005/1(Rev.), Geneva, ILO, 2005; INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, Resolution concerning a fair deal for migrant workers in a global economy, ILC92-PR22-269-En.doc, 2004; INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, 92nd Session, 2004, *Report VI: Towards a fair deal for migrant workers in the global economy, Sixth item on the agenda*, Geneva, ILO, 2004. As a starting point of this debate inside the ILO, see: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, 1999, *Migrant Workers*, International Labour Conference, 87th Session (1999), Geneva, ILO.

⁹ See, for instance: <http://www.oit.org/public/english/bureau/exrel/partners/gmg.htm>; and <http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cmw/GMG.htm>.

migration, while attempting to articulate and co-ordinate fragmented, disparate and sometimes conflicting elements of the actual system.

The second global initiative is a concrete experience of inter-agency coordination. Created in 1998, the IMP is indeed “a sustained inter-agency activity for training, capacity building and government co-operation, [which] relies on the expertise and input from all global and regional institutions dealing with migration, forced displacement, population, development and related matters, including UNITAR, IOM, UNFPA, ILO, UNHCR, OHCHR, OCHA, UNAIDS, UNICEF, ED, AU, IGC, ICMPD, ICRC, RCMRI, ECLAC, CARICOM, ACP, SAMP and other regional organisations and expert groups”¹⁰. Obviously, the IMP’s main purpose is to promote the development of structures for dialogue between States and to enhance multilateral cooperation and, finally, a multi-level approach to migration management¹¹. It aims at developing the capacities of the national governments so that the inter-state dialogue and the multilateral cooperation should be more effective and efficient at the regional level but also at the global level. This capacity-building approach can be considered as part of a more comprehensive incremental approach, as the strengthening of national capacities and resources is conceived as a first necessary stage before engaging any kind of dialogue on an international governance for international migration. Following this logic, the development of multilateralism at the regional level is not a one-way process because it is, basically, promoted by the international institutions backing up the IMP, and the intensification or strengthening of States’ capacities at national and regional levels been seen as reinforcing or re-invigorating multilateralism at the global level.

To conclude on these experiences, it seems that there is an acceleration or an escalation in the creation of structures dedicated to the strengthening of the coordination between existing international cooperation structures. Unsurprisingly, this acceleration is concomitant with the dialogue, at the global level, on the intergovernmental cooperation for the migration – i.e. on the definition of an international, or a global, governance for international migration¹².

¹⁰ See <http://www.impprog.ch>. Four international organisations initiated the IMP : UNITAR, ILO, IOM and UNFPA.

¹¹ The IMP’s goals are “(1) to strengthen the capacity of senior government officials in developing and transition countries to assess migration and forced displacement issues *at national and regional levels*, and to *foster regional and inter-regional dialogue and co-operation among States* sharing common migration and forced displacement challenges; (2) through a comprehensive multi-disciplinary approach, to promote a better understanding of *global and regional migration and forced displacement policies and issues* [...]; (3) to facilitate the expression of distinct national and regional migration perspectives, and *support new models of informal dialogue and co-operation among countries of origin, transit and destination by promoting the interface between senior government officials from different regions.*” [our emphasizes] See: <http://www.impprog.ch>.

¹² During 50 years, no major institutional development, and then, during the last ten years, a multitude of initiatives: the IMP from 1998; the Berne Initiative in 2001; the Geneva Migration Group in 2003; the GCIM in 2004; the Global Migration Group and the Migration Facility in 2006.

2. A CONCOMITANT PROCESS OF REGIONALIZATION.

If the attempts of coordination and rationalization of institutional institutions and networks multiply at the global level, they are also one of the main feature of the evolution of intergovernmental cooperation and multilateralism at the regional level. The governance for international migration does not only build on initiatives at the global level, but a similar dialogue on the governance of migration is gradually set up at the regional level, which also arise the same bulk of questions regarding the nature of this regional governance and multilateralism and of the actors involved.

The various Regional Consultative Processes for Migration (RCPs) around the world seem to be largely inspired by former regional informal cooperation processes between European countries and other industrial immigration countries, processes which developed in Europe from the mid-1980s. By the exportation and the replication of this particular model of informal and non-binding multilateralism, a convergence in the nature of intergovernmental cooperation and governance at the regional level seems to get organized gradually. Indeed, far from being a factor of institutional fragmentation, this regionalization of intergovernmental cooperation – which derives from strategies of exportation and/or importation of these models of regional multilateralism –, can also be analyzed as a first stage towards the promotion of a global dialogue on governance – international or global – for migration.

The purpose of this part is to show how a convergence in the structures of intergovernmental cooperation takes place at the regional level, and how the duplication of this particular model of multilateralism could have some consequences on the definition of an international governance for international migration.

i. Development and definition of the RCPs.

The first RCMP was created in Europe in the 1980s¹³. Then, from the end of 1990s, these processes have multiplied in various regions of the world, not at all questioning the existence and the utility of classic structures of multilateral intergovernmental cooperation. Among others, let us quote, for instance, for Africa, the MIDSA (*Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa, 2000*) and the MIDWA (*Migration Dialogue for West Africa, 2001*); for central and oriental Asia; the *Bali Conference*

¹³ See: WIDGREN, Jonas, 1993, *The Informal Consultations, 1985-1992*, unpublished paper. See also, for a more detailed analysis: CHANNAC, Frédérique, “Between Regionalization and Globalization. Multi-level Governance and Structuralization of an International Migration Regime”, SGIR Conference, The Hague 2004, in SÖDERBAUM, F. BØÅS, M., VAN LANGENHOVE, L. and BULL, B. “States, Regions and Regional World Orders”.

(2002), the *Manila Process* (1996) or the *Issik-Kul Dialogue* (2000); for North America, Latin America and the Caribbean islands, the *South American Conference on Migration (Lima Process, 1999)*, the *Regional Conference on Migration (Puebla Process, 1996)* or the *Seminar for the Caribbean Region*; and, for Europe, the *IGC (Intergovernmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugee and Migration Policies in Europe, North America and Australia, 1985)* and the *Budapest Process (1991-93)*¹⁴.

