

MIGRANT SUPPORT MEASURES FROM AN EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS PERSPECTIVE (MISMES) GLOBAL INVENTORY WITH A FOCUS ON COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN



The views expressed in this report are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Training Foundation, the European University Institute or the EU institutions.

© European Training Foundation, 2015
Reproduction is authorised, provided the source is acknowledged.

**MIGRANT SUPPORT MEASURES FROM AN
EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS PERSPECTIVE (MISMES)**

GLOBAL INVENTORY WITH A FOCUS ON COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

JULY 2015



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.1 Definition of MISMES.....	9
1.2 Conceptual approach and limitations	10
1.3 Study methodology	12
2. LITERATURE REVIEW OF MISMES AND THEIR IMPACT	15
2.1 International job matching and placement services	15
2.2 Pre-departure information, orientation and/or training.....	18
2.3 Recognition of qualifications and skills	19
2.4 Cross-border skills transfer programmes	20
2.5 Labour market reintegration of return migrants	22
3. INVENTORY OF MAIN MISMES MODELS IN COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN	25
3.1 Pre-migration MISMES	26
3.1.1 International job matching and placement services and platforms (MISMES model 1)	26
3.1.2 Pre-departure information, orientation and training (MISMES model 2).....	30
3.1.3 Professional skills development for migration (MISMES model 3)	33
3.1.4 Facilitating access to labour market information and protection in destination countries (MISMES model 4).....	36
3.2 During-migration MISMES	38
3.2.1 Programmes for capitalizing on skills across borders (MISMES model 5)	38
3.3 Post-migration MISMES	40
3.3.1 Validation and recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications (MISMES model 6)	40
3.3.2 Pre-return and return employment information platforms and call centres (MISMES model 7).....	44
3.3.3 Targeted entrepreneurship and income generating schemes for returnees (MISMES model 8)	46
3.3.4 Assisted voluntary return and reintegration – AVRR (MISMES model 9).....	47
3.4 Multi-dimensional MISMES	49
3.4.1 Migrant resource centres (MISMES model 10).....	49
3.4.2 Migrant welfare funds (MISMES model 11)	51
4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INVENTORY RESULTS.....	54
4.1 Summary findings from the 11 MISMES models.....	54
4.2 Broader policy conclusions on MISMES as a policy tool.....	57
4.3 Recommendations for future MISMES design and implementation.....	59
ANNEX: LIST OF INTERVIEWS, REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS...63	
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	65
REFERENCES	67

LIST OF BOXES – MISMES EXAMPLES

Box 3.1 Tunisian Technical Cooperation Agency (ATCT)	26
Box 3.2 Employment Permit System of South Korea	27
Box 3.3 EURES – European Job Mobility Portal.....	29
Box 3.4 IMIS – Integrated Migration Information System in Egypt	29
Box 3.5 Overseas orientation initiatives in Canada	31
Box 3.6 Italian E-Bosla project in Morocco	31
Box 3.7 Improvement of TVET schools for Egyptian youth in Fayoum.....	34
Box 3.8 GIZ – Legal circular mobility of highly qualified labour from Tunisia	35
Box 3.9 Model employment contracts in the Philippines.....	37
Box 3.10 Return and Reintegrating Programme of Qualified Jamaican Nationals for Development ...	38
Box 3.11 TOKTEN programme – Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals.....	40
Box 3.12 Transnational qualifications frameworks.....	41
Box 3.13 Some examples of international recognition tools	43
Box 3.14 Moldova Call Centre for Returning Migrants.....	45
Box 3.15 MITOS – Migration Tools Options for Sustainability, and ‘Business Ideas for Development’: training and networking for SME creation	46
Box 3.16 Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration in Moldova	48
Box 3.17 Migrant resource centres in Armenia	50
Box 3.18 Sri Lanka Overseas Workers Welfare Fund	52

PREFACE

This report is the European Training Foundation's (ETF) latest contribution to an informed policy dialogue on legal and circular migration. It aims to provide evidence-based, policy-oriented inputs to European Neighbourhood countries from an employment and skills perspective. To this end, a dual focus is offered: a global focus to review the migrant support measures implemented worldwide from an employment and skills perspective; and a country focus to take stock and inform policy decisions in that field in the framework of the European Union (EU) Mobility Partnerships with these Neighbourhood countries. The study was coordinated by the Migration Policy Centre of the European University Institute (EUI) under the supervision of the ETF.

This report presents the main findings of a global analytical inventory of migrant support measures implemented in countries of origin from an employment and skills perspective (MISMES). These measures were introduced to facilitate labour mobility and increase the developmental effect of migration in sending countries. This is the first attempt to compile, classify and assess these measures in terms of cost effectiveness and the outcomes of the migration process. Readers can also find the MISMES methodological note (ETF, 2015a), and five additional country studies on the same topic – Armenia, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova¹, Morocco and Tunisia – all countries which concluded Mobility Partnerships with the EU (ETF, 2015b-f).

The report is structured around four phases of migration (pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration and multi-dimensional), and makes a compilation, classification and preliminary assessment of 11 MISMES models identified. An Excel file complementing the report and the country studies with a number of examples on each of the MISMES models is available on the web².

The report was written by Professor Iván Martín and Dr Shushanik Makaryan from the Migration Policy Centre of the EUI, under the scientific coordination of Philippe Fargues and Alessandra Venturini. Ummuhan Bardak from the ETF provided inputs and feedback throughout the elaboration of the report and revised and edited the final version. The study has greatly benefited from the assistance and collaboration of many institutions and individuals involved in the implementation of migrant support measures. We thank in particular the practitioners who shared their views and information on specific MISMES through interviews, e-mail exchanges and the completion of the MISMES questionnaire. They are listed in the Annex.

¹ Hereafter 'Moldova'.

² See www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/MISMES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Migrant support measures from an employment and skills perspective (MISMES) are defined as specific policy interventions aimed at improving the labour market integration of migrant workers and/or at reducing the underutilization of migrants' skills. Although the numbers of MISMES have increased rapidly and spread worldwide over the last 15 years, there is no real knowledge base about their relative effectiveness; their impact on migrant workers' performance in the labour markets of destination or origin countries; and the contextual factors that should be taken into account to improve them. This report is a first attempt to compile, classify and assess these migrant support measures in terms of cost-effectiveness and the labour market outcomes of the migration process. It presents the main findings of a global analytical inventory of MISMES implemented in countries of origin during all phases of migration (pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration and multi-dimensional).

For the purposes of our analytical inventory, MISMES in countries of origin were classified into the 11 different models most commonly found worldwide. These models are as follows: international job-matching and placement services and platforms (including specialized international placement agencies and specific databases for the pre-selection of migrant workers); pre-departure information, orientation and training programmes; professional skills development for migration; facilitation of access to labour market information and protection in destination countries (including model employment contracts and registration of migrant contracts); programmes for capitalizing on skills across borders (including permanent return or temporary stay of skilled migrants); validation and recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications; pre-return and return employment information platforms and call centres; targeted entrepreneurship and income generating schemes for returnees; assisted voluntary return and reintegration (AVRR); migrant resource centres; and migrant welfare funds.

In this global inventory, each MISMES model is briefly explained in terms of basic features, strengths, challenges and risks, as well as in terms of some preliminary elements for the assessment of their efficiency and impact. An Excel file complementing the report and the country studies with a number of examples on each of the MISMES models is available on the web³. In Chapter 4 a brief review of conclusions on each of the models is offered. This exercise is in line with increasing calls from many international organisations on the more efficient use of migrants' labour and skills in both countries of destination and origin. Here relevant measures might include facilitating access to labour markets, recognition of migrants' skills and direct contacts with employers for job matching.

The review of MISMES implementation practices worldwide has demonstrated that there are not enough data and information available to evaluate, in a consistent and scientific way, the efficiency and impact of migrant support measures. The lack of systematic monitoring and follow-up mechanisms and impact assessments has been the main challenge in assessing the impact of MISMES on labour market integration or the skills utilization of migrant workers. Hence, the principal conclusion of our review on MISMES is that available information does not lend itself to a comparative analysis of different MISMES models across different migration contexts. This is a major obstacle to a systematic improvement of MISMES as a labour migration policy tool, which calls for action from the international organisations and donors who manage the bulk of MISMES implementation and funding worldwide.

For this reason, our study had to rely primarily on the review of the existing literature of policy and academic studies and project evaluation reports. However, the classification and analysis of MISMES allowed us to draw some general conclusions on the main implementation modalities and contextual

³ See www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/MISMES

success and failure factors. We were also able to formulate broad policy recommendations for the different categories of MISMEMS as a policy tool to improve their impact on migration cycle outcomes. These are summarised below.

- **Relevance of MISMEMS as labour migration policy tool.** There is an increasing interest and more funds available for MISMEMS in countries of origin and destination, including within the EU and in the European Neighbourhood region (after the establishment of Mobility Partnerships). Considering the fact that labour migration is here to stay, MISMEMS might be a useful tool in the management of legal and circular labour migration, one capable of making the most of labour market integration and skills utilization.
- **Weak knowledge basis on MISMEMS.** No systematic information collection and evaluation exists for MISMEMS, so our knowledge base for any scientific assessment of MISMEMS results is extremely limited. Despite the wide transfer of practices, there is only a limited experience-based 'global learning curve'. Practices and models are transferred and replicated from country to country in a mechanical way, often by global actors in the framework of responses to calls for project proposals. New programmes need to learn from the lessons of past experiences so as not to replicate mistakes and they need to be able to adapt to local contexts.
- **Low number of beneficiaries.** Despite increased numbers of MISMEMS, the number of MISMEMS beneficiaries remains extremely low in most cases, both individually and in aggregate terms. Typically, MISMEMS only reach a small proportion of the total number of migrants for a specific country. Its value is largely underestimated in the management of labour migration by policy-makers in the European Neighbourhood (both by countries of origin and destination). As a result, MISMEMS have been a rather marginal tool in migration management. This means that there is real scope for enhanced measures to improve labour market integration and the skills utilization of migrant workers.
- **Lack of coordination and integration of MISMEMS into a comprehensive approach to migration.** MISMEMS have been largely donor-driven programmes and projects and have not been integrated into national systems. Many MISMEMS are designed and funded by donors, frequently reflecting the priorities of destination countries with time-bound project rationale. Most often, there is no coordination among MISMEMS, nor is there coordination between MISMEMS and national migration strategies. Overlaps in MISMEMS implementation are common.
- **Sustainability.** MISMEMS sustainability has been a consequent major weakness. Continuity after a project's end is by far the most important challenge for almost all policy measures, and the project rationale and dynamics prevailing in many of them further endangers it. Since funding for such measures is largely provided by donors, it is hard to sustain these measures for developing countries with limited budgets after the funding is over.
- **Cost-effectiveness.** The cost effectiveness of measures is hard to assess because typically policy interventions target not one but many objectives. This notwithstanding, MISMEMS seem to have high operational costs and low cost-efficiency. They are often a labour intensive policy intervention and unit cost (per beneficiary) seems to be very high whenever we have data to calculate it. This is particularly true of MISMEMS implemented by international organisations and involving international staff.
- **Target bias.** Most MISMEMS have a bias towards certain migrant groups. Most programmes focus either on high-skilled migrants (where interest is greatest in the countries of origin), or on unskilled/ irregular migrants. In reality, most migrants are medium-skilled migrants, and the result is that there are not many measures for the majority of migrants.

