

STRENGTHENING MIGRATION GOVERNANCE

Implementation of OSCE Commitments
related to migration by OSCE
participating States

STRENGTHENING MIGRATION GOVERNANCE

Compiled and prepared by August Gachter
Center for Social Innovation
Vienna

Editorial oversight by
Patrick Taran and Ibrahim Awad
International Migration Programme, ILO

With contributions from
Alina Cibeá, Martin Hofmann, Albert Kraler, Bernhard Perchinig and David Reichel
at the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)
and Svetlana Rakhimova, ILO.

Jointly Published in November 2009 by the ILO and OSCE

Based on a report *Implementation of OSCE Commitments Related to Migration by OSCE participating States* prepared by the International Labour Office for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, originally for the 17th Economic and Environmental Forum, Athens, May 2009.

Research and preparation of this book was made possible by the generous financial and programmatic support of the 2009 Greek chairmanship of the OSCE

Copyright © International Labour Organization, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 2009
First published 2009

This report has been prepared by the International Labour Office (International Migration Programme) under agreement with and oversight by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. An original version was prepared to support and orient the discussion on international migration at the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum held in Athens, Greece 18-20 May 2009.

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated.

For rights of reproduction or translation of this paper, application should be made to either the OSCE/OCEEA, Wallnerstrasse 6, 1010 Vienna, Austria, or by email: pm-ccaa@osce.org or to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: pubdroit@ilo.org. The OSCE and ILO welcome such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifrro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

ISBN (printed version)

ISBN (web pdf)

The materials in this document are for information purposes only. The ILO and the OSCE do not accept any liability for any loss which may arise from the reliance on information contained in this document.

The designations employed in ILO and OSCE publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

Catalogues or lists of OSCE publications are available at OSCE website: www.osce.org

Catalogues or lists of new ILO publications are available free of charge email: pubvente@ilo.org.

ILO website: www.ilo.org/publns

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

Strengthening Migration Governance : implementation of OSCE commitments related to migration by OSCE participating States / International Labour Office. - Geneva: ILO, 2009

89 p.

ISBN: 978-92-2122994-0 (print version)

ISBN: 978-92-2-122995-7 (web .pdf version)

International Labour Office

international migration / labour migration / migrant worker / workers rights / migration policy / Europe
14.09.2

Photocomposed in Switzerland

Printed in Switzerland

JMB

Table of contents

	Page
I. Introduction: Strengthening migration governance	1
1. Introduction	1
2. Development of OSCE commitments on migration	2
3. Highlights of OSCE commitments	5
4. Reference to legal and policy frameworks for migration regulation and governance	8
5. Observations on the evolution of commitments	9
II. Meeting the challenges: A summary of the key dynamics of migration in the OSCE region	11
1. Determinants of labour migration in the OSCE region	11
a) Presence, role and distribution of migrants in destination countries	11
b) Labour force declines, demographic determinants, economic disparities	16
c) Particular labour and skills demands in specific sectors and occupations	18
d) Economic and other pressures compelling migration	20
2. Migration, economic growth and development	21
a) Contribution of migration to destination countries	21
b) Contribution of migration to origin countries	22
c) Costs of migration: skills deficits, imbalances, family disruption	27
d) Impact of the financial crisis	29
3. Challenges of protection, social cohesion, integration	31

- III. International legal framework and protection of migrants 39**
 - 1. Reference to international normative and policy framework. 39
 - a) International legal standards 39
 - b) International labour standards (ILO Conventions) 43
 - ILO Migration for Employment Conventions 44
 - c) Council of Europe 45
 - d) The European Union 46
 - e) The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) 48
 - f) Human Rights in North America 49
 - 2. Implementation of OSCE commitments on protection and welfare of migrants 50
 - a) Other intergovernmental agreements with provisions addressing protection 52
 - Western Balkans 52
 - Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). 53
 - EU Member States. 54
 - b) Legislation and measures to prevent discrimination and combat xenophobia 55
 - EU Member States. 56
 - Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). 57
 - 3. The Way Forward. 58
- IV. Migration Policy: Optimising benefits and mitigating adverse impact 61**
 - 1. Relevant OSCE commitments. 62
 - 2. Implementing commitments to optimise benefits and mitigate adverse impact 63
 - National migration policy statements or frameworks 63
 - Western Balkan Countries 65
 - CIS Countries. 65
 - 3. Examples of programmes, initiatives and practices implementing commitments. 70
 - 4. The Way Forward. 73
- V. International Cooperation and Dialogue 75**
 - 1. Review of OSCE commitments on international cooperation 76
 - 2. The United Nations System 79
 - The United Nations Organization 79

UN Specialized Agencies	80
a) International Labour Organization (ILO)	80
b) United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	81
UN Programmes, Funds and other bodies	81
c) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) . .	81
d) The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).	82
e) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).	82
f) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	83
g) United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)	83
h) United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF)	84
i) United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)	84
j) United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)	85
k) United Nations Regional Commissions	85
l) The World Bank.	85
m) The Global Migration Group (GMG)	86
3. Intergovernmental and Regional Organizations	86
a) The International Organization for Migration (IOM)	86
b) The Council of Europe	87
c) The European Union	88
The External Dimension of Asylum and Migration Policy	88
d) Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) .	89
e) The Commonwealth of Independent States	89
f) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	90
g) International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)	90
4. International Inter-governmental Consultative Forums.	91
a) The Global Forum on Migration and Development	91
b) The Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) . .	91
c) The Inter-Governmental Consultations (IGC).	91
d) Regional Consultation Processes – RCPs	92
5. Social Partner Organizations.	93
a) International Organisation of Employers (IOE).	93

Strengthening migration governance

b) International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	94
c) BUSINESS EUROPE	94
d) European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC).	94
6. Civil Society Organizations, a sampling of relevant international entities:	95
a) International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)	95
b) Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)	95
c) European Network Against Racism (ENAR)	96
7. Cooperation of participating States in bilateral or multilateral agreements	96
a) Labour agreements and other forms of labour recruitment . . .	96
b) Bilateral labour agreements in the OSCE region	97
Western and Central Europe	97
CIS region	98
8. International social security agreements	99
9. The Way Forward	100
VI. Building structures and institutions for migration administration . . .	103
1. Introduction	103
2. Specialised national agencies and departments corresponding to the intent of commitments	103
3. Selection of practice profiles of institutions and agencies implementing commitments.	107
Pre-migration.	107
Recruitment.	107
Recognition of qualifications.	108
Migrants' rights in the country of destination.	109
4. The Way Forward: Suggested policies and measures to facilitate institutional capacity	110
VII. Conclusions and proposals	111
Conclusions	112
Implementation of commitments	113
Proposals	115
OSCE contributions	115
Ameliorating impact of the global financial and employment crisis . . .	116
References	119

Annex 1: List of OSCE Commitments on Migration and Migrants	127
Introduction	127
International instruments and cooperation	127
Regulation of migration	128
Development and optimisation of benefits from migration	128
Working and living conditions	129
Integration	130
Prevention of discrimination and xenophobia	131
Education	131
Exercising culture	132
Return	132
Annex 2: List of adhesion to relevant international instruments	135
Annex 3: List of bilateral agreements	139
Social security agreements	139
Labour recruitment	142

Preface

Migration is a global phenomenon and an increasingly complex one, having differing impacts on various countries and regions. International migration has long been an important concern of governance for ILO member States and OSCE participating States. Labour migration has been on the agenda of the International Labour Organization since its founding in 1919; migration-related issues have also been addressed by the OSCE/CSCE since its establishment in Helsinki in 1975.

Our constituents and our organizations have recognized that effective regulation and governance of migration can only be sustained through partnerships and co-operation between destination, transit and origin countries, relying on a framework of international standards and policies that ensure protection of the individuals concerned and facilitate dialogue and co-operation.

In view of the importance of migration today, the Greek Chairmanship of the OSCE in 2009 proposed that “Migration management and its linkages with economic, social and environmental policies to the benefit of stability and security in the OSCE region” be the theme for the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum. The Economic and Environmental Forum is the main annual event of the OSCE’s Economic and Environmental Dimension. The Forum took place in two segments: the first one from 19 to 20 January 2009 in Vienna, and the second one from 18 to 20 May 2009 in Athens.

A thorough review of implementation of OSCE commitments on migration over the past years was the obvious starting point to inform Forum participants and to guide subsequent activity of the OSCE Secretariat and its participating States. The Greek Chairmanship in consultation with the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities commissioned the ILO to undertake a study of the effects the OSCE commitments have had on migration management over the years.

The ILO conducted research and prepared the Commitments Report. Preparation of the report drew on existing documentation, referred to relevant international legal frameworks, sought data from countries and concerned organizations

throughout the OSCE region, and conducted an exhaustive analysis of the information and opinions obtained.

The resulting report was presented to the Athens OSCE Forum in May 2009 as the main background document. Some of its suggestions for policy development and activities were highlighted in the conclusions of the Forum. The positive comments on the report by numerous delegations convinced us of the value of jointly publishing the document in this book form.

This publication can serve as a valuable reference document for officials of governments and for concerned staff of stakeholder organizations throughout the OSCE regions to strengthen migration governance. It contains contextual background information, a review of OSCE commitments on international migration, and data on indicators measuring implementation of commitments, and it features numerous examples of concrete useful practices and specific measures. It offers conclusions and a number of suggestions on policy measures and specific follow-up activity.

We anticipate that this book will serve as inspiration and guidance in setting effective national migration policies and practices. We expect it may also promote further dialogue and co-operation among OSCE participating States, international and regional organizations, and other stakeholders including civil society, the business community and trade unions.

The OSCE and the ILO both stand ready to encourage and support the necessary political will to strengthen *good governance* of migration. Our organizations provide platforms for continued dialogue on how to strengthen co-operation to obtain effective migration policies and practices.

We wish to acknowledge the job well done by Mr. August Gächter of the Centre for Social Innovation in Vienna in preparing this book, along with his team of contributors. Appreciation is also due to Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist at the ILO, for initial conceptualization, inputs and editorial oversight and to Ms. Nina Lindroos-Kopolo, Economic Advisor at the OSCE, for her constant review and liaison with the Greek OSCE 2009 Chairmanship to ensure successful completion of the report.



Goran Svilanovic
Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic
and Environmental Activities



Ibrahim Awad
Director, International Migration
Programme, ILO

I. Introduction: Strengthening migration governance

1. Introduction

The theme of the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum is “Migration management and its linkages with economic, social and environmental policies to the benefit of stability and security of the OSCE region”. OSCE participating States, since the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, have agreed on a substantial number of commitments in regard to migrants and migration. In part they cover new ground, in many instances there are calls to follow up on commitments made in other contexts such as the United Nations. In the OSCE Permanent Council Decision No. 857 regarding the 17th Economic and Environmental Forum of July 2008, the OSCE participating States agreed to review the OSCE commitments related to migration and to discuss the review in the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum. This would allow the states to recall the full picture of the commitments and developments during this period, and to understand them as a tool to cope with the current and future challenges.

This review of the OSCE Commitments on migration takes place as international migration becomes an increasingly important economic, social and political feature across the OSCE area. The background study included as a part of this review shows that, as of 2005, the countries of the OSCE were home to about 115 million *international migrants*, meaning persons living outside their country of birth or citizenship for at least one year. This is 9.5 percent of the population of OSCE countries and thus a sizeable presence.

Several millions more would be involved at any given time in seasonal or temporary migration programmes, or as students or temporary business transfers.

Especially of note is that most of the working age adult migrants in this population – are economically active, employed, self-employed or otherwise engaged in remunerative activities. Thus the proportion of foreign born in national workforces is even higher than the proportion of foreign born in the population as a whole.

The size, composition and direction of migration flows within and into the OSCE area have evolved considerably and in unforeseen ways since 1975, when the Helsinki Final Act was adopted and the first commitments on migration agreed upon. However, as migration features have evolved, the CSCE/OSCE process continued to give attention to it and participating States consistently expanded on their commitments to deliberately address migration.

2. Development of OSCE commitments on migration

The Helsinki Final Act¹ elaborated on economic and social aspects of labour migration. Asserting substantial growth in labour migration, in Part II, Title 3.1.11, the Act suggests a bilateral approach to dealing with the problems associated with migration. Collaboration between destination and origin countries should ensure orderly migration, protection of personal and social welfare, recruitment and provision of elementary language and vocational training. The document further mentions the need to ensure equality of rights between migrant workers and nationals of the host countries with regard to conditions of employment and work and to social security as well as the need to ensure satisfactory conditions, particularly housing conditions for migrant workers.

Further aspects mentioned concern equality of opportunity with regard to finding suitable employment in the event of unemployment; favouring the provision of vocational training to migrant workers and, as far as possible, free instruction in the language of the host country, in the framework of migrant workers' employment. Migrant workers should receive regular information in their own language on both their country of origin and the host country. Their children should have access to the education usually given there, under the same conditions as the children of that country and be permitted to receive supplementary education in their own language, national culture, history and geography. Family reunification should be facilitated as far as possible.

The document stressed the potential positive effect of return of migrants, who, after having acquired skills abroad, were moving back to their country of origin and suggested to facilitate the reintegration of returning migrants by the development of appropriate employment possibilities.

¹ Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Helsinki 1975

In order to facilitate travel for personal or professional reasons, the states agreed to gradually simplify and to flexibly administer the procedures for exit and entry, to ease regulations concerning movement of citizens from the other participating states in their territory and to gradually lower the fees for visas and official travel documents. The provision of consular services should be improved through appropriate conventions or agreements of understanding. Finally, the document reiterated that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, apply to all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

The conclusions regarding migration were incorporated in the chapter on economic cooperation of the Helsinki Final Act, highlighting recognition of the linkages among migration, economic cooperation and development. In later OSCE events, commitments regarding migration also put a greater emphasis on the Human Dimension of Migration.

These commitments were reinforced in the Concluding Document of the Second Follow-up Meeting in Madrid in 1983.² Specific attention was laid on an intensified cooperation of the host countries and countries of origin to further improve the general situation of migrant workers and their families, in particular with regard to the special problems of the children of migrants. Again, the issue of language teaching in the mother tongue was addressed: “[The participating States] will also endeavour to provide or promote, where reasonable demand exists, adequate teaching of the language and culture of the countries of origin.”³

Further provisions concern the facilitation of the social and economic reintegration of returning labour migrants, the payment of pensions, the facilitation of regular family contacts, and family reunification. Where necessary, fees – including visa or passport fees – charged in connection with applications for family meetings or family reunification should be reduced.

The “Concluding Document of Vienna – the Third Follow Up Meeting”⁴ of 1989 contains provisions regarding protection against discrimination based on language, religion, national origin and other grounds as well as regarding cooperation between host countries and countries of origin to improve the conditions of migrant workers and their families legally residing in the host countries. The

² Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting 1980 of Representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held on the Basis of the Provisions of the Final Act Relating to the Follow-Up of the Conference, Madrid, 183.

³ Madrid Document, Para 6, Economic and Social Aspects of Migration.

⁴ Concluding Document of the Vienna Meeting 1986 of Representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held on the Basis of the Provisions of the Final Act Relating to the Follow-Up of the Conference, Vienna 1989.

provisions reiterate the statements of the Madrid Meeting 1983 with a strong focus on ensuring the effective equality of opportunity between children of migrant workers and children of own nationals regarding access to all levels of education. In this context states are encouraged to facilitate supplementary teaching in the mother tongue of the children of migrant workers. Regarding the facilitation of travel for family reasons, states are encouraged to conclude agreements for issuing of multiple entry visa to facilitate circular migration.

A series of follow-up documents⁵ reiterated the OSCE's commitments in the field of antidiscrimination and with regard to the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers. They reaffirmed the commitment of the OSCE to the fostering of free movement and contact among the citizens of the participating States, in particular with regard to easing visa regulations and implementing fast and fair visa procedures. With regard to integration the documents encourage the participating States to offer migrants measures to familiarize them with the languages and social life of the respective countries and to allow them to express freely their ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic characteristics as long as they are consistent with the law and international standards.

Since the Document of the Third Meeting of the CSCE Council in Stockholm (1992)⁶ the documents express particular concern at mass migratory movements in the CSCE region due to war, armed conflict, civil strife and human rights violations like "ethnic cleansing" or mass deportations, which characterised the Balkan wars and armed conflicts in the CIS countries in the 1990s. Thus the documents of the 1990s focus on involuntary migration and refugee tragedies while labour migration issues receded into the background.

In its Decision No.2/05 "Migration" of December 6, 2005,⁷ the OSCE Ministerial Council (there is now a newer MC Decision No.5/09 on migration Management passed in Athens on 2 Dec. 2009) acknowledged the increasing importance and diversity of migration and its transnational character. The document asks for increased cooperation at the national, regional and international level. The document stresses the need for all States to adopt effective national frameworks to manage migration and points out the economic, social and human

⁵ Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, 1990; Charter of Paris for a New Europe, 1990; Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, 1991; Concluding Document of Helsinki – The Fourth Follow-Up-Meeting, 1992; Document of the Third Meeting of the CSCE Council, Stockholm, 1992; Document of the Fourth Meeting of the CSCE Council, Rome, 1993; Concluding Document of Budapest, 1994; Lisbon Document, 1996; Istanbul Document, 1999

⁶ Document of the Third Meeting of the CSCE Council, Stockholm, 1992

⁷ Decision No.2/05 "Migration", December 6, 2005, MC.DEC/2/05, Ljubljana.

effects on both host countries and countries of origin. Integration policies including respect for cultural and religious diversity and the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms are depicted as a factor to promote stability and societal cohesion. According to the document, ‘illegal’ migration should be fought and its root causes addressed. The document welcomes the cooperation between the OSCE, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA) and other international organisations and asks the Secretary General and all relevant OSCE institutions to continue their work on migration issues.

The OSCE Ministerial Statement on Migration made in Brussels in December 2006 (MC.DOC/6/06) reinforced the attention of participating States to fulfilling commitments and to carrying out the 2005 Decision. This consensus document called for the OSCE to facilitate, within its comprehensive approach to security: dialogue, partnership and cooperation between its participating States and the Mediterranean Partners on migration-related issues. This Statement also acknowledged the OSCE-IOM-ILO *Handbook on Establishing Labour Migration Policies* to be an effective tool for capacity-building in labour migration management.

3. Highlights of OSCE commitments

The OSCE commitments on migration are directed at fulfilling the commonly agreed policy objectives of protecting the migrant non-citizens on their territory as well as their citizens abroad, optimising the benefits of migration and mitigating its adverse impact in both the countries of origin and of destination and fostering international cooperation. The OSCE participating States comprise destination, origin and transit countries or a mixture of these.

With respect to **protecting migrant workers**, the main commitments are to:

- Protect and promote their fundamental human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, and their social welfare, including their living conditions;⁸
- Condemn discrimination on the ground of race, colour and ethnic origin, and prevent intolerance and xenophobia against migrant workers;⁹

⁸ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983, the Copenhagen Document 1990, the Charter of Paris for a New Europe 1990, the Moscow Document 1991, and the Vienna Document 1989.

⁹ See the Moscow Document 1991, the Budapest Document 1994, the Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, and the Permanent Council Decision No. 621 on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, annexed to the Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination.

Strengthening migration governance

- Ensure equality of rights of legally residing migrant workers with the nationals of the host countries with regard to conditions of employment and work and to social security;¹⁰
- Promote equality of opportunity in respect of working conditions, education, social security and health services, housing, access to trade unions as well as cultural rights for legally residing and working migrant workers;¹¹
- Facilitate the reuniting and regular contacts of legally residing migrant workers with their families.¹²

Moreover, specific commitments have also been made to ensure effective equality of opportunity between the children of migrant workers and children of nationals regarding access to all forms and all levels of education.¹³

In terms of optimising the **benefits of migration** and meeting the needs for labour skills in both origin and destination countries, the commitments are principally directed to:

- Comply with the international agreements to which they are parties;¹⁴
- Consider adhering to relevant multilateral instruments as well as concluding additional agreements in order to improve the consular, legal and medical assistance for migrants;¹⁵
- Adopting effective national frameworks in order to manage migration;¹⁶
- Ease regulations concerning the movement of citizens from the other participant States in their territory, with due regard to security requirements.¹⁷
- Creating conditions to foster integration and greater harmony in relations between migrant workers and the rest of the society in which they reside, including by raising awareness about the enriching contribution of migrants to society and by enabling migrant workers to participate in the life of the society where they lawfully reside;¹⁸

¹⁰ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

¹¹ See the Helsinki Document 1992.

¹² See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983, and the Vienna Document 1989.

¹³ See the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and the Vienna Document of 1989.

¹⁴ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

¹⁵ See the Vienna Document 1989 item (23).

¹⁶ See the Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

¹⁷ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

¹⁸ See the Moscow Document of 1991, the Helsinki Document 1992, the Budapest Document 1994, the Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, and the Permanent Council Decision No. 621 on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, annexed to the Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination.

- Providing elementary language and vocational training for migrant workers;¹⁹
- Facilitating the social and economic reintegration of returning labour migrants in their countries of origin, for instance by attracting their savings with a view to increasing opportunities for employment or by ensuring with appropriate legislative means or reciprocal agreements the payment of pensions;²⁰
- Fighting ‘illegal’ migration and addressing its root causes;²¹
- Increase the possibilities of employment in countries of origin, for instance by developing economic co-operation suitable to both host and origin countries.²²

In addition, a number of commitments encourage **bilateral and multilateral cooperation** by urging the participant States to:

- Ensure orderly movements of workers thorough collaborations between host and origin countries;²³
- Deal jointly with the problems arising from the migration of workers;²⁴
- Cooperate to further improve the general situation of migrant workers and their families.²⁵

Furthermore, the 13th Ministerial Council encouraged the OSCE itself to contribute by “facilitating dialogue and co-operation between participating States, including countries of origin, transit and destination in the OSCE area” and by “assisting the participating States ... to develop effective migration policies and to implement their relevant OSCE commitments.”²⁶

These commitments apply to origin, destination and transit countries as appropriate.

¹⁹ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975 and the Madrid Document 1983.

²⁰ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983 and the Vienna Document 1989.

²¹ *idem*

²² See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

²³ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

²⁴ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

²⁵ See the Madrid Document 1983.

²⁶ Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

4. Reference to legal and policy frameworks for migration regulation and governance

Certain commitments urge participant States to comply with international agreements to which they are parties and to consider adhering to relevant multilateral instruments. The Ministerial Council Decision of 2005 proposes that participant States adopt effective national frameworks in order to manage migration,²⁷ the challenge being to manage migration for the benefit of countries of origin, destination and transit, as well as of migrants and their families.

Such a framework could be derived from a “comprehensive and co-ordinated policy approach which attempts to tackle all dimensions of the phenomenon”, engaging “not merely the participation of governments, but also the social partners and civil society” (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 164-165), which has also been recommended by the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM 2005, 35).

Specifically, policy statements on migration need to be placed within the context of an overall labour and employment strategy with appropriate interaction with other development policies such as education, foreign affairs, trade and investment. Such a policy should also be sufficiently flexible to respond to the changing dynamics of the labour migration phenomenon and, given the transnational nature of labour migration, it should be firmly rooted in bilateral, regional and multilateral mechanisms, which inform and supplement national approaches (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 23-24).

In the light of the core OSCE commitments on migration the main areas of policy concern for governments and stakeholder partners (e.g. employment agencies, employers’ organisations, workers’ organisations, civil society bodies and migrants themselves) are:

- Setting legal foundations based on relevant international norms;
- Establishing an explicit policy framework through stakeholder consultations;
- Establishing regular migration channels;
- Building knowledge and institutional capacity;
- Regulating the labour market efficiently;
- Ensuring protection of human and labour rights;
- Addressing social welfare (i.e. health, education, housing, social security) and integration and social cohesion; optimising development impact;

²⁷ Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

- Preventing irregular migration
- Facilitating circulation, return and reintegration.

These areas of policy concern at the same time also reflect the guidelines for policy and practice highlighted in the ILO Multilateral Framework on Migration agreed in 2006.²⁸

5. Observations on the evolution of commitments

A full list of the verbatim commitments related to migration and migrants is provided in Annex 1 below. Reviewing it a number of observations become evident.

A thematic and chronological ordering of the commitments shows that a number of specific concerns have been addressed, particularly a broad concern with the protection of migrant workers against curtailment of their economic, social and cultural rights. This has largely extended to their families. The ordering also shows that when the cold war ended, the concerns shifted towards acknowledging that immigration had led to settlement and migrant workers needed to be protected against discrimination and racist violence. A degree of expectation on migrant workers to assimilate became evident, although at first without clarity on the distinctions between assimilation and integration.

Initially there was a concern for the situation of workers presumed to be abroad temporarily. This remained predominant until the late 1980s, when concern shifted to integration of long-staying and immigrant workers. Renewed attention to temporary migration issues may be warranted given that similar movements have been occurring in and between OSCE countries in the past decade, and considering also that participating States have been instituting new legislation aimed at satisfying certain labour needs through short-term stays.

A specification that protection concerns applied to migrants with legal residence was first made in 1989 and maintained since. Complementary provisions taking into account the fact that migrants without legal authorization have been accruing long periods of stay and a degree of protection under Human Rights provisions, especially in Council of Europe Member States, remain confined to the “human dimension”. The OSCE, jointly with specialized international

²⁸ ILO Multilateral Framework on Migration. Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/multilat_fw_k_en.pdf.

Strengthening migration governance

organisations, might offer participating States more comprehensive support and, perhaps, suggestions for practicable solutions in this area. Such solutions would address remedying or regularizing the situation of migrants without authorization who are contributing to host communities and cannot reasonably be expelled.

The connection between migration and development fell into abeyance together with the return topic, at the end of the 1980s. Development was acknowledged as a means to enhance the potential of origin countries to reabsorb returning migrant workers and their families. However, while there was some recognition of the contributions migration makes to destination country economic development and well-being, the contributions migration makes to origin country economic and social development as well as to political stability were overlooked.

From about 1989, the wording of commitments has been somewhat more confident, especially concerning the issues and aims. This is not usually matched by equally confident wording of the means or by an increase in the frequency of suggesting the means that might be useful in achieving the ends.

Interestingly there is little on actual movement across borders. There was a commitment to orderly movement, in 1975, and not to obstruct family unification, but it might have been expected the OSCE participating States would see fit to find some common ground especially on international migration between them but perhaps also from outside the OSCE area.

II. Meeting the challenges: A summary of the key dynamics of migration in the OSCE region

1. Determinants of labour migration in the OSCE region

a) Presence, role and distribution of migrants in destination countries

As of 2005, the countries of the OSCE were home to about 115 million migrants, i.e. persons born in another country. This is 9.5 percent of the population of OSCE countries and thus a sizeable presence. More than one third of all migrants, 44.5 million, were residing in Canada and the U.S., another 39 million in the EU-15 countries of 1995 and the four European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries, approximately 26 million in the CIS-countries, about 3 million in the 12 newer EU member countries, i.e. those that joined in 2004 and 2007, and less than 3 million in other OSCE participating States. Consequently, migrants made up more than 13 percent of the population of Canada and the U.S., about 10 percent in the EU-15 and EFTA countries, about 9 percent in the CIS countries, and about 3 percent, both, in the newer EU member countries and in other OSCE participating countries.²⁹

Within each of these country groups population shares varied again. In the U.S., in 2003, immigrants made up about 12 percent of the population while in Canada, in 2006, they accounted for about 20 percent of the total population, i.e. one in five, the highest proportion of immigrants recorded in Canada in 75 years. According to UN data, shares within the 15 European Union member

²⁹ Computed from data provided by the UN Population Division <http://www.unpopulation.org>.

countries of 1995, in 2005, varied between about 3 percent in Finland and about 15 percent in Austria with Luxemburg exceeding that by far and reaching about 37 percent. The four EFTA countries had shares between about 7 percent in Norway and about 23 percent in Switzerland. In the newer EU member countries they were between less than 1 percent in Romania and close to 9 percent in Slovenia with Cyprus, Estonia and Latvia ranging between about 14 and about 20 percent. In the CIS the range extended from about 2 percent in Azerbaijan to about 17 percent in Kazakhstan, but the Russian Federation, although only 8.4 percent of its population were immigrants, hosted nearly half the migrants in the CIS. In South-Eastern Europe and Turkey it stretched from about 1 percent in Bosnia-Herzegovina to about 6 percent in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with Croatia reaching close to 15 percent. In most cases these UN figures refer to persons born in another country, in some cases to citizenship.³⁰

According to UN estimates the migrant population in the OSCE, between 1995 and 2005, grew by about 19 percent from 97 million to 115 million. At 33 percent the largest growth was in the EU-15 and EFTA countries, i.e. from about 29.4 million to about 39.2 million. Likewise in the U.S. and Canada the immigrant population grew by almost 33 percent, from 34.5 million to 44.5 million. In the newer EU Member states the immigrant population declined by about 17 percent, from about 3.5 to 2.9 million, and in the CIS countries by about 6 percent, from 27.3 to 25.7 million. In other OSCE participating States there was a decrease by about 6 percent, from 3.0 to about 2.7 million. These trends probably continued until 2008 but may change in the recession, at least temporarily.

In absolute numbers the Russian Federation, in 2003, had the second largest immigrant population in the world, after the United States, while Germany was third, Ukraine was fourth, France was fifth and Kazakhstan ninth (United Nations 2005, 30). In other words, OSCE countries, in global terms, play an extremely important role as hosts to international migrants.

ILO estimates show that, on average, nearly half of the entire foreign born population of most countries are employed, self-employed or otherwise engaged in remunerative activity. This indicates that most adult migrants and immigrants are economically active and it generally means that the foreign born proportion of the work force is even higher than it is of the population as a whole.

Included in the total 115 million born abroad are approximately 2.7 million recognised refugees that lived in OSCE countries in 2006, down from an estimated

³⁰ See <http://www.unpopulation.org> for detailed data and definitions.

