4.11. United Kingdom

The UK highlighted the positive and negative effects of migration on development in a White Paper already in 1997. A decade later, the Department for International Development (DfID) published a document containing a number of plans to address migration in development policies and programmes. The current UK government, however, does not have a specific policy on M&D although it acknowledges migration’s potential positive effects on the development of countries of origin. Specific M&D programmes do not exist and migration is rather seen as one factor in wider development programmes. In recent years, a focus has been placed on internal and South-South migration and its effects on development as well as on return and reintegration. DfID has a focal point on migration and there is frequent communication between different departments dealing with migration, but in comparison to other areas policy coherence efforts in the area of migration are rather weak. The UK has been actively involved in the GFMD process, in particular until the year 2010, and is actively engaged in the Budapest Process.

4.11.1. The Migration and Development concept

In 1997, the Secretary of State’s “White Paper on international development” included a section on international migration, discussing the positive and negative effects of migration on development. It highlighted environmental causes as reasons for migration, along with disasters, conflict, the persecution of minorities and economic factors. The document emphasised that UK policy will not aim to reduce voluntary migration as there is no evidence to suggest that this is effective. It also stated that the UK’s objective is to “help developing countries manage migration flows as beneficially as possible” by:

- Working through the UN/other international organisations/the EU;
- Being active in conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance;
- Supporting broad-based economic growth;
- Funding research into the impact of migration on development and the environment, and;
- Building on skills of migrants already within the UK to promote development in their countries of origin.

In 2007, DfID came out with a document entitled ‘Moving out of poverty – making migration work better for the poor’, which stated that the aim of DFID’s policy on migration “is to increase the benefits and reduce the risks of migration for poor people and developing countries”. The document focused on poor people who make a decision to leave their home and move through regular channels within their country of origin, or across international borders, in an attempt to improve their economic situation. It distinguished between voluntary economic migration and
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other forms, although it recognizes that this distinction can be difficult, and set out a number of plans to address migration in development policies and programmes, namely:

• Enhance the poverty-reduction and development benefits by planning for migration;
• Increase the poverty-reduction and development benefits of remittances;
• Work in a limited number of ‘focus’ countries to support partner governments’ initiatives to develop managed migration policies that aim to reduce the risks and enhance the benefits of internal migration for poor people;
• Support increased opportunities for both skilled and low-skilled workers that take into account the labour market needs of receiving countries;
• Rebuild and strengthen systems that deliver health services, including actions that help to reduce the permanent loss of health professionals;
• Promote safe and legal migration, which includes non-discriminatory legislation, policies and practices to protect human rights and the national entitlements of men, women and children who migrate, and;
• Support the development and implementation of regional migration management frameworks.

The paper states that DFID will approach migration and development policy coherently and ensure that policies take account of the impact on poverty reduction and development in partner countries.

Two years later, in 2009, DFID’s ‘White Paper on development cooperation’ stated that migration could have positive effects (remittances, bringing in new skills and business links for countries of destination and origin), but also offsetting costs such as brain drain. It stressed that the UK government aimed to harness the benefits and mitigate the costs by giving further consideration to how migration policy could help encourage and support development. The document also noted that the UK would seek to make poverty reduction a priority for EU external policies on migration. The outcome of the 2010 general election overrode the 2007 DFID document on M&D and currently, at the time of writing, DFID does not have an explicit M&D policy.330

4.11.2. Institutional framework and policy coherence for Migration and Development

The departments involved in migration and development policies – DFID, Foreign Affairs, the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice – are constantly in contact and are well aware of each other’s positions on migration (and development).

Migration currently does not feature on the list of ‘key issues’ for DFID, but it has a focal point on migration, who, due to the changing policy priorities, spends much less time on migration (and policy issues) than under the previous government. There are other DFID staff members who deal with migration elements, for example on country programmes or financial transfers relevant to remittances. The migration directorate under the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) prepares the UK’s contribution to the GFMD and the 2013 UNHLD. The Home Office is responsible for the EU’s global


approach and the various dialogues within the EU framework. There is a commitment between the FCO and the UK Border Agency (part of the Home Office) that up to 40% of the posts in the UK Border Agency’s international group are filled with FCO staff to ensure optimal alignment between visa and foreign policies.

Cross-governmental discussions on the links between temporary and circular migration and international development efforts are recent, decentralized (i.e. they often take place at the DfID offices in partner countries) and are mostly organised on an ad hoc basis.\(^{331}\)

An IOM study on PCD conducted in 2008 came up with the following findings in relation to the UK:

1. **Mainstreaming migration into development**: The UK development community has not yet managed to mainstream migration into the UK development policy agenda, partly due to a lack of consensus on the impact of migration on development and the types of measures to be taken. There is tension between prioritizing structural factors (for example, bad governance or inadequate infrastructure) and migration-related interventions. Activities on remittances and the rest of the migration-development nexus also appear operationally disconnected.