- **Skills-related MISMES aimed at improving skills utilization and skills enhancement** are the missing link in labour migration policy interventions. Indeed, specific skills development and migration-oriented training programmes feature a high level of success in terms of labour market integration. They tend, though, to be a very small part of total MISMES investment. Given the high incidence of skills mismatch revealed by international labour migration, this points to a clear line for policy intervention.
- **Success factors.** Some golden rules for the success of MISMES might include the following. The first rule is regular dialogue and cooperation between countries of origin and countries of destination, and in particular the direct involvement of employers from destination countries. The second golden rule is a focus on the migrant's qualifications in the design and implementation of MISMES. The third golden rule is the importance of 'expectations management' during implementation regarding potential migrants, prospective employers and returnees.
- **MISMES integrated packages.** In general, a combination of different measures in one package seems to be the most effective way to implement MISMES. Both the literature review and our observations point to more successful labour market outcomes when several types of migrant support measures on employment and skills are combined and implemented together: for instance, combining job-matching, skills development for migration and validation and recognition of skills upon return.
- **Embedment in national policies.** To maximize their positive impact, MISMES should be fully integrated into the national systems and policies of countries of origin. In our review, we have found a wide consensus and some evidence for the positive externalities of MISMES integration in the general institutions and policies of the countries of origin addressed to the wider population. Put in other terms the better-embedded migration policy interventions are in national policies (in terms of vocational training and skills development, job intermediation services or promotion of entrepreneurship), the more effective they are.
- **Skills partnerships.** There are some promising examples of 'skills partnerships' between countries of origin and destination, which combine international development cooperation with migration management policies. Although these two policy fields usually have little to do with each other, there is an added value in combining these two policy fields in certain economic sectors with high international labour mobility.
- **More evidence and independent analysis to expand the body of knowledge on MISMES.** We recommend that national governments and international donors (in particular EU institutions, EU Member States and the European Neighbourhood countries) undertake the development of more evidence and independent analysis on MISMES through four evidence-related actions:
 1. a 'global repository of MISMES' hosted and coordinated by a voluntary centre;
 2. a mandatory MISMES information template for all projects and programmes implemented (the information required in the MISMES project questionnaire might serve as a guide for this);
 3. a mandatory post-MISMES evaluation framework for all MISMES programmes and projects funded and implemented; and
 4. labour force surveys in countries of destination and origin could systematically oversample migrant/ return communities to reach representative sample sizes and include some additional questions on participation in migrant support measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Migrant support measures implemented from an employment and skills perspective (MISMES) are a relatively recent phenomenon. It is true that there are some examples dating back decades. However, most of these measures date back over the last 15 years or so and have become important around the world as management of labour migration flows has gained importance on the global policy agenda. In this sense, labour migration in general and MISMES in particular can be seen, to a certain extent, as a new frontier of international migration policy and migration cooperation practice.

Resources mobilized to implement MISMES have been considerable in recent years. In the 2007-13 period, as much as EUR 40 million was spent in the framework of the EU Thematic Programme on Cooperation with Third Countries in the Area of Migration and Asylum (European Commission, 2013b), one of the main sources of funding for this kind of measures worldwide. The sum is calculated on the basis of MISMES components of funded projects. Canada and many Asian governments are the other major MISMES-funders. Indeed Asia – from Bangladesh to Nepal to Sri-Lanka to the Philippines – has the most systematic use of MISMES, a longer tradition in implementing them, and the most successful experiences.

The number of MISMES is increasing rapidly and spreading worldwide – there might be several thousand implemented worldwide over the last decade: this contrasts, however, with poor awareness and the poor use of support schemes by migrants and returnees. As evidenced by recent ETF surveys in Armenia, Georgia and Morocco: only between 6% and 11% of migrants were even aware of the existence of any pre-departure measures, and only between 3% and 6% of them had used them. The levels were still lower as far as return support schemes are concerned (ETF, 2013, p. 56). Moreover, despite the fact that many measures are funded projects from donor organisations, and cost hundreds of thousands of euros of public resources (many MISMES projects amount to more than EUR 1 million), the information on the details of these measures is extremely limited. Indeed, any rigorous and systematic scientific assessment of such measures is not possible because of the difficulty of accessing donor organisations' data.

Indeed, there is no knowledge base on their relative effectiveness; their impact on migrant worker's performance in the labour markets of destination countries or countries of origin upon return; or which contextual factors to take into account to improve them. This problem is compounded by the fact that, even policy makers working with migrants have little technical knowledge about the different types of MISMES, their variations and the range of impact they may insert on potential and return migrants. Given the magnitude and reach of MISMES, this is a huge task and it is just starting: mainly compiling and processing all information available, which is scattered among many actors and across the world. This compiling and processing is the main endeavour of the present study.

It must be noted that this is not the only study of this nature. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) has carried out a comprehensive review of its pre-departure training programmes (among others, through the Headstart – Fostering Integration Before Departure – project). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) has, likewise, several research projects with a similar approach, such as Developing a Standard Methodology for Assessing Outcomes for Migrant Workers, or, more specifically, the Survey on pre-employment, recruitment, employment and return phase of the Employment Permit System in South Korea. Bilateral Labour Agreements are also assessed in the framework of several projects ranging from France-Tunisia (see World Bank, 2012) to Spain-Morocco, Colombia and Australia.

This report is the first attempt to compile, classify and assess those migrant support measures in terms of cost-effectiveness and the migration process outcomes. It presents the main findings of a

global analytical inventory of MISMES with a focus on countries of origin. Information is structured around four phases of migration: pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration and multi-dimensional. It makes a compilation, classification and assessment of 11 identified MISMES models. An Excel file complementing the report and the country studies with a number of examples on each of the MISMES models is available on the web⁴.

1.1 Definition of MISMES

In this report, migrant support measures from an employment and skills perspective (MISMES) are defined as specific policy interventions in pre, during and post migration phases. These are aimed at improving the labour market integration of migrant workers by facilitating labour mobility and job matching, as well as access to labour market information and the protection of migrant workers' rights. They are also aimed at reducing the underutilization of migrants' skills and improving skills matching more generally.

In concrete terms, employment-related measures include international job-matching and placement services and platforms; pre-departure information, orientation and training programmes; facilitating access to labour market information and protection in destination countries; return support and labour market reintegration programmes; and targeted entrepreneurship and business start-up support for returnees. Skills-related measures, on the other hand, include professional skills development for migration, during migration or upon return; assessment, certification, validation and recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications; and programmes for capitalizing on skills across borders. There are also some migrant-support interventions combining different types of measures such as migrant resource centres and migrant welfare funds.

To qualify as a MISMES in a country of origin, a policy intervention should mobilize specific budget resources to achieve labour market integration or skills utilization or enhancement objectives, usually over a specific period of time. They are implemented in the country of origin itself, regardless of who funds or implements it (i.e. national governments in countries of origin or governments in countries of destination, international organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and migrants associations).

This excludes general policy measures and regulations such as bilateral labour agreements (though they usually feature different MISMES), international conventions on the recognition of qualifications and social security agreements. Nevertheless, they are part of the national context in which MISMES are shaped and implemented, and important factors that influence the outcomes of MISMES. Therefore, they are taken into account in the assessment of specific country case studies. In addition, policy interventions that aim to mobilise the skills of migrant workers for the development of their origin countries are included in our analysis too, without being MISMES *strictu sensu* as defined above.

In our endeavour, we combined a rights-based approach (i.e., focus on measures to protect the rights of migrant workers) and an efficiency-based approach (i.e., measures to improve the matching of labour supply in countries of origin and labour demand in countries of destination, the optimal matching and use of skills and qualifications in destination countries be it through skills recognition or skills development measures).

After the compilation and classification of MISMES, the study also attempted to assess migrant support measures from an employment and skills perspective, based on an analysis of two basic dimensions:

⁴ See www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/MISMES

- **Internal efficiency**, i.e. cost-effectiveness in terms of the total cost of the measures and the number of direct beneficiaries. The main issue here is the availability of disaggregated budget data on different measures;
- **External efficiency**, or the impact of those measures on labour migration process outcomes in terms of migrant workers' employment and labour force participation, wages, skills utilization and skills enhancement (and the actual use of any acquired skills; the existence of monitoring and follow-up mechanisms and assessments, etc.).

1.2 Conceptual approach and limitations

It must be noted, here at the beginning, that there is lack of a systematic monitoring and follow-up mechanisms and impact assessments of migrant support measures implemented across the globe. For this reason, undertaking a scientific evaluation of the internal and external efficiency of MISMES has not been possible. To measure the impact of MISMES, the best methodological approach would be, of course, a comparison of labour market outcomes of migrant workers (or potential migrant workers) having benefitted from those measures against those who did not. Indeed, that is the approach employed whenever the information was available. However, Labour Force Surveys do not include this kind of data. Specific studies carried out to assess the impact of migrant support measures were, naturally, considered whenever available (or surveys where migrant worker were asked for their eventual participation in migrant support measures in the past). The possibility of using some kind of proxy to capture the impact of migrant support measures were, also, explored.

This notwithstanding, we attempted to make an aggregated comparison between labour market outcomes of migrant workers from countries with a high intensity of such measures and from other countries with a low intensity of migrant support measures. We did so on the basis of labour force survey data from the EU countries of destination. We controlled, to the extent that this was possible, for country of destination and differentiating features of the profiles of migrant workers. Having applied some limited quantitative techniques to labour force surveys (LFS) in the EU to indirectly make deductions on the impact of policy measures at the country-level, this proved unfeasible. It proved unfeasible due to the low number of observations on migrant workers in the LFS's of European countries and the lack of data on their participation in any kind of migrant support measure.

The number of migrants from specific countries of origin included in the LFS samples is often too low to allow for comparisons: be those comparisons across nationalities in the same country of destination or across countries of destination for migrants of the same nationality. For this, a systematic oversampling of migrant communities would be required in order to reach representative sample sizes. Despite these limitations, analysis of the labour market integration of migrant workers in comparison with native workers in the country of destination shows large variations across countries of origin and destination. Some interesting patterns emerged in a 'labour market integration gap index' continuum from 0 to 1 elaborated for 38 migration corridors to the EU in the framework of the Interact project and on the basis of three variables: activity rate, unemployment rate and over-qualification rate (Di Bartolomeo et al., 2015).

The extreme values of the labour market integration gap index were Moroccans in Belgium and Chinese migrants in the UK (highest gap in terms of labour market integration in relation to native workers); and Filipinos in Italy and Chinese migrants in Spain (highest integration). Regarding the countries of origin, migrant workers from India, the Philippines, Moldova, Ukraine and Ecuador were consistently better integrated into the labour markets of the different EU destination countries. Migrant workers from Turkey, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia were, in contrast, consistently less integrated (Di Bartolomeo et al. 2015).