4.5 million ten years earlier. The decline in persons holding refugee status is partly due to return migration but for the most part it results from naturalisations. The EU-15 are home to half of all refugees in the region while slightly more than one third live in the U.S. and Canada. The share of refugees in all migrants is around 2.3 percent.³¹ The number of asylum applications rose from about 408,000 in 1996 to about 600,000 in 2001 and declined to 386,000 in 2006.³² This decadal see-saw movement is not new and is likely to continue in the future.

Migration flows both into and within the OSCE, at least in recent decades, have been predominantly south to north and east to west, although there have also been important movements in the contrary direction. Intra-OSCE migration has been very important in CIS and South-east European countries, and has contributed a major share of the immigrants living in the EU and in Canada. Nonetheless there is a fairly clear separation between migration in the CIS and migration in the EU. This is likely to be due both to historical separation and to the EU's Schengen system, developed since the mid-1980s, which has contributed to freer movement within the EU and to stricter controls at the EU's external borders. Finally, it should be noted that the disintegration of states, especially of the Soviet Union but also of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, has made a substantial contribution to the number of migrants in the OSCE region. Large numbers of formerly internal migrants formally became international migrants over night both statistically and legally.³³ Below we will be taking a quick tour of some salient facts on the migratory interconnectedness of OSCE participating States.

Data republished by the World Bank (2009, 150) indicate that in the European and Central Asian OSCE participating States outside the EU-15 and EFTA 91 percent of the immigrant population originates from that same group of countries and another 7 percent from other OSCE countries, 98 percent in total. In the EU-15 and EFTA countries about 29 percent of the immigrant population is from within the group and about one quarter from other parts of the OSCE, adding up to 56 percent of the entire immigrant population. In Canada about 47 percent of the immigrant population originates from other OSCE countries including only 5 percent from the neighbouring U.S., while in the U.S. a mere 20 percent of the immigrant population is from other OSCE countries including about 3 percent from Canada. For the U.S. the most important origin countries

³¹ Calculation based on United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division 2006: *International Migration 2006*. United Nations Publication, Sales No. E.06.XIII.6; UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2005 and 2006.

³² Data compiled by ICMPD based on: UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2005 and 2006.

³³ It is for this reason that Estonia and Latvia have a share of around 30 percent immigrants in their population, and Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus of 15 to 20 percent.

are to its south, i.e. Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, where about 37 percent of the immigrants were born, and Asia, where about 25 percent were born.³⁴ In the EU Africa has been the most important non-OSCE area of origin from where about one in six of the immigrant population originated including Morocco and Algeria as the most important individual origin countries outside the OSCE.

When ten new member countries joined the EU on 1 May 2004 transition rules applying to the freedom to take up employment were agreed for eight of them, and likewise for the two countries that joined at the beginning of 2007. The transition rules do not apply to self-employment or to the freedom of movement and settlement. For the first two years (2004 to 2006), only Ireland, Sweden, and the UK granted free access to the labour market. All others of the EU-15 except Germany, Austria and France lifted the restrictions in 2006 or 2007. The main source countries for intra-EU East-West migration are Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia and Romania. In the UK, over 508,000 applications for the Worker Registration Scheme, specially introduced for the eight new Eastern European Member States of 2004,³⁵ were filed between 2004 and mid-2007. Among them 58 percent were Polish citizens, followed by Lithuania (13 percent), and Slovakia (11 percent). 362,000 persons from the new EU Member States entered Ireland between 2004 and 2007 to take up work, and in Germany about 250,000 seasonal workers from Poland are registered annually (Council of Europe 2008, 46).

OSCE countries have been key sources of migrants to some destination areas outside the OSCE. About 54 percent of the immigrant population of Australia and New Zealand was born in OSCE countries, largely in the EU-15 and EFTA, and in Latin America 35 percent of the immigrant population were born in OSCE countries, including about 20 percent in the EU-15 and EFTA countries and about 12 percent in the U.S. In the high-income Middle Eastern and North African countries 18 percent of immigrants are from OSCE countries including 15 percent from European and Asian countries not members of the EU-15 and EFTA (World Bank 2009, 150).

The Russian Federation is the most important source country of emigrants, Ukraine is third, Kazakhstan seventh, and Uzbekistan tenth in the world. Countries with large shares of expatriates include Armenia and Kazakhstan with each around 30 percent. Belarus, Georgia, and Moldova have expatriate populations of

³⁴ Percentages calculated from: US Census Bureau, The Foreign Born Population in the United States 2003. <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/foreign/cps2003.html>, 2009-02-12.

³⁵ Due to their membership of the Commonwealth, citizens of Cyprus and Malta already had free access to the United Kingdom.

around 20 percent (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 25). Until 2003, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova experienced a net migration loss less than or around 5 percent of the 1989 population, Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic less than 10 percent, and Tajikistan, Armenia, Georgia, and Kazakhstan around 20 percent. Nonetheless, the Russian Federation is also a major immigration country; it has experienced a 5 percent net migration gain and Belarus a 1 percent gain (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 33).

About 320,000 (34 percent) of the around 936,000 migrants leaving CIS countries other than Russia between 2000 and 2003 moved to Russia, about 160,000 (17 percent) to other CIS countries, and about 280,000 (30 percent) to Western Europe. Of the about 430,000 emigrants from Russia nearly two thirds (273,000) moved to other CIS countries and 85,000 (20 percent) to Western Europe (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 35). 75 percent of the 425,000 immigrants Russia received between 2000 and 2003 originated from other CIS countries. Russia is a net recipient of migrants from the whole CIS region. Between 1989 and 2003, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan contributed more than half of all immigrants to Russia, followed by Georgia, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, the Ukraine, and the Kyrgyz Republic (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 47). Among CIS countries only Ukraine and Moldova are also origin countries of significant numbers of migrants to Western Europe (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 36).

CIS countries are also important in transit migration from within and outside the CIS towards the U.S., Canada, and Central and Western Europe but very little is known about transit migration or transit migrants. Some of them realise that it is unrealistic to reach their target and settle in the transit country. Turkey's experience is similar, as was also true of Bulgaria before it joined the EU. Significant numbers of transit migrants are to be found in Azerbaijan, Russia, and Ukraine. A major factor inhibiting their onward movement is thought to be a lack of information about the rules and regulations for entry to their planned destination country (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 41, 43).

In South-eastern Europe there is a substantial number of displaced persons from neighbouring OSCE participating countries in Serbia, about 400,000 by some estimates. A similar situation prevails in Croatia. In other parts of the former Yugoslavia the numbers are smaller but most of the population born in other countries was indeed born in other parts of the former Yugoslavia. In Turkey there is an incipient migration from the southern CIS kindled by formal and informal labour recruitment. Turkey's and Albania's importance as source countries for some EU and EFTA countries has already been noted. About 38 percent of the population born in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and about 30 percent of the population of Albania and Slovenia have left (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 25). Serbia is another

substantial origin country, especially for the German speaking parts of Europe, and to a lesser degree for Canada and the U.S.. Much of this emigration has resulted in naturalisation in the countries of destination and is no longer discernable in citizenship statistics.

East- and southbound migration, as far as is known, has been having distinct features. It has in part been return migration of at least three different kinds. One is the return of workers and this may have intensified in the current economic crisis, a second one is the involuntary return of emigrants expelled from destination countries, and third there are within-company transfers of occupationally qualified emigrants. Fourthly, the non-return migration has tended to be managerial and technical, i.e. highly skilled and fulfilling very particular functions intended to be temporary until sufficient local capacity has been created. The latter two migration components may have decreased and perhaps even been reversed in the recession. The fact, though, is that little is known about the size and selectivity of return migration, and consequently even less can be said confidently about its impacts on either the origin or the destination countries.

Overall, in the Americas, in the western part of Europe, and in the eastern part of the OSCE the major migratory movements have been south to north. Only within the EU-27 has there been a substantial east-west movement from the late 1980s. In a sense it may be regarded as a substitute for the earlier migration from northern Mediterranean countries to parts of western Europe, and like them it is being followed by substantial return migration. This return migration may likely decline as efforts by the U.S. and the EU to strengthen their southern borders appear to be reducing irregular entries.

b) Labour force declines, demographic determinants, economic disparities

As noted above, large portions of the foreign born populations are economically active in host countries. Although migration may help to remedy future shortages of labour and skills, it cannot fully replace the ageing European population. From 1995, net inflows into the EU-15 of around 1 million per year would have been required to keep the population stable, and around 1.5 million per year to keep the working age population stable. This is being achieved. In order to keep the old-age dependency ratio constant inflows of around 700 million immigrants during the period from 1995 from 2050 would be necessary, or nearly 13 million per year (Münz et al 2006b, 30f). This is not being achieved. In the eastern member countries of the OSCE the required levels of immigration are being achieved even less.

Fertility decline and demographic ageing are widespread phenomena in the OSCE region. Whereas fertility rates in the U.S. have been rising and reached

2.1 children per woman in 2008,³⁶ the overall demographic development in the European Union is characterised by low fertility (around 1.5 children per woman) and increasing life expectancy (75.1 for men and 81.2 for women, in 2004) (Münz et al 2006a, 2). In Canada, too, fertility is below the replacement rate (1.57) (CIA 2008³⁷), and life expectancy is somewhat ahead of the EU average (78 for men and 82.7 for women, in 2005).³⁸ The CIS region displays a varied picture with fertility rates well below the EU average (Ukraine 1.12, Moldova 1.23, Russian Federation 1.33) to countries well above the replacement rate (Kyrgyz Republic 2.71, Turkmenistan 2.76, Tajikistan 3.81), average female life expectancy ranging from 66.3 (Tajikistan) to 74.3 (Georgia) and average male life expectancy ranging from 57.8 (Kazakhstan) to 67.9 (Armenia).³⁹

The age structure of the population of the EU is undergoing rapid change. Presently, every sixth EU citizens is over 65 years of age. The expectation is that by 2020 every fifth and by 2050 every fourth will be over 65, while half of the population will be over 50 years old (Council of Europe 2008, 37). In 2000, the relation between the 20-39 age group and the 40-59 age group in Western and Northern Europe was 1.1, while by 2015 it will be 0.9. Since 2005, the older age group (40-59) has been making up a greater share in the European labour force than the younger age group (20-39) (Council of Europe 2008, 33).

The relation between natural demographic growth and immigration varies considerably. A recent report (Salt 2005, 5; Council of Europe 2008, 38) showed how, in 2002-2003, the Member Countries of the Council of Europe were distributed across six clusters:

- Decline in population due both to a natural population decrease and to net emigration: Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Ukraine;
- Decline in population due to a natural population decrease not offset by net immigration: Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Serbia and Montenegro;
- Decline in population due to net emigration exceeding natural increase: Armenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;
- Population growth due both to natural increase and net immigration:

³⁶ CIA, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2127rank.html>, 2009-02-11.

³⁷ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2127rank.html>, 2009-02-11.

³⁸ Statistics Canada, <http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/health26-eng.htm>, 12.02.2009

³⁹ Stockholm School of Economics. Economic and Social Data rankings, <http://dataranking.com/index.cgi?LG=e>, 2009-01-12.

Strengthening migration governance

Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom;

- Population growth due to natural increase exceeding a negative migration balance: Albania, Azerbaijan, Iceland;
- Population growth due to net immigration exceeding a natural population decrease: Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia.

Gaps in incomes, salaries, decent work, social security patterns and standards of living stimulate migration flows from less prosperous to more prosperous states. The profiles and the distribution of migrants are relatively closely linked to the structure and demands of the labour markets of the destination countries. In the 1950s and the 1960s, a high demand for labour in agriculture, construction and industrial production led to large-scale, mainly low-skilled migration to Western Europe (Council of Europe 2008, 32). This specific recruitment history is still reflected in the skills composition of the migrant population. In the OECD countries of Europe, by 2000, there were about 11 million expatriate adults with low levels of education (nine years of schooling or less), nearly six million with a secondary school education, and slightly less than five million with a tertiary education. By contrast, foreign born adults in North America have substantially higher levels of educational attainment (Katseli et al 2006, 14). No similar estimates seem yet to exist for immigrants in CIS countries.

c) Particular labour and skills demands in specific sectors and occupations

There seems to be a certain tendency for immigrant workers to either be employed in capital-intensive industries characterised by high salaries, employment stability, and high social status, or in low skilled and low paid jobs. Migrants have been found to accept employment in low skilled jobs more readily than natives for at least two reasons. They may construe it as a biographical exception from which they will later return to their “normal” occupation and “normal” social status in the origin country, an impression often directly supported by the legal position the destination country keeps them in, and wages may be higher and more reliable than in their home-countries or their economic home-sectors. For migrants there are large opportunities for low skilled employment, particularly in agriculture, catering, and domestic services including care-giving for the elderly (Council of Europe 2008, 33) often in spite of political and regulatory efforts to the contrary. European Mediterranean countries, for instance, have been absorbing recent immigration from the south and the east in agriculture, construction and service industries,

partly through a large-scale informal sector, as is also true elsewhere. Low-skill employment in manufacturing has been moving between countries rather than gradually diminishing and disappearing, as is often claimed. In the countries it moves to it often attracts migrant labour again, if not sooner then later.

Almost half of the 200 million migrants worldwide (World Bank 2009, 150), estimated for 2008, are women. An increasing number of women are not migrating as spouse or family member, but independently. Women take up both skilled and less-skilled employment. As skilled migrants, women most often work in social and welfare professions, in education, and nursing. As less skilled workers they are mainly employed in domestic services or as care workers, in garment manufacturing, or in the hospitality sector. In the Southern European countries, the Gulf States, and the Middle East the domestic sector is the largest employer of migrant labour (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 19).

Demand for qualified personnel of the research and development sectors in many technologically advanced industries cannot be met by the local or national labour market. Existing education patterns often do not fully meet the demands of the expanding knowledge-based industries, thus vacancies are filled by recruitment of highly skilled workers from elsewhere. There is now a complex pattern of movement by professional, managerial and technical staff involving most states. The main stimuli for this development were multi-nationals, governments introducing skill-based immigration regimes, and the health-systems of some countries competing for medical and nursing staff. The shortage of IT workers, in particular, led European governments to adopt more proactive policies in this field (Salt 2005a, 29). This development has resulted in a degree of international competition for skilled labour (Council of Europe 2008, 34).

Making the best use of migrants' skills is a major challenge for many destination countries. Credentials, qualifications, skills and experience obtained abroad are not easily recognised by regulatory agencies and employers. This has led to disproportionate levels of over-qualification of employees on the one hand (Dumont/Monso 2007; OECD 2008b, 139), and non-employment of qualified immigrants. In all European countries studied by the OECD⁴⁰ at least 25 percent (and nearly 50 percent on average) of skilled migrants were non-active, unemployed or consigned to jobs below their level of qualification (Council of Europe 2008, 91).

⁴⁰ Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland and the UK.

So far there is no common skill recognition system for skills acquired in third countries in the EU. Only few countries have introduced provisions for skill recognition. Italy's legislation provides that "within the framework of a national integration programme, and on the basis of agreements with local and regional authorities, educational institutions must promote (...) study tracks leading to the compulsory education certificate or the upper secondary school diploma which would take account of education obtained in the country of origin (and) criteria for the recognition of qualifications obtained in the country of origin, in order to facilitate integration into the school system" (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 138).

Immigrants are also active in business. Often they provide services to other migrants or start up other small businesses. Entrepreneurship and self-employment tend in part to be a reaction to the lack of employment or career-options on the formal labour market.

d) Economic and other pressures compelling migration

ILO data indicates that the absence of decent work, or any employment opportunities at all, is a major factor driving migration today.

In large part the workers originate from rural agricultural areas as economic development, mechanisation, replacement of family farming by industrialized agro-export business, and environmental deterioration including desertification necessarily shrink farm populations while the major part of jobs in other industries is usually created in urban areas rather than in rural ones. When manufacturing or service activities are difficult to start or maintain, then the new job centres could easily be in urban areas abroad rather than locally. In Europe the transfer of employment and population from agricultural to manufacturing and service activities was largely completed by about 1960. In some cases this took place considerably sooner, in others it continues into the present, as for instance in Poland and Turkey. Outside the OSCE China is certainly the most spectacular contemporary case for observing this unavoidable process. In parts of the former Soviet Union it is also still evident today.

Poverty in itself is not a sufficient cause for migration. According to a Turkish study, negative or halted development and the individual's perception of halted development lead to a higher propensity to emigrate (İçduygu et al 2001, cited in Council of Europe 2008, 58). Not the poorest individuals but rather those with access to information about employment possibilities abroad and ability to

obtain the financial means for the initial emigration costs leave the country. Typically, they have at least some education and work experience (Council of Europe 2008, 58).

An important aspect of labour migration, too often overlooked, is that the migrants earn their income not for themselves alone but for the family or household left behind. Migrants themselves are only one part of the migration experience. The larger part comprises the people who depend on the migrants' income without migrating themselves. Migration for work is not so much a solution to an individual's problem as to a family's. The breakdown – or non-existence – of social security systems in some countries has left households and families, were they not to fall into utter destitution, with no other choice than to delegate one reliable member of the family to migrate into a more prosperous labour market.

Political upheaval and political uncertainty also tend to contribute to emigration as was evident in the late 1980s and early 1990s when the Communist regimes were being replaced. Civil warfare and armed conflict have also resulted in forced displacement and migration in parts of the OSCE region.

2. Migration, economic growth and development

a) Contribution of migration to destination countries

On the whole, the impact of migration on the wider economy in countries of destination seems to be somewhere between broadly neutral and mildly positive (Salt 2005b, 11). For the European Union, very small negative results on the employment and wage levels of natives have been reported, offset by the creation of additional employment due to economies of scale and spill-over effects (Münz et al 2006b, 7). Several OECD studies done between 1984 and 1995 concluded there was no negative impact of immigration on local unemployment. Other studies found an increase in employment of native workers as a result of economic growth associated with immigrant recruitment. Furthermore, the openness of the labour market seems to have an influence. In Greece, Spain, Portugal, and Ireland – countries granting non-EU-citizens somewhat easier access to the labour market than other EU countries do – unemployment of third country nationals has been reported to be lower than that of nationals (Münz et al 2006b, 8). In addition, wage effects are reported to be minimal. Studies have been reporting either very small negative effects, slightly positive effects for highly skilled native workers, or no significant effects at all (Council of Europe 2008, 41).

The main reason why migration has only a minimal impact on wages and employment of the native workforce is a consequence of segmentation and

stratification of labour markets: most part migrant workers complement national workers rather than substituting for them. In most countries of destination immigrant workers are active in sectors where national workers are in short supply. While this is widely, though not unanimously, accepted to be true for the higher skills it has also been true at the lower end of the skills spectrum. Usually migrants are in competition only with marginal sections of the national labour force (Council of Europe 2008, 41). Migrants are more likely to compete with immigrant workers who arrived earlier than with native workers. If the non-competition is achieved by means of distinctly poorer working conditions and wages for migrant workers this usually backfires. The employment of migrant workers tends to be accepted as long as the non-competition is based on differences in occupation while equality of working conditions is maintained. To achieve this often requires a credible threat against employers, not workers, of workplace inspections. Trade unions and journalists have important roles in maintaining the equality.

In many countries, immigrants and their descendants are setting up businesses. In 2005, immigrants accounted for 12 percent of self-employment in the UK, 13 percent in Belgium, France and Germany, and over 14 percent in Sweden (Council of Europe 2008, 92) in spite of their absence from farming which is a mainstay of non-immigrant self-employment.

There is no clear picture with regard to use of welfare programmes by immigrants. Whereas in some countries (e.g. Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Austria, and Switzerland) welfare support is greater for immigrants than for natives other studies have found that immigrants contribute more to government revenue than they receive in benefits (Council of Europe 2008, 44). This is an area that has been suffering from a severe lack of adequate data; this lack will not at all be easy to remedy, especially in the short run.

Overall, most contemporary research argues that immigration generally supports economic growth and development. Some of the wealthiest countries in the world also have the highest proportion of immigrant workers (ILO 2004, 31). A recent study of 15 European countries, for the period 1991 to 1995, found that every 1 percent increase in a country's population through immigration was connected to a 1.25 to 1.5 percent increase in GDP (Council of Europe 2008, 42).

b) Contribution of migration to origin countries

The effects of migration on the origin countries have become an important topic of research and politics in recent years. As migration entails costs as well as benefits for the source countries it is crucial to understand the effects of migration on development, growth and poverty reduction. The evidence is contradictory and

fragmentary. The international community increasingly has agreed that migration issues need to be integrated and mainstreamed into development policies and measures to alleviate poverty and into national employment and labour market policies in order to lead to positive effects for both origin and destination countries (Katseli et al 2006, 9).

Remittances are frequently cited as the main benefit of migration to source countries. Their recorded volume has increased from US\$ 31 billion in 1990 to US\$ 228,7 billion in 2006. Inward remittance flows for all developing countries reached US\$ 280,7 billion in 2007 and the estimate for 2008 is US\$ 305,3 billion. (World Bank 2009) In 2006, remittances surpassed twice the level of official development assistance (US\$ 104 billion) and were equal to two thirds of foreign direct investment (FDI) flows of US\$ 325 billion (Council of Europe 2008, 63).

In the OSCE region remittances have grown considerably in recent years and stood at US\$ 46.8 billion in 2007. The vast majority of the outflows (US\$ 42.6 billion) originates in America. The EU-15 generate a net outflow of approximately US\$ 12.2 billion, and the non-EU-states in Europe a net outflow of approximately US\$ 16.6 billion. The largest net receivers in the OSCE are the 12 newer EU Member States (US\$ 21.2 billion) and the Western Balkans (US\$ 9.9 billion). The CIS, which until 2000 was a net receiving area, has generated about US\$ 6.9 billion net remittances to other countries, chiefly CIS members, in 2007. Between 2000 and 2007, net remittances sent to the 12 newer EU member countries grew twelve-fold and to the Western Balkans 2.5-fold.⁴¹

According to World Bank and IMF figures net remittances, in 2003, were equivalent to over 75 percent of Albania's exports, and over 50 percent of exports from Bosnia and Herzegovina. They amounted to 22.8 percent of Moldova's GDP, 18.4 percent of the GDP of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and 15.6 percent of the GDP of Albania (OECD 2005, cited in Council of Europe 2008, 63).

At the World Bank it has been concluded that remittances are now "an important and stable source of development finance" (World Bank 2003, 11). Remittances have fluctuated less dramatically with economic cycles than capital flows, and this is likely to remain true in the current crisis. Although they are expected to decline, they are at the same time expected to remain larger than foreign direct investment. Further, direct investments and remittances tend not to go to the same countries. They are correlated only poorly and negatively.⁴²

⁴¹ World Bank staff estimates based on the International Monetary Fund's Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook 2008. Data compiled by ICPMD.

⁴² Using data on net remittances and workers compensation as well as net foreign direct investment for

Migrant remittances go directly into the household consumption of families, mainly into improved housing, nutrition, schooling and health care. Thus remittances create human capital by financing the education of children and health expenses, while improving nutrition security for poor households. In countries with patriarchal family patterns, particularly girls profit from remittances, as the money facilitates their schooling which otherwise would not have been funded (Council of Europe 2008, 65). An initial assessment of the impact of the global financial crisis is provided below in subsection 'd'.

One way to enhance and maintain the level of remittances is to provide matching funds on the condition that they are put to effective developmental use (Global Commission 2005, 29). Emigrant networks also can be supportive in bringing newly arrived immigrants into employment and thus secure the transfer of further remittances. For example, 60 per cent of Moldovan migrants claim to have had a job lined up for them through network contacts before they emigrated (IOM 2008, 345).

Return migration and emigrant contacts transfer information, ideas, knowledge, and contacts from the country of residence to the country of origin. These "social remittances" help to transform the economy, culture and everyday life of origin regions and thus are a stimulus for behavioral and social change (Council of Europe 2008, 66). Important agents for these "social remittances" are transnational migrant associations active in both countries of origin and of destination. The activities and behaviour of returning migrants and the information transmitted by migrants can trigger social innovations (Council of Europe 2008, 67). These may be welcomed by sections of the population and frowned upon by others. Some source countries, like Mexico, gradually installed broad programmes fostering the links between emigrants and the country of origin, e.g. by granting voting rights in national elections for their citizens residing abroad.

Circular and return migration may also foster the development of the country of origin when they involve the return and utilisation of skills and capital. Basic preconditions for positive effects are options of employment and entrepreneurial initiative and an encouraging environment for returning migrants. "Sustainable return", defined by the Council of Europe as "a situation, where the migrant returns with sufficient resources (additional skills, financial and social capital) and has no reason to migrate again" (Council of Europe 2008, 71), is sometimes argued to need a period of being abroad long enough and conditions

2005 as provided in the World Bank's World Development Indicators 2007 the correlation across 135 countries is $r=-0.35$.

of employment favourable to the acquisition of skills and the accumulation of social and/or financial capital, and return should take place still at a productive age (Council of Europe 2008, 72). On the other hand there is evidence that even sojourns of a few months or a year can be highly beneficial for individual migrants with a clear aim. Interviews with returnees from the UK to Slovakia who had been au pairs, students, interns and the like show them to exhibit enhanced confidence including occupational and business confidence, and to value highly the progress they made in the use of English (Williams/Baláz 2005).

Emigrant populations can be major providers of knowledge and resources for development in the origin countries. Commonly migrants organise in their country of residence based on local origin, language, faith or other criteria on which to base community. Many are involved in funding and supporting developmental activities in the country of origin by collecting funds for schools, hospitals or investments in infrastructure. Emigrant organisations often also participate in the social and political life of the source community often using their financial muscle in particular. In conflict situations in areas with a sizeable number of emigrants it has therefore become crucial to involve the emigrant communities in peace-building efforts (Bercovitch 2007; Skrbíš 2007; Tölölyan 2007).

Migration also augments international trade. According to a recent study on bilateral trade between the UK and 48 selected trading partners immigration from non-Commonwealth countries had a significant effect on trade with them (Münz et al 2006b, 42). A 10 percent increase in the immigrant population raised UK exports to those countries by 1.6 percent. Similar results have been obtained for the effects of immigration to Spain on bilateral trade with 40 trading partners between 1991 and 1999 (Münz et al 2006b, 43).

In some situations remittances tend to be focused on the richer households thus increasing inequality. This may be a temporary phenomenon arising from the richer households being the first ones to be able to finance migration or long-

An example for a deliberate return policy can be found in Portugal's support schemes for emigrants or their children providing them with opportunities in the country of origin. The government-run "Train in Portugal" scheme assists the return of young people of Portuguese origin between the ages of 18 and 30 holding a technological qualification and unemployed in the host country by helping them enter working life through traineeships with companies (Council of Europe 2008, 73).

Tajikistan is the origin country in Central Asia with the largest out-migration. One in four families has at least one member working abroad. The amount of remittances sent home by labour migrants from Tajikistan through official and informal channels was US\$1,691 million in 2007, equivalent to 45.5% of the country's annual GDP (World Bank 2009). Most of the remittances are used to cover the immediate needs of the migrants' families and investment in sustainable economic activities is limited.

In partnership with UNDP, IOM started a programme in Tajikistan promoting the investment of remittances in viable livelihoods for families. In coordination with local development committees small business and agricultural loans were extended to labour migrant households investing a matching amount from remittances. The total investment amounted to approximately US\$ 80,000. Loans were linked to business training and preparation of business plans. In addition, labour migrants made matching contributions to repair community infrastructure (schools, clinics, bridges, transformers) (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 78).

distance migration with the poorer households following only later. The gap would thus initially open and might then close again. A frequent complaint has been that a relatively small portion of remittances is used for business investment. However, it can be generally expected that, in order for remittances to be invested as well as for households to become entrepreneurially ambitious or competent, the legal and economic circumstances and infrastructure also need to be conducive to small business. The lack of an attractive investment and business climate also appears to hold back those households that might provide services to the remittance receiving households. It is this aspect that is economically crucial, not the question what exactly the receiving households themselves use the income for. In addition, high transfer fees and poor exchange rates have also been diminishing the potential impact of remittances (Newland 2003, 2). The developmental impact of remittances, as with any inflows of money, thus depends on the local circumstances but is distinguished from other inflows by being entered immediately into the circulation of goods and resources among local households. This increases the chances for local development but is not in itself a guarantee.⁴³

⁴³ See, for example, on Albania King/Vullnetari 2003, 49-50.

Family reunification and integration policies of the destination countries have direct and indirect impacts on the generation of remittances. If family reunification is restricted by law, it is likely that sending remittances to family members abroad is preferred to family reunification in the host country. On the other hand, demands put on immigrants, including investment in occupational or language training or in improved housing, may reduce their capacity to send remittances (Council of Europe 2008, 99).

c) Costs of migration: skills deficits, imbalances, family disruption

The loss of human resources – particularly trained professional personnel, but also bright students and other talents who decide not to return – to other countries is debated as a major cost of migration for source countries. Brain drain may lead to a lack of human resources in key areas and hamper the advance and competitiveness of the economy and the social institutions of developing countries. There are several examples of massive brain drain cited in the literature. Many of them concern medical professions.

- Albania lost one-third of its qualified people in the decade after the collapse of communism (Newland 2003, 2).
- Approximately 30 percent of Ukrainian scientists – most of them in the middle of their career – are estimated to have left the country in the last ten years (Council of Europe 2008, 69).
- Over 500,000 persons with an academic degree have left Bulgaria since 1995 (Council of Europe 2008, 69).

Depending on the circumstances the loss of skilled personnel may impact negatively on development. When trained and highly educated persons emigrate permanently, public investments in financing their education and training are essentially lost to the country of origin. Further, depending on the income opportunities of the educated and the trained or potentially generated by them and on the tax regime, there may be a loss of tax-revenue. In an extreme case brain drain could destroy an entire sector of the economy when the educational system is not capable of replacing the emigrants. The evidence so far is inconclusive on whether emigration triggers additional demand for education and training (Commander et al 2003, 2004). Converting any additional demand for training into supply also depends on sufficient training facilities. On the other hand, skill exports may, if well managed, have advantages. Several international organisations run programmes supporting the transfer of knowledge to the country of origin of immigrants. Another means of tackling the issue are migration-

development partnerships intending to obtain some degree of cooperation towards equalising the benefits of migration for source and destination countries.