Even if all these processes have some peculiar characteristics depending on different regional contexts and on the conditions determining their creation, they all share some essential common characteristics which allow to gather them under the generic name of regional consultative processes for the migrations (RCMPs). According to A. Klekowski von Koppenfels, three main characteristics distinguish the RCMPs from classic regional or international institutions: “(1) informality – they are a process, not an institution, meaning that working toward an eventual goal is an important aspect of the process; (2) openness – as agreement on all issues is not required, all options can be explored openly, thus increasing the number of possible solutions to issues; (3) efficiency – as there is a minimum administration, direct communication is more easily possible between high level officials and experts in regional consultative processes.”¹⁵

What lessons do we draw, in turn, of the development of the RCPs as regards the debate on governance for migration at the global level?

First, the fact that the processes open the dialogue exclusively to States seems to indicate that they rather work towards the establishment of an international – and not a global, as defined by Rittberger and Brühl – governance. They facilitate the identification, the capacity-building, the gathering and networking of governmental actors who will then participate more easily in a more constructive dialogue on governance for migration at the global level. In this framework, NGOs are

¹⁴ For a synthetic overview of RCPs around the world, see: KLEIN SOLOMON, Michele, *International Migration Management through Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms. Focus on Regional Consultative Processes on Migration*, IOM's International Dialogue on Migration and the Berne Initiative, Migration Policy, Research and Communications, International Organization for Migration, Paper prepared for United Nations Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development (6 to 8 July 2005).

¹⁵ See: KLEKOWSKI VON KOPPENFELDS, Amanda, *The role of Regional Consultative Processes in Managing International Migration*, IOM Migration Research Series, n°3, IOM, Geneva, 2001, p.9. For a discussion and an analysis of this definition, see: THOUEZ, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Regional Consultative Processes for Migration: An Evaluation Based on IMP's Work*, New York: United Nations Population Fund, June 2005; CHANNAC, Frédérique, “Vers une politique publique internationale des migrations? Réseaux politiques et processus de transfert de modèles”, in *Revue Française de Sciences Politiques*, vol.56(3), juin 2006, p.393-408; THOUEZ, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, “Shaping International Migration Policy: The Role of Regional Consultative Processes”, in GUIRAUDON, Virginie, LAHAV, Gallya, *Who Makes Immigration Policy? Comparative Perspectives in a post-9/11 World*, Special issue, *West European Politics*, vol.29(2):362-379, March 2006.

not integrated into these regional processes, or, at least, they do not participate in decision-making processes. They remain confined, at best, in a consultative role, outside the real decision-making arenas.

Second, the functioning of RCPs entails the inclusion of new governmental actors in multilateral institutions, because they enhance a ‘decompartmentalization’ of policy making processes at the local and national levels and promote intra-governmental cooperation. Alongside this regionalisation, the very nature of diplomacy and of the actors of multilateralism evolve : the multilateral dialogue isn’t restricted to – or mainly directed by – ministries of foreign affairs’ officials, but multilateralism is also opened to representatives of other ministries, such as Home affairs or Labour. This trend implies a diversification of the actors participating in these multilateral forums, not by allowing civil society’s actors to increase their participation, but rather by opening towards new governmental actors¹⁶. In this respect, if this trend of regionalization is indeed a stage towards the governance of the international migration at the global level, then it appears to lean towards an *international* governance rather than towards a *global* governance.

Finally, this regionalization and the diversification in governmental actors it entails also lead to an evolution in the political priorities and in the comprehension and treatment of migration issues. In fact, the order of the priorities and the issues tackled change according to the type of multilateral institution and to the nature of States’ representation within these institutions ; and the approaches of international migration issues seem to vary greatly between the global international organisations and regional consultative processes. The nature of multilateralism and the identity of the actors of

¹⁶ Between 1970 and 2000, at the meetings of the IOM Council and the Executive Committee, governmental delegations were composed of 70-95% of officials from Foreign Affairs ministries, mostly from Permanent Office in Geneva ; at the UNHCR Executive Committee, Foreign Affairs officials represented 70-80% of the governmental officials. Alternatively, 60 to 70% of participants in the Budapest Process are Home Affairs officials, and Foreign Affairs officials represent only 10-20% of the participants. For a detailed study of governmental representation in international organisations and consultative regional processes, see: CHANNAC, Frédérique, “Circulation des idées, circulation des personnes”, GERRI’s First Annual Seminar in International Relations, *La Circulation Internationale des Idées*, Sciences Po Bordeaux, April 26, 2004; THOUZET, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Regional Consultative Processes for Migration: An Evaluation Based on IMP’s Work*, New York: United Nations Population Fund, June 2005, Annexes. At least for international migration, these analysis seem to confirm those of Anne-Marie Slaughter: “Stop imagining the international system as a system of states – unitary entities like billiard balls or black boxes – subject to rules created by international institutions that are apart from, “above” these states. Start thinking about a world of governments, with all the different institutions that perform the basic functions of governments – legislation, adjudication, implementation – interacting both with each other domestically and also with their foreign and supranational counterparts. States still exist in this world; indeed, they are crucial actors. But they are “disaggregated.” They relate to each other not only through the Foreign Office, but also through regulatory, judicial, and legislative channels.” SLAUGHTER, Anne-Marie, *A New World Order*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2004, p.5.

this multilateralism seem then to have some consequences on the definition and the tendencies of intergovernmental cooperation¹⁷.

ii. Transfer of a model of cooperation: partnership for migration management vs. negotiation for a governance for migration.

If RCPs appeared in every regions, was it on the basis of voluntary imitation effects and borrowings from the European experiences of the first regional consultative processes, or was this regionalization initiated and/or imposed, from outside these regions, by other states, interstate or even other regional actors? There is no clear or simple answer to this question, but the explanations for this fast RCPs' worldwide development are certainly to be search either in external effects of European immigration policies – or the externalization of the European immigration and asylum policy, that is as a consequence, in third countries, of the implementation of an EU policy –, or in the transfer¹⁸ of these original European experiences of informal regional cooperation to other continents¹⁹.