On the basis of the country case studies carried out in the framework of the MISMEM project (in Georgia, Moldova, Armenia, Morocco and Tunisia), these results can be put in relation to the high intensity of MISMEM in Moldova and their very low intensity in Morocco and Tunisia. The high intensity and the long tradition of MISMEM identified in the Philippines would point in the same direction. Of course, there is no evidence whatsoever allowing us to establish a correlation between MISMEM intensity and labour market integration, but both variables might be related to a third determining variable: this variable might include the quality of institutions for instance, affecting both the quality of education and training and the quality of migration management policy.

For the assessment of return support measures, data from labour force surveys in countries of origin may be used, but in this case the isolation of the impact of migrant support services is still harder: harder because there is no way to control for the differences in the labour markets of the respective countries. Therefore, the current information levels and evaluation practices of MISMEM did not provide a necessary base to undertake any scientific evaluation of internal or external efficiency: the number of beneficiaries or users of different MISMEM is often unavailable (but seems to be very often low, in any case in relation to total labour migration flows in each country); budget resources are known at best only at project level, and not by activities; and tracing studies of labour market itineraries of beneficiary migrant workers are almost always absent.

Nevertheless, we have reviewed many project assessments of policy measures (rather than nationwide policies) that are typically done by the implementers themselves, or contracted consultants. They are conducted as part of the technical and administrative evaluation of the project (not with the objective of determining the impact of the project). So we found a prevailing project management rationale and we focused on project outputs and activities (deliverables) rather than on their outcomes or impact. It is not unusual to pursue mainly a self-justification purpose, without any endeavour to learn from errors and failures, but rather with the intention of justifying them. The impact evaluations of projects are often done non-systematically, typically shortly after the project implementation has ended, and do not allow to control for the selection and representation bias of project participants, nor of the factors that may have determined the labour market outcomes of beneficiaries.

For example, evaluations conducted during the project implementation or only within months of completion of the implementation (such as in six months as is often the case for business start-up measures) do not yield objective insights into the sustainability, and success and failure outcomes of the measure for its intended beneficiaries. Equally, surveys among beneficiaries have not been necessarily a good evaluation tool, in as much as any satisfaction may be biased by bundling (for instance, with migration opportunities as such or financial incentives to return). Typically, practitioners focus on direct assessments of their measures (manifest results, short-term expected outcomes, focus on direct beneficiaries). In all the evaluations we examined we never encountered a mention of unintended (positive or negative) consequences and side effects of the measure. This is another area where policy assessments need to focus, and beneficiaries, peer international and local organisations can be a rich source of information for gaining insight into the unintended consequences of the project, both short- and long-term. Finally, needs assessment evaluations before starting a MISMEM are common: albeit often repetitive, not generating new knowledge but mainly used to justify the need for MISMEM and increase the grant amount if donor-funded. However, post-MISMEM evaluations are rare and implemented reluctantly.

Academic peer-reviewed research, on the other hand, is not particularly focused on narrow policy interventions, but rather tends to examine the impact of larger, national-level policies, on migrant workers. This lack of academic research on the impact of concrete policy measures is largely due to lack of availability and to the low quality of relevant information. As mentioned above, project information available is generally scattered and often not recorded or disseminated for wider use

beyond the project stakeholders. Given these circumstances, it has not been possible to conduct systematic scientific analyses and causal deductions, identify key factors of success for specific MISMES or contextual factors affecting their relative efficiency. The factors of success and failure that we identified (from the assessment reports we reviewed) concerned the implementation of projects and policy measures rather than their impact on beneficiaries.

This notwithstanding, in the world of a large and expanding number of MISMES across the globe, the review has highlighted a high degree of transfer of practices from some countries to others, basically with the design and implementation of MISMES through the same international organisations. In many cases, the relevant projects include guides on best practices or pilot initiatives, but, in practice, lessons drawn from them seem limited. For all these reasons, our study had to rely on the review of the existing literature of policy and academic studies and project evaluation reports as its primary method of analysis. As a result, one of the key conclusions of this study has been the need for more evidence and more independent analysis to expand the body of knowledge on MISMES. Therefore, we have developed some proposals in the last chapter to try to make up for these shortcomings in the future.

Other aspects to take into account in future analyses of cost-efficiency of measures are included here for future researchers. There are many factors affecting labour migration outcomes including social context: factors such as the education system, the socio-linguistic environment, the social structure of the labour market and the level of economic development of the country. The strategies of different actors (firms, universities) and networks in pursuit of their aims also supersede migration policy interventions as determinants of labour migration outcomes. Moreover, the institutional arrangements or partners involved (such as migrant organisations, business sectors and educational institutions) may determine their degree of success. Therefore, the same measure can have a very different impact (even in an opposite direction) depending on context – the issue of transposability, i.e. the extent to which a particular measure can be re-applied in other contexts, such as in other migrant-sending countries or to migrant groups with different migrant profiles remains. Moreover, the existence of substitutes for at least some measures (such as diaspora networks in destination) may be a more efficient way of producing the same results.

Ideally, the indicators for carrying out any such assessment would be the same for all types of measures, but it might be necessary to differentiate them to a certain extent across skill levels: unskilled versus mid-level skills versus highly-skilled migrant workers. It might also make sense to differentiate by country of origin and destination (to control for other factors). Also, one should not ignore the potential side effects these measures may have. They may change expectations, for instance, or they may shift migration dynamics from circular to undocumented or to permanent migrant workers, not to mention shifts in terms of gender roles or other social features, both for migrants and for their families.

1.3 Study methodology

The study started with a review of academic literature and policy studies to identify the main MISMES types, dynamics and causal variables with the implementation impact of relevant policy measures on labour migration outcomes. Existing research on labour migration outcomes typically focused on the integration of immigrants in destination countries and the labour market outcomes for native populations. This study aimed to close this gap with its focus on the countries of origin. Indeed, research on policy measures implemented in or by origin countries has been largely neglected by the academic community, in part due to the low quality or limited data available on such interventions and policy measures. This study might be a good starting point for the wider dissemination of existing policy measures; the challenges in data quality and accessibility; implementation of the policy measures; and their follow-up assessment.

The study also addresses the calls of international organisations for more efficient use of migrants' labour and skills through a number of measures (OECD and EU, 2014; and 2015) and the calls of policy practitioners for more research and understanding into costs and benefits of various migrant support interventions and measures (Sumption, 2013). Our findings can help address the concern expressed in the European flagship initiative 'Agenda for new skills and jobs' (European Commission, 2010) and the Europe 2020 Strategy. Namely, 'while it is crucial for EU development to have optimum job and skills matching within the EU, limited information exists on the skills of third-country nationals in the EU, and the geographic mobility and migration benefits for the EU are not employed as well as they could be'.

Following a comprehensive literature review of policy measures on labour migration outcomes and a compilation of existing information a wide a range of tactics were used to collect information on hundreds of actual projects and interventions implemented for migrants. These included academic literature, policy studies, project leaflets, internet sources, more than 150 questionnaires sent out to practitioners, reports of awarded projects by various donors, more than 60 project evaluations, network of migration experts, etc. As a result, we made this inventory of globally implemented policy measures, 2000-14, with a basic classification of measures.

This inventory was then used to develop a typology of MISMES models identified in practice. This typology was structured around the four phases of migration (pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration and multi-dimensional) and classified around 11 main MISMES models. For each of those models, we created a fiche including its approach, intervening actors, beneficiaries, main modalities, as well as some general observations. There were also their results and some elements to assess cost-effectiveness, factors of success and failure shaping the implementation and the labour outcomes of migrant workers. The total list of compiled policy measures (so-called inventory) contained more than 300 MISMES from around the world and the EU Neighbourhood countries (see Excel file with more detailed information on the most relevant ones on the web).

It is important to note that this list is neither comprehensive, nor unbiased since projects and policy measures that were successful, had larger budgets for dissemination, or were larger-scale projects. These were more likely to receive publicity, and hence, had a higher chance of being mentioned in the data platforms and sources that we relied upon. Less successful or failed policy measures, as well as smaller-scale measures naturally had less chance of being disseminated in the data sources we addressed. Projects from smaller and economically disadvantaged countries were less likely to be included in our inventory of studies. Whenever possible, we compiled and reviewed project assessments of these measures (more than 70 such evaluations were reviewed).

To gain additional insights into implementation dynamics and the trends of various policy measures, many face-to-face interviews were conducted with major international organisations that coordinate, fund, or implement such policy measures globally (such as the IOM or ILO). We also disseminated a thorough questionnaire on MISMES to more than 100 policy projects and migrant experts with an effort to expand the pool of inventory of policy measures globally (see ETF, 2015 for the methodology and MISMES questionnaire). However, due to the complexity of the information required for completing the questionnaire, the rate of responses to the questionnaire has been very low (see the list of 24 people/institutions who completed the questionnaires in the Annex).

Following this introduction, Chapter 2 presents the results of a comprehensive review of literature, which focused on the observations and evaluations of migrant support measures implemented worldwide. These findings from the literature are grouped around five headlines: international job matching and placement services; pre-departure information, orientation and/or training; recognition of qualifications and skills; cross-border skill transfer programmes; and labour market reintegration of returnees. This information served us in our assessment of the 11 MISMES models presented in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3 presents the worldwide analytical inventory of 11 identified MISMES models. These have been structured around four phases of migration: pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration and multi-dimensional. Each MISMES model is explained in terms of basic features, strengths, challenges and risks, as well as some elements for assessment. A list of examples is given to support each model, with some boxes of additional information on some specific examples.

Finally, Chapter 4 summarises the findings from the literature review as well as from our inventory of 11 MISMES models and examples. It also offers a comparative analysis of overall results, though with the limitations already mentioned in the previous section, including lack of a systematic monitoring and follow-up mechanisms and impact assessments. Although measuring the internal and external efficiency of MISMES through specific indicators has proven largely unfeasible with existing information, we managed to develop some general observations and results on MISMES actors, beneficiaries, main implementation modalities, success and failure factors shaping the implementation and the labour outcomes of migrant workers. Then some broader policy conclusions on MISMES as a policy tool are drawn and some recommendations for the future design and implementation of MISMES are developed, including proposals to make up for information shortcomings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW OF MISMES AND THEIR IMPACT

This literature review is the result of an extensive search of academic peer-reviewed research (more than 200 peer-reviewed articles from economic, sociology, migration and other area journals) and policy studies (assessments, reports, relevant documents). All were published from 2000 to 2014 (i.e. in the last 15 years). Since 2000, increased attention on the migration-development nexus has been noticed, and confirmed by De Haas (2012, p. 15). While publications of the early 2000s only mention the *possible* benefits of diaspora engagement, the circularity of migration and of the lifecycle approach to return migration, by the late 2000s, these issues had become the main pillars of the migration-development debate.

Research on labour migration outcomes is typically centred on labour market integration practices for migrants from the perspective of destination countries (Hawthorne, 2005 and Siew-Ean et al., 2007 for Australia; Amir, 2002 for Israel; Preibisch, 2010 for Canada; Kim, 2008 for Korea; Sumption, 2013; IOM, 2013a; ILO, 2013; Abella, 1997; Shachar, 2006). Fewer studies consider the role of origin country policies on migrants' employment and skill matching in host states.