An example of origin-destination partnership is the Mali-France Consultation on Migration, established in 2000. It provides for annual discussion at ministerial level on the integration of immigrants from Mali in France, co-management of migration flows and developmental cooperation. France supports the Malian education sector, and the skills of Malians living in France are registered by a French-Malian committee to be integrated into development projects. Information on jobs and living conditions in France is provided to Malian citizens before immigration, and consulates in France provide assistance to Malian expatriates (Council of Europe 2008, 77).

Migration can have important impacts on family life. Transnational families have been defined as those “that live some or most of the time separated from each other, yet hold together and create something that can be seen as a feeling of collective welfare and unity, namely ‘familyhood’, even across national borders” (Bryceson/Vuorela 2002, 3, cited in IOM 2008, 154). The impact of migration on family members left behind seems to depend in part on the division of labour between the sexes and whether the migrant is a female or a male member of the household. A recent study conducted in Bangladesh, an important migrant origin country for a number of OSCE participating States, examined the impacts of male migration on family members, specifically on wives left behind. In the majority of the observed cases, women, along with their children, experienced an increase in their standard of living as a result of the remittances sent by their migrant husbands. On the other hand, the migration of women appeared to have a particularly strong impact on the children left behind. In some cases the mother’s absence was felt to contribute to the decline in her children’s school attendance while, in others, the remittances sent by the mother enabled her children to benefit from better schooling. There was also evidence that some children suffered emotionally from the absence of their mothers, particularly when the fathers did not or could not make up for it (IOM 2008, 155).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Similar observations on Albania are provided by King/Vullnetari 2003, 53-54.

The effects of migration on development have been recently studied with regard to Armenia (ILO 2008a), the Kyrgyz Republic (ILO 2008b) and Tajikistan (ILO 2008c). The three studies show very diverse patterns with regard to the effects of migration on the respective countries.

According to the report on Armenia (ILO 2008a), 14.5 percent of Armenian households were involved in migration activities. Since 2002, about 55,000 migrants have returned to Armenia and decided not to leave again, at least in 2008. In general, and probably for a variety of reasons, returnees have been tending to do better in terms of employment and salary non-migrants. While returnees had a positive influence on skills and technology transfer for the company hiring them, their contribution to the origin country in terms of investment, job creation and business development appeared to be limited.

The report on the Kyrgyz Republic (ILO 2008b) gives a mixed picture. During the last decade Kyrgyzstan became a country of origin of labour migration for CIS countries, and the third largest Central Asian supplier of labour migrants to Russia (after Uzbekistan and Tajikistan). The country is highly reliant on migrants' remittances. Recorded remittances in 2006 were US\$ 7.39 billion or 27.4 percent of the GDP. Interestingly, the demand for skilled manpower in the Kyrgyz Republic and the main destination countries, Kazakhstan and Russia, is similar. Given that Kyrgyzstan is also experiencing a shortage of skilled labour the national labour market is competing with foreign markets for the same category of labour but is losing due to the huge income differentials. Salaries in Kazakhstan and Russia are several times higher than the average salary in the range of US\$ 100 to 200 in the Kyrgyz Republic. Thus there is nearly no incentive for highly skilled emigrants to return.

The study on Tajikistan (ILO 2008c) gives detailed information on the effects of return migration. The survey findings revealed that 64 percent of respondents acquired additional skills abroad. For a sizeable group of returnees these skill gains led to an improved position on the labour market. 39 percent of respondents said that after migration it was easier for them to find a well-paid job. For 43 percent nothing had changed, and 18 percent felt that after their return it had become more difficult for them to find a well-paid job. Their effect on business innovations seems to be felt most in small companies, particularly in the service sector.

d) Impact of the financial crisis

Migrants tend to be among the workers most hit by economic downturns for several reasons. Migrant labour is often used as a cyclical buffer, like other macro-economic policies aimed at maximizing growth and minimizing unemployment. For migrants, this means they are often the last to be hired and the first to be fired

and their employment relationships are frequently non-standard, and in poorly regulated sectors or activities.

From a social and political perspective, in times of economic insecurity migrants easily become scapegoats; xenophobic sentiments and discrimination against migrant workers rise. This alone presents one of the most formidable challenges for social peace and cohesion, and therefore for governance, in hard times.

An initial ILO assessment of the impact of the global financial and economic crisis confirms a number of premises about the impact on migrant workers:

- Migrants and persons of foreign origin are hard hit, they are disproportionately among those already laid off or rendered unemployed;
- Those migrants remaining employed are often affected by reductions in pay, working time, and worsening working conditions;
- Migrant workers have reduced access to social safety net support. This is especially true for migrants in irregular situations;
- However, many migrant workers are not returning home, unless forcibly expelled. This is the case even when they are being offered financial incentives to voluntarily depart. Conditions at home are even worse. While there may be opportunities for some kind of work in host countries, there are now effectively none at all in many origin countries;
- Migrant workers are compelled to take whatever work they can find. They may accept even more substandard pay and abusive conditions than before. This fact presents an immediate policy challenges for governance and for stabilization of labour markets and working conditions;
- Scapegoating of migrants and xenophobic violence against foreigners is already on the rise throughout the world. It is expressed in increased murders and lynchings of migrants in some countries, in generalized expressions of anti-foreigner sentiment, in hostile political discourse, and in calls for exclusion of migrants from access to labour markets and from emergency social protection benefits;
- Many countries have reduced quotas or intake of foreign workers; some countries have embarked on deliberate policies of exclusion and expulsion of migrant workers;
- Migrant remittances to countries of origin are declining;
- The further deteriorated situations in home countries make whatever remittances migrants can send an even more crucial lifeline for their families and local communities;
- What employment opportunities existed earlier for those remaining at home are also evaporating, meaning even fewer options for persons coming back

from abroad. This makes the return of migrant workers a greater threat to labour market stability and ultimately, to social stability at home.

These impacts can easily destabilize labour markets, deteriorate working conditions, and undermine social cohesion in migrant employment countries. The large scale return of migrant workers and the reduction of remittances are already destabilizing economically, socially, and politically migrant origin countries.

Migration represents a long term solution to labour and skills needs in economies across the OSCE region. Thus short term crisis responses are needed, not only to prevent economic and labour destabilization, but also to sustain long term efforts to ensure protection and integration of migrants along with institutionalised regulation of labour migration.

Areas for policy intervention include taking measures to shore up decent work conditions and protection for migrant workers – along with vulnerable national workers – in employment countries; enhancing job creation and social safety net protections for returning migrants and populations as a whole in migrant source countries; and repressing xenophobic violence anywhere it appears while explicitly discouraging nationalist anti-migrant and anti-trade discourse and action.

3. Challenges of protection, social cohesion, integration

Evidence from most of the EU Member States suggests that migrants from outside the EU are concentrated in low paid, insecure, and poorly regarded jobs, such as seasonal work, low-skill occupations, or domestic work.⁴⁵ Even where migrants are not predominantly employed in these occupations, and not only in the EU, these occupations tend to be predominantly filled by migrants, male or female. The reasons range from these jobs being acceptable if they can be construed as an exception in the life-course to wages being sufficient for the purpose in mind and to a lack of alternatives due to systematic discrimination and even victimisation.

While it is not implausible to attribute the abuses partly to a situation where the supply of job seekers exceeds demand, the availability of residence and work permits, and the terms of their availability, also play a role. The fact that people risk their lives in border crossing testifies to this. If they are willing to risk their lives, they will be willing to risk lesser consequences, such as exploitation and slavery.

⁴⁵ See for example: EUMC (2003) *Migrants, Minorities and Employment: Exclusion, Discrimination and Anti-Discrimination in 15 Member States of the European Union*, p.45.

Protection obviously starts with people not having to risk their lives or their freedoms in order to improve their situation in a world that offers plenty of opportunities. Some of the most common problems encountered by migrant workers concern high intermediation fees of recruitment agencies, contract violations or unilateral contract changes at the beginning of employment, lack of, reduced or late payment of wages, and non-fulfilment of obligations to fund return travel.

Protection of migrant workers' human and labour rights begins in the country of origin. Issues include measures to prevent exploitative recruitment, e.g. the regulation and licensing of recruitment and employment agencies and recruitment fees, pre-departure assistance, particularly with regard to correct information on life and work abroad, on-site services and support to get access to legal remedies (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 35). The better migrant workers are prepared for work abroad the more likely will they be able to enjoy appropriate protection in the destination country and to know about their right (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 40). Disseminating information on working abroad is most successful if a variety of channels of communication – resource centres, print media, TV, radio – are used (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 55) simultaneously and for an extended period. State-based activities to regulate employment agencies might usefully be accompanied by voluntary initiatives to develop codes of conduct (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 50).

Measures to protect migrants already at the stage of recruitment need to be developed jointly with recruitment agencies. A good example is the self-regulation of recruitment-agencies implemented in the Russian Federation. Russian legislation provides for compulsory licensing of agencies dealing with employment of Russian citizens abroad. As of February 2009, 590 recruitment agencies had received a license from the Russian Federal Migration Service (FMS). In addition to regulation by FMS, initial steps towards self-regulation have been taken. A non-commercial partnership, International Association on Labour Migration (MATM), was established in 2004 and includes over 70 private recruitment agencies from Russia, Tajikistan and Moldova. The Association's principal task is the development of "civilized" forms of labour migration. The members of this network have adopted a Code of Business Ethics by which they are guided in their work. The Association works in close cooperation with state and international agencies in that field, like e.g. the Russian Federal Migration Service, the Russian Federal Service on Labour and Employment, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as with representative offices of IOM and ILO in Moscow and other partners (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 50).

Most of the protection issues for migrant workers in destination countries are addressed in the international human rights framework, in international labour law, and, increasingly, in national laws. Protection is best achieved by equal application of the national labour law to the employment of migrant and non-migrant workers. A necessary complement is monitoring and inspection, particularly in areas known to be conducive to exploitation and discrimination (Council of Europe 2008, 143).

Equality of treatment with national workers and non-discrimination regarding migrant workers are the cornerstones for protection of migrants. Tolerance of inequalities encourages exploitation of foreign workers, facilitates substitution of national workers by less well protected immigrants, can lead to a general deterioration of working conditions, and is therefore detrimental to social cohesion (Council of Europe 2008, 144).

Granting the right to join a trade union without hindrance is a further major element of protection of migrant workers. Trade union rights include freedom of association and collective bargaining rights, and are recognised universally as a core of international human rights instruments. The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has been instrumental in implementing the relevant international norms in OSCE participating States in recent years.

With its *Legislationline* service the ODIHR is offering an invaluable tool box for lawmaking, among others, in the field of migration (<http://www.legislationline.org/topics/topic/10>). In English and Russian it offers materials on 14 subtopics including fundamental rights, immigration law and policy, external borders, migrant rights and entitlements, migrant workers, discrimination of migrants, children and migration, family reunion, legal recourse, other mechanisms of legal recourse, migration and crime, international co-operation on migration, freedom of movement within state territory, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and also offers links to international legal norms and to state legislation in the OSCE area.

Employment is a key element of inclusion and integration into society, for natives as well as for newcomers. In many OSCE countries immigrants concentrate in vulnerable employment sectors, face atypical employment and are barred from most public-sector jobs. The systematic disadvantages on the labour market cannot only be attributed to lower levels of education or the lack of knowledge of the national language. Studies conducted under the supervision of the ILO (Zegers

The ODIHR has been engaged in anti-trafficking work including research and proposals on how better to protect and to compensate victims. There have been three main avenues of action:

- support the establishment of multi-agency anti-trafficking structures (National Referral Mechanisms) that develop human-rights-based policy and practice in anti-trafficking;
- improve the identification and assistance of trafficked persons, including victims of labour exploitation and Roma victims; and
- strengthen access to remedies and rights by raising awareness of rights amongst trafficked persons, vulnerable groups and civil society.

On its website (<http://www.osce.org/odihr/13475.html>) the ODIHR offers a range of useful documents for download.

de Beijl 2000), since 1994, have been showing that discriminatory behaviour by employment *gatekeepers* against immigrants and persons of immigrant origin in recruitment are an important cause of their disadvantaged position. Legislation against discrimination, well established specialised institutions of law enforcement and an easily accessible support system for victims are key pillars of the protection of immigrants and of a comprehensive integration policy. Repeated, reinforced discrimination leads to resignation, marginalisation and social exclusion, and does not only prevent integration, but also prevents origin and destination societies to gain from migration (Council of Europe 2008, 102).

Highly qualified migrants are often confronted with de-skilling and employment below their skill-level. This downgrading is often aggravated by non-recognition of qualifications obtained in the country of origin. De-qualification not only leads to a waste of intellectual and educational resources, but also to an under-utilisation of human capital, reducing the potential economic gains both for the source country and the country of origin.

Migration changes society and institutions. In most cases the social composition of migrants differs from the host society with regard to the level of education or vocational experience leading to disadvantages at the labour market. Furthermore, migrants often speak languages, adhere to religions or follow traditions different from the majority population. Whereas the first factor may lead to changes in the social stratification of the host society, the second questions the notion of a socially or ethnically homogeneous nation, which characterised the self-conception of most European and non-European “Western” countries in the last century. Today, most societies are characterised by a rich and growing

In Canada, the Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Programme (ISAP) assists immigrants in job search, job-specific language training, bridge-to-work assistance and work placement. The programme also includes an accurate evaluation of the qualifications of the immigrant and, if necessary, provides supplementary training modules to better fit the credentials obtained abroad to the Canadian system of qualifications. Three years after arrival, half of the migrants working in Canada are placed in positions commensurate with their original qualifications, and 75 percent of immigrants with an university degree are working in jobs that require a Bachelor's degree at minimum (Council of Europe 2008, 79).

Neither within the OSCE region nor within the EU a system of recognition of qualifications and credentials obtained in third countries exists. Within the EU-funded "EQUAL"-initiative a number of projects have developed projects aiming at improving this deficit. A good example is the project "Equal works" tackling discrimination and inequalities in the labour market in the United Kingdom. Between 1991 and 1998, the project comprised 174 development partnerships, for those in work or seeking work and included actions to help the integration of migrants and asylum seekers. One development partnership MEET (Migrants Empowerment and Employment Training) funded within this programme concerned the recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications and developed tools for matching migrants' qualifications with British certificates and trainings to increase employability.

socio-cultural diversity, encompassing on the one hand growing differences in life style and value orientation among the "native" population and on the other hand growing diversity as an effect of immigration.

This intermingling of people of different backgrounds on the one hand presents an opportunity for increased social dynamics and cultural innovation, and on the other hand challenges social cohesion in the sense of "the capacity of a society to ensure the welfare of its members, minimizing disparities and avoiding polarisation" (Council of Europe 2004, 3). Successful integration is part and parcel of achieving these goals.

Respect for migrants' rights, dignity and equal treatment stand at the core of integration. An integration framework must guarantee equality and non-discrimination, safeguard fair rules for migration and settlement and ensure decent opportunities for all. A coherent approach to integration must include local and

national authorities, the social partners, and civil society including migrants and their organisations. Furthermore, it must be based on respect for cultural differences as long as they do not conflict with international human rights instruments and the rights of other people.

Residence- and employment security is a major facilitator for integration. Most nationals in OSCE countries can expect protection, access to employment services and unemployment benefits in case of unemployment. Permanently settled migrants usually also have acquired these rights, but for temporary migrants losing the job often also entails the loss of the residence permit. The risk to lose the right to live in the country in case of unemployment is a major impediment to integration, and also heightens vulnerability to mistreatment.

Securing equal access to and equal treatment with regard to public goods – the education and training system, the health system, housing and social provisions, public security – is a main challenge for coordinated integration policies (Council of Europe 2008, 113-125).

As knowledge of the national language is a precondition for success in the labour market as well as for social and political participation, immigrants should be given ample opportunity and actively encouraged to learn the language as an aid to employment, vocational integration and participation in society. Provisions should take into account the living conditions and constraints migrants face to ensure they can and are motivated to access them. Courses should be available outside working hours and at affordable costs and offer facilities for childcare and for women from more gender-segregating societies (Council of Europe 2008, 120).

Effective integration requires the possibility to participate properly in social life and the political process. Migration challenges the established notion of citizenship as a bundle of rights bound to a single nationality. A growing number of people identifies with more than one culture and lives in more than one country. A coherent integration strategy should encourage active participation from the earliest possible moment. Political integration entails as well active participation in civil society organisations and political parties as the right to obtain the nationality of the host country. Granting local voting rights to immigrants has proven as an effective tool to enhance political participation in a great number of European countries. EU citizens are granted local voting rights in all Member States, and several EU and EEA countries⁴⁶ also grant local voting rights to all or certain groups of settled non-nationals to improve their political integration. Facilitating

⁴⁶ e.g. Belgium, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, UK, Switzerland. Source: The Immigrant Voting Project, <http://www.immigrantvoting.org/material/TIMELINE.html>.

civic and political participation of immigrants in particular at the local, town or regional level, including the participation of migrants' organisations is an essential component of comprehensive integration. Ultimately, naturalisation could be considered and dual citizenship recognised as a means of accommodating existing ties to both the country of origin and the country of residence (Council of Europe 2008, 122).⁴⁷

⁴⁷ It may be remembered that the current mayor of Rotterdam, Europe's most important port city, is a dual citizen (Morocco and Netherlands).

III. International legal framework and protection of migrants

This chapter highlights the OSCE commitments towards implementing international and regional legal frameworks applying to international migration. It summarizes the relevant international, ILO, European, CIS and Inter-American instruments and reviews indicators of progress in adopting these. Annex 2 provides a list of adhesions by OSCE participating States to the most relevant international instruments.

1. Reference to international normative and policy framework

a) International legal standards

One of the core commitments on migration first mentioned in the Helsinki Final Act and reaffirmed in subsequent documents is to implement the relevant international obligations of the participating States. Furthermore, this is complemented by the pledge to “consider adhering to further relevant multilateral instruments or bilateral agreements in order to improve arrangements for ensuring effective consular, legal and medical assistance for citizens of other participating States temporarily on their territory.”⁴⁸

There is a fairly detailed set of legal rules, multilateral conventions, and bilateral agreements that govern and channel state authority over migration.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ The Vienna Document 1989 item (23).

⁴⁹ “Migration and International Legal Norms” edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Vincent Chetail. (2003) page 1.

These norms have been created through state to state negotiations, usually through international processes under auspices of the United Nations, the ILO and other institutions.

Several distinct branches of international law include standards regarding the protection of rights of migrants and refugees and addressing international cooperation in regulating migration. These include:

- 1) International Human Rights law, notably the eight fundamental human rights instruments, comprising the two Covenants respectively on Political and Civil rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, along with the six international conventions addressing specific situations and groups: racial discrimination, torture, women, children, migrant workers, and disabilities.
- 2) International Labour Standards, in effect all of them, except where—rarely—foreign workers are exempted, and notably the two ILO Conventions specifically on migration for employment.
- 3) Refugee and asylum law, particularly the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol on the Status of Refugees.
- 4) Consular Relations, namely the Vienna Convention on the subject of protection of foreign nationals through access to representatives of their governments.
- 5) International Criminal Law, particularly the Protocols on Trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants of the International Convention on Transnational Organized Crime.

Particularly important among these branches are International Human Rights Instruments and International Labour Law, both of which can be considered human rights law.

International Human Rights Instruments provide a broad and ample normative framework for protection of migrants. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 laid out a comprehensive set of universal human rights principles. The two major International Covenants elaborated these principles into binding normative standards on political and civil rights, and economic, social and cultural rights in 1966⁵⁰. These Covenants, together with the UDHR, are often

⁵⁰ See, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, entered into force on 23 March 1976 and *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, entered into force on 3 January 1976.

referred to as the "International Bill of Human Rights", and are applicable to all human beings. Specific conventions subsequently explicitly extended the application of universal rights to victims of racial discrimination, women, children, and migrants: Convention for the Elimination of Racism and Racial Discrimination (CERD), Convention Against Torture (CAT), Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), and the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CMR).⁵¹

In legal terms, the Universal Declaration is non-binding; however, it is generally recognised today as customary international law, as norms that have received widespread support in state practice and are generally recognized by states as binding legal obligations. The provisions of other international treaties are binding for the States party to the respective Conventions. These instruments generally provide for protection of the rights of all human beings regardless of their nationality and legal status.

The core principle is that human rights are universal, indivisible, inalienable, and interdependent. The principle of universality implies that States of origin, transit and destination are all responsible for the protection of migrants' human rights.⁵² This universality of human rights and fundamental freedoms was also reaffirmed for instance in the OSCE Helsinki Document of 1992 (Art. 32).

The rights of migrant workers are specifically addressed in the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICRMW) of 1990, as well as in two ILO instruments, Conventions 97 and 143 noted below. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) protecting all individuals within the jurisdiction of a State from discrimination and exploitation on grounds of race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin is also particularly relevant. Furthermore, the Convention on the Rights of the Child forbids discrimination against any child on the basis of its parents' status, including 'illegal' status (Art. 2(1)), with access to schooling and healthcare being areas of main concern.

All 56 OSCE participating States have ratified the two Covenants, the ICCPR and the ICESCR, and all 56 have also ratified the ICERD.

As of 30 June 2009, the ICRMW had been ratified by 41 States and signed by 15 others. Among OSCE participating States six are parties to the Conven-

⁵¹ Texts and status of ratifications of these conventions are available on the website of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, at: www.unhchr.ch.

⁵² *International Migration and Human Rights*. Global Migration Group. 2008 p.3.

The ICRMW is a fundamental element for the protection of the human rights of migrants since it applies to all aspects of the life of migrants including the migrant's family and the situation of women and children, and explicitly recognizes the rights of undocumented migrants. Another positive element of the Convention is its broad vision of rights; although it is intended to regulate the rights of workers, it is not limited to the employment context but regulates the entire spectrum of workers' rights. The Convention articulates even more broadly the principle of equality of treatment between migrants and national before courts and tribunals, with respect to remuneration and other working conditions, as well as with regard to migrant workers access to urgent medical assistance and education for their children. In the Migrant Workers Convention (ICRMW), equality and non-discrimination extend to migrant workers in irregular situations, in accordance with national laws. Thus, the ICRMW does not depart substantively from the fundamental rights protected in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and other universal human rights treaties, but it does articulate these rights in ways which take into account the particular situation of migrant workers and their families. It seeks to establish basic principles for the treatment and to establish norms which will contribute to the harmonization of States' attitudes towards migration through acceptance of these basic principles. It also requires action by States to 'prevent and eliminate clandestine movements and trafficking' and to 'eliminate' the employment of irregular migrants by employers.⁵³

tion⁵⁴ and another two (Montenegro, Serbia) have signed it. No EU member State has yet signed or acceded to the Convention. However, legal reviews in several EU countries have shown existing national legislation to be largely if not fully consistent with the content of the ICRMW. Obstacles to ratification of this Convention in Europe were identified in a recent set of national studies published by UNESCO⁵⁵ (MacDonald/Cholewinski 2007, 51-66).

⁵³ *International Migration and Human Rights*. Global Migration Group. 2008 p.3.

⁵⁴ Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyz Republic have acceded to it, while Tajikistan and Turkey have ratified it.

⁵⁵ Namely the concern of a number of States that the ICRMW would restrict their sovereign right to decide upon admission to their territory; the lack of adequate capacity of some governments to implement the advocated migration policies; the clashes between the rights-based approach of the Convention and their current priorities, often dominated by security concerns; the difficulty in both gaining cheap labour and ensuring the protection of migrants' rights and equal opportunities; and the misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the legal text.

b) International labour standards (ILO Conventions)

Certain principles and rights at work that derive from the ILO Constitution and that have been expressed in eight ILO Conventions⁵⁶ are deemed to be fundamental for the protection of human rights for all workers, including migrant workers, by the ILO along with its 184 member countries. They concern freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, freedom from forced labour and child labour and non-discrimination in employment and occupation. Moreover, following the adoption of the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work,

all members, even if they have not ratified the Conventions in question, have an obligation arising from the very fact of their membership of the Organization, to respect and to promote and to realize in good faith and in accordance with the Constitution, the principles concerning the fundamental rights which are the subject of those Conventions (ILO, 1998: para.2).

International Labour Standards in the areas of occupational safety and health, conditions of work, protection of wages and labour inspection, employment policy, maternity protection, the regulation of private and public employment agencies, as well as those covering sectors employing a large number of migrant workers have been identified by ILO as equally important to the promotion of decent work of all migrant workers.

The ILO instruments that promote equality of treatment between migrant workers and nationals in the field of social security are also particularly relevant. ILO social security standards define personal scope of coverage irrespective of nationality, almost all contain similar clauses on equality of treatment between nationals and foreign workers in the host country, and the majority also contains special non-discrimination clauses⁵⁷. The ILO has also adopted several further standards that deal specifically with the protection of migrant workers' social security rights.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ C87 Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention (1948), C98 Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention (1949), C29 Forced Labour Convention (1930), C105 Abolition of Forced Labour Convention (1957), C100 Equal Remuneration Convention (1951), C111 Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention (1958), C138 Minimum Age Convention (1973), C182 Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999).

⁵⁷ Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention No. 102 of 1952; Employment Injury Benefits Convention NO. 121 of 1964; Invalidity, Old-Age and Survivors' Benefits Convention No. 128 of 1967; Medical and Sickness Benefits Convention No. 130 of 1969; Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention No. 168 of 1988; and Maternity Protection Convention No. 183 of 2000.

⁵⁸ The Equality of Treatment (Accident Compensation) Convention No. 19 of 1925; The Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention No. 118 of 1962; The Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention No. 157 of 1982.

International jurisprudence has amply reinforced the application of all *International Labour Standards* to policy and practice regarding employment dimensions of migration. Decisions and opinions of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations have repeatedly underscored the applicability to all migrant workers of International Labour Standards covering conditions at work, occupational safety and health, maximum hours of work, minimum remuneration, non-discrimination, freedom of association, collective bargaining, and maternity leave, among others. The ILO Committee on Freedom of Association supervising the core international conventions on freedom of association and collective bargaining has specifically ruled that all migrant workers regardless of status are entitled to protection and expression of basic association and representation rights⁵⁹.

ILO Migration for Employment Conventions

Two ILO Conventions particularly relevant for the OSCE commitments on migration and also representing a consensus on labour migration are:

- the Migration for Employment Convention No. 97 of 1949 (Revised) and;
- the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention No. 143 of 1975, as well as their accompanying Recommendations.⁶⁰

Equality of opportunity and treatment with respect to employment and work conditions are stipulated in both Conventions (Art. 6 of ILO Convention No. 97 and Art. 10 and 12 of ILO Convention No. 143), as is the requirement to facilitate the reunification of migrant workers with their families. Most of the provisions of this Convention are, more or less, replicated in the ICRMW (ICMPD 2009, 93. Böhning 1991).

As of February 2009, 20 OSCE participating States are parties to the 1949 Convention,⁶¹ and 13 to the 1975 Convention.⁶²

Furthermore, the ILO has published comprehensive non-binding policy principles and guidelines on labour migration, the Multilateral Framework

⁵⁹ See Fifth Edition of the 'Digest of decisions and principles of the Freedom of Association Committee of the Governing Body of the ILO' (2006).

⁶⁰ ILO Recommendations No. 86 and No. 151.

⁶¹ Albania, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, France, Germany, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, United Kingdom.

⁶² Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Italy, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, Tajikistan.

on Labour Migration,⁶³ which reflect the relevant international standards and illustrate successful practical experience from countries in all world regions. The entire framework is relevant for States and especially useful in elaborating policy and its implementation. The framework provides explicit guidance to address needs for expanding avenues for regular labour migration, taking into account labour market needs and demographic trends, and identifying key policy lines. The "MLF" addresses development of national policies in the context of ensuring that they are coherent, effective and fair" (Council of Europe 2008, 52).

c) Council of Europe

The Council of Europe currently has 47 Member States including all the EU countries and most of the other OSCE participating States.⁶⁴ Treaties, either conventions or agreements, are concluded within a multilateral framework: once opened for signature, they constitute straightforward international treaties and not legal instruments of the Council of Europe. The treaty rights are conferred solely on nationals of other contracting parties.

Among the instruments developed by the Council of Europe, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) has had the most impact, particularly because of the European Court of Human Rights on whose jurisdiction its members have agreed. Other Council of Europe agreements referring specifically to the protection of migrant workers are:

- the Convention on Establishment (1955);
- the European Social Charter (1961);
- the European Convention on Social Security (1972), and;
- the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers (ECMW) (1977).

Different from the ECHR, these instruments are applicable only to legally resident migrants who are nationals of contracting states. As of 16 February 2009, the ECMW had been ratified by 11 OSCE participating States and signed

⁶³ Available at http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/multilat_fw_k_en.pdf, 2009-02-19.

⁶⁴ The OSCE participating States not members of the Council of Europe are the European states of Belarus and the Holy See, and the Central Asian countries of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, and Canada and the United States.

by another four.⁶⁵ It is also worth remembering that in 1997 the ECHR itself and implicitly the jurisprudence of the Court became part of the European Union *acquis communautaire* as per Art. 6(2) of the Consolidated Treaty on the EU. This has been an important part of a broader movement towards convergence between the EU and the Council of Europe. Indeed, if the EU's Lisbon Treaty entered into force, the EU itself could accede to the Convention.⁶⁶

d) The European Union

At present the EU *acquis* of legal guidance on migration matters includes a number of European Council Directives with binding application on member States, and other Council documents and Communications that may be considered prescriptive. Relevant Directives and other documents determine the right of family reunification for third country nationals;⁶⁷ define rules for the admission of third country nationals who are long-term residents;⁶⁸ provide frameworks for the integration of third-country nationals;⁶⁹ regulate financial and technical assistance for third-countries in the areas of migration and asylum;⁷⁰ and stipulate rules on non-discrimination on the grounds of racial and ethnic origin.⁷¹

The family reunification directive is the central piece of legislation on the rights of family members on the European level and it allows for a probationary period of up to five years.⁷² The implementation of this clause ranges from two years (Portugal, the Czech Republic) to five years (e.g. Sweden, Poland) (Groenendijk et al 2007, 9).