Considering the small number of studies evaluating the concrete achievements of these regional processes, one can wonder if the success and the development of the regional consultative processes is really due to simple learning processes between regions, or if this development isn't rather pertaining to a wider strategy, at the international level more than at the regional level, of creation of institutional structures and political networks aiming at facilitating an interstate dialogue on the management of international migration, at the global level. The reproduction and duplication of the regional consultative processes, from the same European model, isn't fortuitous, and isn't limited to simple effects of imitation between regions.

The development of institutional structures and national and regional political networks is in fact a

¹⁷ CHANNAC, Frédérique, "Circulation des idées, circulation des personnes", GERRI's First Annual Seminar in International Relations, *La Circulation Internationale des Idées*, Sciences Po Bordeaux, April 26, 2004; THOUÉZ, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Regional Consultative Processes for Migration: An Evaluation Based on IMP's Work*, New York: United Nations Population Fund, June 2005.

¹⁸ "[The process of policy transfer is] the process by which knowledge of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political system (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political system." DOLOWITZ, David P., "Introduction", *Governance*, 13(1), January 2000, p. 3.

¹⁹ It is interesting to observe that Canada, Australia and the United States of America are directly involved and participate in the development of most processes in nearby regions. What is also meaningful is the fact that the processes enhanced directly by the participation of these immigration countries were the first to appear and develop after the European-based processes. Thus, these governments all participated as well in the IGC and some in the Budapest Process. As for us, this is strong point for the idea of transfer and adaptation of models and learning processes. Furthermore, a "second generation" of RCMPs is also developing in other, non-neighbouring, regions, receiving direct or indirect support from these governments, as it is the case in Africa for instance.

prerequisite, that is as the first stage towards the convergence of the perspectives and understandings of international migration; a convergence which will then facilitate the opening of an interstate dialogue on the international governance of the migration. This first stage consists in gathering and networking governmental actors who, because of their socialization within these regional processes, will integrate and will eventually pass on, in their countries and regions, the political experiences exchanged in these multilateral forums. During this transfer, the distinction can not be clearly established between situations of *lesson-drawing* and situations of *coercive transfer*.

The awareness of the necessity of developing multilateral cooperation is relatively recent, and even if, *a priori*, all States – that they are countries of origin, transit or destination – would have to win from orderly migration, to maximize the positive effects and minimize the negative effects of international migration, all States do not share the same interests when it comes to use migration for national development and according to national interests. The facts that international migration remain a highly politicized domain, and that the definition of migration policies is regrettably often influenced by myths and false perceptions, make it all the more difficult to develop multilateral process of cooperation.

The RCPs' main aim is to build networks of information exchange between participating governments, and so to promote, on the one hand, relations of trust and confidence amongst actors who are said to share common ideas and cultures, and then a common understanding of migration issues, and, on the other hand, some convergence, harmonization, in migration practices and policies between various levels of decision-making, from the global to the national level – and/or the other way round. To develop these relations and enhance multilateral cooperation, RCPs lean on existing regional agreements or institutions. In most cases, there have already been experiments of regional multilateral cooperation, which probably facilitates the establishment of the new RCP²⁰. Also, by paying particular attention to information exchanges, to the promotion of a common language, to increasing the frequency of the meetings and gatherings, the processes gradually build up confidence among the actors, together with the idea of *common understanding* or of *like-*

²⁰ In Africa, while associating some southern EU states, the *Conference on Western Mediterranean Cooperation (5+5)* also gathers all the UMA's member states (*Union of Arabic Maghreb*). Also, the MDSA (*Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa*) exactly follows the borders of the SADC (*Southern African Development Community*) and of the COMESA (*Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa*); and the ECOWAS (*Economic Community of West African States*) and the UEMOA are closely associated to the development of the MIDWA (*Migration Dialogue for West Africa*). In Latin America, RCMPs are bound to regional economic groupings, such as the MERCOSUR (*South American Common Market*), the NAFTA (*North American Free Trade Area*), the OAS (*Organization of American States*), or even the Caricom (*Caribbean Community*). For Asia and the Pacific, the ASEAN (*Association of South-East Asian Nations*), the SAARC (*South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation*), the PIF (*Pacific Island Forum*) and the APEC (*Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation*) supports the majority of the RCPs.

mindedness, community of interest and shared principles, all these elements combining to promote multilateral cooperation for migration.

The constitution of networks and the decompartmentalization of the intergovernmental cooperation, with the opening of the “migration diplomacy” to new governmental actors also introduce a more technical dimension in this multilateral cooperation at the regional level. This technicalization of the cooperation is conducive, in his turn, to a depoliticization – at least in discourses and perceptions – of the migration issues in these multilateral forums. For instance, the more frequent use of “management” of the international migration instead of “governance” of international migrations is symptomatic of this attempt of “depoliticization”. Therefore, this depoliticization can bring countries of origin to cooperate with countries of destination to “manage” international migration. This form of multilateralism hence promote a shift in perceptions, from a political and conflicting perspective towards a technical and consensual perspective on cooperation for migration. Moreover, a semantic shift can be observed from “multilateral negotiation” to the idea of “multilateral partnership”²¹. This shift is not totally innocent: if partners share the same perspectives, the same interests and the same objectives, they are also bound as regards their responsibilities and duties towards one another. In the field of the international migration, it can also mean that countries of origin also have responsibilities in the management of international migration, and this contributes to justify the delegation of the management of the migrations from countries or regions of destination to countries or regions of origin or transit.