Research also usually examines the impact of migration on labour market outcomes of the native population in the destination country. This might be, for example, the impact of Mexican low-skilled migration on the employment of native youth in the USA (Smith, 2012); or the impact of post-Soviet migration on the employability and wages in Germany of the local populations (Glitz, 2012); or the impact of domestic temporary workers on the labour force participation of native women in Hong Kong (Cortes and Pan, 2013). Studies also tend to focus on national policies at large (Hawthorne, 2005; Siew-Ean et al., 2007; Boyd, 2013; Fernandez, 2013) rather than on specific policy interventions. Even when the country under study is a large migrant-sending country (such as Turkey or Romania), the analytical focus is still on migrant receiving aspects and the policy support measures of the receiving state (IOM, 2012a).

In general, there is overwhelming evidence that: lack of knowledge of the language and differences in education systems and skills, are some of the main factors that affect the labour market integration of migrant workers in the host state. These, then, determine their earnings and the employability of migrants at large (Basilio and Bauer, 2010; Hawthorne, 2005; Harrison, 2013; NYU Wagner, 2013). False perceptions about the job and the lack of proper skills not only delay the employability of migrants in the host state (for example, until language proficiency is achieved), they also increase their vulnerability to irregular migration. Below is a brief review of literature based on the key MISMES models identified in the field.

2.1 International job matching and placement services

These are the most necessary support measures, at least according to the migrants themselves (ETF, 2013). The ETF survey reveals that in Armenia, Georgia and Morocco as many as 70% of potential migrants and return migrants need support in finding jobs abroad (2013, p. 58). The proper recruitment of migrants also minimises the job mismatch and increases the protection of migrant rights abroad. Migrant recruitment measures vary largely for migrants already abroad versus potential migrants, depending on the skill level of the migrants – low, medium or high – or the type of occupation and the industry sector.

Recruitment agencies are an important source of job placement for first-time migrants if these migrants do not have social networks or do not know a foreign language well enough to find jobs themselves (interview with labour provider cited in Findlay and McCollum 2013). Employers tend to

rely on professional and occupational associations, private recruitment agencies, foreign consulates and job fairs to advertise their migrant labour needs (IOM, 2013a). For regulated professions and for seasonal labour, employers in host states tend to rely on recruitment agencies (in both sending and receiving countries). It is ideal if these agencies are *accredited* and also undertake qualification standardisation (IOM, 2013a).

Governments are typically regulators of recruitment services, rather than providers: though public employment services are increasingly investing in the field of labour migration, at least in the EU Neighbourhood and in Latin America. In migrant sending countries, many governments are interested in emigration in order to ease domestic unemployment and to ensure circularity of skills. Attempts to protect the rights of migrants abroad by putting too much regulation on recruitment services recruitment (both in sending and receiving countries) may have an adverse impact on the volumes of migration and its circularity (Martin and Abella, 2009). Thus, one of the challenges is finding the balance in recruitment regulation.

Many migrant-sending countries, such as the Philippines, Jordan, Nicaragua and Sri Lanka, have incorporated model employment contracts that recruitment agencies use for sending migrants abroad. This is sometimes required by the government (e.g. Jordan) to ensure the protection of migrant workers' rights (Wickramasekara, 2011). Other countries, with the help of international organisations, establish migrant support centres or Migrant Resources Centres that provide information about jobs and employers, such as the IOM's Migrant Assistance Centres administered in Albania for potential migrants to Italy (Martin et al., 2002a). These have become a standard tool to support both departing and returning migrants (see Chapter 3 below).

Yet, perhaps one of the main issues with recruitment agencies are the high service fees. These discourage migrants (especially low-skilled migrants who have lower salaries, see Martin and Abella, 2009; Martin et al., 2004) and for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that have lower profits. Most recruitment services are provided by private agencies that try to maximise their profit. Thus, recruitment agencies often defy ILO conventions and require migrants (rather than only employers) to pay for recruitment service fees: these can range as high as 25% of the anticipated earnings of the migrant for two years abroad (Martin and Abella, 2009, p. 435). It is for this reason that many policy makers insist on promoting non-for-profit recruitment and job matching: relying on civil society and migrant support organisations in both sending and receiving states (IOM, 2013a).

There are, then, private agencies driven by profits and determined to satisfy their employer-clients by finding the 'job-ready' migrant workers or a steady supply of temporary migrant labour. However, in some countries, recruitment agencies operate with a status of a social enterprise entity (see Forde and MacKenzie, 2010 for the UK). As Forde and MacKenzie (2010) show, in such recruitment agencies the priority is not only on providing the job placement of migrants, but also on providing migrants with the 'necessary package' (skills, accreditation licenses, awareness about worker rights, etc.) for future job opportunities and labour mobility in the host state. Such recruitment agencies combine job placement with skills development and accreditation – e.g. the Construction Skills Certification Schemes in the UK (see Forde and MacKenzie, 2010).

While the role of recruitment agencies is crucial for labour sorting and optimum labour matching (Benson-Rea and Rowlinson, 2003), the private sector in the host states often prefers government-to-government labour-matching systems, such as the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Programme of Canada (SAWP). They do so partly because these systems rely on accredited and approved recruitment agencies in the sending state. They do not normally lead to a mismatch of expectations of migrant workers in terms of job pay promised, or excessive fees for job placement, etc. (Preibisch, 2010).

The IOM (2013a) study in Canada, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden, the UK and the USA found some interesting job recruitment dynamics from both employer and prospective migrant perspectives. In immigration countries, job recruitment venues target prospective migrants abroad (rather than those who have already arrived in the country): they use elaborate online job advertisement platforms (IOM 2013a). However, these platforms are typically in English and in the national language of the receiving country, hence, they are useful only for highly-skilled prospective migrants who are more likely to possess these foreign languages and the necessary computer skills. Successful websites, such as *workinginsweden.com* by the Swedish Institute, advertise jobs in multiple languages (e.g. Russian, Arabic and Chinese): they provide information on the labour law and the country specifics of destination to attract potential migrant workers from abroad.

There are several interesting trends in the job search dynamics of migrants. Due to their language proficiency and level of skills, highly skilled migrants self-select in their access to such websites. Low-skilled and medium-skilled migrants, on the other hand, opt for recruitment agencies, or network ties to access foreign labour markets (IOM 2013a). SMEs are typically in more need of migrant workers to fill their labour shortage than the bigger corporations. This is primarily because SMEs are not aware of foreign recruitment procedures or because they do not have the same resources to advertise and fill their needs in foreign labour (IOM 2013a, IOM 2013b). This benefits migrant workers who are more successful in finding jobs in smaller settlements (where, despite high unemployment, SMEs typically need migrant labour) than in big urban settlements. In larger urban settlements even though there are more jobs, job competition is also much higher (cited in Frank 2013 for Canada, IOM 2013b for EU Member States).

The role of recruitment agencies also varies depending on migration trends and dynamics. Research by Findlay and McCollum (2013) on migrant worker recruitment in the UK agriculture sector reveals that employers typically rely on recruitment agencies when they do not have direct contacts with migrant labour. If dissatisfied with recruited labour (typically due to migrant profile mismatch), employers resort to direct recruitment. However, as migrant social networks in the host-state expand, and the migrant labour force becomes abundant, employers are less likely to recruit from origin countries or rely on recruitment agencies (Findlay and McCollum 2013). Instead, employers rely increasingly on migrant networks for direct recruitment locally in the host state (Findlay and McCollum 2013).

This is an important finding which indicates that depending on the industry sector and migration contextual factors (in the host state), the responsibility to recruit 'good migrant workers' may shift from the recruitment agency to migrants themselves (Findlay and McCollum, 2013). As migrant networks gain social control over the recruitment process, they may also be inclined to neglect violations of migrants' rights by employers: they would do so not to damage the employment chances of other migrants. Thus, the role of origin states in increasing migrants' awareness about rights increases in the pre-departure phase.

Governments employ a combination of mechanisms in both origin and migrant-receiving countries to protect the rights of migrants. For example the Philippines, a major migrant-sending countries, has three main mechanisms to protect Filipino migrants' rights abroad: licensed recruitment agencies in the Philippines; labour attaché services in the consular services abroad; and Overseas Workers Welfare Administration services in settlements abroad with large concentrations of Filipinos (the latter help in emergency repatriation costs and other welfare services for Filipino migrants and their families, see Martin et al., 2004). The payment for these services comes from fees that migrants pay upon departure to the Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) that regulates the recruitment and pre-departure orientation of potential migrants (Martin et al., 2004).

2.2 Pre-departure information, orientation and/or training

One of the most commonly applied policy measures is pre-departure information, orientation and/or training: something that helps clarify the expectations of migrants about the job (characteristics and pay) and the country of destination. For example, many legal migrants who arrived in Australia or New Zealand had false perceptions that jobs were waiting for them, and that their profession (such as engineering) did not require knowledge of English (Hawthorne, 2005; Benson-Rea and Rowlinson, 2003). The poor overseas job orientation and the lack of language led to the temporary unemployment of legal migrants until sufficient English language training (which can last up to 2.5 years in Australia) was received for job eligibility (Hawthorne, 2005, p. 676). Proper language screening reduced the unemployment of legal migrants by half in Australia (Hawthorne, 2005), thus partially increasing the cost-efficiency of migration.

Pre-departure programmes often operate within bilateral agreements (between governments of migrant sending and receiving countries). These include partnerships with organisations that receive or work with migrants, and that are often funded by receiving countries (IOM, 2013a). Unfortunately, the surveys also show that often, only a tiny fraction of potential migrants are aware of various pre-departure support programmes. This dips as low as 6% in Armenia, 8% in Georgia and 11% in Morocco (ETF, 2013, p. 56; World Bank-ETF, 2010).

Governments and other actors (local and international organisations) have typically built their pre-departure orientation programmes around 'information exchange' objectives. The assumption here is that the information given about the host society and any jobs would help migrants navigate their way through the host labour market. In their turn, host employers can also learn about the foreign education and qualification systems from similar programmes (Sumption 2013).

However, a larger challenge has been that of meeting migrants' needs and ensuring that pre-departure training or skills development schemes efficiently enhance migrants' skills. This means, in part, that they deal with the relevant language skills for the job level, but also the necessary *occupational/professional vocabulary* (Sumption 2013). Policy research also notes that while pre-departure orientations and language classes may help protect migrants' rights abroad, these trainings also increase the pre-departure costs and debts of migrants and may make them more vulnerable abroad as migrants try to repay their debts (Martin and Abella 2009).

Training programmes for migrants can range from profession-specific training modules, such as aptitude tests that both screen and increase the occupation-specific skills of the person, to general skills development trainings, such as computer literacy courses, applicable to a wider range of professions. A study conducted in Germany revealed that aptitude tests, followed by skills provisions tests were best for both immigrants (foreign nationals and naturalized citizens) and natives in helping them move from the social welfare to finding employment (Thomsen et al., 2013). Instead, job search training and combined training programmes were ineffective. The authors suggest that aptitude tests provide profession-specific skills, and therefore also improve labour matching in the labour market. However, job-search trainings were less effective because these are typically preparatory trainings and '[do] not provide a direct path to employment' (Thomsen et al., 2013, p. 14).