⁶⁵ Ratifications: Albania, France (reservation regarding Art. 18 on social security), Italy, Moldova, Netherlands (reservations regarding Art. 7 on travel and Art. 11 on the recovery of sums due in respect of maintenance), Norway (reservation regarding Art. 11), Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and Ukraine (reservation from Art. 28 on the rights of migrant workers to organise for the protection of their economic and social interests in political parties and trade unions). Signatures: Belgium, Germany (declarations regarding Articles 14, 18 and 6), Greece, and Luxembourg.

⁶⁶ See http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/eu_human_rights_convention_en.htm, 2009-03-13.

⁶⁷ The Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification entitles immigrant family members to the same status as their sponsor, including in terms of access to the labour market.

⁶⁸ The Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 on the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents ensures their access to employment on equal terms with the nationals.

⁶⁹ See for instance the Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBPs) of 2004 and the Common Agenda for Integration of 2005, cited above.

⁷⁰ The Global Approach to Migration (GAM) was adopted in 2005 by the European Council. Initially GAM focused on migration originating from and transiting through Africa and the Mediterranean, but in 2007 it was extended to the Eastern and South-Eastern regions neighbouring the EU. See COM (2007) 247 final, 16 May 2007.

⁷¹ See the Framework Strategy for Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunities, COM (2005) 224 final, 1 June 2005.

⁷² Article 15 of Council Directive 2003/86/EC (2003-09-22) on the right to family reunification.

In parallel, the directive on the status of third-country nationals institutes the distinction between short- and long-term residents and thus divides third country nationals into two categories according to the duration of their stay, which entitles them to full, limited, or no access to the labour market as well as to other areas of socioeconomic life. To acquire a more secure residence status or even to maintain the current one depends on fulfilling a number of requirements of which the most important are a regular income, social insurance, uninterrupted and legal stay, and not posing a threat to public order.

The very relevant EU Directives on racism and eliminating racial discrimination in employment are discussed in the following section, on page 39.

The development of these EU instruments was shaped by the adoption and evolution of the *Tampere Programme* (1999-2004)⁷³ and the adoption of the five-year *Hague Programme* in November 2004 in the field of Justice, Freedom and Security.⁷⁴ The overall objectives established in these political programmes agreed to by heads of State of EU member countries were translated into concrete action along ten priority areas, among which feature the respect for and active promotion of fundamental rights, the development of a common policy on legal migration, and the establishment of a coherent European framework for integration.⁷⁵ This framework for action has since led to the adoption of the Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBPs),⁷⁶ the Common Agenda for Integration⁷⁷ and the Policy Plan on Legal Migration,⁷⁸ which aimed precisely at creating a coherent and co-ordinated EU approach to integration and migration, directed towards reaching the Lisbon goals of ‘delivering stronger, lasting growth and creating more and better jobs.’ All these documents include elements of combating racism and xenophobia, mainstreaming integration in all relevant policies, preventing discrimination on the labour market and monitoring the implementation of EU legislation protecting immigrant rights.⁷⁹

Among European Union Member States (with the exception of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom that have opted out of the common immigration

⁷³ European Commission COM (2004) 401 final, 2 June 2004.

⁷⁴ Annex 1 to the Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council of 4/5 November 2004, http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/information_dossiers/the_hague_priorities/doc/hague_programme_en.pdf, 2009-02-20.

⁷⁵ Council document 9778/2/05 REV 2, 10 June 2005, and COM (2005) 184 final, 10 May 2005.

⁷⁶ Press release 14615/04 (Presse 321) from the Council of the European Union, 19 November 2004, http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/jha/82745.pdf, 2008-10-30.

⁷⁷ COM (2005) 389 of 1 September 2005.

⁷⁸ COM (2005) 669 final of 21 December 2005.

⁷⁹ For instance, the third CBP highlights the importance of the effective integration of immigrants into the labour market for reaching the Lisbon targets on growth and jobs.

and asylum policies), a trend towards approximation can be identified for institutional arrangements, for decision-making processes as well as for the thematic scope of migration policies covered by the EU regulatory framework.

e) The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

The Commonwealth of Independent States, (CIS) comprises twelve countries that emerged from the demise of the Soviet Union, namely the Russian Federation, the Caucasus countries Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, the Central Asian Republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, along with Belarus, Moldova and the Ukraine.

On 14 November 2008, the Council of Heads of Government of the CIS endorsed the *'Convention on the Legal Status of Labour Migrants and Their Family Members'*, which had been under discussion since 2006. The agreement seeks to create conditions for equal treatment of migrant workers and their families with the citizens of the host country, as well as to effectively regulate labour migration and to contribute to the socio-economic development of the parties.⁸⁰ It recognizes the principle of non-discrimination, judicial protection, and equal remuneration, but not also the right to education or other rights. Endorsement signifies that the Convention is now open for ratification by CIS member States. Belarus became the first CIS country to ratify this instrument on 5 June 2009.

The Interparliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the CIS (IPA CIS) was created on 27 March 1992 as an advisory body for the preparation of draft legislative documents of mutual interest. In 1995 it received the status of an inter-state body, occupying ever since the leading role in the system of agencies of the CIS.⁸¹ The IPA CIS adopts model legislative acts and recommendations aimed at harmonising the legislations of the Commonwealth states and at establishing a basis for interaction on matters of mutual interest. As part of these efforts, a model law on 'The Migration of Labour in the CIS Countries' was adopted in 1995, which spells out the principle of equality with respect to employment and work conditions and non-discrimination on the grounds of nationality, race, religion or gender (Art. 9), it specifies under which conditions migrant workers can benefit from equal access to social security (Art. 14) and it includes further provisions on the right to join trade unions (Art. 15), on the access to education and vocational training for migrant workers and their families (Art. 16), on the recognition of

⁸⁰ <http://cis.minsk.by/main.aspx?uid=12890>, 2009-02-22.

⁸¹ At present it brings together the heads of parliaments of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan and Ukraine.

educational certificates and professional qualifications (Art. 11) as well as on the prevention of 'illegal' labour migration (Art. 21).⁸² The *'Declaration on the Coherent Migration Policies'* adopted by the Council of Heads of States of the CIS, on 5 October 2007, reaffirms the principle of non-discrimination including political and social rights in accordance with international conventions.⁸³

f) Human rights in North America

In the case of Canada and the U.S., the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (1948) reiterates that the essential rights of man are attributes of one's personality and not derived from his/her nationality, and stipulates the right to work and to fair remuneration and the right to social security, as well as the corresponding duties to social security and welfare and to work.⁸⁴ Other major human rights documents relevant for the Inter-American system include the American Convention on Human Rights from (1969),⁸⁵ and the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights "Protocol of San Salvador" (1988),⁸⁶ the latter recognizing the benefits that stem from the promotion and development of cooperation among States and introduces an obligation to non-discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political and other opinions, national or social origin, economic status, birth or any other social condition (Art. 3). Moreover, the Protocol also lays down the right to just, equitable and satisfactory conditions of work (Art. 7), trade union rights (Art. 8) and the right to social security (Art. 9). However, the Convention was so far only signed by Canada and the Protocol by neither of the two OSCE participating States.

Also relevant, the Inter-American Human Rights Court, in 2003, issued an Advisory Opinion on the juridical condition and rights of undocumented migrants, which states that labour standards should apply to all workers in an employment relationship in the Americas, regardless of immigration status.⁸⁷ According to the Opinion, "the State has the obligation to respect and guarantee the labour human rights of all workers, irrespective of their status as nationals

⁸² <http://www.iacis.ru/html/index-eng.php?id=54&str=list&nid=9> and <http://www.iacis.ru/html/?id=22&pag=24&nid=1>, 2009-02-19.

⁸³ Information provided by ILO Moscow.

⁸⁴ <http://www.cidh.oas.org/Basicos/English/Basic2.American%20Declaration.htm>, 2009-03-13.

⁸⁵ It was only signed by the U.S. on 1 June 1977. <http://www.cidh.oas.org/Basicos/English/Basic3.American%20Convention.htm>, 2009-03-13.

⁸⁶ <http://www.cidh.oas.org/Basicos/English/basic5.Prot.Sn%20Salv.htm>, 2009-03-13.

⁸⁷ Advisory Opinion OC-18/03 of 17.09.2009, requested by the United Mexican States. http://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/opiniones/seriea_18_ing.doc, 2009-03-13.

or aliens, and not to tolerate situations of discrimination that are harmful to the latter in the employment relationships established between private individuals (employer-worker). The State must not allow private employers to violate the rights of workers, or the contractual relationship to violate minimum international standards.”

2. Implementation of OSCE commitments on protection and welfare of migrants

With respect to **protecting migrant workers**, the main OSCE commitments are to:

- protect and promote their fundamental human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, and their social welfare, including their living conditions;⁸⁸
- ensure equality of rights of legally residing migrant workers with the nationals of the host countries with regard to conditions of employment and work and to social security;⁸⁹
- promote equality of opportunity in respect of working conditions, education, social security and health services, housing, access to trade unions as well as cultural rights for legally residing and working migrant workers;⁹⁰
- facilitate the reuniting and regular contacts of legally residing migrant workers with their families.⁹¹
- condemn discrimination on the ground of race, colour and ethnic origin, and prevent intolerance and xenophobia against migrant workers;⁹²

Moreover, specific commitments have also been made to ensure effective equality of opportunity between the children of migrant workers and children of nationals regarding access to all forms and all levels of education.⁹³

⁸⁸ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983, the Copenhagen Document 1990, the Charter of Paris for a New Europe 1990, the Moscow Document 1991, and the Vienna Document 1989.

⁸⁹ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

⁹⁰ See the Helsinki Document 1992.

⁹¹ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983, and the Vienna Document 1989.

⁹² See the Moscow Document 1991, the Budapest Document 1994, the Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, and the Permanent Council Decision No. 621 on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, annexed to the Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination.

⁹³ See the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and the Vienna Document of 1989.

In the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 the participating States committed themselves to protecting the “personal and social welfare” of migrant workers, ensuring their “equality of rights with the nationals of the host countries with regard to conditions of employment and work and to social security”, and to “endeavour to ensure that migrant workers may enjoy satisfactory living conditions, especially housing conditions”. These core commitments were reaffirmed in subsequent documents and have been complemented by further pledges aimed at protecting the migrant citizens on their territory as well as their citizens abroad, optimising the benefits of migration and mitigating its adverse impact in both the countries of origin and of destination, and fostering international cooperation.

In the Moscow Document of 1991 the participating States condemned “all acts of discrimination on the ground of race, colour and ethnic origin, intolerance and xenophobia against migrant workers” and pledged to “take, in conformity with domestic law and international obligations, effective measures to promote tolerance, understanding, equality of opportunity and respect for the fundamental human rights of migrant workers,” as well as to adopt “measures that would prohibit acts that constitute incitement to violence based on national, racial, ethnic or religious discrimination, hostility or hatred.”

Additional commitments to promote equality of opportunity also with respect to education, health services, housing and access to trade unions have been made in the Helsinki Document of 1992 (Art. 38), while the provision of elementary language and vocational training for migrant workers as well as the facilitation of the reuniting and regular contacts of migrant workers with their families count also among the commitments of the Helsinki Final Act.

Ratification and implementation of the international standards and policy frameworks discussed above is fundamental to achieving these commitments. Given the importance of these protection concerns, a number of additional agreements have been elaborated among groups of OSCE participating States. These agreements provide further evidence of implementation of these commitments in the OSCE region. Furthermore, these agreements demonstrate the necessary complementarity between enactment of legal standards and development of policy and administrative measures to give full effect to the standards, principles and commitments on protection.

The following subsections look respectively at (a) several examples of general inter-country agreements, and (b) specific measures on discrimination, racism and xenophobia.

a) Other intergovernmental agreements with provisions addressing protection

Western Balkans

Cooperation among the countries in the Western Balkans on migration-related aspects materialises through several regional initiatives such as the *Regional Cooperation Council* (RCC, the successor to the Stability Pact for South-East Europe, <http://www.rcc.int/>)⁹⁴ and the *Migration, Asylum, Refugees, Regional Initiative* (MARRI, <http://www.marri-rc.org/>).⁹⁵ Relations between the EU and the Western Balkans are anchored in the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP).

Following the adoption of MARRI 'Strategy and Programme of Action 2008',⁹⁶ an Action Plan for 2008/2009 has been developed by the MARRI Regional Centre in order to achieve the objectives set out in the strategic priority areas (i.e. migration, trafficking in human beings, visa liberalisation and implementation of readmission agreements, document security, border management, asylum and refugees).⁹⁷ Under the priority area of migration a seminar was organised in Ohrid on 12 September 2008 to highlight the importance of development and adoption of comprehensive national migration policies as prerequisite for sound migration management. The output included a set of recommendations identifying several key elements of comprehensive migration management systems: unambiguous national legislation harmonised with relevant instruments of international law; adoption of comprehensive migration policy and establishment of a governmental inter-agency working group; creation of a Central Migration Authority to ensure effective inter-agency co-operation; competent information management support IT mechanisms; regionally harmonised and coherent data collection methods; development of permanent training systems for staff involved; regional cooperation and exchange of information; development of policies for migrant integration etc.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ The RCC membership consists of 45 countries, organizations and international financial institutions. For a complete list, see http://www.rcc.int/index.php?action=page&id=14&link_id=21, 2009-02-20.

⁹⁵ MARRI counts with 6 member States: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

⁹⁶ MARRI Strategy Programme of Action 2008, <http://www.marri-rc.org/upload/Documents/MARRI%20SPoA%202008.pdf>, 2009-02-20.

⁹⁷ MARRI Regional Centre Action Plan for 2008/2009, <http://www.marri-rc.org/upload/MARRI%20RC%20Action%20Plan%202008-2009.pdf>, 2009-02-20.

⁹⁸ MARRI Recommendations – Comprehensive Migration Management Systems, Ohrid, 12 September 2008, http://www.marri-rc.org/upload/Documents/Recommendations/Recommendations%20-%20Comprehensive%20Migration%20Management%20Systems%20_Ohrid,%2012%20September%202008.pdf, 2009-02-20.

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

In the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the Council of Heads of the CIS Migration Bodies regularly discusses and determines priority areas for cooperation in migration management, aiming at concerted policy approaches within the CIS framework, fostering the harmonisation of migration legislation in the CIS countries, safeguarding migrants' rights and enhancing the exchange of migration-related data and information (ICMPD 2008, 10). CIS countries concluded an 'Agreement on Cooperation in the Sphere of Labour Migration and Social Protection of Migrant Workers in the CIS' (Moscow, 15 April 1994), which was amended in 2005 by the 'Protocol on Changes and Amendments to the Agreement on Cooperation in the Sphere of Labour Migration and Social Protection of Migrant Workers' of 15 April 1994 (Moscow, 25 November 2005).⁹⁹ Ten countries are party to the Cooperation Agreement and 2 more have signed but not ratified it,¹⁰⁰ while only 3 countries are also parties to the Protocol and 6 have signed but not ratified it.¹⁰¹ The agreement includes a series of mutual commitments in the field of labour migration, specifically related to the social protection of labour migrants in other CIS countries. In particular, it provides for:

- Mutual recognition of diplomas, qualification, certificates, documents certifying degrees, titles, qualifications;
- Mutual recognition of work records and work experience records;
- Equal treatment of migrant workers under a the national labour legislations, including social benefits and special conditions granted to workers;
- Veto on double-taxation;
- Migrant workers' eligibility for social protection, insurance and medical treatment provisions under national legislation, except for pension benefits (Kabeleova et al 2007, 39-40).

The Agreement authorizes quotas for labour migrants subject to regulation by bilateral agreements between parties. It determines recognition of work periods and the right to pension, but lacks provisions on non-discrimination, equality of treatment, equality of rights, relying instead on the 'inherited' principle of equality among citizens of the USSR. Social protection is guaranteed

⁹⁹ A list of all CIS Human Rights Treaties concluded during 1991-2001 and ratification status is available on the webpage of the Executive Committee of the CIS: <http://www.cis.minsk.by/sm.aspx?uid=9696>, 2009-02-19.

¹⁰⁰ Parties: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Ukraine. Signatories: Georgia, Turkmenistan.

¹⁰¹ Parties: Belarus, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova. Signatories: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine.

only for regulated migrants. The agreement did not envisage the harmonisation of national legislations.

EU Member States

Labour market access in EU Member States is, on average, only partly complying with the OSCE commitments in terms of the eligibility of migrant workers for the same opportunities as EU nationals to work in most sectors; their access to labour market integration measures to adjust to the language and professional demands of the labour market; the opportunities to get their full set of skills and talents recognised, to access training, and to develop language skills that are critical for the job market; the security of their situation in employment, including having possibilities to renew most types of work permits and to remain living in the country and look for work, in case of losing the job; the freedom to change employer, job, industry and work permit categories in order to pursue their professional development; having the right to join a trade union. Most migrants can renew all but seasonal work permits, and participate in trade unions and work-related negotiation bodies.¹⁰² Central and Eastern Europe lags substantially behind the rest, while Western Mediterranean countries like Spain, Italy, Portugal and Nordic countries like Finland, Sweden and Norway have the best performances in these areas.

In Canada, the rules relating to family reunion for migrants admitted as permanent residents are generous on the whole. Migrants with permanent residence in Canada can be joined by family members, provided that they agree to sponsor them for a period of three to ten years depending on the relationship. Persons eligible for family reunion are:

- spouses, common-law or conjugal partners 16 years or older;
- dependant children up to the age of 22, including adopted children;
- intended adoptees under the age of 18;
- parents and grandparents;
- brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews, or grandchildren who are orphans, under the age of 18, and unmarried or not in a common-law relationship.¹⁰³

¹⁰² <http://www.integrationindex.eu/topics/2585.html>, 2009-02-24.

¹⁰³ Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001), sections 12(1) and 13 (1); Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations, SOR/2002-227, 11 June 2002, pp. 116-137.

With regard to family reunion,¹⁰⁴ the EU member States diverge most on the provisions that determine how long residents must wait to be eligible and which family members they can sponsor. Generally, migrants are not forced to take language or 'integration' tests and courses to secure the right to live with their family. However, most sponsors must prove that they have a job or a certain income. Families are partially secure in their status and have slightly more favourable rights. If their application is refused or permit withdrawn, most have legal guarantees and avenues to appeal. Family members and their sponsors have equal access to take up jobs or further their education.

Over the past 20 years or so, courts, especially in EU Member States, have increasingly tended to invoke Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the European Court of Human Rights, and the Court itself also became more active in protecting the right to family life (Guiraudon/Lahav 2000. Thym 2008). To pick out one prominent example relevant for the application of the OSCE commitments regarding family reunification, in the case of *Sen v. Netherlands*, in 2001, the European Court of Human Rights found violations concerning disproportionate restrictions placed on the right to respect family life (Art. 8 of the ECHR) in the context of the expulsion of foreigners or their admission into a State party. The rights guaranteed in the ECHR are applicable to "everyone within [the] jurisdiction [of the contracting parties]".

In countries of origin in the OSCE region, the protection and welfare of migrant workers are usually achieved through regulatory measures, i.e. streamlining and simplification of regulations and procedures intended to protect workers, and provision of support services (pre-employment orientation and information campaigns, empowerment of migrant workers, close supervision and monitoring by governments of recruitment activities undertaken by employment promoters or agencies, introduction of criminal proceedings against serious offenders, introduction of stronger measures to ensure enforcement of the employment contract at the worksite, inter-state cooperation between countries of origin and destination etc.) (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 43).

b) Legislation and measures to prevent discrimination and combat xenophobia

Several OSCE commitments emphasize need to condemn discrimination on the ground of race, colour and ethnic origin, and prevent intolerance and xenophobia against migrant workers.

¹⁰⁴ <http://www.integrationindex.eu/topics/2586.html>, 2009-02-24.

Prevention of discrimination and protection of the human, civil and labour rights of migrants in the countries of employment are intrinsically linked with achieving their full integration and thus enabling them to better contribute to the socio-economic welfare in the country of employment. Likewise, upholding economic and social rights in countries of origin will prevent migration from being a compelled decision and will enhance the beneficial effects of migration on the development in the country of origin (CMW n.d., 9).

All OSCE participating States have ratified the International Convention for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) and nearly all have ratified the fundamental ILO Convention on Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) No. 111 (of 1958), as noted in the list of ratifications in Annex II on page 81.

In many OSCE States, national labour legislation is applicable to all workers and makes no distinctions on the basis of nationality, but application of this legislation is problematic because it often affords no explicit protection to non-nationals and access to redress and remedies is also difficult in practice for non-citizen migrant workers. According to the ILO, in a significant number of countries, national laws applying principles of non-discrimination exclude mention of nationality as prohibited grounds and thus do not explicitly apply to migrant workers (Council of Europe 2008, 73). The applicability of anti-discrimination laws is often limited to certain grounds, such as ethnicity, 'race' national origin or sex, without reference to nationality.

Access to employment or to the labour market is considered a sovereign prerogative of States and can be limited, although, in many European OSCE States, restrictions are generally lifted after two to five years of employment (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 145). Although neither the ICERD nor ILO Convention 111 specifically included nationality in the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination, the ILO supervisory bodies have interpreted broadly provisions of ILO C-111 to cover migrant workers in a number of situations. In an especially significant development to prevent discrimination on the basis of citizenship status or nationality, the latter grounds has been introduced in national anti-discrimination legislation in an increasing number of EU Member States including Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia.

EU Member States

In the EU, the Member States have now by and large transposed the 'Racial Equality Directive'¹⁰⁵ and the 'Employment Equality Directive'¹⁰⁶ into national

¹⁰⁵ Council Directive 2000/43/EC, 29 June 2000.

¹⁰⁶ Council Directive 2000/78/EC, 27 November 2000.

law (though full and correct transposition in all 27 Member States is yet to be achieved), setting a common framework for all Member States to implement anti-discrimination law and policies. The provisions of the directives are minimum requirements, i.e. Member States may always do more, but never less, to combat discrimination.

Since the Equality Directives entered into force, all Member States have introduced or amended national anti-discrimination law. In some countries, it was the first time enforceable legislation on equal treatment was put in place; in most countries, the transposition of the Directives into national law contributed to clarification and strengthening of the legal protection against discrimination. The implementation of the Directives is not yet complete. The Commission sent a 'reasoned opinion' to 14 Member States in June 2007 for failing to implement the Racial Equality Directive fully, and to 11 Member States in January 2008 for incorrect implementation of the Employment Equality Directive. The main problem areas include definitions of discrimination, assistance to the victims of discrimination – such as the shift in burden of proof and victimisation – and the scope of the protection granted.¹⁰⁷

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

In the CIS, the Council of Heads of State adopted in 2007 a 'Declaration on Coherent Migration Policies of the CIS countries'¹⁰⁸ which reaffirms the principle of non-discrimination including political and social rights in accordance with international conventions. The high level at which this declaration was adopted is

Trade union as well as employer organizations have increasingly played a prominent role in preventing discrimination and promoting equality of treatment. For example, in the UK, the Southern and Eastern Trades Union Congress and Unionlearn have produced a pamphlet to assist in campaigning against racism. It provides information on ethnic minority discrimination and disadvantage in the labour market and provides practical advice to union organisers for identifying and combating racist behaviour and practices in the workplace (FRA 2008, 54).

¹⁰⁷ European Commission (2008) Commission acts to close gaps in employment equality rules. Press release 31 January 2008, http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/fundamental_rights/pdf/news/ip08_155_en.pdf, 2008-10-16.

¹⁰⁸ Results of the meeting of the Council of Heads of State, 5 October 2007, in Dushanbe, <http://www.cis.minsk.by/main.aspx?uid=10308>, 2009-02-20.

In Croatia, in line with the provisions of the Aliens Act regulating the work of aliens in the Republic of Croatia, aliens shall be guaranteed identical rights as provided in the labour law regulations of the Republic of Croatia regarding the employment and work conditions, that is, in collective agreements and arbitration rulings. The guaranteed rights shall refer to the maximum stipulated working hours and minimum rest periods, the minimum paid annual leave, the minimum wage rate, including the overtime wage rate, health conditions and safety at work, protective measures for the employment of expecting mothers, women and minor workers, and ban discrimination.¹⁰⁹

evidence of the importance of this topic within the CIS as well as of the difficulty of managing migration. The Declaration does not mention the common labour market, which was meant to be further developed by the working groups.

3. The Way Forward

In general, the necessary legal and institutional frameworks for regulating migration and protecting migrants in the OSCE region have been steadily developing over recent decades. This reflects on the one hand the elaboration of relevant international and European legal standards, and their gradually widening ratification. On the other hand, expanding multilateral efforts whereby various groupings of participating States are coordinating their respective actions within cooperative structures such as the EU or the CIS, or by creating additional partnerships, as in the case of the Western Balkan countries with the EU.

The increasing incorporation of international standards into national legislation and policies is a clear and relatively widespread manifestation of implementation of relevant OSCE Commitments on migration. However, this is an on-going process with important gaps still to be filled.

Most limitations in implementing the relevant international obligations of the participating States are in terms of explicitly ensuring equal treatment with nationals and non-discrimination on all grounds, including on nationality.

In addition, actually adhering to international standards ratified or otherwise incorporated in national legislation often lags behind the commitments, especially as national administrative, juridical and law enforcement capacities

¹⁰⁹ <http://www.mup.hr/1266.aspx>, 2009-02-24.

remain insufficiently developed in some countries and administrative structures are sometimes lacking the necessary knowledge, efficiency or funding.

Clearly, the national adoption and transposition of foundational legal standards for protection of migrants and building effective policy is far from complete.

While a significant number of OSCE participating States have ratified and incorporated one or more of the most relevant instruments, a substantial number have not yet done so.

Two important steps on the path forward involve providing information and technical support to concerned States to improve legislation through incorporation of international standards, and offering advisory services, technical assistance and capacity building to improve administration and implementation of relevant standards.

IV. Migration policy: Optimising benefits and mitigating adverse impact

This chapter focuses on the policy arena. Elaboration of explicit migration policy and concrete action measures are the necessary complement to legislative enactment of normative standards. Effective governance of labour migration requires legislation, policy and concrete measures taken together. This chapter highlights the numerous commitments to establish policies and practices that ensure that migration is deliberately regulated in order to meet needs and obtain benefits for concerned countries. The chapter illustrates that while many initiatives have emerged, many gaps remain unfilled.

1. Relevant OSCE commitments

In terms of optimising the benefits of migration and meeting the needs for labour skills in both origin and destination countries, the OSCE commitments are directed to

- adopting effective national frameworks in order to manage migration;¹¹⁰
- ease regulations concerning the movement of citizens from the other participant States in their territory, with due regard to security requirements;¹¹¹
- creating conditions to foster integration and greater harmony in relations between migrant workers and the rest of the society in which they reside, including by raising awareness about the enriching contribution of migrants to society and by enabling migrant workers to participate in the life of the society where they lawfully reside;¹¹²
- providing elementary language and vocational training for migrant workers;¹¹³
- facilitating the social and economic reintegration of returning labour migrants in their countries of origin, for instance by attracting their savings with a view to increasing opportunities for employment or by ensuring with appropriate legislative means or reciprocal agreements the payment of pensions;¹¹⁴
- fighting ‘illegal’ migration and addressing its root causes;¹¹⁵
- increase the possibilities of employment in countries of origin, for instance by developing economic co-operation suitable to both host and origin countries.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ See the Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

¹¹¹ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

¹¹² See the Moscow Document of 1991, the Helsinki Document 1992, the Budapest Document 1994, the Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, and the Permanent Council Decision No. 621 on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, annexed to the Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination.

¹¹³ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975 and the Madrid Document 1983.

¹¹⁴ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Madrid Document 1983 and the Vienna Document 1989.

¹¹⁵ See the Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration

¹¹⁶ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

2. Implementing commitments to optimise benefits and mitigate adverse impact

National migration policy statements or frameworks

A particularly significant OSCE commitment was the one incorporated in the Ministerial Council Decision of 2005, urging participating States to adopt “*effective national frameworks in order to manage migration*.”¹¹⁷

The general trend among the OSCE participant States is to develop migration policies directed at encouraging and regulating legal migration. Some of these comprise comprehensive national strategies or “coherent, comprehensive and balanced National Action Plans” covering a range of concerns and spelling out the intersecting involvements of different branches of government and other stakeholders, including social partners.

Some national policy statements have had a more limited focus on countering ‘illegal’ migration, particularly where it is associated with such phenomena as trafficking in human beings and organized crime. However, the participant States have understood that in addressing the problem of irregular migration, measures of control or restriction alone are insufficient. Therefore efforts are being taken to adopt cross- or multi-sectoral approaches, engaging not merely the participation of governments in the countries affected by irregular labour migration, but also the social partners and civil society.

Countries of origin are starting to focus on developing labour emigration and return strategies, with steps being taken regarding the recognition of qualifications and diplomas acquired abroad and on providing information about legal routes to emigrate. On the other hand, progress is less marked with regard to enhancing the protection of expatriates’ rights. Countries of destination do put more emphasis on controlling their borders and regulating the inflow of migrant workers, but at the same time they are starting to develop measures aimed at enhancing integration and social cohesion, and at protecting the rights of the migrants.

¹¹⁷ See the Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

Elements for Policy Formulation

Migration concerns the individual migrant and his/her family, and the source and the host country alike. A sustainable and successful migration policy has to establish procedures and regulations optimising the effects of migration for all three simultaneously for otherwise it will be circumvented by one or the other of the parties.