Nevertheless, as international migration do not take place solely on a regional basis, that multilateral cooperation at regional level can only have a limited impact on trans-regional

²¹ This semantic shift is also observable at the global level, for instance in the Berne Initiative’s documents, which is an intergovernmental forum that promotes the dialogue on an “international framework for the management of international migration” and which explicitly intends to draw lessons from the RCPs’ experiences to apply the same recipes at the global level. For instance, this shift towards a depoliticization of migration issues and a “managerial” approach, in terms of partnerships and mutual responsibilities appears in the report of the Berne Initiative’s regional consultations for Africa: “Potential polarization of the migration debate along North-South lines quickly gave way to the recognition that nearly all states are states of migration, even as they continue to be informed by their previous perspective as countries of origin, transit and destination, and now share many concerns and priorities.” BERNE INITIATIVE, Berne Initiative Regional Consultations for Africa (25-26 March 2004, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia), *Chairman’s Summary*, p.2. “It was emphasized that as so many African States are no longer exclusively countries of origin, transit or destination but more often than not all three simultaneously, new perspectives and opportunities in the migration debate and the management of migration are opening up. Ambassador Langenbacher assured the participants that a clear message emanated from these consultations: although the phenomenon of migration may not be new for the African continent, the resolve to manage it is. [...] First is the importance of establishing a common language on migration, and the participants have come to the conclusion that the Common Understandings of the International Agenda for Migration Management help in finding that common language. Second, and related, is the importance of moving away from polarised and divisive debates and instead taking an approach that focuses on management of migration. In Addis, a genuine discussion about the management of migration has begun; a discussion among equal partners in this effort. [...]” [underlines in the original document] BERNE INITIATIVE, Berne Initiative Regional Consultations for Africa (25-26 March 2004, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia), *Report*, p.8.

migration. Hence the necessity to move on towards a second stage, which is a dialogue, at the global level, on a governance for international migration or a global framework for the management of international migration.

3. PROMOTING GLOBAL DIALOGUE AND MULTILATERAL GOVERNANCE: A REVIEW OF RECENT INITIATIVES.

Recently, three initiatives aiming at promoting – or leading – the debate on the governance of the international migration were launched at the global level: the Berne Initiative, the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), and the Hague Declaration²². Each of these initiative ends with a different definition of what the multilateralism and the global governance for migration should be.

Launched in June 2001 by the Swiss government, supported also by the IOM, the Berne Initiative is defined as “a State-owned consultative process with a goal of obtaining better management of migration at the regional and global level through co-operation between States. As a process, the Berne Initiative enables governments from all world regions to share their different policy priorities and identify their longer-term interests in migration, and offers the opportunity of developing a common orientation to migration management, based on notions of cooperation, partnerships, comprehensiveness, balance and predictability.”²³, “It is a process that is *consultative, co-operative, comprehensive, consistent* (not uniform but broadly compatible) and *balanced*, but *non-binding* and *non-prescriptive*.”²⁴ According to these goals, the Berne Initiative set up, in 2004, after a series of consultations at regional and global level, an “International Agenda for migration management” (IAMM) which includes a list of 20 “Common understandings for the management of international migration” and a list of “Effective practices for a planned, balanced, and comprehensive approach to management of migration”. The Initiative of Bern is dominated by States, and the participation and role of non governmental actors is more than marginal²⁵. This initiative focuses very explicitly

²² For a summarised description of these three initiatives, see: MARTIN, Philip L., MARTIN, Susan F., and WEIL, Patrick, *Managing migration : the promise of cooperation*, Lanham, Lexington Books, 2006, p.239-246.

²³ BERNE INITIATIVE, *The Goal of the Berne Initiative*, April 2003. See: http://www.iom.int/DOCUMENTS/OFFICIALTXT/Goal_E.pdf. See also, for a more detailed and complete definition of the Berne Initiative: BERNE INITIATIVE, *Information Note III: A Global Consultative Process for Managing Inter-State Co-operation on Migration Management*, October 2003, p.2.

²⁴ BERNE INITIATIVE, Berne Initiative Consultations (2-3 July 2003, Berne), *Final Report: “An International Agenda for Migration Management”*, p.3.

²⁵ For a detailed analysis of the functioning and the goals of the Berne Initiative, and also an analysis of the debates which ended up in the definition and the adoption of the IAMM, see: CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Vers une gouvernance globale des migrations internationales? Genèse et évolution des institutions et de la coopération intergouvernementales*

on the idea of “management” and intends to draw from the multilateral cooperation experiences led at the regional level, within the regional consultative processes. In this respect, it aims above all at promoting an international governance for international migration, a political process strictly managed and controlled by States.

The GCIM is a global commission launched in December 2003 by the UN Secretary-General, and sponsored by a group of countries of origin and destination. The GCIM “is independent and was given the mandate to provide the framework for the formulation of a coherent, comprehensive and global response to the issue of international migration”²⁶. In October 2005, the Commission presented its final report to the UN Secretary-General²⁷. One of the main conclusions of this report is that “the international community has failed to realize the full potential of migration and has not risen to the many opportunities and challenges it presents. [It] stresses the need for greater coherence, cooperation and capacity to achieve a more effective governance of international migration”. This report presents “six ‘Principles for Action’ and thirty-three related recommendations that can serve as a guide to the formulation of migration policies at the national, regional and global levels”²⁸. Among these Principles of Action and these recommendations, some are directly of concern for the debate on a governance for international migration, and point, for instance, the importance of non governmental actors’ participation, at least at the national level, and of a coordination between regional consultative processes and multilateral institutions at the global level²⁹. Even if this report insists on the role and the place which should be those of non governmental actors, it reminds all the same that the State actors always have a central role to play and that their sovereignty in the field of international migration should remain unchallenged, sovereignty not being incompatible with multilateral cooperation, but being rather a condition for an efficient management of international migration and the reaffirmation of States’ responsibilities in this area. Thus, in this multilateral system proposed implicitly by the GCIM, one would find some elements of *global* governance and others of *international* governance.

dans le domaine des migrations internationales, Thèse pour le Doctorat de Sciences Politiques et Relations internationales, Sciences Po Bordeaux & Université Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV (forthcoming).

²⁶ See : <http://www.gcim.org>.

²⁷ GCIM, *Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action*, October 2005. Downloadable at : <http://www.gcim.org>.