Training courses also help migrants negotiate the impact of structural barriers in the host state. For example, among post-Soviet migrants who arrived in Israel in the early 1990s, high levels of human capital increased the likelihood of employment of male post-Soviet migrants in Israel: but this was not true for women migrants (Stier and Levanon, 2003, p. 95). However, participation in job-learning and skills enhancement courses in the host state improved the skill-level job matching among female (but not male) migrants; for men the training in the language of the host state (Hebrew) led to improved labour market outcomes (Stier and Levanon, 2003).

2.3 Recognition of qualifications and skills

Policy measures on recognition of qualifications and skills are important for potential migrants, who are educated in origin countries and intend to put in use their skills abroad. But they are also important for return migrants, who received their education abroad and who have returned home to utilize their qualifications and skills (IOM, 2012a; Sintov and Cojocar, 2013). These measures aim to highlight the relevance and value of foreign education, training and the experience of migrants to employers (Sumption, 2013).

For potential migrants such policy measures make migrants' skills 'visible' in the host labour market: hence the increased emphasis on the pre-departure certification of qualifications and language skills (see NYU Wagner, 2013). The lack of recognised qualifications among migrants leads to the underutilization of migrants' skills and to brain waste (Zietsma, 2010 for immigrants in Canada; World Bank and ETF, 2010 for migrants from Moldova and Ukraine; ETF, 2013 for migrants from Georgia and Armenia). Migrants from small countries are especially at a disadvantage since foreign employers usually have little knowledge about the education and qualification systems of these countries (Sumption, 2013; Zietsma, 2010).

Skill recognition measures shape labour market upward mobility and the integration outcomes of migrants, and thus, are especially important in the early stages of migrant's arrival in the host state. For example, those migrants in Israel that started their employment at lower skill level and in coming years moved to adequate skill-level jobs, had significantly lower salaries than those migrants whose first job in Israel was already at the adequate skill-level (Stier and Levanon, 2003, p. 98). Thus, employment at equivalent skill-level *upon arrival* (rather than in later years) is crucial for maximising the labour market integration of migrants in the host state.

Sumption (2013) argues that, while it is relatively easy to assess the transferability of degrees, it is harder to assess the content and quality of education, i.e. what has been learned. Moreover, skill certification measures vary depending on whether the profession/occupation is regulated (i.e. whether a licence is required to practice it, such as in medicine, law or in architecture) or whether it is unregulated. Bilateral or multilateral mutual agreements are one of the mechanisms for regulating the recognition of qualifications among countries with similar education and training standards. They provide the automatic recognition, or temporary or partial practice licenses to migrant-workers, depending on the structure of the profession and the source of knowledge gap in the education process (Sumption et al., 2013).

When the automatic recognition of skills is not applied, one possible option for skills-testing is aptitude tests, such as exams based on mock situations for the verification of knowledge, or the issuing of a provisional or conditional licence (Sumption, 2013). Here a migrant works on the job to demonstrate his/her skill-level, or to practise in a limited authorised format. As in pre-departure training, success depends not only on how accurately the certification tests assess and determine the compatibility of a migrant's qualifications: a factor of both the individual skills of the migrant and the difference in education systems between sending and receiving states (ETF 2014). It also depends on how the measure aims to enhance migrant skills and how it addresses the qualifications gap, if one emerges during certification (Sumption 2013).

Qualification and skills certification is only one-step in the process of improving the use/application of migrant workers' skills. While skill matching is important, it does not ensure that migrants get jobs adequate to their skills. Employers need also to be aware of the migrants' skills, and they must also recognise the timely value of these skills (NYU Wagner, 2013, p. 55). For example, academic research from Germany reveals that the human capital (education and labour market experience) accumulated outside the migrant-receiving country yields lower returns on wages than the human capital that migrants accumulate in the host country (e.g. Basilio and Bauer, 2010 for Germany).

Importantly, prior labour market experience yields *zero* returns. This means that while the transferability of education is an important starting point for efficiency in migrant support measures, the actual training or skills obtained in the host country are better valued by employers. Hence, these are more significant factors in shaping the wage and job placement of migrants (Basilio and Bauer, 2010 for Germany; Li and Campbell, 2009 for New Zealand). This, in turn, highlights the possible importance of short-term work exchange programmes between sending and receiving states, programmes that can be paired with various measures to increase the marketability of migrant workers abroad (for a discussion see ETF, 2014).

Policy research on employment and migrant skills has also centred on the perspective of migrant-receiving countries (GIZ, 2013; NYU Wagner, 2013; IOM, 2013d; ETF, 2011a; Stier and Levanon, 2003). However, a major challenge has been the lack of data on skilled worker mobility, especially for sending countries that do not retain data on emigration or the return and circular migration of their skilled labour (Wickramasekara, 2009; Lowell and Findlay, 2002).

Studies on developing countries point towards problems of inadequate labour force matching even in their domestic labour market (ETF, 2011b; and 2012) and the lack of 'skills visibility' abroad (World Bank-ETF, 2010; ETF, 2013). This is true not only for emigrating migrant workers, but also for return migrants (GIZ, 2013). Many migrants acquire skills on the job when they are abroad, but often they do not have certificates to prove it (ETF, 2013). Skills learned on the job (i.e. mid-level skills) are the hardest to bring out; nevertheless the medium-skilled migrants constitute the majority of flows (ETF, 2014). Origin countries often do not have policy measures in place to recognise and certify skills learned by migrants abroad (see ETF, 2013 for studies of Armenia, Georgia and Morocco).

Often, a perception exists in home states that return migrant workers are those who did not succeed in the host society due to their inadequate skill level: they are hence useless for the home state (GIZ, 2013; Czerniejewska and Goździak, 2013). This indicates the lack of awareness about how developing countries can capitalize on the human capital of return migrants. As few as 1% of return migrants in Armenia, 2% in Georgia and 7% in Morocco were aware of various return reintegration support policy measures (survey results from 2011-12 cited in ETF, 2013, p. 56).

2.4 Cross-border skills transfer programmes

Programmes on diaspora engagements have become one of the pillars on which international organisations and think-tanks now advocate development-centred policy making (see Kuznetsov, 2006; Global Migration Group, 2010; World Bank, 2011; Agunias and Newland, 2012), and emphasize the 3Ts – transfer of people, transfer of knowledge, transfer of finances (Global Migration Group, 2010); the 3Es – engage, enable, empower (IOM, 2013c); the 3Cs – capacity, coherence, cooperation (ICMPD and ECDPM, 2013); and the 3Rs – recruitment, remittances and return (Papademetriou, 1991). All of these stand as possible mechanisms for diaspora engagement and diaspora contributions.

This is one area where there is an abundant literature with a focus on migrant-sending countries. Research also emphasizes the role of organised migrant networks *vis-à-vis* unorganised migrant networks (Meyer, 2001; Pellegrino, 2001). Networks are an important force that increases the diaspora engagement through foreign direct investment in homeland development (see Baghdadi and Cheptea, 2010 for French migrant associations on foreign direct investment in France).

Successful policy measures on diaspora and migrant integration typically include inter-sectoral partnerships between the government and the private sector, civil society and migrant organisations abroad and in the home country. These programmes cover a spectrum of possibilities. There are, for example, policy measures to strengthen the skills of migrants abroad, such as the Tulay or Bridge Education programme, implemented by the Philippine government and Microsoft: these aims to teach

Filipino migrants and their families abroad computer and internet-browsing skills to increase their labour market competitiveness (IOM, 2013c). There are 'talent return' programmes where diaspora skills are invested in homeland development, such as the IOM programme 'Return of Qualified Afghans' implemented by the Ministry of Education of Afghanistan and the Danish Embassy. This scheme was designed to create an online database of highly-qualified Afghans abroad from which local government can recruit potential candidates for jobs in strategically important sectors of the Afghani economy. Such jobs are impossible to fill locally.

There are also 'brain circulation' programmes where diaspora migrants in certain professions train new migrant workers and transfer their knowledge to homeland business, e.g. the project on 'migrants' skill transfer in aquaculture and fisheries', implemented by civil society and expert networks in Egypt and Greece (Global Migration Group, 2010); or the UN's TOKTEN (Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals); or the professional networks of scientists, experts or academicians where expatriates make short-term business visits to the homeland to collaborate with local entities on joint expertise projects. This includes the Arab Expatriate Scientists Network that aims to help the Qatar government design the roadmap of Qatar National Research Strategy (www.aesnetwork.org/).

While such projects are widespread and are frequently borrowed and modelled worldwide, their success is disputed. For example, to adapt TOKTEN to an Indian context, the Indian government established the INRIST-Interface of Non-Resident Indian Scientists and Technologists. Yet neither TOKTEN nor INRIST has been acclaimed as successful in India (Khandria, 2009 cited in Wickramasekara, 2011).

One of the main shortcomings of these policy interventions is their high cost as compared to the number of diaspora representatives engaged. For example, phase 3 of the IOM project Return and Reintegration of Qualified African Nationals, that started in 1995 and that lasted for five years in 11 African countries, aimed to 'return and place 631 qualified African nationals in the priority public and economic sectors in the development process of the participating countries'. It had a total budget of over ECU⁵ 13.3 million (MOFA, 2013). Thus, the average cost per returned and placed African highly skilled migrant was ECU 20,811.

Perhaps due to its high cost, the sustainability of such projects is hard to achieve and more often than not such initiatives are funded by grants and implemented by international agencies, rather than by the national governments of origin countries. For example, despite widespread diffusion of IOM's 'talent return' programmes (implemented in more than ten African countries), national governments rarely took up these projects as their own (IOM 2000 cited in Wickramasekara, 2003). Additionally, many such programmes assumed the permanent return of highly skilled migrants, but due to unrealistic objectives were then revised into 'brain circulation' models.

Finally, professional networks that aim to bring skills across borders for local development are often formed not just for expatriates, but also for regional scientists with specific profiles of expertise, relying on the voluntary commitment of their members to coordinate the network. For countries with fragile scientific infrastructures, this voluntary commitment leads to lower productivity as compared to full-time paid staff (SciDev.Net 2005). Fragile democratic and fragile domestic stability is another factor that affects the sustainability of these structures: local instability distracts scientists from participating in such professional platforms (that are often online and virtual); and leads to in-action and the eventual decline of such professional networks (SciDev.Net, 2005). Examples here might include the Arab Network of Women in Science and Technology (ANWST) and the Arab Women Network for Research and Development (SciDev.Net, 2005).

⁵ ECU refers to the European currency unit, the predecessor of the euro.

2.5 Labour market reintegration of return migrants

Policy measures on the reintegration of return migrants and labour market policies can be classified as those that support voluntary return, and those that aim to manage temporary migration flows (OECD, 2008). Many countries have policies and specific measures to encourage the return of their nationals. For example, the Countries of the Caribbean – Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Guyana, Jamaica, St Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, but not Belize – offer special tax incentives on cars and household items. These incentives come into play if people who have lived abroad for a fixed period of time (3-10 years, depending on the country) return home for permanent residence, i.e. implementing an Assisted Voluntary Return policy (Bristol, 2010).