Migration is a process with several stages. Pre-migration information has to give accurate and reliable information about conditions of travel and recruitment and the working and living conditions in the host countries. Recruitment has to be regulated in a way guaranteeing a fair treatment of potential immigrants and avoiding exploitation and dependency from the recruitment agent. Travel has to be organised under decent conditions at a fair price.

In the host country, dependency on a sole employer has to be avoided by granting fair admission procedures including free choice of the employer and equal treatment with nationals with regard to employment and working conditions and access to social rights, including protection against discrimination, and full respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining (trade union) rights.

Migrants should be given the possibility to acquire the lingua franca of their host country at conditions adequate to their situation, and they should also be given the possibility to follow their traditions, as long as they are consistent with international human rights and the laws of their country of residence. Integration policies should include institutional facilities informing immigrants about their rights and about the laws, norms and practices of the host society. Their children should be given access to the educational system in the same way as children of nationals enjoy it, and particular emphasis should be given to their educational advancement. Family reunification should be facilitated, and family members be given access to the labour market as soon as possible.

In order to allow sustainable return, their employment should give room for the acquisition of transferable skills and knowledge. Thus they should have access to training and retraining programmes in the same way and under the same conditions as nationals. Temporary migration programmes should last for the period necessary to allow skill acquisition. Visa regulations should allow for travel between host and source country. The transfer of remittances should be facilitated, and its costs reduced to a minimum. Associations of immigrants should be supported in activities supporting migrants in the host country and the advancement of the country of origin.

Return to the country of origin should be seen as an option the individual migrant has to decide about. Returning migrants should be supported with regard to the utilisation of capital and knowledge acquired in the host coun-

try. In the country of origin, returning migrants should be supported in their re-integration process.

In order to facilitate a holistic migration policy, bi- and multilateral agreements regarding the joint development of migration policies should be concluded. In the source country, one-stop-shop agencies for pre-departure information, recruitment and information and support on return should be set up. Also in the host countries, one-stop-shop agencies informing about migrants' rights and living conditions should support migrants' settlement. Co-operation with the migration agencies active in the countries of origin should be sought, in particular with regard to sustainable return and support for returning migrants with regard to transfer of skills, capital and knowledge.

(Drawn from ILO, IOM and ICMPD policy recommendations)

Western Balkan Countries

In the Western Balkan region, the latest Enlargement Strategy and Progress Reports¹¹⁸ indicate that slow progress is being made in the area of migration policy development and implementation. Legislation regarding the movement, stay and employment of aliens is in most Western Balkans countries newly adopted or in process of adoption, but the administrative capacities required to implement the legislation in this field is insufficiently developed. The most quoted impediments are insufficient staffing levels, lack of or insufficient intra-agency cooperation, lack of technical capacities, lack of compatible data systems on migration etc. On the other hand, due to the conclusion of a significant number of readmission agreements both with the European Community and with other countries, the number of returned people is starting to rise steadily, which makes integration of readmitted persons a priority. However, for the moment secondary legislation on migration policy and an integration policy plan are still either lacking or in their first stages. Also, visa policies are only in their beginnings in most of the Western Balkan countries.

CIS countries

Being increasingly confronted with the negative consequences of unregulated migration, CIS countries have invested greatly in improving the quality of

¹¹⁸ Reports are available for Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey at http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/how-does-it-work/progress_reports/index_en.htm, 2009-02-24.

migration management systems in recent years. Most CIS countries have developed the necessary legislative basis, generally in line with international standards and agreements. Nevertheless, a good legal basis is contrasted with the underdevelopment of administrative and operational structures (such as labour-related entry and residence policies, labour market services, public or private job agencies) (Hofmann 2007, 15). The main problem areas are border control (where clear-cut responsibilities are often missing, equipment is not updated or cannot be properly used, inter-agency cooperation is not working efficiently, the sheer length of the borders etc.), visa policies (which are at an early stage of development and the understanding of the visa system as an instrument of migration control is not fully developed yet),¹¹⁹ and the cumbersome procedures for issuing work and residence permits. The actual admission policies with regard to labour purposes and work permits have proved to impose too many bureaucratic hurdles, financial burdens and tedious procedures on employers and labour migrants (ICMPD 2005, 273). The inefficiency of these procedures leads to the paradoxical situation that in spite of the acknowledged need for workers many labour migrants find themselves pushed into irregularity since they cannot fulfil the administrative requirements (Hofmann 2007, 16).

Five OSCE participating States (namely Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine) are engaged in cooperation with the EU through the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP),¹²⁰ the Commission outlined the main principles of the new ENP, acknowledging the necessity to apply the full range of its policies (foreign, security, trade, development, environment and others) to this end.¹²¹

Under the framework of the ENP, cooperation in the field of Justice, Freedom and Security on migration issues with Georgia and Moldova included the objective of elaborating and starting the implementation of coherent, comprehensive and balanced National Action Plans on migration and asylum issues a) to improve coordination between relevant national agencies dealing with migration, b) to achieve the exchange of information and possibly cooperation on transit migration, c) to support training activities in the field of immigration

¹¹⁹ Apart from entry and transit visa there is also still an issue with exit visa. Uzbekistan keeps requiring them of its citizens while Turkmenistan gave up the practice in 2004.

¹²⁰ The ENP for Belarus is not yet activated because there are no agreements in force with it, and the ENP builds upon such existing agreements. Also, relationships with Russia are instead developed through a Strategic Partnership covering four “common spaces.”

¹²¹ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A new Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours. Brussels, 11 March 2003, COM (2003) 104 final, p. 4.

and asylum, d) to develop cooperation with international organisations and the relevant agencies of the main countries of origin, transit and destination in order to manage migration processes etc.¹²²

Moreover, steps have been taken to strengthen the dialogue and cooperation in preventing and fighting 'illegal' migration with the view of eventually reaching agreements on readmission as well as on reintegration of returned asylum seekers and migrants. Georgia has readmission agreements in place with three EU Member States and is negotiating with most others. The European Commission has funded several AENEAS projects in Georgia including document security, reintegration of returning migrants, and informed migration.¹²³

In Sweden, new rules for labour immigration entered into force in December 2008. The new bill seeks to create a more open and flexible system for labour migration. Concrete measures to this end include ending the labour market testing by government agencies and enabling individual employers to identify which skills cannot be filled internally. The basic requirement for immigrating to work in Sweden is that there be an offer of employment that will provide the immigrant with an adequate living and the terms of employment offered are no worse than those specified in relevant Swedish collective agreements or provided for by common practice in the occupation or industry. However, the principle of Community preference must be respected, which means that nationals of EU and EFTA countries are to have first priority for access to employment opportunities. Sweden does not use quotas for labour migrants.¹²⁴

In January 2007, Russia adopted a new immigration policy which should contribute to decelerating the country's population decline, fill labour shortages more effectively, maintain economic potential and increase revenue, as well as reduce social tensions. The law defines quotas for migrant origin countries and high penalties for employers who employ migrants without the required permits and it is expected to provide 6.5 million migrants in 2007 with a registration

¹²² See respective Action Plans available at http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/documents_en.htm, 2009-02-24.

¹²³ Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2007", SEC (2008) 393, Brussels, 3 April 2008, http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/progress2008/sec08_393_en.pdf, 2009-02-24.

¹²⁴ <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/3083/a/114169>, 2009-02-20.

On 20 July 2007 the President of Ukraine signed the decree entitled “Improvements of State Migration Policy of Ukraine” (No. 657/2007). The decision reinforces the Decision of the Council for National Security and Defence on “Directions of State Migration Policy of Ukraine and Urgent Measures of Improvement of Its Effectiveness” dated 15 June 2007. Implementation measures should ensure a) regulation and differentiation of immigration to Ukraine, including of temporary character, depending on investment, scientific and cultural needs of the state, b) improvement of national legislation on refugees, creation of legal institutes for implementation of rights of persons who are in need of complementary and temporary protection, and c) effective counteraction to ‘illegal’ migration and reinforcement of responsibility for offences related to it. In line with the Decision, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, among others, submitted, by the end of 2007, a draft Concept Paper on State Migration Policy of Ukraine (with involvement of public organizations, scientists and experts) to Parliament. It also drafted laws on the ‘Basic Grounds of the State Migration Policy of Ukraine’, on the ‘Introduction of Amendments to the Law of Ukraine on Legal Status of Aliens and Stateless Persons’, on ‘Refugees, Persons Who are in Need of Complementary and Temporary Protection’, and on ‘Ratification of the Agreement between the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Government of Russia on Readmission.’ In parallel, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs conducted preparatory measures for the ratification of the Ukraine/EU Readmission Agreement and for ensuring Ukraine’s participation in the EU programme on financing of forced and voluntary return of irregular migrants to the countries of their origin or citizenship, as well as negotiations for concluding readmission agreements with a number of countries of origin.¹²⁵

and working permit.¹²⁶ The changes in legislation are intended to simplify the procedure for registering foreign citizens at their place of residence, along with employment, which were among the most serious obstacles for the legalisation of the status of migrants. Regarding the reform of the process governing migrant employment, which concerns only non-visa CIS citizens arriving in Russia from the CIS, labour permits are now issued directly to the immigrant, and not, as in the past, to the employer, which in practice means that workers are no longer tied to one employer. Moreover, the migration services are now obliged only to inform

¹²⁵ <http://soderkop.org.ua/page15519.html>, 2009-02-20.

¹²⁶ http://www.euromonitor.com/Russias_new_immigration_policy_will_boost_the_population, 2009-02-20.

The UK Home Office (Interior Ministry) – which issues entry permits – utilizes existing surveys and data in order to identify and evaluate current and future labour market shortages and to assess labour demand and skill needs (Department for Education and Employment, 2001). Moreover, in the UK, evidence of labour market tightness is documented before a decision to facilitate the immigration of persons with a particular set of occupational skills is taken and implemented (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 38).

Programmes for training, counselling and assistance for minorities to succeed in the labour market can be found for instance in the Czech Republic primarily for Roma, in Estonia for the non-Estonian speaking unemployed, and in Hungary for refugees (FRA 2008, 53).

the employment authorities about work permits issued to foreign immigrants but not to wait for its approval before issuing them, as before 2007 (Zayonchkovskaya 2007, 143).

Albania, Turkey and most of the countries that comprised the former Yugoslavia are in a process of adapting their legal and administrative systems to the requirements of future EU membership. This lends direction to the development of migration policies and has tended to speed them up.¹²⁷

However, in terms of implementation, reports from some countries note that capacity of governments to manage migration has remained low due to limited financial resources, lack of experienced staff, an unwieldy bureaucracy, and a high level of informal payments. Insufficient coordination and cooperation among concerned Ministries has also been cited as a problem

¹²⁷ See the latest Enlargement Strategy and Progress Reports available at http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/how-does-it-work/progress_reports/index_en.htm, 2009-02-24.

3. Examples of programmes, initiatives and practices implementing commitments

The EU's sectoral policy dialogue with European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)¹²⁸ partner countries covers a wide range of subjects – from the political to the technical, supporting the transition, reform and modernisation of ENP partner countries' administrations and public institutions. On migration and visa facilitation, Ukraine and Moldova concluded readmission and visa facilitation agreements with the EU, which entered into force on 1 January 2008. Guidelines were drafted to support the correct and harmonised implementation of the visa facilitation agreements.

The European Commission is developing a model of 'mobility partnerships'¹²⁹ to facilitate legal migration while at the same time combating 'illegal' migration, which involve the Commission, interested EU member States, and relevant third countries.¹³⁰ These partnerships are not limited only to mobility but touch upon many aspects related to the migration-development nexus. A pilot-mobility partnership is currently being developed with the Republic of Moldova, and exploratory talks will be undertaken with Georgia. The programme in Moldova seeks to assist the Moldovan authorities in encouraging the return and facilitating the reintegration of highly-skilled Moldovan migrants abroad (Council of Europe 2008, 77). A Common Visa Application Centre was opened in Chisinau under Hungarian leadership, also including Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia. More Member States are expected to join.

¹²⁸ The European Neighbourhood Policy applies to the EU's immediate neighbours by land or sea – Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Syria, Tunisia and Ukraine. Although Russia is also an EU neighbour, relations are developed through a Strategic Partnership covering four "common spaces". See ENP website at: http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/index_en.htm

¹²⁹ In brief, EU Mobility partnerships are agreements with certain origin countries in which the latter agree to take certain actions, such as discouraging irregular migration to EU countries and readmitting their own nationals caught in the destination country, in exchange for enhanced opportunities for legal migration and for short-term study or visit visas in EU member States. See <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/07/197>

¹³⁰ Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament 'Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2007'. Progress Report Moldova. SEC (2008) 399, Brussels, 3 April 2008, <http://soderkoping.org.ua/files/pages/16680/1.pdf>, 2009-02-20.

In Russia, a six year government programme, starting in June 2007, encourages “compatriots” living abroad to return to Russia. Repatriates are to receive cash, social benefits and support to regain Russian citizenship. By February 2009, 20,000 people had already applied.¹³¹

The Council of Heads of the CIS Migration Bodies is shortly expected to start working on establishing and improving mechanisms for gathering and analysing the relevant information and statistical data in order to monitor the migration situation and also to devise common unified standards in the interests of a possible inter-State exchange.¹³²

As a notable development in the migration field the agreements on visa facilitation and readmission between the European Community and Albania,¹³³ Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia, signed on 18 September 2007, should be mentioned. The agreements entered into force on 1 January 2008. Furthermore, during spring 2008, a structured dialogue on visa liberalisation was initiated between the above countries and the EU. In this process detailed roadmaps have been developed with clear benchmarks to be met in order to advance towards visa liberalisation (ICMPD 2008, 12). The agreements substantially improve the conditions for obtaining visas for travel to the EU. The facilitation agreements are linked to readmission agreements that were negotiated and concluded in parallel, and to the introduction of biometrics.¹³⁴

¹³¹ http://www.euromonitor.com/Russias_new_immigration_policy_will_boost_the_population, 2009-02-20.

¹³² Migration Management and its linkages with economic, social and environmental policies to the benefit of stability and security in the OSCE region. Statement by Mr. Nikolay Smorodin, Deputy Director of the Federal Migration Service of Russia, at part I of the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum, Vienna 19-20 January. Reference No. EEFDL/13/09, 20 January 2009, available at http://www.osce.org/documents/eca/2009/01/35971_en.pdf, 2009-02-24.

¹³³ For Albania only a visa facilitation agreement was signed, as a readmission agreement was already in force.

¹³⁴ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “Western Balkans: Enhancing the European perspective”, COM (2008) 127 final, Brussels, 5 March 2008, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/balkans_communication/western_balkans_communication_050308_en.pdf, 2009-02-24.

With regard to the fight against 'illegal' migration a number of CIS countries concluded an 'Agreement on Cooperation in Combating Illegal Migration' in 1998.¹³⁵ Subsequently, in June 2004, the CIS Council of Ministers of Internal Affairs adopted a decision and addressed the Council of Heads of States of CIS to elaborate a joint roadmap on the fight against 'illegal' migration for the years 2006-2008. Based on this decision the Council of Heads of States adopted a concept on the fight against 'illegal' migration of the CIS states in Astana, in September 2004, and decided upon the creation of the Joint Commission of CIS Member States.

The Czech Immigration Police Officers (IPOs) are members of the Foreign Police Service and are posted to third and transit countries for the purpose of establishing and maintaining contacts with the host countries in an effort to contribute to 'illegal' migration prevention, repatriation of migrants without rights to stay, and legal migration management. The main tasks of these officers are to provide the staff of an embassy with methodological and expert assistance and to assist them during interviews with visa applicants. There is also the benefit of ensuring a flexible cooperation and communication between embassies in risk regions and the Czech Ministry of the Interior. In 2007, the destinations for the IPOs were Moscow, Ulaanbaatar, Hanoi, Lvov, Cairo, and Algiers. In 2008, the destinations were Cairo, Kiev, Lvov, Hanoi, Moscow, Peking, Istanbul, Damascus, and Ulaanbaatar.

For the past 6 years, Hungary has been implementing an 'in depth integrated controlling system' of the foreigners residing in the country. The controls are ad-hoc and carried out on the basis of cooperation agreements between the police, the labour inspectorate, the Hungarian Customs and Finance Guard, and the Office of Immigration and Nationality. Checks can take place separately or as a common act of these authorities. If, during a control, an authority notices irregularities pertaining to the competence of another authority, it informs the responsible body. Furthermore, the visa authority makes efforts to sign bilateral agreements with the receiving institutions in order to have a registry of the participating foreigners especially for the following entry purposes: entry of tourist groups, participation in cultural and sport events, larger student groups. A similar system has been in place in Austria.

¹³⁵ These countries were Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine.

In Belgium the mandatory declaration of employment by migrants is part of a broader employment project, Limosa. Through this project the Belgian authorities aim to create better guarantees for the free movement of services and workers with extra attention being paid to everyone's rights and conditions of employment in Belgium. The website www.limosa.be plays an important part in this project. Immediately after each declaration of activity from a foreign national via the website, a 'Limosa-1' certificate is supplied. This certificate must be presented to the Belgian client or principal. If an employee, self-employed person or trainee is unable to produce this Limosa-1 document, the Belgian client or principal must report this to the authorities immediately. In time, the www.limosa.be website's functionalities will be expanded to allow employers to fulfil almost all their administrative obligations concerning working in Belgium via a single electronic portal. The Limosa declaration is an important step towards legal employment in Belgium while observing the Belgian and European regulations.

Trade Unions of Migrant Workers were organised in Russia in accordance with their right of association.¹³⁶ Since 2008, Kazakh trade unions are actively engaging migrant workers in trade union membership in order to protect their worker and human rights.¹³⁷ Trade unions of Kyrgyzstan¹³⁸ and Tajikistan have policy papers on labour migration whereby they seek collaboration with trade unions of destination countries for support of trade union members abroad.

4. The Way Forward

As highlighted in the OSCE-ILO-IOM Handbook on Establishing Effective Labour Migration Policies, the policy objectives of protecting citizens while working abroad and optimizing the developmental benefits of labour migration can only be met if two important elements form a part of a deliberate plan. First,

¹³⁶ Trade unions of migrant workers in Russia have their own newspaper "Migrant."

¹³⁷ Kazakh trade union policy paper "Labour Migration in Kazakhstan and the activity of social partners", Astana, 2008.

¹³⁸ Kazakh trade union policy paper "Labour Migration in Kazakhstan and the activity of social partners", Astana, 2008.

countries must establish the necessary institutional capacity and inter-ministerial coordination to meet their policy objectives. This includes giving priority attention to labour migration in the formulation and implementation of overall development policy, in foreign policy, and in economic, employment and labour policy agendas. It also means providing for adequate resource allocation to support this attention and implement agreed measures.

Second, inter-state cooperation is essential (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 36).

Therefore, further development of comprehensive migration management systems and strategies are needed in the participating States, based on enhanced cooperation among the countries of origin, transit and destination. As also recommended by the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) in 2005, and specified with more detailed guidance in the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration, states should provide additional opportunities for regular migration and establish clear and transparent criteria for the recruitment of foreign workers. Last but not least, policy frameworks must include mechanisms for data collection and monitoring the implementation and effects of measures, which would enable their proper evaluation in view of improving the policies and their outcomes on a regular basis. All of this requires establishing viable and appropriate administrative structures with the knowledge, capacity and authority to elaborate policy, ensure intra-governmental coordination, and carry out necessary tasks and measures.

Building on the way forward suggested by the previous chapter, a second main path is to support countries to elaborate and implement national migration policy frameworks, commitment statements, and plans.

A key form of international support to assist States in elaborating and implementing effective national policy frameworks will be provision of technical cooperation, advisory services and sharing of practical models.

Complementary support will be providing technical assistance and capacity building for establishing and/or strengthening the administrative structures and institutions to carry out the activities and measures giving effect to agreed policy frameworks.

V. International cooperation and dialogue

This chapter notes the emphasis given in the OSCE Commitments to international cooperation and dialogue on migration. It includes a summary of the main international and regional organizations that concern OSCE participating States, as well as certain more informal international consultative forums on migration. It also outlines several particularly relevant international and European social partner and civil society organizations. Moreover, this chapter reviews the development of bilateral labour migration agreements and international social security accords as evidence of expanding implementation of these OSCE commitments by many participating States.

1. Review of OSCE commitments on international cooperation

OSCE commitments encourage bilateral and multilateral cooperation by urging the participant States to:

- ensure orderly movements of workers thorough collaboration between host and origin countries;¹³⁹
- deal jointly with the problems arising from the migration of workers;¹⁴⁰
- co-operate to further improve the general situation of migrant workers and their families.¹⁴¹

Furthermore, the 13th Ministerial Council encouraged the OSCE itself to contribute by “facilitating dialogue and co-operation between participating States, including countries of origin, transit and destination in the OSCE area” and by “assisting the participating States ... to develop effective migration policies and to implement their relevant OSCE commitments.”¹⁴²

In analysing the “migration dimension” in international cooperation and dialogue, it should be noted that a comprehensive international migration regime is still evolving at the global level. On the one hand, “an international refugee regime based on the 1951 UN Convention and 1967 Protocol on the Status of Refugees as well as the ongoing activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is well established.” (Kosłowski 2008, 3).

As shown by chapter II, the broad and comprehensive array of international legal standards applying to migration can be considered an international legal framework on migration. There has also been extensive elaboration of common policy recommendations at the global level over the last twenty years. Milestones in this process included the substantive chapters on migration in the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, the Berne Process (2002-2005) which elaborated (although without formal adoption) an International Agenda for Migration Management, and the Report and Recommendations of the Global Commission on International Migration in 2005. Particularly significant advances were the Resolution --including Plan of Action-- on a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in the Global Economy formally adopted at ministerial level by the International

¹³⁹ *idem.*

¹⁴⁰ See the Helsinki Final Act 1975.

¹⁴¹ See the Madrid Document 1983.

¹⁴² Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

Labour Conference in 2004, and the ILO Multilateral Framework for Labour Migration (2006) resulting from formal negotiating processes and adoption by representatives of governments and social partners from all regions. Each of these accomplishments built on previous efforts and formulations. All of these outcomes were elaborated through high level international dialogue processes; the Cairo UN Conference and ILO formulations resulted from formal negotiating processes among governments worldwide. There is a high degree of consistency on the main policy formulations among these products. Put together, they comprise an extensive and comprehensive policy framework.

However, adoption, enactment and implementation at national level of international policy guidelines and legal standards are less advanced. Most countries have been represented in drafting the relevant international legal standards and policy recommendations. However, there are manifestly differing views within many governments about how and to what extent to adopt and implement the existing international legal and policy formulations.

Reasons for ambiguity in implementation are the subject of frequent national and international debates. On the one hand, many governments have long perceived migration as an internal matter, in which policy and practice is unilaterally determined according to national interest and protection of national sovereignty. And, given that a large proportion of migration concerns labour, management of labour markets is seen as primarily and necessarily a domestic governance concern.

On the other hand, there is increasing recognition that as migration by definition is international, it cannot be regulated effectively by solely unilateral efforts by individual States. Contention over applicability of existing international standards, institutions and policy guidelines led to the establishment of a further intergovernmental consultative process on migration in 2007, the Global Forum on Migration and Development. This explicitly “States-owned” dialogue process has in fact focused on identifying practical approaches and ‘good practice’ models for managing international migration as a way forward on international cooperation.

Today, a multitude of international mechanisms, fora and organisations have evolved to deal with international migration (Hoffman et al. 2004, 79ff). The importance of migration issues to international relations was recognized almost a century ago by inclusion of specific reference to protection of workers in countries other than their own in the ILO Constitution contained in the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 that ended World War I. The first international conferences on migration took place in the 1920s and the first international agreements on migration and refugees were elaborated in the 1930s. International organizations

specifically addressing refugees and displaced persons were established in the aftermath of World War II: the UNHCR and the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration both came into being in 1951; the latter evolved over time into the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Migration and labour mobility were included in the agendas of the Council of Europe and the European Commission/European Union from their earliest days.

Over recent years, these traditional actors in migration governance at international level have been supplemented by a broad number of multilateral fora dealing with migration governance. Regional consultative processes such as the Budapest Process and the Söderköping Process in Europe, the Puebla Process in the Americas, the Asia-Pacific Consultations and the MIDSA Migration Dialogue in Southern Africa have assumed an important role in addressing issues of migration policy development and governance in their respective regions. Experiences in regional processes have also fed into further development of migration policy cooperation on the global level in fora such as the Berne Initiative and the Global Commission on International Migration mentioned earlier.

Participating States also made commitments through the OSCE to deal with migration in a cooperative manner. Most explicitly this was the case in 1975 when they pledged to resolve the problems arising bilaterally from the migration of workers in Europe as well as between the participating States in their mutual interest, and to comply with the bilateral and multilateral agreements to which each one is party. The CSCE/OSCE has since then provided its participating States with a platform for political dialogue on migration and security related issues.

International cooperation on migration necessarily involves working through and with multilateral institutions and structures built up over the last century. Migration has been and is an important component of work of the United Nations system, of European and other regional organizations, and of social partner and civil society bodies. Policy and practical efforts of governments can be and are being facilitated, supported and coordinated through activity and dialogue under auspices of international institutions and multilateral processes.

Following is a brief overview of the international organizations and multilateral processes particularly relevant for OSCE participating States in implementing Commitments on migration..

2. The United Nations System

a) The United Nations Organization

The United Nations organization as a whole, three of its six main organs including the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the Secretariat, as well as many of its Specialized Agencies and Programmes, have important mandates, roles and activities regarding international migration. This is a natural and evolving reflection of the fact that international migration touches many distinct political, economic, social and cultural concerns, and thus many areas of governance.

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) regularly considers issues and adopts resolutions with direct relevance to migration, such as migrants rights, the situation of refugees, women migrants, and the migration-development nexus. Its Committees regularly report to the UNGA and submit draft resolutions and decisions for adoption by the Plenary. Migration-related matters are often taken up by the nature of the work of the Economic and Financial Second Committee and the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Third Committee of the UNGA.

The Secretary General and the United Nations Secretariat have given considerable attention to migration in recent years. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) of the United Nations Secretariat is the primary source of information on matters related to international migration and development for the General Assembly, its committees, ECOSOC and its functional commissions. UNDESA's activities in this area are part of its overall responsibilities for the analysis of development prospects globally, and aim at providing the foundation for the policy debate on maximizing the benefits of international migration for development. They include providing objective analyses of the causes and consequences of international migration; compiling, analyzing and disseminating statistics on international migration; working to improve the availability and comparability of those statistics; and, in collaboration with the Regional Commissions, monitoring national and regional policies on international migration.

The relevant roles and functions of the main concerned UN specialized agencies and programmes are summarized below; these descriptions are drawn from a recent report¹⁴³ by the inter-agency Global Migration Group (described below) in which these agencies participate:

¹⁴³ Global Migration Group (2008) International Migration and Human Rights; Challenges and Opportunities on the Threshold of the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UN Specialized Agencies

a) International Labour Organization (ILO)

The International Labour Organization (ILO) is the UN specialized agency on labour issues. It has been dealing with labour migration since its founding in 1919; the Preamble to its Constitution contained in the Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I specifically establishes ILO responsibility for *protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own*.¹⁴⁴ The 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia¹⁴⁵ and the ILO Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998)¹⁴⁶ reinforce the specific ILO mandate on protection of workers outside their own countries. ILO became the first specialized agency of the UN in 1946. Its main objectives are 1) elaboration and monitoring of international labour standards, 2) promotion of employment and enterprise creation, 3) extension of social protection to all, and 4) facilitating social dialogue. It has pioneered international Conventions to guide migration policy and protection of migrant workers. Activity on labour migration is carried out by all major sectors and units, within the overarching ILO framework of 'decent work for all'. ILO has a rights-based approach to labour migration and promotes tripartite participation (governments, employers and workers) in migration policy.

The ILO role and activities on labour migration were reaffirmed and redefined by decision of the 2004 International Labour Conference – comprising member country representation at ministerial level together with leadership of representative national employer and worker federations. ILO provides advisory services to Member States, promotes international standards, provides a tripartite forum for consultations, serves as a global knowledge base, and provides technical assistance and capacity-building to constituents. ILO has recently developed a Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration¹⁴⁷ to guide elaboration and implementation of labour migration policy. Areas of ILO competence relevant to implementation of OSCE commitments on migration include labour law, labour administration, employment policy, statistics, social security, recognition of skills, assessing labour demand, migrant insertion and reinsertion in labour markets, labour inspection, equality and non-discrimination, gender and labour migration, integration of migrants, training, and others.

¹⁴⁴ Text of the ILO Constitution can be accessed online at: <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/constq.htm>

¹⁴⁵ For printable text, see: http://www.ilocarib.org.tt/projects/cariblex/conventions_23.shtml

¹⁴⁶ See: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/ilc/ilc86/com-dtxt.htm>

¹⁴⁷ Op sit

b) United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) emphasises the human face of migration and addresses the implications of the movement of people in its fields of competence. These include: the migration education nexus and the challenges raised by brain drain/gain, student mobility, and the international recognition of qualifications; the migration-development nexus, with a particular emphasis on the development of knowledge diasporas through the use of ICTs; the impact of environmental trends and climatic change on forced migration; the cultural integration of migrants in host societies, with particular attention to the balance between social cohesion and the respect for cultural diversity; and the research-policy nexus through the creation of research networks and of innovative platforms enabling exchanges between researchers and policy-makers. It does so by cooperating with a wide range of partners, including intergovernmental organizations, civil society groups and universities.

UN Programmes, Funds and other bodies

c) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), created in 1950 by the United Nations General Assembly, is charged to provide protection and assistance to the world's refugees. Over the past six decades, it has become one of the world's principal humanitarian agencies. Under its mandate, UNHCR's work is humanitarian and non-political. Its founding statute entrusts UNHCR with two main and closely related functions – to protect refugees and to seek durable solutions to their problems. Its first function, "international protection," is aimed at ensuring refugees' basic human rights, particularly that no refugee be returned involuntarily to a country where he or she has reason to fear persecution. UNHCR thus undertakes a range of activities to promote ratification of and accession to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol.¹⁴⁸ The second major function of seeking durable solutions to refugee problems is accomplished by repatriation to their homeland, integration in first countries of asylum, or resettlement to third countries.