²⁸ According to the terms of its mandate, the GCIM’s goals are: “1. Placing International Migration on the Global Agenda by promoting a comprehensive debate among governments, international organisations, academia, civil society, private sector, media and other actors on all aspects of migration and issues related to migration; 2. Analysing Gaps in Current Policy Approaches to Migration and Examining Inter-linkages with Other Issue-Areas by focusing on various approaches and perspectives of governments and other stakeholders in different regions, and by addressing the relationship of migration with other global issues that impact on and cause migration; 3. Presenting Recommendations to the United Nations Secretary-General and other Stakeholders on how to strengthen national, regional and global governance of international migration.” See: http://www.gcim.org/en/a_mandate.html.

²⁹ See: GCIM, *Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action*, October 2005, p.91.

Finally, a third global initiative, The Hague Process, was launched in 2000 by the Society for International Development's Netherlands Chapter. This process gathers almost 800 persons – from governments, academics, non governmental and civil society actors, international organisations, etc. In 2003 a Club of The Hague has been established to guide, advice and position The Hague Process³⁰. The Hague Process intends to have a “multiplier effect” and play a “catalytic role”. According to its official presentation, “the Hague Process is a non-political platform that advocates to policy makers, at a local, regional, national and global level. [...] THP is trying to get more participants involved, particularly in the health sector, the Big Cities, representatives of migrant and refugee communities, public transport and other relevant sectors. [...] The tools THP uses, are: (1) the provision of relevant information; (2) dialogue within and spreading from our networks; and (3) the dissemination and amplification of key messages through the high-profile membership of the Club of The Hague, whose members have ready access to policy makers and other relevant actors. [...] THP draws upon the work of existing organizations and networks, [...] to assemble information and present it in forms accessible to important constituencies. Due to the approach and methodology of THP, it has already created a 'multiplier effect' thanks to the independent international network and the spin off effect by the partners. The possibility of extension of the action outcomes is enormous, because of the nature of the approach: low costs in combination with the great amount of high profile knowledge and advice on migration and refugee policy. Due to the successes made, the word is spreading and the network is growing, providing us with a broader network and ever-greater possibilities.”³¹

According to this official presentation, the Hague Process' main purpose seems to be the establishment of a think-tank network to promote exchanges of views and sharing of experiences between all the stakeholders in the international migration domain ; that is not only States and intergovernmental organizations, but also private actors, business leaders, non governmental organisations, and associations of migrants and refugees. The presupposition founding this approach is that States can not manage international migration efficiently on their own for the

³⁰ http://www.sid-nl.org/archive/The_Hague_Project.php.

³¹ <http://www.thehagueprocess.org/activities/Samenvatting.htm>. The Hague Process aims also at “Advocating vis-à-vis policy makers, particularly at the regional and national levels”: “Many specialist seminars take place on issues relating to both refugees and migration. Nevertheless, their impact on practical policy making has been limited. There is a gap between the expert knowledge on the one hand and the practical responses of politicians and of the general public on the other. Two different ‘speeds’ develop: one follows the expert debate, while the other follows public attitudes to asylum and migration. The program aims to ‘map out’ and minimise the gap by transferring knowledge from the experts towards the politicians and vice versa.” <http://www.thehagueprocess.org/activities/Advocating.htm>.

benefit of all interested parties. To conclude, The Hague Declaration calls for the re-examination of existing institutional arrangements at the regional and global levels³².

In conclusion, it appears that even if these three global initiatives share the same insight as regards the actual international system for migration – i.e. the necessity of developing multilateral cooperation and the gaps and lacunas of the current system in addressing new migration issues; or the necessity to promote multilateralism at the regional level before engaging more serious discussions at the global level –, they do not propose the same solution nor do they share the same idea of what this governance should be at the global level. The differences do not only concern the number or the identity of the actors – only States or also non governmental actors – who should participate in decision-making processes at the global level. These differences hide also more profound disagreement on what the goals, purposes and rules of this governance should be³³.

4. CONCLUSION: MIGRATION OF CONCEPTS AND APPROACHES FROM THE EU AGENDA TO THE GLOBAL LEVEL.

In fact, there seem to be many coincidences and linkages between the European agenda on migration policy and the international debate on the governance of migration; and it appears that the genesis of the concept of “comprehensive approach” and the interest for “co-development policies” at the global level could be, indeed, traced back down to the original EU’s immigration and asylum policy.

The comprehensive approach promoted at EU level consists in bringing asylum and immigration policies on the external relations agenda of the EU. The main idea on the EU agenda is that migration can not be efficiently managed only at the EU’s borders. Coincidentally, this is exactly the same idea that is promoted by the global initiatives: migration can not be effectively managed at the national or regional level, hence the necessity to develop a global framework for multilateral cooperation.

³² See: SOCIETY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT/NETHERLANDS CHAPTER, *Declaration of the Hague on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy*, Project on the Future of Asylum and Migration (FAM), 22 November 2002.

³³ For a detailed analysis of these differences, see: CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Vers une gouvernance globale des migrations internationales? Genèse et évolution des institutions et de la coopération intergouvernementales dans le domaine des migrations internationales*, Thèse pour le Doctorat de Sciences Politiques et Relations internationales, Sciences Po Bordeaux & Université Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV (forthcoming).

To avoid – or discriminate – the influx of migrants on their territories, EU Member States have then to manage this influx at its sources, that is by addressing the “root causes” of migration in the countries of origin. This strategy implies to establish a link between migration and development. In brief, this strategy is more born to be successful if it gives the impression or influence the perception that it serves EU’s interests as regards migration management and, at the same time, as those of countries of origin in terms of development. At the EU level, this strategy is clearly that of the “comprehensive approach” and the “co-development policy”³⁴.