Already in the 1970s Turkey, Taiwan, and South Korea were among the first countries to implement programmes to facilitate the return of their expatriates with little knowledge of the results (Wickramasekara, 2003; for Turkey see Martin, 2006). Academic research insists that there is no empirical evidence demonstrating the positive impact of various return facilitation policies and measures, and policy-makers implement these measures from the mere recognition of diaspora potential in homeland development (Bristol, 2010, p. 142). Policy makers insist that the success of these measures depends on many factors, including whether the return is assisted (for irregular migrants) or whether it is fully voluntary (Wickramasekara, 2003; OECD, 2008). There is also the question of what has led to the return: a failure in the host state, innovation, retirement, etc. (Cerase, 1974).

For developed and wealthier countries, return migration is the most typical form of migration among the younger educated and retiring unskilled population (OECD, 2008 for OECD countries). Very limited data exist for developing or migrant-sending countries. For example, limitations of data on additional human capital gained during migration restricts research on factors shaping the employment outcomes of return migrants (Mischkin, 1993), or on the motivations of return in particular (ILO, 2010; Connell, 2013), though there have been some dedicated research projects, such as MIREM⁶ for EU Neighbourhood countries. Migrant-sending countries, also, have limited, if any, data on the number of repeat migrants: those persons whose failed attempts to adapt after return pushed them into migration again (Czerniejewska and Goździak, 2013). Almost no or only very limited data exists on return migration in general, and on reintegration in particular.

Many return policies do not discriminate by the skill or age level of return migrants. However, there are differences in the contribution of return migrants, depending on the age of the returnee. When people return at the age of retirement, their contribution to the home economy may be in the form of investments alone. After all, these persons are no longer part of an active workforce and hence, will neither utilize their skills, nor the networks that they had acquired abroad (see Bristol, 2010 for CARICOM). Thus, the expectation of sending countries that return migrants will readily employ their human capital at home and be 'highly productive' is exaggerated. Return migrants often have a 'work abroad, leisure at home' attitude (Martin and Straubhaar, 2002, p. 11). In Turkey, for example, most returned migrants were exhausted from work in other countries and upon return carried out only limited economic activity, e.g. retail shops or taxis (Martin and Straubhaar, 2002).

Research also addresses the importance of the structural context in which return migrants have to utilize their human capital. A study of Chinese 'sea turtles' (i.e. return migrants) reveals some important points here. In societies where network ties are important for entrepreneurship, such as in China, return migrants, who have spent their most productive years abroad and have, hence, failed to accumulate network ties in their homeland (such as in the government) can fail. They are certainly less

⁶ <http://rsc.eui.eu/RDP/research-projects/mirem/> and Cross-regional Information System on the Reintegration of Migrants (CRIS), <http://rsc.eui.eu/RDP/research-projects/cris/>

productive in winning and succeeding in venture capital business projects and proposals than non-migrants (Sun, 2013).

Some limited evidence shows that return migrants are more likely to be unemployed than the general population (see for Poland Grabowska-Lusinska, 2012 cited in White, 2013): but this is disputed by recent evidence in Morocco (ETF, 2013). According to Muschkin (1993 for Puerto Rican return male migrants from the USA), the duration of stay in the host state and the recentness of return have a much less important impact on employment outcomes of migrants than the fact of being a return migrant itself. The human capital characteristics of these return migrants (such as English language skills, education, vocation training) did not increase or reduce the chances of employment *vis-à-vis* non-migrants, which may indicate that the structural context in which return migrants seek employment reduces the potential benefits of human capital, which had accumulated during migration (Muschkin, 1993, p. 99).

As part of return support, entrepreneurship and business start-up grants are a quite popular strategy employed by many countries to encourage the investment of migrants' financial capital in homeland development projects: these may be diasporas or return migrants. For example, France and Mali, together with the United Nations, have implemented a project to foster the return and business entrepreneurship of Malians living illegally in France (Martin et al., 2002b). A joint IOM-UNDP project in Tajikistan, meanwhile, encourages families of migrants that receive remittances to apply for micro-loans for businesses by using their remittances as collateral for the micro-loan (Global Migration Group, 2010).

However, the sustainability and durability of such measures is the biggest challenge. For example, business start-ups in the France-Mali project (mentioned above) were still operational two years after the project. However, return migrants faced hardships in receiving loans from banks to expand their businesses as they lacked guarantees of 'local records' for loan repayment (Martin et al., 2002b). Family reunification is another factor that reduces migrants' commitment to homeland.

Both India and Sri Lanka have various investment stimulating programmes for their non-resident citizens abroad. These countries offer foreign currency accounts or premium foreign currency exchange rates and flexible financial schemes if their migrants abroad open bank accounts in the homeland (and hence stimulate the local economy) rather than in the destination country (Wickramasekara, 2003). Highly skilled migrants are typically more likely to use such Non-Resident Foreign Currency Schemes than low or un-skilled migrants. And because highly-skilled migrants eventually take their families with them abroad, then the extent of remittances and bank investments in the country of origin decrease over time (Wickramasekara, 2003).

Additionally, successful measures include multi-sectorial partnerships that can bring together various interest groups for a common goal. The EU on Maximising the Development Impact of Migration (European Commission, 2013a, p. 8) identifies migration and mobility as 'enabling factors for development', and emphasizes the need to incorporate multiple stakeholders, both across sending and receiving countries, as well as at various levels of development. When such multi-sectorial partnerships do not exist or malfunction, it is the migrants who suffer first. Marchetti (2012), in the study of Filipino domestic workers in Italy, demonstrates that trade unionists of migrant origin, who are employed in host states' labour organisations, can be key players in helping with the recognition of migrant rights in Italy. However, she also shows that they are not able to do so since their role is neither fully acknowledged nor utilized by either the home or the host state labour organisations (due to antagonism between various organisations). There are, thus, very real concerns that migrant rights are not adequately addressed.

More generally, the cost-efficiency of migration support measures is another concern. Some challenges have already been identified above and relate to the efficiency of various policy measures.

However, on a larger scale policy makers wonder about the cost-effectiveness of policy interventions based on the low number of persons benefiting from such measures, the high costs of implementation and the low sustainability of such measures (OECD, 2008). This is exacerbated by a sporadic and unsystematic approach to evaluating such policy measures: when, for example, in a multi-phase project, an evaluation is conducted only during the third phase (see the Return of Qualified Africans Nationals (RQAN) programme cited in Wickramasekara (2003)).

3. INVENTORY OF MAIN MISMES MODELS IN COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

In order to facilitate analysis and to be able to draw relevant policy conclusions, in this chapter we offer a worldwide analytical inventory of 11 MISMES models. These are focused on countries of origin and are structured around the four phases of the migration cycle:

- pre-migration phase (i.e. migrant support measures implemented before migration, targeting potential or would-be migrants);
- during-migration phase (i.e. migrant support measures implemented during migration, diaspora mobilisation targeting current migrants or their skills);
- post-migration phase (i.e. migrant support measures implemented after migration, for the reintegration of returnees);
- multi-dimensional MISMES (i.e. migrant support measures involving different types of measures and interventions at different migration stages that cannot be classified under one).

In a second stage, the 11 stylised MISMES models are grouped with similar objectives or implementation modalities. These are explained in detail in terms of basic features, strengths, challenges and risks, as well as some elements for assessment. A list of examples is given for each model (see Excel file with more detailed information at: www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/MISMES). Some specific examples are provided with more information in boxes.

Pre-migration phase

- International job matching and placement services
- Pre-departure information, orientation and training
- Professional skills development for migration
- Facilitating access to labour market information and protection

During-migration phase

- Programmes for capitalizing skills across borders

Post-migration phase

- Validation and recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications
- Pre-return and return employment information platforms and call centres
- Targeted entrepreneurship and income-generating schemes for returnees
- Assisted voluntary return and reintegration (AVRR) programmes

Multi-dimensional MISMES

- Migration resource centres
- Migrant welfare funds.

3.1 Pre-migration MISMES

3.1.1 International job matching and placement services and platforms (MISMES model 1)

Countries of origin with a national policy aiming to maximize or facilitate labour migration have developed different strategies to manage the pre-selection, international matching and placement of national migrant workers going abroad. Two common strategies have consisted in creating specialised public international placement agencies or developing dedicated databases or labour market information systems to manage this process: this is often done in the framework of public employment services. Regulation of international private employment agencies is another typical policy to protect labour migrants.

Specialised international placement agencies

Several countries of origin have established public agencies devoted to identifying international placement opportunities for their citizens and to managing labour migration. The most often-cited example is the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) that deals with migrants of all skills types and covers the whole migration cycle. The example of the Tunisian Technical Cooperation Agency (ATCT) given in **BOX 3.1** deals, instead, only with high-skilled migrants in the pre-migration phase.

BOX 3.1 TUNISIAN TECHNICAL COOPERATION AGENCY (ATCT)

The ATCT is a state agency specialised in the international placement of Tunisian graduated with work experience: these workers are largely public officers who receive a leave of absence for a maximum of five years, though around 10% of the placed workers come from the private sector. In its 25 years of activity, the ATCT has placed more than 40,000 'coopérants' (qualified workers), 80% in the Gulf countries, where it has seven placement offices focused on the search for and identification of job opportunities. Currently it has a portfolio of 13,000 qualified workers working abroad.

There were 3,800 placements in 2013. In some of them, ATCT limits itself to administrative support, to the extent that public officers have to go through this agency if they want to take leave to work abroad. Since 2012, ATCT also places graduates without experience (a few hundred in 2013). Usually, ATCT does not provide their 'coopérants' with job-specific training. Despite its management resources (staff of 100), the ATCT has not conducted any study so far on the impact of its placement activities on the public administration of qualified workers. It does not follow the 'coopérants' it places after they end their contracts.

Source: Interviews with ATCT officers, ETF (2015f)

Generally, these public agencies search for international job opportunities for their citizens, pre-select candidates and support them by providing standardized services: these services last, at least, through the recruitment process, if not through the entire migration process. They often cooperate with some destination countries, which have also set up specific schemes to manage the international recruitment of labour. Such an example is the Korean Employment Platform described in **BOX 3.2**.

With the exception of a few countries like South Korea, the Philippines and Tunisia, private international placement agencies prevail in international recruitment. For example, they play a central role in recruitment from Asian countries to the Gulf countries (the biggest global migration corridor, with more than 18 million migrant workers). In this case, public authorities in countries of origin often establish mandatory registers and regulate their activities (when permitted) in relation to recruitment procedures, fees charged and respect of the international ILO Convention n° 181 on Private Employment Agencies, forbidding to charge workers for their services and the prevention of exploitation of vulnerable migrant workers.

BOX 3.2 EMPLOYMENT PERMIT SYSTEM (EPS) OF SOUTH KOREA

South Korea has developed an idiosyncratic job-matching system in cooperation with 15 Asian countries with which it has Memoranda of Understanding: Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. The EPS is jointly implemented by South Korean and sending country authorities, and it allows Korean employers who have failed to fill in vacancies from the domestic labour force to turn to foreign labour, in several industries such as agriculture, stockbreeding, manufacturing, construction and fishery.