¹⁴⁸ Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees and the 1967 New York Protocol. Entry into force 22.04.1951 (Convention) and 04.10.1967 (Protocol). As of 1 October 2008, 147 States were Parties to one or both the Convention and the Protocol. See: UNHCR, States Parties to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol. <http://www.unhcr.org/3b73b0d63.html> (27-6-2009).

In order to fulfill its mandate to protect refugees and find durable solutions for them, UNHCR is actively involved in a range of activities with a direct bearing on migration. They include contributing to the work of regional fora on migration and asylum; assisting states to address the phenomenon of mixed migratory movements; capacity-building and institutional support relating to asylum; data-collection and analysis on forced migration and secondary movements of refugees; advocacy relating to asylum, statelessness and the phenomenon of internal displacement; provision of assistance for the voluntary repatriation and reintegration of refugees and return of displaced persons; advocacy to encourage the development aid community to recognize and mitigate the development impact of hosting large numbers of refugees or receiving back large number of refugees and displaced persons.

d) The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) promotes a human rights approach to migration throughout its work. In particular, it supports the mandates of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants and the UN Special Rapporteur on Trafficking and services the Committee on Migrant Workers (CMW), the treaty body monitoring compliance with the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. The CMW reviews reports submitted by States Parties to the Convention to assist them in improving implementation of Convention standards. The Committee on Migrant Workers has also endeavoured to identify good practices through its examination of reports of States Parties.

OHCHR also implements a technical cooperation project on Trafficking which is guided by OHCHR's Recommended Principles and Guidelines on Human Rights and Human Trafficking. Issues of migration, development and human rights are further addressed and analyzed, including at the regional and country level, through a variety of other mandates and programmes, such as that of national human rights institutions.

e) United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations focal point for the integrated treatment of trade and development, aims, *inter alia*, to make migration work for development and contribute to the achievement of the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs). Under its three pillars (research and analysis, technical assistance and inter-governmental

consensus-building), UNCTAD actively promotes coherence and global understanding by offering strategic policy analysis and options on the nexus between migration, trade and development, including through expert meetings and key publications. It undertakes analytical work and provides advice and technical assistance to policy makers, trade negotiators and regulators on: contribution of migrants to development; the potential benefits and opportunities of trade, investment and developmental links between countries of origin of migrants and their communities abroad; and the potential of migrants' remittances to contribute to development. It also contributes to the knowledge base on trade- and development-related issues and trends including on circular migration; gender-related migration; brain-drain and brain circulation. UNCTAD's work on trade in services include market access, regulatory issues and institutional frameworks to facilitate the temporary movement of natural persons at the multilateral (GATS Mode 4), regional and bilateral levels as well as trade in labour intensive services and fostering skills development and recognition of qualifications. UNCTAD collects migration-related data and information and participates in the inter-agency Task Force on Statistics of International Trade in Services.

f) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) aim is to maximize the developmental benefits of migration for developing countries, and mitigate any negative consequences. UNDP country offices provide capacity development support to governments that wish to develop pro-poor, prodevelopment and human rights-based migration strategies, as part of their broader MDG-based national development strategies. Particular attention is given to the efficiency and use of remittances, retaining key skills, improving the participation of diasporas, strengthening local governance and investment in education. Within the international debate on migration, UNDP advocates for a focus on sustainable human development and protecting the rights of migrants, as well as progress on the GATS Mode 4 negotiations on the temporary movement of labour.

g) United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

International migration has important implications for demographic dynamics and thus for the core mandate of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). UNFPA's approach towards policy and programmatic interventions in this area is rights-based and culture and gender sensitive. Among issues of particular concern are the challenges of female migration, including trafficking and smuggling; migration and the spread of diseases such as HIV/AIDS; the provision of basic

Strengthening migration governance

social services, including reproductive health services, in areas of destination; and protection of the human rights of migrants. UNFPA seeks to improve data, research and institutional capacity for formulating and implementing migration policies and programmes. UNFPA is strongly dedicated to providing directed policy, advocacy and technical support to ensure that international migration is recognized as an important factor in development.

h) United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF)

The United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), guided by the Convention of the Rights of the Child, is dedicated to the realization of the rights of children and women affected by migration. It carries out policy research and evidence-based analyses to find practical solutions to the challenges that migration can bring, including an assessment of unaccompanied and separated migrant children. UNICEF focuses on the social impact of migration and remittances on children left behind, and the role that social protection and legislative reform can play in supporting the realization of the rights of affected children and women. UNICEF is currently testing methodologies to measure the social impact of migration and remittances on children left behind, and is seeking to estimate the numbers of international migrant children. In addition to its research and analysis, UNICEF is also strongly committed to working directly with governments and civil society to develop protective policies for children, adolescents and women affected by migration, including human sustainable development, child trafficking and child protection.

i) United Nations Institute for Training and Research's (UNITAR)

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research's (UNITAR) mandate is to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations system through capacity development. For over a decade, UNITAR has been involved in inter-agency collaboration on international migration and related issues, providing training to government officials in most regions of the world. In addition, it supports the progress of international policy dialogue processes, principally the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the United Nations General Assembly's debate on international migration and development. Together with its partners, UNITAR works to enhance knowledge on legal underpinnings, policies and good practices related to migration and development, thereby enabling governments to make informed decisions in this field. Dedicated to promoting inclusive dialogue among all stakeholders in the migration process across sectors and world regions, the Institute offers a platform for networking, trust building, the exchange of ideas and the dissemination of lessons learned.

j) United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), as custodian of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children as well as the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, which both supplement the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, assists governments in their ratification and implementation. UNODC promotes international cooperation among governments, assisting them in implementing comprehensive, multi-disciplinary approaches, with a special focus on criminal justice responses. It provides legal assistance and supports capacity-building for law enforcement, prosecution and the judiciary. Victim support and witness protection are also part of UNODC's work. The implementation of the two Protocols will contribute to the reduction of irregular migration and related criminal activities.

k) United Nations Regional Commissions

International migration is a phenomenon that exhibits regional specificities. The work of the five United Nations Regional Commissions – including the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) – is dedicated to fostering incorporation of the regional perspective in any analysis of international migration and in addressing the multidimensional aspects of migration, which entails the integration of this phenomenon with development goals. Their activities include monitoring the development of regional and sub regional consultative processes focusing on migration, striving to move towards interregional convergence and regional integration initiatives. As a complement to these efforts, the regional commissions are actively engaged in analyzing the countries' priorities and experiences regarding labour markets, training, exchanges of human capital and portability of pension and health benefits.

In the region of many OSCE participating countries, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) has a special unit, the Population Activities Unit (PAU), which coordinates regional activities in data collection and research on demographic change and migration.

l) The World Bank

The World Bank's engagement on international migration focuses on the development impact of migration and remittances for developing countries. The focus to date has been largely on generating reliable data and deepening existing knowledge on the potential benefits and costs of migration at both the household and aggregate level. This work has led to a number of important global and regional reports and has improved the availability and quality of data on priority issues.

Strengthening migration governance

Operational work to date has focused on reducing the costs of remittances and better channeling of these resources; enhancing the portability of pensions and strengthening the protection of migrant workers. The World Bank has also been actively engaged in the attempt to gain global policy coherence in the area of international migration by means of improved partnerships and coordination.

m) The Global Migration Group (GMG)

The Global Migration Group (GMG) is an inter-agency group bringing together heads of the above listed 13 UN agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to promote the wider application of all relevant international and regional instruments and norms relating to migration, and to encourage the adoption of more coherent, comprehensive and better coordinated approaches to the issue of international migration. The GMG is particularly concerned with improving the overall effectiveness of its members and other stakeholders in capitalizing upon the opportunities and responding to the challenges presented by international migration. The GMG consists today of 14 organizations that are actively involved in international migration and related issues.

The GMG built on an existing inter-agency group with a more limited membership, the Geneva Migration Group, established in April 2003. The GMG contributed actively to preparations for the 2006 General Assembly High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development and to the meetings of the Global Forum on Migration and Development in Brussels in July 2007, in Manila in October 2008 and in Athens in 2009.

3. Intergovernmental and Regional Organizations

a) The International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Created in 1951 as the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration, IOM's mandate is to promote humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all; to promote international co-operation on migration issues; to aid in the search for practical solutions to migration problems by providing a forum for discussion; and to provide humanitarian assistance to migrants in need, be they refugees, externally or internally displaced persons, or other uprooted people. IOM's Constitution explicitly recognises the link between international migration and economic, social and cultural development.

IOM acts with its partners to uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants; encourage social and economic development through migration; assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management;

and advance understanding of migration issues. It does these by using its long experience and world-wide presence to provide a full range of services and advice to governments and migrants, from projects and practical solutions to policy and broad strategic approaches, from data collection, research and analysis to the provision of a forum for States, intergovernmental organizations and civil society to exchange views and experiences and promote cooperation and coordination of efforts on international migration issues.

Based on a global network of field offices and representations, IOM carries out a large variety of field-based operations and programmes. IOM activities include technical cooperation and capacity building, assisted voluntary return for irregular migrants, medical and public health programmes for migrants, measures to counter trafficking in human beings, awareness raising and education on migration.

b) The Council of Europe

The Council of Europe, through its European Committee on Migration (CDMG) conducts studies, develops recommendations, contributes to elaborating legal standards and delineates policy guidance covering most issues of migration governance. The CDMG incorporates operational participation from all 47 member countries (all of which are also OSCE participating States). The composition of the committee reflects the breadth of government institutions charged with addressing migration concerns, including ministries of immigration, labour/employment, interior or home affairs, foreign affairs, integration, and others. Many of its policy lines have been endorsed by the Council of Europe Conferences of Ministers on Migration Affairs, thus giving political impetus at the highest level to ensure their implementation by member states. Policy evolution in many member states shows that Council of Europe guidance has been especially relevant to shaping consistent national policies and to encouraging co-operation among member countries.

Other Council of Europe bodies address migration issues. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) is tasked with combating racism, xenophobia, anti-semitism and intolerance from the perspective of protection of human rights; its focus includes discrimination and integration regarding persons of immigrant origin. The current Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, serving in an independent capacity, has given particular attention to rights of migrants as a major theme under this mandate. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) plays an important role, particularly through its Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population. This Committee elaborates

policies for protection of the rights of migrants, refugees and displaced persons and the improvement of their living conditions and, secondly, proposes political solutions consistent with the humanitarian values of the Council of Europe.

c) The European Union

The institutionalization of the European Community into the European Union was from the outset a project concerned with migration, in the sense that trans-border mobility of Community citizens within the EC was to be facilitated, and by the 1990s, largely treated as internal labour mobility. Today, “the community encompasses two distinct legal regimes relating to migration – on the one hand there is a highly developed EC legal framework regarding the right of nationals of the Member States to migrate and seek employment in any one of the other Member States, and, on the other, a less elaborated legal regime relating to third country nationals (Guild 2004, 47). The legal acquis of the EU on migration matters is briefly summarized in chapter III, at page 32.

Entry into force of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1999 represented the formal step towards ‘harmonisation’ or ‘communitarisation’ of immigration governance at European level.. Amsterdam made cooperation in the field of border and migration management binding for EU Member States, but required unanimity among them when it came to the actual decision-making process. The current ‘Hague Programme’ envisaged enhanced coordination and harmonization in asylum and migration matters within the EU. Entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty – upon ratification by the EU Member States – will shift most EU decisions on asylum, immigration and integration to qualified majority voting in the Council after 2009. The Lisbon Treaty underlines that Member States will ‘retain the right to determine the volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to seek work’. In practice, this reservation implies that admission and labour migration from newly arriving third-country nationals will remain in the sole competence of the Member States.

The External Dimension of Asylum and Migration policy

The ‘external dimension’ of a common EU asylum and migration policy has been developing over a number of years. One strategic framework for intensifying cooperation and dialogue on asylum and migration with third countries is provided by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), intended to contribute to increased stability, security and prosperity among neighbouring States, particularly to the East. Dialogue and cooperation on migration have also been central elements in relations with Mediterranean countries and in the emerging African Union-European Union partnership.

d) Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)

The OSCE itself is an important international reference for participating countries in the implementation of the OSCE Commitments on migration. It is a regional security organization comprising of fifty-six participating States as well as Partners for Cooperation that provides an important forum for dialogue and conducts activities in a comprehensive and co-operative manner in three dimensions of security: the politico-military, the economic and environmental, and the human dimension. Comprehensive security has been an integral element of the OSCE philosophy since its inception with the Helsinki Final Act 1975. Migration was included in this concept when freedom of movement was identified as a valuable component. Successive OSCE documents and Ministerial Council decisions reaffirmed migration as an important topic that should be approached by all three dimensions.

In 2005, under the Slovenian Chairmanship migration and security related issues were brought to the forefront of the political dialogue resulting in the Ljubljana Decision on Migration No.2/05. Since then migration related issues have frequently been discussed in various OSCE fora. This has been reemphasized in 2009 with the selection of migration management as the theme of the 17th OSCE Economic and Environmental Forum and the passing of a new Ministerial Decision No.5/09 on migration Management in Athens on 2 December 2009. The Office of the Co-ordinator of Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA) and the other divisions of the OSCE continue to lend support and work closely with the participating States to build capacity and strengthen inter-state co-operation to achieve the OSCE commitments in migration.

e) The Commonwealth of Independent States

The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) is a regional organization whose participating countries are former Soviet Republics. Created in December, 1991, the CIS is comparable to a confederation similar to the original European Community. The CIS has coordinating powers in the realms of trade, finance, lawmaking, and security. It has also promoted cooperation on democratization and cross-border crime prevention.

At present, CIS membership unites Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. In September 1993 the Heads of the CIS States signed an Agreement on the creation of Economic Union to form common economic space grounded on free movement of goods, services, labour force, capital; to elaborate coordinated monetary, tax, price, customs, external economic policy; to bring

Strengthening migration governance

together methods of regulating economic activity and create favourable conditions for the development of direct production relations. Its numerous initiatives in lawmaking and policy guidance on labour migration are described in Chapter III of this report.

f) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

The OECD groups 30 member countries and provides governments with a framework for the discussion on and improvement of economic and social policies. OECD's work covers economic and social issues from macroeconomics, to trade, education, development and international migration. Since the 1960s the migration activities of the OECD have mainly been carried out under the auspices of the Working Party on Migration. The migration observation group of the OECD, named SOPEMI, monitors and analyses migration and asylum flows in OECD member countries on the basis of national reports. The migration activities of the OECD are organised around two main areas: monitoring trends in international migration movements and policies and conducting analyses and studies on specific migration-related issues. Emphasis is placed on the employment situation of foreigners, the fight against illegal foreign employment, economic aspects of migration and its effects on wages, employment, labour shortages, growth and productivity, and the mobility of highly skilled workers.

g) International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)

The International Centre for Migration and Policy Development is an inter-governmental organisation with headquarters in Vienna. ICMPD was created in 1993 at the initiative of Switzerland and Austria. The purpose of the Centre is to promote innovative, comprehensive and sustainable migration policies and to function as a service exchange mechanism for governments and organizations in the wider European region. A major task of ICMPD is to develop a pan-European cooperation framework, so as to ensure that the countries in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe are fully included in a common European migration and asylum regime. Today more than 30 governments actively support ICMPD in various ways. ICMPD's main objective is to support governmental and international actors through policy expertise, research and information, dialogue and networking facilities. In the framework of East-West migration cooperation, ICMPD serves as Secretariat to the Budapest process (see below) and has participated in other fora, processes, projects and institutions dealing with East-West migration.

4. International Inter-governmental Consultative Forums

a) The Global Forum on Migration and Development

The Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) is a recent initiative among governments to address the migration and development interconnections in practical and action-oriented ways. It reflects progressive acknowledgement of the need to address migration policy implications and responses in a multilateral framework. The goals of the GFMD are: a) to bring together government expertise from all regions to enhance dialogue, cooperation and partnership in the areas of migration and development; b) to address the multidimensional aspects, opportunities and challenges related to international migration and its inter-linkages with development; and c) to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes at the national, regional and global levels. Its inaugural meeting was held in Brussels in July 2007, the second in Manila in October 2008 and the third session prepared by the government of Greece is in Athens in November 2009. The Forum is seen as a multilateral space to examine potential synergies between international migration and development and to steer current research findings and good practices towards more cooperative forms of migration and development management.

b) The Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM)

The Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) was launched in December 2003 by the UN Secretary General as an independent body to broaden high level political discussion and to foster international understanding on the issue. The GCIM had three mandates: to bring international migration issues to the top of the global agenda, to analyse shortcomings in approaches by governments or other bodies to migration, and to make practical recommendations to the UN Secretary General and other stakeholders on strengthening governance of international migration. It successfully articulated a set of recommendations providing a comprehensive response to migration issues. Presentation of its report to the Secretary General in October 2005 concluded the GCIM work; the Commission's recommendations served as a basis for the agenda of the High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development of the UN General Assembly in September, 2006.

c) The Inter-Governmental Consultations (IGC)

The Inter-Governmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugee and Migration Policies in Europe, North America and Australia (IGC) started as an informal

meeting point for only a few Governments for the exchange of views and experiences, but within a few years developed into an important regional multilateral mechanism. IGC is an informal, non-decision making forum for information exchange and discussion on policy coherence in migration, asylum and refugee protection. Many of the concepts discussed in the framework of IGC (such as carrier sanctions for the transport of undocumented aliens, common visa policies, accelerated asylum procedures, and the concepts of "first-host-country" and "safe third country") later found their way into international agreements (such as the Dublin and Schengen Conventions and the London Resolutions) and into national asylum legislation. Subjects regularly dealt with by IGC include: asylum, temporary protection, return, trafficking, unaccompanied minors, family reunification, illegal migration, burden sharing and country of origin information. Since 1996, the IGC has established a "Trafficking Information Exchange System" (TIES), in which the governments of the IGC participating States exchange information on irregular migration, human smuggling and trafficking.

d) Regional Consultation Processes – RCPs

When analysing the impact of multi-lateral cooperation on the governance of international migration, the role of regional initiatives has to be considered of similar importance as the initiatives at global level. The first forms regional cooperation processes have developed in Europe during the 1980s. Despite of their individual characteristics all of the various RCPs have in common that they were established to facilitate the dialogue on migration issues between States. They are characterised by pursuing a "particular model of informal and non-binding multi-lateralism" (Channac 2007, 9), by "openness" towards issues to be discussed and solutions to be found, and by "efficiency" in communication and administrative procedures. RCPs aim to build networks of information exchange and knowledge transfer, which in a second step, should contribute to convergence and harmonisation of national migration policies (Channac 2007, 13). Initially, many of the RCPs on migration issues had focused on irregular migration, asylum and border management. Meanwhile most of them have broadened their thematic scope and also deal with issues related to admission policies, labour migration or integration. This change in thematic orientation reflects a general change in perception towards an understanding for the need to develop comprehensive migration policies that cover all aspects of international migration.

In context of the OSCE region, the *Budapest Process* represents the largest and longest-standing platform for informal dialogue and cooperation between States on migration issues. The process was established in 1991 and today it

represents a consultative forum of some 50 governments in the wider European region (plus Australia, Canada and USA) and 10 international organisations, aiming at preventing irregular migration and at developing sustainable solutions for the governance of legal migration in the wider European region. The *Söderköping Process* was launched in 2001 upon the initiative of Sweden and UNHCR to promote dialogue on asylum and irregular migration issues among the countries situated at the European Unions' eastern border. At present the Söderköping Process involves 10 States.

Examples of regional consultative processes on migration in other regions include the *Puebla Process* initiated in 1996 and bringing together 11 governments from South and North America. It aims to deepen cooperation between participating States, to deepen the knowledge on size and structure of regional migration flows and to counteract anti-immigrant attitudes. The *Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa* (MIDSA) aims to facilitate regional dialogue and cooperation on migration policy issues amongst the 15 governments of the Southern African Development Community (SADC). The overall objective is to facilitate regional co-operation in migration management by fostering greater understanding of migration and strengthening regional institutional and personnel capacities.

5. Social Partner Organizations

a) International Organisation of Employers (IOE)

The International Organisation of Employers consists of 147 national employer organizations from 140 countries from all over the world. The mission of the IOE is to promote and defend the interests of employers in international fora, particularly in the International Labour Organization (ILO), and to this end works to ensure that international labour and social policy promotes the viability of enterprises and creates an environment favourable to enterprise development and job creation. As migration is one of IOE's policy areas, the organization works closely with the ILO and other relevant international organizations on this topic. For example, it cooperated with the Global Commission on International Migration set up by the UN in 2003. The IOE tracks developments in the further liberalization of trade in services through cross-border movement of professional, managerial and technical personnel through the WTO consultative process, in which it participates. The IOE participated in the drafting of the ILO Multilateral Framework on labour migration as a guide to future work in this area.

b) International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)

The ITUC's primary mission is the promotion and defense of workers' rights and interests, through international cooperation between trade unions, global campaigning and advocacy within the major global institutions. The Programme Document adopted at the ITUC founding Congress sets out the Confederation's overall policy framework, which builds on existing international trade union policies. Promoting respect of diversity at work and in society and implementing effective measures to combat racism and xenophobia, in particular at the workplace and in the labour market, are priorities for the ITUC. To that end, campaigns are being run on combating the discrimination and the unfair and often abusive working and living conditions that women workers, migrant workers and the members of their families are facing throughout the world.

c) BUSINESS EUROPE

BUSINESSEUROPE, the Confederation of European Business, represents more than 20 million small, medium and large companies. Its members are 40 central industrial and employers' federations from 34 countries, working together to achieve growth and competitiveness in Europe. Within its policy priorities, BUSINESSEUROPE works also for the removal of all hurdles to movement of workers. BUSINESSEUROPE encourages Member States to step up their efforts to remove the administrative and legal obstacles, which continue to stand in the way of workers who want to exercise their right to free movement. This implies, in particular, lifting restrictions on entry of citizens from the new Member States while taking account of the situation on the different labour markets. At EU level, the completion of the modernization and simplification of existing rules on coordination of social security schemes is key to facilitate European citizens' right to move freely.

d) European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC)

The ETUC exists to speak with a single voice, on behalf of the common interests of workers, at European level. Founded in 1973, it now represents 82 trade union organizations in 36 European countries, plus 12 industry-based federations. The ETUC's prime objective is to promote the European Social Model and to work for the development of a united Europe of peace and stability where working people and their families can enjoy full human and civil rights and high living standards. ETUC stands for fair and equal treatment for migrant and ethnic minority workers throughout Europe. The confederation calls for a coordinated EU-wide approach to managing the flow of people seeking a better life in Europe

for themselves and their families. Such an approach involves reducing irregular immigration by dismantling human trafficking networks and penalizing unscrupulous employers who seek to benefit from this trade, as well as support measures for countries of origin.

6. Civil Society Organizations, a sampling of relevant international entities:

Today, numerous civil society organizations address migration concerns at local, national and international levels. These include a range of social service, civil rights, faith-based, community and specific interest organizations, including migrant-based entities. While a number of civil society organizations may be relevant in each national context, several international entities are especially helpful references in implementation of the OSCE Commitments on migration.

a) International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)

The International Catholic Migration Commission serves and protects the needs of uprooted people, refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants, with operations in 30 countries of the world, including Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan and Turkey. It advocates for durable solutions and rights-based policies directly and through a worldwide network of member organizations. ICMC's expertise and core programming consists of refugee resettlement, return and reintegration, local integration, work with extremely vulnerable individuals, counter-trafficking and rescue, NGO capacity-building, technical cooperation and government institution-building, emergency response and advocacy. It has observer status with the Council of Europe, the ILO, the IOM and the UN, and collaborates in implementation of EU, UNHCR and other international organization projects.

b) Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)

The Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants, is a non-governmental organisation (NGO) that aims to promote respect for the human rights of undocumented migrants within Europe. It also seeks dialogue with organisations and networks with similar concerns in other parts of the world. PICUM provides a direct link between the grassroots level, where undocumented migrants' experience is most visible, and the European level, where policies relating to them are deliberated. PICUM reports on issues regarding undocumented

Strengthening migration governance

migrants through its members' experiences and simultaneously monitors developments within the European institutions. This approach mainstreams undocumented migrants' concerns into key policy debates, ensures PICUM's network is well informed of the EU agenda and develops their capacity to engage in the realisation of just and fair strategies for undocumented migrants.

c) European Network Against Racism (ENAR)

The European Network Against Racism (ENAR) is a network of European NGOs working to combat racism in all EU member states and represents more than 600 NGOs throughout the European Union. ENAR is determined to fight racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, to promote equality of treatment between European Union citizens and third country nationals, and to link local/regional/national initiatives with European Union initiatives. In the context of the debate on migration and integration, ENAR seeks to promote an intercultural ethos respectful of equal rights and diversity in all spheres of society. Its works towards the full political, social, economic and cultural participation of third country nationals and wants to end all forms of discrimination based on citizenship and nationality. ENAR generally aims to ensure that the rights of third country nationals are protected in all circumstances.

7. Cooperation of participating States in bilateral or multilateral agreements

a) Labour agreements and other forms of labour recruitment

Labour migration in the OSCE region is mainly governed by two different regimes. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), aiming at the liberalisation of trade in services (Martin 2006, 3), has developed into the main mechanism for facilitating transborder movement of the so-called "skilled" labour force. So-called "low-skilled" labour migration is mainly governed by a multitude of labour agreements and other forms of labour recruitment schemes (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 97).

Labour agreements have a long tradition in the OSCE context. In 2004, the OECD counted a total of 176 bilateral labour agreements and other forms of labour recruitment schemes for its Member States (including countries in North America and elsewhere). The actual scope and content may vary significantly between respective agreements. Generalising, it can be said that their main purpose is to respond to labour force shortages in destination countries. But

besides that, they are designed to serve other purposes as well. Labour agreements aim to govern labour migration flows between two or more countries and to reduce irregular migration between them, they aim to open new migration channels, to improve relationships between countries and to facilitate cultural and knowledge exchange.

The first bilateral schemes on labour migration governance were drawn up in the post war period to satisfy specific labour market demands in Northern European countries. In the 1970s, most of these schemes came to an end during the economic downturn in the aftermath of the oil crisis. The early 1990s saw intensified efforts to negotiate and conclude labour agreements and recruitment schemes in response to the fall of the Iron Curtain and the increased mobility over the newly opened borders. The more recent schemes primarily had and have a focus on the admission of seasonal and temporary workers for certain sectors in need of so-called “low skilled” work, namely agriculture, construction, tourism and catering (European Commission 2004, 6). To a lesser extent they also cover specific project-related employment, apprenticeships and trainee-ships. Their emphasis on seasonal and temporary work is also an expression of the attempt to channel migration flows, which typically comprise irregular forms of entry and residence, to legal types of migration.

b) Bilateral labour agreements in the OSCE region

Western and Central Europe

Most of the 92 bilateral labour agreements specific to Europe date back to the 1990s. A better part of these agreements were a reaction to significantly increased migration following the dissolution of the former Soviet Block and the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia, and an attempt to better manage the resulting flows. With the two enlargement rounds of the European Union in 2004 and 2007 and the end of the transition period in 2011, when all EU Member States will have to comply with the EC rules regulating the free movement of labour, many of the existing labour agreements for central and western Europe will have become redundant.

The experiences made with bilateral labour agreements are quite positive. First of all, labour migration governed under the agreements obviously does not compete with local labour but covers shortages that cannot be filled with domestic workforce (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 103). Second, well-designed labour agreements really contribute to a reduction of irregular labour migration while at the same time ensuring the return of migrant workers. The example of Spain proves that these two objectives can be met by way of bilateral labour agreements. Spain

has concluded several agreements with the main countries of origin of irregular migration flows. An important feature of these agreements is that they not only define target groups, sectors and types of occupation, but also place strong emphasis on the protection of social rights of labour migrants and compliance with national labour regulation standards. The agreements pay particular attention to the issue of return. Seasonal workers, for instance, have to sign a commitment that they will return home after their contract has expired. They have to present themselves at Spanish consular offices in their country of origin after return, and they do not enjoy rights for family reunification. But the agreements also include a very important incentive for migrants to return by assuring the transferability of social security contributions to their home countries (European Commission 2004, 7).

CIS region

Labour agreements in the CIS region traditionally centred on issues related to the legal status of labour migrants and the protection of their social rights. The break-up of the former Soviet Union divided the USSR's territory into fifteen independent states divided by borders that had transformed from internal administrative to international borders. This not only disrupted traditional trade channels, but also created large-scale minorities on the territories of the newly founded states and turned previously internal movements into international migration. The high degree of economic and social interaction between areas and regions that previously were part of a common state caused the successor states to pursue rather liberal entry and visa policies towards other CIS citizens. The liberal visa and entry policies together with the practical problems resulting from the enormous length of the new external borders and the challenges in building up migration management systems facilitated irregular migration. Estimates speak of about 5 to 15 million migrants currently residing on the territory of CIS countries without the required papers, 3 to 5 million of them on the territory of the Russian Federation as the region's main country of destination (Hofmann 2007, 86). Consequently, in concluding regional and bilateral labour agreements the CIS countries focused on the protection of the interests of their citizens living and working abroad. The most important regional agreements in this respect are the "Agreement on cooperation in the field of labour migration and protection of migrant workers" from 1994 and the "Agreement on Cooperation in Combating Illegal Migration" from 1998. Of more practical relevance are the bilateral agreements concluded between CIS countries. The Russian Federation has concluded the largest number (nine), followed by Belarus (six), Kazakhstan and Ukraine (four each). However, the estimates on the extent of irregular labour migration

within the CIS region exceed the numbers of registered (“legal”) migrants by far. Related figures suggest that the existing schemes do not always provide sufficient solutions to the demand for foreign labour force and migrants’ wish to work abroad (Mansoor/Quillin 2007, 104).