What are exactly this “comprehensive approach” and these “co-development policies” for international migration? The comprehensive approach is “an approach that would integrate policy areas and modes of policy conceptualization. This means that asylum and immigration would not be isolated as a domestic policy issue, but its foreign policy implications and the implications which foreign policy has for it would also be taken into account. In the process, all forms of migration (legal, illegal, refugee, and asylum) would be taken into account, and the full course from motives to move through to ultimate “solutions” (integration, return or for some refugees, resettlement) would be connected.³⁵” A “co-development policy” is a policy that uses cooperation as a strategy to manage international migration³⁶. These two concepts are linked to the idea that migration are the consequences of “root causes” that are to be found – and addressed – in countries of origin³⁷.

Where do we find references to these strategies in EU documents?

³⁴ In fact, precisely, this strategy first appears in France in the 1980s before being transferred to the EU agenda. See, for instance, on the relations between France and Mali : MARTIN, Philip L., MARTIN, Susan F., and WEIL, Patrick, *Managing migration : the promise of cooperation*, Lanham, Lexington Books, 2006

³⁵ VAN SELM, Joanne, “Immigration and Asylum or Foreign Policy: The EU’s Approach to Migrants and Their Countries of Origin”, in LAVENEX, Sandra, UÇARER, Emek, *Migration and the Externalities of European Integration*, 2002, p.144. For a critical analysis of this “root causes” and “comprehensive” approach, see: GENT, Saskia, “The root causes of migration: criticizing the approach and finding a way forward”, Sussex Migration Working Paper n°11, September 2002. For a genealogy of the concept, see also: THORBURN, J., “Root causes approaches to forced migration : part of a comprehensive strategy? A European perspective”, in *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 9(2), 1996.

³⁶ This policy has three components : « (1) managing flows. [...] These mechanisms are not meant to undermine the sovereign responsibility of each government to manage the movements of people into or out of their countries, but they provide an opportunity to discuss and to negotiate changes to policy and procedures. They also enable countries to cooperate against smuggling and trafficking, so that the net effect is the expansion of legal channels for emigration/immigration and better controls over unauthorized movements; (2) Diaspora-led development; and (3) targeting assistance (micro-credit, education, health in home countries...)” MARTIN, Philip L., MARTIN, Susan F., and WEIL, Patrick, *Managing migration : the promise of cooperation*, Lanham, Lexington Books, 2006, p.232.

³⁷ As Ferruccio Pastore wrote it: “The root causes seem, by definition, almost to dig exclusively in the ground of the countries of origin. Root causes seem to identify with what old migration theories call “push factors”.” Pastore, Ferruccio, “ “More development for less migration” or “better migration for more development”? Shifting priorities in the European debate”, Migration Research Program, MigraCtion Europa, CeSPI, December 2003. Conversely, this “root causes” approach seems to forget totally the existence of “pull factors” in countries of destination.

The concept of a “root causes” approach in third countries is first to be found in a Commission’s communication³⁸. Then, in the conclusions of the Tampere Council, in October 1999. In this document, it is stated that: “The European Union needs a comprehensive approach to migration addressing political, human rights and development issues in countries and regions of origin and transit. This requires combating poverty, improving living conditions and job opportunities, preventing conflicts and consolidating democratic states and ensuring respect for human rights, in particular rights of minorities, women and children. To that end, the Union as well as Member States are invited to contribute, within their respective competence under the Treaties, to a greater coherence of internal and external policies of the Union. The European Council stresses the need for more efficient management of migration flows at all their stages. It calls for the development, in close cooperation with countries of origin and transit, of information campaigns on the actual possibilities for legal immigration, and for the prevention of all forms of trafficking in human beings.”³⁹

Another document indicate that the Commission endorses this approach: “The Member States at the Tampere Council acknowledged the principle that an EU asylum and immigration policy must necessarily involve cooperation with the countries of origin and transit of migrants. [...] With today’s increasingly mixed flows of migrants caused by economic and other reasons and with populations straddling two cultures as part of survival strategies it is possible to develop policies which use migration to the mutual benefit of the country of origin and the receiving country.”⁴⁰ Then, another document of the Commission – the title of which speaks for itself – establishes a clear link between the EU foreign policy, the root causes approach and co-development policies with third countries of origin⁴¹. The report of the Seville Council, in July 2002, also focus on “an integrated, comprehensive and balanced approach to tackle the root causes of immigration”, an approach that “must remain the EU’s constant long-term objective”. All this resulted in the creation of the High Level Working Group in December 1999. According to its Terms of Reference, the HLWG “by a cross-pillar combination of measures, [is] to help reduce the influx of asylum seekers

³⁸ EU Commission, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on immigration and asylum policies, COM(94)23final, p.4 and p.11.

³⁹ Conclusions of the European Council at Tampere, Finland, 15-16 October 1999. www.europarl.eu.int/summits/tam_en.htm#a.

⁴⁰ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Common Immigration Policy, Brussels, 22/11/2000, COM(2000)757final.

⁴¹ European Union Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament : Integrating migration issues in the EU’s relations with Third countries. I/ Migration and development; II/ Report on the effectiveness of financial resources available at community level for repatriation of immigrants and rejected asylum seekers, for the management of external borders and for asylum and migration projects in third countries*, COM/2002/0703final, 03/12/2002.

and immigrants into the Member States of the EU. Its main aim is to analyze and combat the reasons for flight taking account of the political and human rights situations⁴².

Strangely indeed, this is the exact formulation of the definition of the goals of the Berne Initiative, and these are also exactly the words used in the documents of the international initiatives and of most the RCPs to define their goals and purposes⁴³. What are the implications of these “migration and development” and “root causes” approaches?

First, the main point is that these approaches can only be implemented at a bilateral or a multilateral level. In this respect, the efforts of the EU to promote the development of RCPs around the world are totally consistent with this goal to enhance multilateral cooperation. These efforts are to be witnessed in the development of multilateral initiatives in regions that are more or less close to the external borders of the EU, as it is the case, for instance, with the 5+5 Process – which gathers Southern European countries and countries of the Maghreb, or the recent financing of the ICMPD – which is the Secretariat of the Budapest Process – on the Commission budget line for financial and technical assistance on migration (B7-667) to open a dialogue for cooperation with countries of the Balkans and South-East Europe. They are also perfectly transparent when European immigration countries participate, as observers but also as financers, in the meetings of African RCPs, such as the MIDWA (Migration Dialogue for West Africa) or the AU/IMP Conferences for East Africa, the Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes Region.