The way it works is as follows: the employers submit a request to South Korean Job Centres for Employment Permit of Foreign Labour, for quotas set out by the government. Government agencies in migrant sending countries pre-select qualified potential migrants (18-39 years old) based on standardised online testing of knowledge in the Korean language (the EPS-TOPIK test), skill-test and work experience. Each test has a passing eligibility score. There is then a roster of pre-selected potential migrants submitted to the South Korean government. The South Korean government then approves the roster of job candidates and sends it to Job Centres, which in turn pick out qualified candidates for employers. When an employer selects a foreign worker, the worker receives the Employment Permit and the employers sign a standard labour contract (which indicates the minimum wage, holidays, working hours [typically set at 40 hours a week], overtime pay, etc.), visa paperwork is then processed. Migrant workers also receive health and accidental insurance.

Upon arrival in South Korea the migrant worker does an employment-specific training course; attends a further Korean language course; trains on industrial safety and education; and receives an orientation course to the EPS, and South Korean culture and traditions. Migrant workers can work for as much as three years, but they cannot bring their families to South Korea, and are required to return home for at least six months after the end of their contract before being allowed to come back to South Korea as migrant workers. Their contract can be renewed for an additional two years by the employer; at that point the contract is terminated.

Source: www.eps.go.kr/ph/index.html. Charpin and Aiolfi (2011)

Apart from Asian examples, however, private employment services in countries of origin tend to be more focused on headhunters for highly-skilled jobs than for medium or low-skilled jobs. This is particularly the case with big multinationals in the sectors (ADECCO, Manpower, etc.). In the European Neighbourhood countries, private employment agencies, which do not focus on headhunting, are not very present in migration business. Actually, they are not very present in job intermediation in the local labour market. This is true even when they are regulated. The reason for this low profile can be explained by several factors: 'reliability/reputation' issues linked to abuses of potential migrants reported in the media; reticence of public employment services; and more generally public authorities cooperating with them, regulation issues, etc. One success factor for such agencies dealing with medium-to-low skilled migrants is specialisation in a single economic sector, e.g. KMS Georgia focuses only on the hospitality sector (including training aspects), something demanded by foreign employers in the sector.

Strengths and weaknesses: The main strength of specialised public international placement agencies consists in their high degree of professionalism and efficiency. A common risk for these public agencies is that they become unnecessary intermediaries: obligatory administrative entry points for international migration, without, though, any real added value for migrants or international employers.

Elements for assessment: Whereas their specialisation and high numbers reduce the unit costs of these agencies, this is also the main downside of their activity, to the extent that they are very labour intensive and require a dedicated administration. Very often they do not manage to recover the costs of their services from international employers. On the other hand, they tend to develop expertise in

international skills matching based on qualifications, an expertise that contributes to improving the migration cycle results (and labour market outcomes of beneficiaries).

However, since they focus on recruitment and placement, impact assessments in terms of labour market outcomes or skills utilisation are very rare: there are hardly any 'tracing' studies of beneficiaries. For the same reasons, usually the macro-economic impact of their activity for countries of origin (for instance, in terms of brain drain or more generally in terms of the developmental impact of migration) are not considered. As for success factors, this kind of agency can only be effective to the extent that they are in direct contact with employers in destination countries: i.e., if they develop specific job prospection capabilities. Labour attachés at embassies can facilitate matters (as it is the case in the Philippines), but specialised job search offices have proved to be more effective (Tunisia).

Though not covered in this inventory due to the fact that they exist mainly in Anglo-Saxon destination countries (the UK, the USA, Australia, New Zealand, etc.), another variant of recruitment agencies are non-profit, social enterprise organisations regulated by law. Whereas private recruitment agencies pursue only profit making by meeting the interests of client-employers, the social enterprise recruitment agencies prioritise the social interest of migrant workers. The ultimate emphasis is on providing workers with information and other requirements (such as skills licenses) to allow them navigate the labour market beyond the first job placement. They tend to provide a more comprehensive package of migrant services to increase market-specific skills, engage in skills enhancement and professional accreditation, in order to help decrease the skills underutilization of migrants. Therefore, they can be good examples for countries of origin, as well as combining job intermediation and social objectives.

Examples: Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA, www.poea.gov.ph/); Sri Lanka Foreign Employment Agency (www.slfea.lk/); on the regulation of international recruitment agencies, see for instance Uganda – Rules and Regulations Governing the Licensing, Recruitment and Employment of Ugandan Migrant Workers Abroad (Statutory Instrument No 62, 2005). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

Development of specific databases/labour market information systems for the pre-selection of migrant workers

The specificities of international job matching has prompted job intermediation operators, and in particular public employment services from countries of origin, to develop specific databases, e-platforms and, indeed, whole departments dealing with the international placement of migrant workers. These have often developed in the framework of bilateral labour agreements or circular migration schemes, at times linked to capacity-building development cooperation projects. They are also frequently done in relation to specific international job offers. These databases and services carry out the pre-selection of migration candidates on the basis of qualifications and work experience, knowledge of languages and other variables defined by the employer.

Besides international placement services (the matching of international job offers and job seekers), they may also provide other services: information services; administrative support or even some forms of training (language courses or basic complementary professional training); as well as skills testing and the more general assessment of potential migrants. Tunisia-Aneti International and Morocco-Anapec International are examples of international placement departments created within public employment services.

Strengths and weaknesses: International placement services are in high demand in emigration countries. This can lead to an 'announcement effect' attracting high numbers of would-be migrants whenever an opportunity is communicated. This creates, in turn, serious capacity problems in the respective services, and often problems in the pre-selection process and hence in the matching between candidates and job offers. In this sense, to manage the expectations of potential beneficiaries

is a key issue. On the other hand, another recurrent problem is the mismatch between the migrant profiles required (in particular in terms of qualifications) and the candidates' profiles available in the database. This leads to an inability to meet demand. This can be overcome by linking these services with skills development programmes. This is done, for example, by the National Training Service (SENA) in Colombia.

A typical challenge concerns the bureaucratization of these kind of services when they emerge as a response to specific migration opportunities, in particular circular migration. In some cases, these international placement departments become administrative windows limiting themselves to 'stamp' recurrent migrants without any real added value. In other cases, the permanent update of the database of job seekers is a pre-condition for the efficient working of these services.

The public online databases created for international job-matching have mixed results. For example, the European Job Mobility portal (EURES) works quite well due to the active involvement of public employment services from Member States (see **BOX 3.3**). However, some other placement databases created within specific projects have not been successful in placing migrants. This is typically because there is only a limited attention to employer's needs, such as the Umbrella Information Support System for Employment Services (ULISSES) in Armenia (ETF 2015b); and the Integrated Migration Information System (IMIS) in Egypt (see information in **BOX 3.4**).

BOX 3.3 EURES – EUROPEAN JOB MOBILITY PORTAL

Set up in 1993, EURES is a cooperation network between the European Commission and EU Member States and the European Economic Area, through public employment services, to facilitate mobility across national borders and between labour markets in Europe. It provides information, advice, recruitment and placement (job-matching) services for any EU citizen workers and employers. EURES provides information on job vacancies in 31 European countries, CVs from interested candidates and information on living and working conditions abroad. Currently more than 1.5 million job vacancies, 1 million CVs and 30,000 employers are registered in EURES, which counts on a network of more than 850 advisers in the Public Employment Services of Member States.

Source: <http://ec.europa.eu/eures/>

BOX 3.4 IMIS – INTEGRATED MIGRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM IN EGYPT

IMIS was launched in 2001 by the IOM with Italian funding targeting migration to Italy to support the Egyptian Ministry of Manpower and Migration, in particular its Emigration and Egyptians Abroad Sector, to manage labour migration effectively. This involved the creation of the IMIS database that was first developed in 2003 to provide online job matching for potential Egyptian migrants and Italian employers. The second phase of IMIS, IMIS+, began in 2008 and focused on supporting the Emigration and Egyptians Abroad Unit and the External Employment Department of the ministry in attaining the sustainability of IMIS, so to enhance match making between labour demand and supply between Egypt and receiving countries. All parties considered the results unsatisfactory: the number of registered migration candidates never reached 800; the information contained was often incorrect and outdated; matchings were rarely available; and the technological solution adopted was incompatible with the standard ministry's platform. In 2013, a third phase of the project (IMIS III) was launched focusing on the ministry's capacity building and support to circular migration.

Source: Fandrich (2009)

Often, these kinds of services fail due to the lack of control mechanisms. These mechanisms should, ideally, check the correctness of information inserted by potential migrants; ensure the regular updates of job vacancies and CVs; and provide on-time feedback on job matching. Moreover, given the importance of social networks in recruitment in certain cultures and the physical limitations on the

reliability of potential workers, employers are not always keen to use these tools. This means that there is a basic lack of international job offers to process.

Elements for assessment: The fixed costs of this MISMES (both in terms of system development, implementation and of management costs, in particular personnel costs), are typically very high. So a permanent flow of international job offers and placements is required to justify its working. As a rule, the better integrated the international placement services with the standard national labour market intermediation system of a country of origin, the more cost-effective it is and the bigger its contribution to the institutional strengthening of national public employment services (see Martín 2011, p. 77). Another key factor for success is whether these databases or placement services are integrated with international job prospecting services, searching and identifying for work opportunities for the potential migrants in the database. Purely reactive services tend to become non-operational over time.

A thorough, recent review of pre-departure job-matching migrant support measures, their verifiability, replicability, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, ownership and effectiveness can be found at Chindea (2015, pp. 140-173).

Examples: Tunisia-Aneti International (www.aneti-international.tn/); Morocco-Anapec International (www.anapecinternational.com/); Armenia: ULISSES – Umbrella Information Support System for Employment Services (<https://platform.ulisses.am/eng/>); FLEXI Platform 2009-11 (Italy/Ghana, Egypt, Senegal, Libya, Nigeria and Tunisia); Accueil emploi (Senegal, see Martín, 2011, pp. 52-53). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.1.2 Pre-departure information, orientation and training (MISMES model 2)

Generally, migration practitioners refer to short training modules offered to would-be migrants before departure as 'pre-departure training': these can range from 2-3 hours up to 21 days, the latter including some job-specific training. Their main goal is to provide beneficiaries with basic orientation on the social and labour context they are going to face in destination countries, as well as giving some sense of their rights and support services. It may or may not be linked to specific migration opportunities. The IOM has many different pre-departure training programmes implemented worldwide, often funded by destination countries and consisting of general information on the risks of irregular migration.

For the most part, pre-departure training programmes are so basic that one might question whether they really qualify as MISMES. Moreover, they usually focus on the risks of irregular migration; how to maintain legal status and legal employment status in countries of destination; language/culture of country of destination; and practical information and referral institutions upon arrival. In the same line, in the European Neighbourhood countries most of such pre-departure interventions include very general information tools on migration: most of which is accessible by internet anyway. They are also focused on the prevention of irregular migration by providing information on the risks and dangers of those who travel illegally. They are not necessarily linked to actual job offers or to employers in destination countries, so that the result might end by creating false expectations and some degree of frustration afterwards.