2. **Mainstreaming development into migration policies**: There are some efforts to foster cross-government action on migration. DfID also sits on the Home Office Voluntary Returns Steering Group. However, on the whole, there is a lack of integrated thinking within government as a whole in this area, primarily because of the inherent tensions in policymaking on migration and development.

IOM found that policy incoherence results principally from a hierarchy of ministries and of policy priorities, in which development priorities for the benefit of sending countries come second to the UK’s immediate interests. There were also inherent conflicts of objectives, with DfID being concerned that remittances reach the poorest, whereas the Treasury was focused on the legality of transfers. Migration authorities may want to play down country risk assessments because of the implications for asylum claims, whereas DfID may want to highlight the need for preventive humanitarian action. Trade negotiators may be reluctant to open the door to lower-skilled workers from developing countries while DfID may be supporting developing country negotiators to obtain more development-friendly outcomes.\(^{332}\)

In 2010, the OECD DAC found that the UK’s policy coherence efforts in the area of migration are weak compared to other areas. According to the OECD DAC, more could be done to ensure consistency between the UK migration policy and its development objectives. The DAC recommended that the UK should make better use of research done by UK institutes in strengthening coherence in the area of migration.\(^{333}\)

Until 2010, cross-governmental public service agreements (PSAs) existed, which aimed
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\(^{332}\) IOM, 2008, op. cit.

to reinforce coherence among UK policies and help develop a whole-of-government approach. PSA 3 on migration focused on four key delivery priorities:

1. Strengthening UK borders;
2. Fast-tracking asylum decisions;
3. Compliance with UK immigration laws, and;
4. Boosting Britain’s economy.  

These PSAs no longer exist. The current government does not place a great amount of emphasis on the link between migration and development and how to make it stronger in UK policies. DfID makes its position known through its Minister in the Cabinet but has to be realistic on what it can and cannot achieve. Like other EU Member States, the government has also made political and legal commitments to promoting Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) in EU Treaties and in EU policy documents respectively – most notably in this context the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. The Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force in December 2009, states that the Union “[…] shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries”. More information on these EU policies can be found in chapter 4.12 on the European Union.

4.11.3. Operationalising the Migration and Development policy

The UK adopted a Code of practice for the international recruitment of healthcare professionals in 2001, changed in 2004. The Code aims to prevent brain-drain and promotes standards of practice in the ethical international recruitment of healthcare professionals. All employers are strongly commended to adhere to this code of practice. The Code does not aim to prevent all international recruitment from countries facing difficulties, but only active recruitment.

The UK participates in the Global Remittances Working Group, co-chairs the Inter-Agency Remittances Task Force and has contributed to the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor’s (CGAP’s) Technology Programme which has conducted feasibility studies and pilots to test branchless banking approaches to transferring remittances across borders.

The UK has supported several multi-year M&D research programmes. Between 2003 and 2009 it supported the ‘Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty’, which undertook research, capacity building and dialogue on evidence-based and pro-poor migration policies. Building on this programme, the 2010-2016 ‘Migrating out of Poverty’ (budget EUR 7 485 290 or £6 400 000) research programme focuses on the relationship between regional migration, internal migration and poverty, and is located in six regions across Asia, Africa and Europe. It conducts research on how to maximise the poverty reducing and developmental impacts of migration and minimise the costs and risks of migration for the poor. This includes generating new knowledge related to migration and poverty; creating new datasets; engaging policymakers, and building capacity to understand and research migration and poverty linkages. The Migrating out of Poverty RPC has been established as a partnership between research


Country Chapters

institutions in Bangladesh, UK, Ghana, Kenya, Singapore and South Africa, all working on the links between migration and development.

4.11.3.1 Priority regions and countries
DfID country offices choose the partners they work with (e.g. NGOs, European aid agencies, universities, etc.), which makes it difficult to generalize who its priority partners are. Depending on the country context, DfID chooses its partners. At headquarters, the policy division responsible for migration has mainly worked with academics from the University of Sussex.

1. **Eastern and Southern Africa**: Eritrea, Lesotho, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Zambia, Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Mozambique, Uganda, Angola, DRC, Niger, Sierra Leone;

2. **West and Central Africa**: Burundi, Ghana, Nigeria, The Gambia, Cameroon, Liberia, Rwanda;

3. **Middle East**: Iraq, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Yemen;

4. **South Asia**: Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka;

5. **Central Asia**: Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan;

6. **East Asia and Pacific**: Burma, Indonesia, Cambodia, Vietnam, China;

7. **Caribbean**: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, Guyana, St. Kitts and Nevis, Dominica, Haiti, St. Lucia;

8. **Europe**: Bosnia Herzegovina, Russia, Kosovo, Serbia, Moldova;

9. **Latin America**: Brazil.