8. International social security agreements

Closely linked to the governance of labour migration is the issue of the protection of migrant workers’ social rights and economic interests. The portability of social rights, namely the ability to preserve, maintain, and transfer acquired social security rights, is not only a key aspect when protecting migrant workers’ interests but also a crucial measure in more effectively combating irregular labour migration and illegal foreign employment. Lacking portability entails a number of negative consequences for migrant workers. They might lose their contributions to the respective welfare systems, might have to come up for double contributions, and might suffer from reduced wages or pensions.

Especially in so-called “low skilled” employment, lacking portability of social rights is likely to work as a disincentive to take on gainful employment in order to maximise the revenues from one’s work. The large numbers of irregular labour migration flows and illegal foreign employment must at least partly be attributed to this fact. In this respect, enhanced negotiation and conclusion of international social security agreements at bilateral or multi-lateral level and providing for the portability of social rights are crucial and necessary measures. Such agreements have a long history going back to the beginning of the twentieth century (Roberts 2000, 8).

However, many migrant workers originating from the main source countries of international labour flows are not yet protected by international social security agreements. NATLEX, the ILO database on international agreements, has counted a total of 1,886 international social security agreements in existence. At the same time NATLEX figures reveal that the distribution of such bilateral or multi-lateral agreements is highly uneven at the global scale. While the highly industrialised countries have signed a multitude of agreements, many of the main source countries of international labour migration have not concluded any agreements at all, neither amongst each other nor with the main destination countries of their citizens working abroad. Annex three provides a listing with the number of bilateral social security agreements held by each OSCE participating country.

Among OSCE countries migrant workers benefit from the portability of social rights to widely varying degrees. Western European countries, Canada and

the USA have concluded between 50 and more than 200 agreements respectively, with France (394), Germany (224) and Spain (142) having the most in effect. The new Member States of the EU and the CIS countries have concluded significantly fewer agreements. The south-eastern European countries also have only few bilateral social security agreements in effect. One of the reasons for the different degrees of social protection of migrant workers in the form of bilateral agreements lies in the inadequately developed social security systems of the main countries of origin of international migration flows. This fact runs against the principle of reciprocity implying that each party shares the costs and benefits of the agreement on “a reasonably equal basis” (Roberts 2000, 9). While this principle can be implemented in agreements between states with comparable social security systems and standards, it often constitutes an insurmountable obstacle for the conclusion of agreements between states where such convergence does not exist.

9. The Way Forward

The progress in multilateral dialogue and cooperation on migration has gained considerable momentum since the early 1990s. Several global and regional fora deal with migration issues and have broadened the scope of related activities.

However, the multifaceted complexity of migration itself is but reflected in the multiplicity of specialized organizations and forums addressing it.

Several existing forums are particularly relevant for most or all OSCE participating States. The Council of Europe Committee on Migration (CDMG) provides a broad platform for dialogue and for elaboration of common policy guidelines on many areas relevant to the OSCE commitments related to migration; it involves key government ministries concerned for migration from most OSCE participating States except for Central Asia; Canada and the US are observers to the CDMG.

The international dialogue forums on migration convened by the ILO and IOM provide a direct interface between regional and global migration policy for OSCE participating States. Recent IOM International Migration Dialogue sessions have focused, respectively, on labour migration and protection of migrants rights.

With regard to existing Regional Consultation Processes on migration, the composition of OSCE participating States can add specific value to cooperation and knowledge exchange at the global level.

However, no existing forum on migration and security specifically incorporates all OSCE participating States, nor entirely incorporates important

emerging concerns around environmental change and migration, and the interface between human security, national security and international mobility. The OSCE provides a unique platform for these aspects of policy dialogue on migration. With regard to the “external dimension” of the EU’s migration policy, the composition of OSCE participating States can add specific value to the further development of cooperation on migration governance between the EU and other OSCE countries.

Several OSCE participating States have concluded bilateral labour agreements and have developed measures that have proven successful in fostering labour migration in certain sectors, whilst reducing the extent of irregular labour migration and ensuring return of seasonal and temporary migrant workers. These policies provide an excellent knowledge base and the experiences made could be shared as ‘good practices’ among OSCE participating States, using the OSCE as a platform, and feed into the further negotiation and conclusion of agreements in the areas of labour mobility, social security, co-development, return of talent, development assistance, and so on.

In this context, OSCE participating States should also explore deepened cooperation on the further development of social security and welfare systems amongst them to ensure that the principle of reciprocity can be better fulfilled as a precondition for social security agreements.

VI. Building structures and institutions for migration administration

1. Introduction

As illustrated in previous chapters, implementation of OSCE commitments on legislation, policy frameworks and international cooperation are advancing. However, a considerable number of participating States have made less progress on an essential step, the establishment of viable and effective structures and institutions to govern and administer the specificities of international migration. Some of those that have made strides in developing implementing institutions have not fully succeeded in bridging the gaps between good intentions and successful outcomes.

OSCE commitments on migration did not address the practical structures, mechanisms and institutions required to elaborate, coordinate and carry out the activities and measures to implement and supervise legislation and policy on migration. However, given that obtaining implementation is as important as expressing commitment, this chapter completes this report with a brief review of examples of how OSCE participating States are organizing to carry out their commitments.

2. Specialised national agencies and departments corresponding to the intent of commitments

A wide variety of governmental departments, agencies and specialised bodies are involved in implementing the commitments of the OSCE in the migration field. Several institutional solutions to dealing with migration are found.

Often one ministry – the Ministry of the Interior or the Ministry of Labour, but also others, like the Ministry of Justice or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – has the main responsibility. In other cases responsibilities are shared between different ministries. A number of countries also have set up specific ministries for migration and/or specific administrative agencies dealing with migration and integration. Shifts in responsibility are not infrequent and usually reflect changes in the government or evolution of the national migration policy framework. However, to the large extent that contemporary migration is related to labour market and employment needs, there is reason for substantial if not coordinating responsibilities to be lodged with ministries of labour.

Nonetheless, the Ministry of the Interior has main responsibility for immigration in a considerable number of governments, notably among countries of the former socialist block. Examples include Hungary, where an Immigration Department within the Ministry of the Interior is the leading state agency¹⁴⁹, Poland, where migration issues are the remit of an Undersecretary of State within the Ministry of the Interior¹⁵⁰, and Slovenia, where the Migration and Integration Division of the Ministry of the Interior is responsible for migration policy development.¹⁵¹ Specialised departments of the Ministry of the Interior also can be found e.g. in Lithuania (Migration and Integration Division)¹⁵², Latvia (Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs)¹⁵³ or Estonia, where the Citizenship and Migration Board, a government agency acting within the administrative area of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, is responsible for migration affairs.¹⁵⁴ A similar solution was found in Russia where the Federal Migration Service¹⁵⁵ is a specialised agency within the Ministry of the Interior. It is also the case of the United Kingdom, where the Home Office is responsible for immigration;

Competencies may change depending on changes in the institutional framing of migration policies. So, for instance, in Finland all competencies regarding migration, including labour migration, have been shifted from the Ministry of Labour to the Ministry of the Interior as of January 1, 2008.¹⁵⁶

In Malta, the Netherlands and Ireland the Ministry of Justice is the main governmental institution in the migration field. The Ministry of Labour has the

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.bmbah.hu/>

¹⁵⁰ <http://www.mswia.gov.pl/portal/en/3/63/Structure.html>

¹⁵¹ http://www.mnz.gov.si/en/areas_of_work/internal_administrative_affairs/#c5226

¹⁵² <http://www.vrm.lt/index.php?id=124&lang=2>

¹⁵³ <http://www.pmlp.gov.lv/en/>

¹⁵⁴ <http://www.mig.ee/index.php/mg/est>

¹⁵⁵ <http://www.fms.gov.ru/>

¹⁵⁶ <http://www.intermin.fi/>

overall responsibility for refugee, immigration and integration policy in Norway (Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion, AID)¹⁵⁷. In Luxembourg the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Immigration¹⁵⁸ is the main political actor. In Azerbaijan the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection is the lead ministry (ICMPD 2005, 54). In Armenia, the Department for Refugees and Immigration, which was previously directly subordinated to the Prime Minister, has been integrated into the Ministry of Territorial Administration (ICMPD 2005, 24).

Joint political responsibilities can be found in Austria, where the Ministry of the Interior is responsible for the overall immigration policy and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs regulates access of non-EU-immigrants to the labour market. In Kazakhstan, migration policy is jointly formulated by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Labour that coordinated a Migration Committee. In Kyrgyzstan the State Committee for Migration and Employment (SCME) coordinates the migration policy of the country. In Turkmenistan a number of ministries and other state institutions jointly forge migration policies (ICMPD 2005, 243).

In some countries specialised ministries for immigration have been set up. In Belgium the Federal Minister of Migration and Asylum Policy¹⁵⁹ is responsible for migration issues at the federal level. In France a Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Solidary Development¹⁶⁰ was recently established. In Denmark the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs¹⁶¹ is the leading state body in this field. In Spain responsibility for elaboration and coordination of migration policy resides with what is now named the Ministry of Labour and Immigration, which has a specialized Secretariat of State for Immigration and Emigration.¹⁶² This replaced in 2004 a long tradition of the Ministry of the Interior being in charge of this matter. In Canada the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration Canada¹⁶³ holds the main responsibility. In some CIS countries specialised governmental structures have been set up, as for instance the Moldovan State Migration Service (ICMPD 2005, 170).

¹⁵⁷ www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/aid.html?id=165-65k

¹⁵⁸ <http://www.gouvernement.lu/ministeres/mae.html>

¹⁵⁹ http://www.belgium.be/fr/la_belgique/pouvoirs_publics/autorites_federales/gouvernement_federal/composition_gouvernement/index.jsp

¹⁶⁰ http://www.immigration.gouv.fr/article.php?id_article=133

¹⁶¹ http://www.nyidanmark.dk/en-us/the_minister/minister_of_refugee_immigration_and_integration_affairs.htm

¹⁶² <http://extranjeros.mtas.es/es/Presentacion/>

¹⁶³ <http://www.cic.gc.ca/>

A number of countries have organised specialised administrative agencies to deal with migration issues. Among them is Germany, where the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF),¹⁶⁴ a specialised unit under the control of the Ministry of the Interior, deals with migration affairs. In Switzerland the Federal Office for Immigration¹⁶⁵ was established in 2005 to coordinate the implementation of migration and integration policies and administrate migration. In the U.S. the Citizenship and Naturalisation Service¹⁶⁶ under the Department of Homeland Security is responsible for this matter, and in Sweden the Swedish Immigration Board¹⁶⁷ is responsible for the reception of asylum seekers and for making decisions concerning visas, work and residence permits and citizenship. The Board falls under the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, which is responsible for immigration questions, and the Ministry of the Interior, which is responsible for immigrant affairs within the Government Chancery.

In Uzbekistan the External Migration Agency under the Ministry of Labour is responsible for organized recruitment and documentation of national workers to other countries. In Ireland the Naturalisation and Immigration Service (INIS)¹⁶⁸ was established in 2005. It is responsible for the administrative functions of the Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform in relation to asylum, immigration (including visas) and citizenship matters. The INIS also facilitates a unified government approach to immigration and asylum issues enabling a more efficient service to be provided in these areas.

A common framework against discrimination has been enacted within the European Union by the Council Directive 2000/43 EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin and the Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. The Directives require setting up independent agencies supporting victims of discrimination and granting legal remedies. Thus there are state agencies against racial discrimination in all EU member countries. In most EU member countries, enforcement functions on human rights and non-discrimination are being combined in single national human rights monitoring bodies responsible for monitoring and enforcing anti-discrimination legislation across a broad range of grounds, including gender, race, ethnicity, nationality or national origin, age and sexual orientation.

¹⁶⁴ <http://www.bamf.de>

¹⁶⁵ <http://www.bfm.admin.ch/bfm/de/home.html>

¹⁶⁶ <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis>

¹⁶⁷ <http://www.migrationsverket.se/>

¹⁶⁸ <http://www.inis.gov.ie/>

3. Selection of practice profiles of institutions and agencies implementing commitments (such as labour administration, immigration, statistics and development)

A wide variety of institutions and agencies are dealing with migration and integration issues in both origin and destination countries. Their practices concern various stages of the migration process.

Pre-migration

With regard to pre-migration assistance in countries of origin, the main issues concern factual information on employment possibilities and working and living conditions in the host country, as well as on rights and responsibilities of migrants. In this respect the *Information Resource Centre for Labour Migrants in Tajikistan* presents an example. The Centre was established in 2004 by the IOM and the Government of Tajikistan with support of the OSCE in order to provide intending and actual labour migrants with accurate information on their life and work abroad. Most migrants from Tajikistan work in the informal and lower skilled sectors in Russia. Many economic migrants do not know where to go with questions or for information on travel and work abroad. Unofficial recruiters and traffickers use this situation to their advantage (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 54). At the Centre qualified counsellors provide information tailored to the needs of migrants. They provide information on employment conditions, travel and document requirements, registration, migrants' rights, press reports, maps and contacts, risks of trafficking and smuggling in persons, health risks and tips for economic migrants. Through this project, information is also provided on community organizations and resources, social services and longer-term integration facilities. Particular attention is paid to collecting and preparing up-to-date information in the field of labour migration and disseminating it to intending labour migrants (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 54).

Recruitment

With regard to recruitment in the country of origin, the regulation of Private Employment Agencies – including registration, licensing, monitoring and enforcement of regulations – is of major concern. Furthermore, cooperation with Public Employment Agencies should be sought and developed and potential migrants should have access to resource or advice centres giving correct information on the terms and conditions Private Employment Agencies have to follow.

In Ireland, a regulatory framework for *Private Employment Agencies based on ILO Convention No. 181* was developed in 2004. Ireland had a rather liberal regulation of employment agencies based on legal provisions dating back to 1971. When Ireland became a country of destination for immigrants in the 1990s, a number of Private Recruitment Agencies active in Ireland and in a wide range of recruitment countries were founded. It became clear that the existing regulations, which were developed when Ireland was a major country of emigration, were not sufficient any more. After broad consultations with Private Employment Agencies, the Immigrant Council of Ireland, and the Social Partners, a white paper was published by the Department of Enterprises, Trade and Employment suggesting new legislation, which was based on the ILO Convention No. 181. The new registration system also includes a Statutory Code of Good Practice and a complaints procedure. An Advisory and Monitoring Committee including the government, social partners, and the association of recruitment agencies will be responsible for monitoring and implementing the code (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 167).

In Uzbekistan, an external Migration Agency under the supervision of the Ministry of Labour is responsible for organized recruitment and the documentation of migration of national workers to foreign countries. Regional employment centres have been set up acting as state employment agencies for recruitment.

A further example concerns the recruitment of agricultural workers by recruitment agencies known as “gangmasters” in the United Kingdom. Most of them worked without regulation and were known for exploitative practices. After a tragic incident involving the death of 20 migrant cockle pickers recruited under this system in 2003, regulation was developed. The *Gangmaster Licensing Act* of 2005 makes registration compulsory. The agencies have to comply with a code of conduct. Unlicensed recruitment was made a criminal offence. The Gangmaster Licensing Authority audits the agencies using a risk assessment procedure including data analysis and interviews, and scores compliance. Thus only agencies with a relevant risk profile will be targeted for assessment and will have to bear inspection procedures and auditing costs (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 167).

Recognition of qualifications

The recognition of qualifications and credentials is an important precondition for enabling migrants to succeed on the labour market in host countries and to avoid brain waste. Only a few states work in this field and, have implemented legal regulations promoting the recognition of school degrees obtained abroad (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 138).

In Canada it was noticed that many skilled immigrants cannot get a job in their chosen field despite adequate qualifications. In order to overcome the problem the Foreign Credential Recognition Programme was established. Foreign Credential Recognition is the process of verifying that the education and job experience obtained in another country are equal to the standards established for Canadian professionals. Credential recognition for regulated occupations is mainly a provincial responsibility that has been delegated in legislation to regulatory bodies. The Government of Canada is playing a facilitative role with provinces and territories and providing strategic leadership to foster the development of consistent national approaches to this issue. For the implementation of the programme an agency, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), was set up. The programme is designed to facilitate the recognition of international qualifications so that internationally trained workers may better contribute to Canada's economic and social development. To achieve this goal, cooperation with stakeholders is sought. For example, federal and provincial governments are working with key medical community stakeholders to improve procedures for licensing internationally trained doctors. Similar work is under way to speed the recognition process for internationally trained nurses and other health care professionals, including pharmacists, medical laboratory technologists, medical radiation technologists, physiotherapists and occupational therapists.¹⁶⁹

Migrants' rights in the country of destination

The protection of the rights of labour migrants in the host country can best be achieved if they are treated equally with nationals with regard to employment and working conditions and granted trade union rights. Integration also entails information and advice on the living conditions in the host country, and information about migration and migrant communities for the resident population. The Information and Resource Centre for Migrants in Portugal may serve as an example in this regard. The Centre builds networks with migrant organisations, national institutions and NGOs and provides information on the legal status of immigrants in Portugal, measures to fight discrimination, the placement in the labour market and access to social security, health care, the educational system and other social rights and runs a specialised Service Centre on family reunification (OSCE/IOM/ILO 2006, 148).

Bilateral and multilateral agreements between source and host countries may also facilitate decent treatment of migrant workers. They determine the

¹⁶⁹ <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/cs/comm/hrsd/news/2005/050425bb.shtml>

documentation of labour migrants, equality of treatment, remuneration and conditions of work, and elimination of forced labour and illegal recruitment. The effectiveness of these agreements depends on the accuracy of provisions and the quality of implementation.

An example of improved practice is the collaboration of Penza province of Russia with provinces in Kyrgyzstan. According to the agreement, the receiving party is responsible for informing about vacancies, the search for potential employers, transfer of migrants to the employment location, and their accommodation. Furthermore the receiving party assists the migrants with regard to issues concerning their legal status and labour agreements. The sending party is responsible for information about workers who wish to migrate for employment, the organised recruitment of labour migrants, their transport to Penza province, and the information of labour migrants on legal procedures in Russia and working conditions.

4. The Way Forward: Suggested policies and measures to facilitate institutional capacity

The establishment and/or strengthening of viable and effective structures and institutions is crucial to successfully administering law, policy and the practicalities of international migration. While there are numerous examples of ‘good practices’ in this area, it is nonetheless one of large weaknesses.

Many countries lack a coherent structure able to devise, implement, and supervise the multiple aspects of governing the main labour-related aspects of international migration. And many countries also lack a structure or mechanism for efficiently consulting and coordinating governmental policy and action among the numerous different ministries and departments concerned, not to mention involving key stakeholders in consultation to ensure their cooperation.

An important, practical and extremely useful function will be further sharing of practical guidance and examples of ‘good practices’, such as contained in the OSCE-IOM-ILO Handbook on Effective Labour Migration Policies.

As with implementation of standards and elaboration of national policy, a key form of international support to assist States in establishing or strengthening institutions, structures and capacity for effective governance of international migration will be provision of technical cooperation, advisory services and sharing of practical models.

VII. Conclusions and proposals

The need to address the increasingly diverse and complex phenomenon of migration in a comprehensive manner by adopting a cross-dimensional approach at the national, regional and international levels (OSCE 2005) is reflected in the commitments that the OSCE participating States have made throughout the years.

The overall picture provided by this review report is one of progress over a long period in the sense of facing and meeting new issues in the area of migration and security as they arose. The report shows that progress has not been equally swift in all regards. There is clear evidence that legislation has tended to be considerably ahead of implementation. Addressing the particular challenges of implementing agreed upon measures will therefore need to be central to the joint effort of OSCE countries. One issue is the capacity of authorities to actually carry out the tasks provided for by national and international law. Another issue is the coordination between authorities within countries and between countries, a third one is the legal and logical consistency of aims and tasks. In many instances this review can only scratch the surface of the issue. Detailed studies at national level would often be necessary in order to understand the mechanisms providing for the observed outcomes. Part and parcel of raising capacity and streamlining aims and tasks is therefore the expansion of review and research capacities at national level.

The size, composition and direction of migration flows within and into the OSCE area have changed considerably and in unforeseen ways since the mid-1970s. No doubt, in another 30 years they will be very different again. Foreseeability is no greater today than it was then. Likewise, migrant populations in

the OSCE have changed in size, composition and origin. Although governments and populations keep entertaining the idea that migration can be kept temporary, settlement during the past 30 years has occurred on a scale that is probably no less than in earlier times. Temporary and more permanent migration will continue to coexist and settlement should be expected to continue. There is far more choice regarding the migrant populations' legal status than its size.

It is now generally understood that migration poses opportunities and risks for origin, transit, and destination countries and that therefore migration policy cannot successfully be implemented unilaterally. More immediately than for countries or states migration poses large opportunities and large risks especially for the migrants and their families and communities in the origin countries that depend on the migrants' incomes. While many states have involved social partners and civil society organisations in policy making in one way or another, migrants and potential migrants and their dependents have largely remained excluded, more so than would be implied, for instance, by UN and Council of Europe instruments that have become available in the course of the past 60 years. If migration policy is to be successfully implemented this clearly is an issue that will need to be considered by the OSCE participating States.

This background, the Review of Commitments above, and the conclusions of the OSCE Ministerial Council in December 2005 all point to a growing need for effective international cooperation, including stronger partnership with international bodies specialised in migration. This partnership is enhanced specifically by involving them in policy formulation, not least by acceding to the legal instruments they offer, and to more and deeper cooperation between states of origin, destination and transit in developing not only policies but capacities to implement and to evaluate them without prejudice.

Conclusions

The OSCE commitments adopted over a period of 35 years now have consistently focused on protecting and promoting the fundamental human rights of migrants, on combating discrimination and xenophobia against them, on ensuring equality of treatment for regular migrants, and for facilitating family reunion and contacts of migrant workers with their families.

In order to realize protection and social cohesion as well as the economic and development benefits of migration, the OSCE commitments have emphasized participating States' need to comply with the international agreements and

consider adhering to relevant multilateral instruments, to adopt effective national frameworks to manage migration, to ease regulations concerning the movement of citizens, and to foster integration and greater harmony in relations in society, including by raising awareness about the enriching contribution of migrants and enabling migrant workers to participate in society where they reside.

Specific commitments have been made to ensure effective equality of opportunity for children of migrant workers to education, to provide language and vocational training, to facilitate social and economic reintegration of returning labour migrants in their countries of origin, to fight illegal migration and addressing its root causes, and to increase employment in countries of origin.

A number of commitments encourage bilateral and multilateral cooperation. These include orderly movements of workers through collaboration between host and origin countries, to deal jointly with the problems arising from the migration of workers, and to cooperate to further improve the general situation of migrant workers and their families.

OSCE itself is asked to contribute by “facilitating dialogue and co-operation between participating States, including countries of origin, transit and destination in the OSCE area” and by “assisting the participating States ... to develop effective migration policies and to implement their relevant OSCE commitments.”¹⁷⁰

Implementation of commitments

Today, there is clear recognition that migration poses large opportunities and substantial risks for migrants and their families and communities, for the destination countries, and for origin communities and countries. Today, there is also undisputed consensus that coordination between authorities within countries and between countries is imperative; migration policy cannot be formulated or implemented unilaterally.

A clear finding throughout this review is that considerable, but uneven, progress has been made in elaboration and implementation of OSCE commitments on migration by participating States. Progress has varied across the different commitments. It is evident that legislation has tended to be considerably ahead of implementation. A significant constraint has been in developing the necessary implementing policy and institutions.

The national adoption and transposition of foundational legal standards for protection of migrants and establishing adequate national legislation

¹⁷⁰ Ministerial Council Decision No. 2/05 on Migration.

addressing the various aspects of migration is far from complete; while a significant number of OSCE participating States have ratified and incorporated one or more of the most relevant instruments, a substantial number have not yet done so.

A general trend has emerged in recent years to develop migration policies directed at encouraging and regulating legal migration. Some are comprehensive national strategies or balanced national action plans on migration covering a range of concerns and spelling out the intersecting involvements of different branches of government and other stakeholders, including social partners.

However, the findings of this review show that effective implementation of legislation and national action plans remains constrained by lack of institutional mechanisms and capacity, lack of resources, and lack of training of relevant authorities and civil society partners.

Countries must establish the necessary institutional capacity and inter-ministerial coordination to meet their policy objectives. This includes giving due priority attention to labour migration in terms of overall development, foreign policy, and resource allocation. Second, inter-state cooperation is essential

The identification and involvement of relevant stakeholders remains uneven at best. In some countries, the various concerned ministries have been involved, as have the key social partner stakeholders. In others, authority over migration has been concentrated in one ministry or executive department of government without adequate consultation across the several concerned ministries of national government. In too many countries, migrants and potential migrants and their dependents have largely remained excluded from any consultation on policy directly concerning them.

Internal and international dialogue, coordination and cooperation on migration have clearly advanced, especially in recent years. However, findings of this review indicate that this cooperation is still far from satisfactorily resolving the many challenges of together ensuring orderly movements of workers, dealing jointly with problems arising, and cooperating to further improve the general situation of migrants.

Further development of comprehensive migration management systems and strategies is needed in the participating States, based on enhanced cooperation among the countries of origin, transit and destination.

At best, this initial review only scratches the surface of these complex phenomena and equally complex responses. Detailed studies at national level would be helpful to further assess what has really been accomplished and what remains to be done to fulfil these OSCE commitments on migration.

Proposals

This review makes evident that there is much to be done, and that there is a very substantial role and responsibility for the OSCE in getting this done.

It is evident that intensified efforts are clearly in order to support OSCE participating States to meet the commitments made in the OSCE context. These efforts would address:

- Further adoption and implementation of relevant international standards,
- Enhanced elaboration and implementation of national migration policy statements and action plans,
- Strengthening of non-discrimination and anti-xenophobia measures,
- Establishing or strengthening national institutions, structures and capacity to administer migration,
- Conclusion of further multilateral and bilateral agreements on labour mobility and social security coverage for migrant workers.

The elaboration of national legislation, policy, institutions and their respective implementing measures will be accelerated and made more effective through the provision of technical cooperation, advisory services and exchanges of models and practice experience.

OSCE contributions

Drawing on the conclusions and way forward identified in each preceding chapter, paths for OSCE action would include:

- 1) Providing information and technical support to concerned States to improve legislation through incorporation of international standards.
- 2) Mobilizing support to governments in elaborating and implementing effective national policy frameworks as well as institutional mechanisms and capacity. A large component of this will be provision of technical cooperation, advisory services and sharing of practical models, evidently in cooperation with the main international agencies concerned such as the ILO and the IOM.
- 3) Encouraging and supporting expansion of data collection, research and policy review capacities at national level. Also needed is further exploration of policy responses and development cooperation on enhancing decent work and employment opportunities in origin countries, on ameliorating the potential migratory impact of environmental degradation, and on enhancing the development contributions of migration.

Strengthening migration governance

- 4) Providing a platform on migration and security issues that incorporates all OSCE participating States where, for example, experience could be shared on concluded bilateral labour agreements and developed measures that have proven successful in fostering labour migration in certain sectors, whilst reducing the extent of irregular labour migration and ensuring return of temporary migrant workers. The knowledge and experience shared could help feed into further negotiation and conclusion of agreements in the areas of labour mobility, social security, co-development, return of talent, development assistance, and so on. Such a platform should be complementary to existing international agencies and forums.
- 5) Facilitating stronger partnership with international bodies specialised in migration, notably towards reinforcing protection of rights of migrants and elaborating coherent national policy and practical action.

An important topical niche exists for the OSCE at the international level. It comprises two areas:

- 6) Advancing analysis and understanding of the links between migration and security including in particular addressing threats to public order and social cohesion arising from xenophobic hostility and violence expressed against migrant workers and other foreigners.
- 7) Analyzing environmental factors and international migration, and identifying policy responses to provide early warning and ensure better preparedness in this area. No existing forum on migration entirely incorporates important emerging concerns around environmental change and migration. The OSCE could provide a unique platform for these aspects of policy dialogue on migration.

Ameliorating impact of the global financial and employment crisis

Immediate measures are required to prevent the impact of the crisis on migrant workers from destabilizing labour markets, working conditions and social cohesion in migrant employment countries, and from destabilizing economically, socially, and politically migrant origin countries.

Areas for intervention include: (1) taking measures to uphold decent work conditions and protection of migrant workers – along with vulnerable national workers — in migrant employment countries; (2) enhancing urgent employment creation and social safety net protections for returning migrants and populations as a

whole in migrant source countries; and (3) resolutely repressing xenophobic violence and explicitly discouraging *nationalist* anti-migrant and anti-trade discourse.

International labour migration represents a long term solution to labour and skills needs in economies across the OSCE region. Short term crisis responses need to reinforce long term efforts to ensure protection and integration of migrants and institutionalised regulation of labour migration, efforts underlying OSCE concern to manage migration for stability, security and socio-economic well being.

Immediate lines of crisis response should include:

1. Avoiding forced returns of migrant workers, and maintaining intakes for agriculture and other sectors where labour and skills remain necessary and will be required for recovery.
2. Increasing capacity and extending labour inspection, particularly to sectors and workplaces where migrant workers are concentrated, to ensure decent treatment in the face of pressures to cut pay and increase exploitation – and to prevent unfair competition with national workers.
3. Strengthening anti-discrimination measures and discourse.
4. Using all appropriate legal and administrative means to repress racist violence and xenophobia against foreigners, and prosecuting perpetrators of violent acts to the fullest extent of the law.
5. Discouraging explicit or implicit scapegoating of migrants in public discourse and in administrative measures.
6. Expanding international support for employment intensive recovery measures, employment creation, and extension of social protection measures to affected populations, particularly to returning migrants in home countries.