Second, these approaches tend to reject the responsibilities regarding the management of migration from the immigration countries to the countries of origin. For instance, the development of concepts such as “protection in the region” or the externalization of asylum status determination processes are some among of other co-lateral effects, of this delegation or shift in responsibilities⁴⁴. According to the comprehensive approach, countries of origin are now “partners” in migration

⁴² EU, January 1999, Terms of Reference of the HLWG on Asylum and Migration, 5264/2/99, Rev2, JAI1, AG, 1, p.2. On the role of the HLWG and its shortcomings, see: VAN SELM, Joanne, “Immigration and Asylum or Foreign Policy: The EU’s Approach to Migrants and Their Countries of Origin”, in LAVENEX, Sandra, UÇARER, Emek, *Migration and the Externalities of European Integration*, 2002; GENT, Saskia, “The root causes of migration: criticizing the approach and finding a way forward”, Sussex Migration Working Paper n°11, September 2002; CHALOFF, Jonathan, “Co-development: a myth or a workable policy approach?”, CeSPI.

⁴³ This approach is even promoted in the report of the UN Secretary-General on Migration and Development. See: UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY, *Globalization and interdependence: International migration and development*, Report of the Secretary-General, 6th Session, A/60/871, 18 May 2006, p.16 [The Path ahead: a policy agenda. A. Improved international cooperation through co-development]; p.63-70 [Migration as a tool for development] and p.77-83.

⁴⁴ See for instance the development of cooperation between the EU Commission and Libya. STATEWATCH, “EU: European Commission technical mission to Libya: exporting Fortress Europe”, Statewatch Bulletin, 15(2), March-April 2005. Or even the “Pacific solution” developed, as the same strategy, by Australia.

management and in development. As explained earlier in this paper, “partners” also share responsibilities and duties.

Third, these approaches in terms of Migration and Development tend also to transfer the responsibility of development in countries of origin towards the Diaspora and the migrants themselves⁴⁵. Yet, if there is a general trend in international documents at the global level at the moment, it is clearly the success of the notion of migrants and Diaspora as agent of co-development. This is, unfortunately, forgetting that migrants are individual actors, with individual rationality, and that, furthermore, remittances are private funds that can not be substitutes for official development aid. With the growing confusion between migration and development agenda at the international level, confusion that derives mainly from this comprehensive approach initiated by the EU, there exists a risk that development aid could be progressively replaced by aid for migration management.

Finally, the main achievement of this migration of European approaches to the international agenda and this consequent confusion of the migration and development agendas is certainly the High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development that took place in New York last week. Following this logic, a migration of policy concepts seem to be taking place from the EU level to the processes of dialogue on the international governance for migration.

Our purpose isn't to state that this evolution or these approaches are wrong or right. Our purpose is simply to explain how a certain idea of multilateralism, or the use of multilateralism to achieve goals consistent with the EU interests, is migrating from the EU policy-making bodies toward the regional and global levels, and how it influences the dialogue on the definition of a governance for international migration at the global level.

⁴⁵ This has been clearly analysed by Eva Ostergaard-Nielsen: “It may be argued that projects of co-development disproportionately burden migrants and make them responsible for functions that the state (of origin) should rightfully assume”. OSTERGAARD-NIELSEN, Eva, “Co-development policies and the role of migrants’ transnational networks”, Abstract, Roundtable on “Migration and Development: Transnational networks, remittances, civil society and human capital potential”, Seminar on Co-development: From theory to good practice, 19-21/09/2005. Jonathan Chaloff also puts the problem in these terms: the problem with “migrant as co-development agent” “is that development aid should shift part of its focus from aid-driven development projects to those of emigrants. In this vision, migrants take on the responsibility for development in their countries [...] The onus is shifted from the host country to the migrant”. CHALOFF, *op. cit.*, p.4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BERNE INITIATIVE, Berne Initiative Regional Consultations for Africa, *Chairman's Summary*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 25-26 March 2004.
- BERNE INITIATIVE, *The Goal of the Berne Initiative*, April 2003, downloadable at: http://www.iom.int/DOCUMENTS/OFFICIALTXT/Goal_E.pdf.
- BERNE INITIATIVE, *Information Note III : A Global Consultative Process for Managing Inter-State Co-operation on Migration Management*, October 2003.
- BERNE INITIATIVE, Berne Initiative Consultations, *Final Report*, "An International Agenda for Migration Management", Berne, 2-3 July 2003.
- BRÜHL, Tanja, RITTBERGER, Volker, « From international to global governance : Actors, collective decision-making, and the United Nations in the world of the XXIst C-century » in RITTBERGER, Volker (ed.), *Global Governance and the United Nations System*, Coll. The United Nations System in the 21th Century, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, 2001.
- CHALOFF, Jonathan, "Co-development: a myth or a workable policy approach?", Migration Research Program, MigraCtion Europa, CeSPI.
- CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Vers une gouvernance globale des migrations internationales? Genèse et évolution des institutions et de la coopération intergouvernementales dans le domaine des migrations internationales*, Thèse pour le Doctorat de Sciences Politiques et Relations internationales, Sciences Po Bordeaux & Université Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV (forthcoming).
- CHANNAC, Frédérique, "Vers une politique publique internationale des migrations? Réseaux politiques et processus de transfert de modèles", in *Revue Française de Sciences Politiques*, vol.56(3), juin 2006.
- CHANNAC, Frédérique, "Circulation des idées, circulation des personnes", GERRI's First Annual Seminar in International Relations, *La Circulation Internationale des Idées*, Sciences Po Bordeaux, April 26, 2004.
- CHANNAC, Frédérique, "Between Regionalization and Globalization. Multi-level Governance and Structuralization of an International Migration Regime", in SÖDERBAUM, F. BØÅS, M., VAN LANGENHOVE, L. and BULL, B. "States, Regions and Regional World Orders", SGIR Conference, The Hague 2004.
- DOLOWITZ, David P., "Introduction", *Governance*, 13(1), January 2000.
- EUROPEAN UNION COMMISSION, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on immigration and asylum policies*, COM(94)23final.
- EUROPEAN UNION COMMISSION, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Common Immigration Policy*, Brussels, 22/11/2000, COM(2000)757final.
- EUROPEAN UNION COMMISSION, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament : Integrating migration issues in the EU's relations with Third countries. I/ Migration and development ; II/ Report on the effectiveness of financial resources available at community level for repatriation of immigrants and rejected asylum seekers, for the management of external borders and for asylum and migration projects in third countries*, COM/2002/0703final, 03/12/2002.
- EUROPEAN UNION, *Terms of Reference of the HLWG on Asylum and Migration*, 5264/2/99, Rev2, JAI1, AG, January 1999.
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL, Conclusions of the European Council at Tampere, Finland, 15-16 October 1999. www.europarl.eu.int/summits/tam_en.htm#a.
- GENT, Saskia, "The root causes of migration: criticizing the approach and finding a way forward", Sussex Migration Working Paper n°11, September 2002.
- GLOBAL COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION, *Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action*, October 2005. Downloadable at: <http://www.gcim.org>.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION, *ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration*, TMMFLM/2005/1(Rev.), Geneva, ILO, 2005.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, *Resolution concerning a fair deal for migrant workers in a global economy*, ILC92-PR22-269-En.doc, 2004.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, 92nd Session, 2004, *Report VI: Towards a fair deal for migrant workers in the global economy, Sixth item on the agenda*, Geneva, ILO, 2004.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, 1999, *Migrant Workers*, International Labour Conference, 87th Session (1999), Geneva, ILO.
- KLEKOWSKI VON KOPPENFELDS, Amanda, *The role of Regional Consultative Processes in Managing International Migration*, IOM Migration Research Series, n°3, IOM, Geneva, 2001.
- LOESCHER, Gil, *The UNHCR and World Politics. A Perilous Path*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- MARRUS, Michael R., *The Unwanted. European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1985.