4.11.3.2 Lessons learnt
In terms of labour migration, the UK does not currently have a national policy that promotes temporary and circular migration for the purpose of development in countries of origin. To date the focus has largely been on *ad hoc* initiatives. A study by the Home Office/UK Border Agency for the European Migration Network on lessons learnt on circular/temporary migration in the UK found that:

- A lack of clear definitions and associated immigration categories creates challenges in assessing patterns of temporary and circular migration;

- The current UK Government debate on migration leaves scope for future policy developments on temporary and circular migration without affecting the level of permanent settlement;

- While there is no national policy for circular migration, there are examples of successful *ad hoc* collaboration between the UK and countries in the South, which focus on a ‘bottom-up’ approach and evidence potential benefits of a ‘triple win’ (see below on MTI), and;

- The role of social benefit portability as an incentive for migration from the UK to countries of origin remains under-explored.

The *Medical Training Initiative* (in place since 2006) accommodates overseas post-graduate medical specialists to undertake a fixed period of training and experience in the UK for up to two years. Its popularity is based on its potential to achieve a ‘triple win’ through promoting the UK educational sector abroad, enhancing participants’ skills and allowing countries of origin to capitalise on these skills upon their
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return. Since April 2010 the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges has acted as a sponsor. Rather than being centrally regulated these types of movements are managed through partnerships between the UK’s medical Royal Colleges. Ongoing discussions focus on how the MTI can be altered to further maximise its positive impact on overall national development in countries of origin as well as the health sector in the UK.338

In Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Russia, IOM (responsible for policy work with government and service delivery), UN Women (gender) and the World Bank (policy work, remittances and economic growth analysis) are currently implementing DfID’s Regional Migration Programme in Asia with a budget in 2010-2013 of EUR 7 000 370 or £ 5 985 385339 to protect the rights and enhance the social and economic benefits of migrant men, women and their families and ensure labour migration benefits in both labour-sending and labour-receiving countries. The programme addresses issues relating to governance and institutional reforms, service delivery to migrants, gender issues in the migration process, and working with mass media. In 2011, some challenges were identified on improving gender integration in policy development, increasing understanding of the opportunities offered by labour migrants from Central Asia, and mainstreaming a gender sensitive and rights-based development perspective into relevant labour migration policies in each country in bilateral and regional political dialogues.340 A paper by INTRAC examines the main challenges DFID has encountered in working with diasporas:341

- Ensuring DFID engages with as ‘representative’ a range of diaspora groups as possible, particularly in regard to countries with conflicting political factions;
- To be aware of different levels of capacity of diaspora groups, adapt DFID’s ways of working, and try to support groups unreachable by competitive processes;
- Building trust and increasing communication between DFID, ‘traditional development actors’ and diaspora groups, against conflicting and sometimes prejudicial narratives about migration;
- Gaining a better understanding of the role and impact of different types of diaspora groups in the long term.

4.11.4. Involvement in international fora on Migration and Development

The UK has placed importance on engaging in the Budapest Process, which allows for discussions on migration issues with partners as part of an established expert network and along a key migration route.342 The EU Dialogues with the European neighbourhood and Latin America are not necessarily relevant to DFID’s work as DFID does not have country offices in these countries/regions (e.g. Latin America, North Africa).

The UK has taken part of and provided funding to the MTM i-Map, a long-term project
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339 OANDA currency converter was used, exchange rate which was applied on 15 April 2013 was 1.16958.
building an information database and tool on migration around the Mediterranean. This tool is used to inform the UK on strategies and operations in place to address irregular migration in the region. The UK also participates in intelligence fora with third countries to identify and tackle threats related to smuggling.\textsuperscript{343}

The UK considers itself to be a great supporter of the GFMD. The government has been actively involved in the GFMD, in particular until the year 2010, having chaired three round tables and participated in several roundable government teams and provided voluntary contributions. The UK finds the Forum useful as it is inclusive and the only one of its kind at the international level that discusses migration, which is a rather sensitive topic. Because the GFMD is informal and non-binding without conditional texts for agreement, participants tend to speak more freely. In addition to informal exchange it is important to build policy and programme implementation on the evidence available and generate knowledge about different ways of governing migration. In the UK’s view, the GFMD has become much more practical and has been used to share good practices in recent years (e.g. the UK presented its Foresight study on migration and the environment\textsuperscript{344}). The GFMD’s Platform for Partnerships is another very useful method to share and learn about practices.

During the data collection period the UK did not yet put forward proposals or first indications of its position for the upcoming UNHLD and negotiations towards a post-2015 global development framework.

\textsuperscript{343} Home Office/UK Border Agency, 2011a, op. cit.
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