This report and these conclusions and proposals assisted delegates to the OSCE 17th Economic and Environmental Forum to conduct well-informed discussions, to elaborate findings and to agree on proposals for *the way forward* for the OSCE in this arena of major concern to participating States.

References

- Aleinikoff, T.Alexander and Chetail, Vincent (eds.) (2003) *Migration and International Legal Norms*. The Hague. T.M.C. Asser Press.
- Bauböck, Rainer / Perchinig, Bernhard (2006) *Evaluation and Recommendations*. In: Bauböck, Rainer / Ersboll, Eva / Groenendijk, Kees / Waldrauch, Harald (eds.) *Acquisition and Loss of Nationality: Policies and Trends in 15 European Countries, Volume I: Comparative Analysis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp 431-479.
- Bendel P. (2007) *Everything under Control? The European Union's Policies and Politics of Immigration*. In: Faist, T. / Ette, A. (eds.) *The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Immigration: Between Autonomy and the European Union*. Palgrave.
- Bercovitch, Jacob (2007) *A Neglected Relationship: Diasporas and Conflict Resolution*. In: Smith/Stares (eds.) 2007, 17-38.
- Böhning, Roger (1991) *The ILO and the New UN Convention on Migrant Workers: The Past and the Future*. *International Migration Review* 25, 4, 698-709.
- Bryceson, Deborah Fahy / Vuorela, Ulla (2002) *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Carrera, Sergio (2007) *The EU Border Management Strategy: FRONTEX and the Challenges of Irregular Immigration in the Canary Islands*. http://shop.ceps.be/download.php?item_id=1482, 2009-03-13.

- Centre for Peace (2006) Conversion and Foreign Policy in Ukraine. Brain Drain from the Ukraine: Current Situation and Future Challenges. Ukrainian Monitor 6/2006.
- Channac, F. (2007) Global or International Governance for Migration? Building up cooperation and enhancing multilateralism from regional to global level, GARNET Working Paper No. 19/07.
- Cholewinski, Ryszard (1997) Migrant Workers in International Human Rights Law: Their Protection in Countries of Employment. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- CIA (2008) The World Factbook. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook>.
- CICP (1999) Centre for International Crime Prevention/Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention/United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute, Global Programme against Trafficking in Human Beings. An outline for action, February.
- Commander, Simon / Kangasniemi, Mari / Winters, L. Alan (2003) The Brain Drain: Curse or Boon? IZA Discussion Paper 809 www.iza.org 2007-04-15. In: Baldwin, R. / Winters, L. A. (eds.) Challenges to Globalisation. NBER and University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Commander, Simon / Chanda, Rupa / Kangasniemi, Mari / Winters, L. Alan (2004) Who gains from skilled migration? Evidence from the software industry. http://www.london.edu/assets/documents/PDF/commander_3.pdf 2007-04-15.
- Commander, Simon / Kangasniemi, Mari / Winters, L. Alan (2004) The Brain Drain: A Review of Theory and Facts. Brussels Economic Review/Cahiers Economiques de Bruxelles 47, 1, 29-44.
- Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (CMW) (n.d.) Respecting the Rights of All Migrant Workers as a Tool to Enhance Development. A contribution by the Committee on Migrant Workers to the General Assembly's High Level dialogue on Migration and Development, available at <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cmw/docs/CMW.C.4.CRP.2.pdf>, 2009-02-16.
- Council of Europe (2004) A New Strategy for Social Cohesion. Revised strategy for Social Cohesion, approved by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, Strasbourg, 2004-03-13.

- Council of Europe (2008) Economic migration, Social cohesion and development: towards an integrated approach. Thematic report for the 8th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers Responsible for Migration Affairs, Kyiv, 4-5 September 2008, Ref. Nr. CDMG (2008) 45, edited by Patrick Taran. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <http://www.libertysecurity.org/article2236.html>, 2009-01-13. http://8emc.mvc-expo.com.ua/img/zstored/File/MMG8_thematic_report_color_final_en.pdf, 2009-02-19.
- Dumont, Jean-Christophe / Monso, Olivier (2007) Matching Educational Background and Employment: A Challenge for Immigrants and Host Countries. In: OECD 2007, 131-159.
- European Commission (2003) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A new Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern Neighbours, Brussels 11 March 2003, COM (2003) 104 final.
- European Commission (2004) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Study on the links between legal and illegal migration, Brussels 4 June 2004, COM(2004) 412 final.
- European Commission (2007) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration. COM (2007) 512 final, Brussels, 2007-09-11.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2008) Annual Report. http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/ar08p2_en.pdf, 2009-02-24.
- Global Commission on International Migration (2005) Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action. Report of the Global Commission on International Migration. <http://www.gcim.org/attachements/gcim-complete-report-2005.pdf>, 2009-02-17.
- Global Migration Group (2008) International Migration and Human Rights; Challenges and Opportunities on the Threshold of the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- Groenendijk, K. / Fernhout, R. / Dam, D. van / Oers, R. van / Strik, T. (2007) The Family Reunification Directive in EU Member States; the First Year of Implementation. Nijmegen: Centrum voor Migratierecht, p. 35; A. Szczepanikova (2008) Family Migration Policies in the Czech Republic: Actors, Practices and Concerns, project report. <http://research.icmpd.org/1291.html#c2507>, 2009-02-20.

- Guild, Elspeth (2004) The Legal Framework of EU Migration. IMIS Beiträge 25:47-83.
- Guiraudon, Virginie / Lahav, Gallya (2000) A Reappraisal of the State-Sovereignty Debate. The Case of Migration Control. Comparative Political Studies 33, 2, 163-195.
- Hecker, Pierre (2006) Länderprofil Türkei. Fokus Migration Nr. 5. <http://www.focus-migration.de/Tuerkei.1234.0.html>, 2009-01-17.
- Hix, Simon / Noury, Abdul (2007) Politics, Not Economic Interests: Determinants of Migration Policies in the European Union. International Migration Review 41, 1, 182-205.
- Hofmann, Martin (2007) Migration Management in the CIS Region. SIAK-Journal: Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft und polizeiliche Praxis 1
- Hofmann, Martin / Jandl, Michael / Nygard, Anne (2004) The Multilateral Response to Migration in Europe. In: Jandl, Michael / Stacher, Irene (eds.) Towards a multilateral migration regime. Vienna.
- İçduygu, Ahmet / Sirkeci, Ibrahim / Muradoğlu, Gulnur (2001) Socio-Economic Development and International Migration: A Turkish Study. International Migration 39, 4, 112-137.
- İçduygu, Ahmet (2003) Irregular Migration in Turkey. Geneva: IOM.
- İçduygu, Ahmet (2006) Gaining from Migration: A Comparative Analysis and Perspective on How Sending and Receiving Countries Can Gain from Migration: Case Study of Turkey. Paris: OECD Development Centre.
- ICMPD (2005) Overview of the Migration Systems in the CIS Countries. Vienna: ICMPD.
- ICMPD (2008) Building Migration Partnerships. 5th Budapest Process Ministerial Conference. Background and Discussion Papers for the 1st Preparatory Meeting in Prague.
- ICMPD (2009) REGINE – Regularisations in Europe. Study on practices in the area of regularisation of illegally staying third-country nationals in the member States of the EU. Vienna: ICMPD. http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/immigration/studies/docs/regine_report_january_2009_en.pdf, 2009-02-19.
- ILO (2003) New Approaches to Combating the Problem – Special Action Programme to Combat Forced Labour. International Labour Organisation.
- ILO (2004) Towards a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in the Global Economy. Report VI, International Labour Conference, 92nd Session, Geneva.

- ILO (2006) Multilateral Framework on Migration. Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration. Geneva: ILO. http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/multilat_fwk_en.pdf, 2009-02-17.
- ILO (2008a) Migration and Development: Armenia Country Study, Draft Report. Geneva: ILO.
- ILO (2008b) Labour Migration and Productive Utilisation of Human Resources in the Kyrgyz Republic, Draft Report. Geneva: ILO.
- ILO (2008c) Migration and Development: Tajikistan Country Study, Draft Report. Geneva: ILO.
- Independent Commission on Turkey (2004) Turkey in Europe: More than a Promise? Report of the Independent Commission on Turkey. Brussels: British Council and the Open Society Institute.
- IOM (2008) World Migration 2008: Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy. Geneva: IOM.
- Kabelova, Hana / Mazmanyany, Armen / Yeremyan, Ara (2007) Assessment of the migration legislation in the Republic of Armenia. http://www.osce.org/documents/oy/2007/07/25415_en.pdf, 2009-02-24.
- Katseli, Louka T. / Lucas, Robert E. B. / Xenogiani, Theodora (2006) Effects of Migration on Sending Countries: What do we know? OECD Development Centre Working Paper 250. Paris: OECD <http://titania.sourceoecd.org/vl=1375053/cl=39/nw=1/rpsv/cgi-bin/wppdf?file=5l9kcbv39z9q.pdf>, 2009-01-12.
- King, Russell / Vullnetari, Julie (2003) Migration and Development in Albania; Working Paper C5; Sussex Centre for Migration Research http://www.migrationdrc.org/publications/working_papers/WP-C5.pdf, 2009-04-22.
- Kirisci, Kemal (2003) Turkey: A Transformation from Emigration to Immigration. Migration Information Source – Country Profiles. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=176>, 2009-01-10.
- Koslowski, R. (2008) Global Mobility and the Quest for an International Migration Regime. Revised draft paper presented at the Conference on International Migration and Development: Continuing the Dialogue – Legal and Policy Perspectives, at the Centre for Migration Studies (CMS) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) , January 17-18, 2008. New York.

- MacDonald, Euan / Cholewinski, Ryszard (2007) The Migrant Workers Convention in Europe. Obstacles to the Ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families: EU/EEA Perspectives. UNESCO migration studies No. 1. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001525/152537e.pdf>, 2009-02-16.
- Mansoor, Ali / Quillin, Bryce (eds.) (2007) Migration and Remittances. Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. The World Bank <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/ECAEXT/0,,contentMDK:21173991~pagePK:146736~piPK:146830~theSitePK:258599,00.html?gclid=CITFr-i5xYsCFSi4EAod8FoGDg>, 2007-04-15.
- Martin, P. L. (2006) GATS, Migration, and Labor Standards. Discussion Paper 165. International Institute for Labour Studies.
- Münz, Rainer / Straubhaar, Thomas / Vadean, Florin / Vadean, Nadia (2006a) What are the migrants' contributions to employment and growth? A European approach. Hamburgisches Weltwirtschaftsinstitut – Migration Research Group, HWWI Policy Paper 3-3. http://www.hwwi.org/uploads/tx_wilpubdb/HWWI_Policy_Paper_3-3.pdf, 2009-01-12.
- Münz, Rainer / Straubhaar, Thomas / Vadean, Florin / Vadean, Nadia (2006b) The Costs and Benefits of European Immigration. Hamburgisches Weltwirtschaftsinstitut – Migration Research Group, HWWI Policy Report No. 3. http://www.hwwi.org/uploads/tx_wilpubdb/HWWI_Policy_Report_Nr__3_01.pdf, 2009-01-12.
- Newland, Kathleen (2003) Migration as Factor in Development and Poverty Reduction. Migration Information Source. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=136>, 2008-09-17.
- OECD (2005) Migration, remittances and development. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2007) International Migration Outlook. Annual Report, 2007 Edition; Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2008a) International Migration Outlook. Annual Report, 2008 Edition; Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2008b) A Profile of Immigrant Populations in the 21st Century; OECD.
- OECD (ed.) (2004) Migration for Employment: Bilateral Agreements at a Crossroads; OECD.

- OSCE / IOM / ILO (2006) Handbook on Establishing Effective Labour Migration Policies in Countries of Origin and Destination. Vienna and Geneva: OSCE, IOM, ILO. http://www.osce.org/publications/eea/2006/05/19187_620_en.pdf, 2009-02-16.
- Roberts, S. (2000) Migration and social security: Parochialism in the global village. Paper presented at the Year 2000 International Research Conference on Social Security, Helsinki, 25-27 September.
- Salt, John (2005a) Trends in international migration in Europe. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Salt, John (2005b) Types of migration in Europe: Implications and policy concerns. Paper given at the European Population Conference 2005, organised by the European Population Committee in collaboration with the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe. Strasbourg, 7-8 April 2005. www.coe.int/t/e/social_cohesion/population/EPC_2005_S3.1%20Salt%20report.pdf, 2009-02-08.
- Skrbiš, Zlatko (2007) The Mobilized Croatian Diaspora: Its Role in Homeland Politics and War. In: Smith/Stares (eds.) 2007, 218-238.
- Smith, Hazel / Stares, Paul (eds.) (2007) *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?* United Nations University Press.
- Statistics Canada (2007) Place of birth for the immigrant population by period of immigration, 2006 counts and percentage distribution, for Canada, provinces and territories – 20% sample data (table). Immigration and Citizenship Highlight Tables, 2006 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 97-557-XWE2006002. Ottawa. <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/data/highlights/Immigration/Table404.cfm?Lang=E&T=404&GH=4&GF=1&G5=0&SC=1&RPP=100&SR=1&S=6&O=D&D1=1>, 2009-02-12.
- Surtees, Rebecca (2008) Trafficking of Men – a Trend Less Considered: The Case of Belarus and Ukraine. Migration Research Series No. 36. Geneva: IOM.
- Thym, Daniel (2008) Respect for Private and Family Life under Article 8 ECHR in Immigration Cases: A Human Right to Regularize Illegal Stay? *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 57, 1, 87-112.
- Tölölyan, Khaching (2007) The Armenian Diaspora and the Karabagh Conflict Since 1988. In: Smith/Stares (eds.) 2007, 106-128.
- UNHCR (2007) *Statistical Yearbook 2005 and 2006*. Geneva: UNHCR.

- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2005) World Economic and Social Survey 2004. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/esa/policy/wess/wess2004files/part2web/chap2.pdf>, 2009-04-24.
- UN Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat (2006) Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2005 Revision. <http://esa.un.org/migration>, 2009-02-02.
- US Census Bureau (2004) The Foreign Born Population in the United States 2003. <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/foreign/cps2003.html>, 2009-02-12.
- Williams, Allan M. / Baláž, Vladimír (2005) What Human Capital, Which Migrants? Returned Skilled Migration to Slovakia from the UK. *International Migration Review* 39, 2, 439-468.
- World Bank (2003) Global Development Finance 2003. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2007) Migration and Remittances Factbook. <http://www.world-bank.org/prospects/migrationandremittances>, 2009-01-12.
- World Bank (2009) World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography; The World Bank.
- Zayonchkovskaya, Zhanna (2007) Russia's Search for a New Migration Policy. *European View* 5, 137-145. <http://migrocenter.ru/science/zayonchkovskaya.pdf>, 2009-02-24.
- Zegers de Beijl, Roger (2000) Documenting discrimination against migrant workers in the labour market. A comparative study of four European countries. Geneva: ILO.

Annex 1: List of OSCE Commitments on migration and migrants

Introduction

Most commitments made by OSCE participating States are statements of aims to be pursued. In some cases a statement on the means by which the particular aim was to be pursued was included. In later years statements of issues, principles, values or norms became more numerous, sometimes in connection with aims, occasionally also with means. Below the issues and aims participating States committed themselves to are ordered thematically. In each instance the place and time when the commitment was made are added in parentheses. Where any means are mentioned in the respective commitment this information is also appended. In a few instances it was necessary to rearrange the syntax of the sentences in order to separate ends and means as cleanly as possible.

Stated issues and aims with regard to international instruments and cooperation

- To resolve the problems arising bilaterally from the migration of workers in Europe as well as between the participating States in their mutual interest (Helsinki 1975).
Means towards this aim: The participating States, taking due account of the activities of the competent international organisations, more particularly the International Labour Organisation, in this area, are of the opinion that these problems should be dealt with by the parties directly concerned.

Strengthening migration governance

- Each state to comply with the bilateral and multilateral agreements to which it is party (Helsinki 1975);
Means towards this aim: Obligation.
- Consider that, in future international instruments concerning the rights of migrant workers ... take into account the fact that this issue is of importance for all of them (Copenhagen 1990).

Note: This commitment was made on the eve of the adoption by the UN of the 1990 International Convention on the Rights of All Migrants and their Families (ICRMW).

Stated issues and aims with regard to the regulation of migration

- Ensure the conditions under which the orderly movement of workers might take place (Helsinki 1975);
Means towards this aim: in particular by developing economic co-operation appropriate for this purpose and suitable for the host countries and the countries of origin.
- To facilitate, as far as possible, the reuniting of migrant workers with their families (Helsinki 1975).
- Facilitate travel on an individual or collective basis for personal or professional reasons and for tourism, such as travel by delegations, groups and individuals. To this end they will reduce the time for the consideration of applications for such travel to a minimum (Vienna 1989).
- Give serious consideration to proposals for concluding agreements on the issuing of multiple entry visas and the reciprocal easing of visa processing formalities, and consider possibilities for the reciprocal abolition of entry visas on the basis of agreements between them (Vienna 1989).
- Consider favourably applications for family reunification as well as family contacts and visits involving migrant workers from other participating States legally residing in the host countries (Vienna 1989).

Stated issues and aims with regard to development and optimisation of benefits from migration

- Encourage the efforts of the countries of origin directed towards increasing the possibilities of employment for their nationals in their own territories (Helsinki 1975);

- *Means towards this aim:* ... in particular by developing economic co-operation appropriate for this purpose and suitable for the host countries and the countries of origin.
- Bear in mind that migrant workers, particularly those that have acquired qualifications, can by returning to their countries after a certain period of time help to remedy any deficiency of skilled labour in their country of origin (Helsinki 1975).
- ... undertaking activities to raise public awareness of the enriching contribution of migrants and migrant workers to society (Sofia 2004).

Stated issues and aims with regard to working and living conditions

- If appropriate, to organise the recruitment of migrant workers (Helsinki 1975).
 - Protecting their [i.e. the migrants'] personal and social welfare (Helsinki 1975).
 - If appropriate, to organise ... the provision of elementary language and vocational training (Helsinki 1975).
 - Ensure equality of rights between migrant workers and nationals of the host countries with regard to the conditions of employment and work and to social security (Helsinki 1975).
 - Endeavour to ensure, as far as possible, that migrant workers may enjoy the same opportunities as nationals of the host countries of finding other suitable employment in the event of unemployment (Helsinki 1975).
 - Provision of vocational training to migrant workers ... in the framework of their employment (Helsinki 1975).
 - As far as possible, [provision] of free instruction in the language of the host country, in the framework of their employment (Helsinki 1975).
 - Endeavour to ensure that migrant workers may enjoy satisfactory living conditions, especially housing conditions (Helsinki 1975).
 - Improving further the general situation of migrant workers and their families, inter alia the protection of their human rights including their economic, social and cultural rights while taking particularly into account the special problems of second generation migrants (Madrid 1983).
- Means towards this aim:* host countries and countries of origin, guided by a spirit of mutual interest and cooperation, intensify their contacts.
- To improve further the economic, social, cultural and other conditions of life for migrant workers and their families legally residing in the host countries (Vienna 1989).

Strengthening migration governance

- Consider adhering to the relevant multilateral instruments as well as concluding complementary or other bilateral agreements, if necessary, in order to improve arrangements for ensuring effective consular, legal and medical assistance for citizens of other participating States temporarily on their territory (Vienna 1989).
- Take any necessary measures to ensure that citizens of other participating States temporarily on their territory for personal or professional reasons, inter alia for the purpose of participating in cultural, scientific and educational activities, are afforded appropriate personal safety, where this is not already the case (Vienna 1989).
- Create the conditions for promoting equality of opportunity in respect of working conditions, education, social security and health services, housing, access to trade unions as well as cultural rights for lawfully residing and working migrant workers (Helsinki 1992).
- The participating States recognise that issues of migrant workers have their human dimension (Vienna 1989).
- The participating States reaffirm that the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers have their human dimension ... [and] are the concern of all participating States (Copenhagen 1990);
Means towards this aim: they should be addressed within the CSCE process.
Means towards this aim: to implement fully in their domestic legislation the rights of migrant workers provided for in international agreements to which they are parties.
- We recognize that the issues of migrant workers and their families legally residing in host countries have economic, cultural and social aspects as well as their human dimension. We affirm that the protection and promotion of their rights, as well as the implementation of relevant international obligations, is our common concern (Paris 1990).
- The participating States restate that human rights and fundamental freedoms are universal, that they are also enjoyed by migrant workers wherever they live and stress the importance of implementing all CSCE commitments on migrant workers and their families lawfully residing in the participating States (Helsinki 1992).

Stated issues and aims with regard to integration

- Enable migrant workers to participate in the life of the society of the participating States (Moscow 1991);

Means towards this aim: adopt appropriate measures.

- Encourage the creation of conditions to foster greater harmony in relations between migrant workers and the rest of the society of the participating State in which they lawfully reside (Helsinki 1992);

Means towards this aim: offer, inter alia, measures to facilitate the familiarisation of migrant workers and their families with the languages and social life of the respective participating State in which they lawfully reside.

- To promote the integration of migrant workers in the societies in which they are lawfully residing. ... recognize that a successful process of integration also depends on its active pursuit by the migrants themselves (Budapest 1994);

Means towards this aim: encourage them in this regard.

Stated issues and aims with regard to the prevention of discrimination and xenophobia

- Condemn all acts of discrimination on the ground of race, colour and ethnic origin, intolerance and xenophobia against migrant workers (Moscow 1991);

Means towards this aim: in conformity with domestic law and international obligations, take effective measures to promote tolerance, understanding, equality of opportunity and respect for the fundamental human rights of migrant workers

- Adopt, if they have not already done so, measures that would prohibit acts that constitute incitement to violence based on national, racial, ethnic or religious discrimination, hostility or hatred.
- To better prevent racist attacks and other manifestations of violent intolerance against migrant workers and their families (Budapest 1994).

Means towards this aim: take appropriate measures.

- Combat discrimination against migrant workers (Maastricht 2003).
- Take steps ... against discrimination, intolerance and xenophobia against migrants and migrant workers (Sofia 2004).

Stated issues and aims with regard to education

- Ensure that the children of migrant workers established in the host country have access to the education usually given there, under the same conditions as the children of that country (Helsinki 1975).

Strengthening migration governance

- Ensuring equality of opportunity between the children of migrant workers and the children of their own nationals regarding access to all forms and levels of education (Vienna 1989);
Means towards this aim: participating States affirm their readiness to take measures needed for the better use and improvement of educational opportunities.

Stated issues and aims with regard to exercising culture

- Confirm the right of migrant workers to receive, as far as possible, regular information in their own language, covering both their country of origin and their host country (Helsinki 1975).
- To permit [the children of migrant workers established in the host country] to receive supplementary education in their own language, national culture, history and geography (Helsinki 1975).
- Endeavour to provide or promote, where reasonable demand exists, adequate teaching of the language and culture of the countries of origin (Madrid 1983).
- The participating States will ensure that migrant workers from other participating States, and their families, can freely enjoy and maintain their national culture and have access to the culture of the host country (Vienna 1989).
- Encourage or facilitate, where reasonable demand exists, supplementary teaching in their mother tongue for the children of migrant workers (Vienna 1989).
- Ensure that the rights of migrant workers and their families lawfully residing in the participating States are respected and underline their right to express freely their ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic characteristics. The exercise of such rights may be subject to such restrictions as are prescribed by law and are consistent with international standards (Moscow 1991).

Stated issues and aims with regard to return

- Increasing ... appropriate opportunities for employment, thereby facilitating the reintegration of these workers on their return home (Helsinki 1975);
Means towards this aim: regard with favour the efforts of the countries of origin to attract the savings ... facilitating the reintegration of these workers.

- Facilitating the social and economic reintegration of returning migrant labour (Madrid 1983);
- Among other measures ... the payment of pensions as acquired or established under the social security system to which such workers have been admitted in the host country should be ensured
Means towards this aim: appropriate legislative means or reciprocal agreements.
- Facilitating the reintegration migrant workers and their families returning to their countries of origin (Vienna 1989);
Means towards this aim: host countries and countries of origin should promote their co-operation in relevant fields.

Annex 2: List of adherence to relevant international instruments

Ratifications of Conventions Relevant to Commitments on migration by OSCE participating states						
State	ICERD	ILO C111	ILO C97	ILO C143	EC-LSMW	ICRMW
Albania	1994	1997	2005	2006	2007	2007
Andorra	2006					
Armenia	1993	1994	2006	2006		
Austria	1972	1973				
Azerbaijan	1996	1992				1999
Belarus	1969	1961				
Belgium	1975	1977	1953			
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1993	1993	1993	1993		1996
Bulgaria	1966	1960				
Canada	1970	1964			-	
Croatia	1992	1991				
Cyprus	1967	1968	1960	1977		
Czech Republic	1993	1993				
Denmark	1971	1960				
Estonia	1991	2005				
Finland	1970	1970				

Ratifications of Conventions Relevant to Commitments on migration by OSCE participating states						
State	ICERD	ILO C111	ILO C97	ILO C143	EC-LSMW	ICRMW
France	1971	1981	1954		1983	
Georgia	1999	1993				
Germany	1969	1961	1959			
Greece	1970	1984				
Holy See	1969				-	
Hungary	1967	1961				
Iceland	1967	1963				
Ireland	2000	1999				
Italy	1976	1963	1952	1981	1995	
Kazakhstan	1998	1999			-	
Kyrgyzstan	1997	1992	2008		-	2003
Latvia	1992	1992				
Liechtenstein	2000					
Lithuania	1998	1994				
Luxembourg	1978	2001				
FYR Macedonia	1994	1991	1991	1991		
Malta	1971	1968				
Moldova	1993	1996	2005		2006	
Monaco	1995					
Montenegro	2006	2006	2006	2006		
Netherlands	1971	1973	1952		1983	
Norway	1970	1959	1955	1979	1989	
Poland	1968	1961				
Portugal	1982	1959	1978	1978	1979	
Romania	1970	1973				
Russian Federation	1966	1961				
San Marino	2002	1986		1985		
Serbia	2001	2000	2000	2000		
Slovakia	1993	1993				
Slovenia	1992	1992	1992	1992		
Spain	1968	1967	1967		1980	

Ratifications of Conventions Relevant to Commitments on migration by OSCE participating states						
State	ICERD	ILO C111	ILO C97	ILO C143	EC-LSMW	ICRMW
Sweden	1971	1962		1982	1978	
Switzerland	1994	1961				
Tajikistan	1995	1993	2007	2007	-	2002
Turkey	2002	1967			1981	2004
Turkmenistan	1994	1997			-	
Ukraine	1969	1961			2007	
United Kingdom	1969	1999	1951			
United States	1994				-	
Uzbekistan	1995	1992			-	
Total OSCE	56	51	20	14	11	6
Total World	173	168	48	43	11	41

Annex 3: List of bilateral agreements

Social security agreements

The table below gives for each country the number of international social security agreements and the year of the first and of the latest one. The data are from the ILO's NATLEX database and contain not just the actual agreements but also amendments etc. If an agreement was made between two OSCE participating States, it is counted with each one of the two states and therefore shows up twice in the total.

	International social security agreements	Year of first agreement	Year of most recent agreement
Austria	146	1958	2006
Belgium	170	1947	2008
Denmark	50	1951	2005
Finland	55	1955	2004
France	394	1947	2005
Germany	224	1950	2002
Greece	58	1958	1995
Ireland	20	1949	1994
Italy	112	1948	2001
Luxembourg	140	1949	2008
Netherlands	175	1947	2007
Portugal	95	1962	2006

Strengthening migration governance

	International social security agreements	Year of first agreement	Year of most recent agreement
Spain	142	1956	2007
Sweden	68	1955	2003
United Kingdom	158	1947	2000
Andorra	10	1970	1988
Holy See	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland	22	1957	2003
Liechtenstein	30	1965	1996
Monaco	16	1952	1998
Norway	54	1948	2003
San Marino	10	1949	1991
Switzerland	127	1950	2007
EU-15, EFTA, small states	2,276	1947	2008
Bulgaria	36	1955	2006
Cyprus	17	1957	2006
Czech Republic	13	1992	2005
Estonia	4	1994	2003
Hungary	25	1957	2006
Latvia	1	1993	1993
Lithuania	7	1993	2002
Malta	14	1956	2001
Poland	51	1947	2006
Romania	47	1957	2006
Slovakia	12	1992	2002
Slovenia	27	1992	2007
EU-12 newer members	286	1955	2007
Albania	6	1958	1998
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7	1950	2007
Croatia	34	1993	2006
FYR Macedonia	22	1997	2007

	International social security agreements	Year of first agreement	Year of most recent agreement
Montenegro	1	2008	2008
Serbia	1	2006	2006
Serbia and Montenegro	75	1950	2003
Turkey	69	1959	2006
non-EU, non-CIS	215	1950	2008
Armenia	2	1992	1995
Azerbaijan	1	1998	1998
Belarus	7	1992	2006
Georgia	3	1997	1998
Kazakhstan	1	1992	1992
Kyrgyzstan	1	1992	1992
Moldova	5	1992	1995
Russian Federation	8	1992	2006
Tajikistan	1	1992	1992
Turkmenistan	1	1992	1992
Ukraine	8	1992	2001
Uzbekistan	1	1992	1992
CIS	39	1992	2006
Canada	186	1942	2008
United States of America	97	1942	2001
Northern America	283	1942	2008
OSCE	3,067	1942	2008

Source: ILO NATLEX database. http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/natlex_browse.home, 2009-03-03.
Compiled by ICMPD.

The totals include double counting as agreements between two OSCE countries are counted in each country separately.

Included are agreements, acts, treaties, supplementary agreements amending existing agreements, and other legal regulations.

Labour recruitment

For information on and an assessment of bilateral labour recruitment agreements and alternatives and complements to them see the conference volume edited by the OECD (2004). It covers Switzerland, France, Italy, Romania, and the Czech Republic, the U.S., United Kingdom, and Ireland, Germany, the Philippines, and Poland. It also contains a 25 page overview of principal agreements made by OECD member countries.