- MARTIN, Philip L., MARTIN, Susan F., and WEIL, Patrick, *Managing migration: the promise of cooperation*, Lanham, Lexington Books, 2006.
- ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE POUR LES MIGRATIONS, *État de la migration dans le monde*, Genève, OIM et Nations unies, 2000.
- OSTERGAARD-NIELSEN, Eva, “Co-development policies and the role of migrants’ transnational networks”, Abstract, Roundtable on “Migration and Development: Transnational networks, remittances, civil society and human capital potential”, Seminar on Co-development: From theory to good practice, 19-21/09/2005.
- PASTORE, Ferruccio, “ “More development for less migration” or “better migration for more development”? Shifting priorities in the European debate”, Migration Research Program, MigraCtion Europa, CeSPI, December 2003.
- PROUDFOOT, Malcolm J., *European Refugees : 1939-1952. A Study in Forced Population Movement*, London, Faber and Faber, 1957.
- RITTBERGER, Volker (ed.), *Global Governance and the United Nations System*, Coll. The United Nations System in the 21st Century, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, 2001.
- SIMPSON, John Hope, Sir, *The Refugee Problem. Report of a Survey*, London, Oxford University Press, issued under auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939.
- SLAUGHTER, Anne-Marie, *A New World Order*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2004.
- SOCIETY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT/NETHERLANDS CHAPTER, *Declaration of the Hague on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy*, Project on the Future of Asylum and Migration (FAM), 22 November 2002.
- SOLOMON, Michele, “International Migration Management through Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms. Focus on Regional Consultative Processes on Migration”, IOM’s International Dialogue on Migration and the Berne Initiative, Migration Policy, Research and Communications, International Organization for Migration, Paper prepared for United Nations Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development, 6 to 8 July 2005.
- STATEWATCH, “EU: European Commission technical mission to Libya: exporting Fortress Europe”, *Statewatch Bulletin*, 15(2), March-April 2005.
- STOESSINGER, John George, *The Refugee and the World Community*, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- THOMPSON, Dorothy, *Refugees : Anarchy or Organization ?*, New York, Random House, 1938.
- THORBURN, J., “Root causes approaches to forced migration : part of a comprehensive strategy? A European perspective”, in *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 9(2), 1996.
- THOUEZ, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, “Shaping International Migration Policy : The Role of Regional Consultative Processes”, in GUIRAUDON, Virginie, LAHAV, Gallya, *Who Makes Immigration Policy? Comparative Perspectives in a post-9/11 World*, Special issue, *West European Politics*, vol.29(2) :362-379, March 2006.
- THOUEZ, Colleen, CHANNAC, Frédérique, *Regional Consultative Processes for Migration: An Evaluation Based on IMP’s Work*, New York: United Nations Population Fund, June 2005.
- UNITED NATIONS, POPULATION DIVISION, *International Migration Report*, New York, Nations unies, 2002.
- UNITED NATIONS, Assemblée générale, *Migrations internationales et développement*, Rapport du Secrétaire général, A/60/871, 18 mai 2006.
- UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, *Globalization and interdependence: International migration and development*, Report of the Secretary-General, 6th Session, A/60/871, 18 May 2006.
- UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, *2005 Global Refugee Trends. Statistical Overview of Populations of Refugees, Asylum-Seekers, Internally Displaced Persons, and Other Persons of Concern to UNHCR*, Field Information and Coordination Support Section, Division of Operational Services, UNHCR Geneva, 9 June 2006.
- VAN SELM, Joanne, “Immigration and Asylum or Foreign Policy: The EU’s Approach to Migrants and Their Countries of Origin”, in LAVENEX, Sandra, UÇARER, Emek, *Migration and the Externalities of European Integration*, 2002.
- VERNANT, Jacques, *The Refugee in the Post-War World*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953.
- WIDGREN, Jonas, 1993, *The Informal Consultations, 1985-1992*, unpublished paper.