Only in some Asian countries of origin (Sri Lanka, the Philippines and Bangladesh are outstanding examples), is there targeted national investment in job-related and pre-departure vocational training, with longer, compulsory programmes (in the Philippines, since 1983), often involving NGOs, private employment agencies and even trade unions. Among destination countries, Canada has invested heavily in this specific MISMES, but with a slightly different implementation modality from the rest, as these programmes are directly linked to the acceptance of immigrants to go to Canada (see **BOX 3.5** below). Overall, there is an increasing trend in creating information websites on immigration by countries of destination. Among them, one might mention the EU Immigration Portal, the Swedish and

German portals, in addition to the websites of traditional immigration countries such as Canada and Australia⁷.

BOX 3.5 OVERSEAS ORIENTATION INITIATIVES IN CANADA

In 2012, Citizen and Immigration Canada published an evaluation of its Overseas Orientation Initiatives, including a programme called 'Canadian Orientation Abroad' (a one, three or five-day session delivered by the IOM in over 40 locations worldwide for all would-be migrants), 'Active Engagement and Integration Project' (two-hour group orientation session, topic-specific workshops and one-on-one interviews), and the 'Canadian Immigrant Integration Programme' (a one-day orientation session plus an individual interview addressed to would-be economic migrants in India, China, the Philippines and the UK). Some of the main conclusions of the evaluation, which may be relevant for other pre-departure training programmes, are presented below.

- This kind of pre-departure training is useful for refugees, but not for other types of migrants who need employment-related support. Actually, in terms of effectiveness the biggest challenges and gaps for orientation participants were employment-related.
- There was no articulate rationale for how the locations and target groups for pre-departure orientation were selected, though some programmes opted for voluntary participation.
- Overall, participants in pre-departure orientation were satisfied with the sessions, though not all of the enhanced services (e.g., referrals, workshops) offered were useful to all participants.
- The cost per participant of these programmes is influenced by a number of factors, including the number of participants per programme, and whether they are implemented in existing facilities and offered by trainers (such as IOM's) used for other purposes or by trainers fully dedicated to these programmes.
- Among the recommendations, the evaluation called for integrating pre-departure orientation into a comprehensive strategy with targeted services for different categories of migrants, depending on their specific needs and increased coordination with immigration authorities at destination.

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012)

BOX 3.6 ITALIAN E-BOSLA PROJECT IN MOROCCO FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION BENEFICIARIES

Family reunification beneficiaries are entitled to join the labour market in the country of destination after a certain period of legal stay, and often do so. Therefore, MISMES for them are as important as MISMES targeting labour migrants. The E-Bosla project aimed to facilitate the integration of Moroccan family reunification beneficiaries moving to Italy. The EUR 400,000 pilot project was implemented between November 2012 and December 2014 by the IOM in Morocco in cooperation with the Moroccan NGO 'Entraide nationale' and the Maan Morocco-Italy Association. Besides a 40-hour basic Italian course and a 20-hour civic education course given over a two-month period just before departure, the project has developed a set of pedagogical materials and an online learning platform for future expansion. The 45 beneficiaries of the first phase of the project were mostly women with a low or medium education level.

Whereas a survey conducted among beneficiaries showed a high level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of the project, the pilot nature and some procedures and conditions imposed by the Italian government as donor (for instance, the instructors for the Italian course had to come from Italy) led to high unit cost for the project.

Source: MISMES country study Morocco, ETF (2015d)

⁷ The EU Immigration Portal (www.ec.europa.eu/immigration/) was launched in 2012 with the aim of becoming a one-stop-shop (first point of entry) for clear, accessible, up-to-date, targeted and practical information on EU and national immigration procedures and policies, including visas and work permits for potential migrants. See also <http://work.sweden.se/>, www.bmbf.de/en/19727.php, www.immigration.ca/en/ and others.

Here it must be noted that the target groups of such orientation and training programmes are either general public that is considered 'potential migrants' or explicit labour migrants who declared to work abroad. However there are many other types of migrants moving for other reasons than work purposes (family members, students, refugees and asylum seekers), which could benefit from such programmes. Indeed, only around 20% of first residence permits granted to the third country nationals within the EU are for work reasons and the rest is for family members, students and refugees (OECD and EU, 2014)⁸. Therefore, pre-departure orientation and training must be offered for the beneficiaries of family reunification, refugees and students as well (see the E-Bosla project in **BOX 3.6**), so that they could benefit for labour market integration in destination.

Strengths and weaknesses: Often the participation of potential migrants in pre-departure skills trainings is low. Policy-makers explain this by two factors (Charpin and Aiolfi 2011): since there are many types of migrants, it is hard to meet the needs of all skills-profiles and organise effective training. Additionally, when there are other (non-legal) channels available for migration (including the lack of transparency in domestic institutions dealing with migration), potential migrants are less enthusiastic about pre-departure trainings for hoped for jobs.

There is little evidence of the impact of pre-departure training on migrant labour market integration. Most of the evidence collected is based on surveys of beneficiaries asking them for their level of satisfaction; however, it is not clear how the satisfaction about the possibility of migrating (of which pre-departure training is often a step) can be dissociated from the actual training received.

Another key issue is the frequent lack of relations between pre-departure services and integration services in countries of destination, or even with job-matching services in countries of origin. Because many pre-departure training programmes are funded by destination countries (and often implemented by international organisations), there is the clear risk of them being supply-driven, and not based on the actual needs of beneficiaries. Foreign donors often have priority issues, which are not necessarily related to migrant's needs: for instance, emphasis on trafficking instead of practical labour market access information. The targeting of beneficiaries also raises some issues, since there is often no clear selection procedure, and the percentage of migrants benefitting from these programmes is often limited.

Elements for assessment: While pre-departure trainings may be well organised for potential migrants, one can never guarantee that potential migrants will use these skills abroad (Charpin and Aiolfi, 2011). For example in Bangladesh the manufacturing vocational training course was suppressed from the EU implemented policy intervention when the implementers realized that Italy, the relevant destination country, was not hiring migrants based on pre-departure training and pre-departure assessment of skills. Rather, Italy was relying on the employer's assessment of the motivation and adaptation skills of the migrant. Migrants with the right profile would then be given intense on-the-job training (Charpin and Aiolfi, 2011). Thus, the pre-departure training was ineffective due to the employer abroad.

In any case, language courses are the only pre-departure training measure for which there is ample evidence of a positive impact on labour market outputs of beneficiaries (see Martin and Abella 2009). This is particularly true when they are linked to workplace readiness (Stephen, 2014). In contrast, the success of more general cultural and legal orientation is not so clear. It can be useful, of course, for first-time temporary migrants in the framework of circular migration programmes in order to provide them with some basic notions of the context they are going to meet and even some practical

⁸ In 2013 for example, 23,853 first residence permits were issued for Tunisians by the EU Member States. The reasons stated for issuing first-residence permits to Tunisians can be broken down into family reasons (59.5%), education reasons (18.3%), work reasons (14.9%), and other reasons (7.3%) (Eurostat).

professional advice for a successful migration experience. However, for longer-term or permanent migrants the kind of orientation provided by such programmes may be largely irrelevant to the far-reaching training and preparations that are actually needed. In terms of the implementation of pre-departure training programmes, a success factor identified by IOM in its practice is the use of bicultural or cross-cultural trainers with the same cultural and linguistic background as the target population (Stephen, 2014).

In any case, evidence shows that pre-departure training is only useful to the extent that it is linked to concrete migration opportunities: general introductions without a clear migration prospect often create frustration in beneficiaries and quickly become irrelevant. For the same reason, associating destination countries (and if possible employers in them) to pre-departure training programmes enhances their utility.

A thorough, recent review of pre-departure information and orientation support measures, their verifiability, replicability, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, ownership and effectiveness can be found at Chindea (2015, pp. 83-116).

Examples: Morocco: E-Bosla project (for family reunification beneficiaries to Italy, IOM); Moldova: Educational Programme in Moldova (National Employment Agency, Greek Government); the Philippines: Compulsory Pre-Departure Orientation Seminars (PDOS); Sri-Lanka: pre-departure training courses (www.slbfe.lk/page.php?LID=1&PID=114?); and Bangladesh: pre-departure orientation training manuals. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.1.3 Professional skills development for migration (MISMES model 3)

In attempting to overcome the skills gaps, often preventing successful international placement of migrant workers, a number of programmes have been designed to help migrant candidates develop professional skills and adapt them to international employers' needs. These programmes are generally based on a detailed identification of skill needs in destination countries and skills gaps in countries of origin, including the development of specific curricula to fill them. They often take a sectorial approach (often in relatively standardised sectors such as tourism or construction), and sometimes they are linked to skills recognition schemes or international vocational education and training (VET) harmonisation processes. This is the case, for example, with the FOIL project on labour training, orientation and insertion carried out by the ILO in Central America⁹.

These training programmes are implemented in countries of origin (which generally proves cheaper) and often involve national VET centres or systems from these countries. While this practice may have a positive knock-on effect on the improvement of certain general VET programmes, in other cases the institutional weaknesses affecting the general VET system may be transferred to those programmes. This means poor quality training. One good example is the combination of development cooperation with migration-related training. As shown in **BOX 3.7** below, Italy invested in the improving of TVET tourism schools in Fayoum (Egypt), in order to help likely migrant populations to develop, use, enhance and renew skills with longer-term social benefit for a region with high migration flows. Better quality training is, however, sometimes provided by private companies or foreign entities, but this usually increases the cost of these programmes significantly.

⁹ www.ilo.org/sanjose/programas-y-proyectos/formacion-orientacion-insercion-laboral/lang-es/index.htm

BOX 3.7 IMPROVEMENT OF TVET SCHOOLS FOR EGYPTIAN YOUTH IN FAYOUM

This project is based on the idea that strengthening vulnerable youth's access to good quality technical education and vocational training in rural communities with high-migration pressure will provide them with the skills and knowledge they need to take advantage of economic opportunities, both at home and abroad. These training schemes will also, it is hoped, assist in curbing irregular migration. A situation analysis published in 2010 showed that TVET graduates face low employment rates because of a lack of quality in curriculum, training and equipment. This project was, therefore, funded by Italy and implemented by the IOM combining training-for-migration activities with an upgrade of the TVET tourism schools through the upgrading and renovation of Fayoum Advanced Hotel School and the adoption of a specific methodology for skills development.

The educational and training curricula were updated for three training profiles (gastronomy, service and sales room, and tourism services) in line with the European Qualifications Framework and the improvement of school premises and laboratories. In addition, Italian was introduced as the first foreign language; twinning agreements were signed with Italian institutions, school-to-work transition counselling and partnerships with private sector developed and teachers and trainers were trained. The Ministry of Education has selected the Fayoum model as a best practice to be duplicated in a further 27 schools across the country in the near future.

Source: Interview with the IOM Cairo office

A variant on professional skills development programmes for migration is international traineeship for potential migration candidates (see GIZ example in **BOX 3.8**). This can be a smooth way to promote labour migration benefitting all the parties involved and reducing the cost and matching risks of international recruiting, while, at the same time, facilitating integration. They offer beneficiaries a period of training-related employment (3-12 months) in the country of destination, with the possibility of receiving an employment offer from employers after that. This provides the employer with the opportunity of testing the skills and capabilities of the trainee, and the latter to receive work experience and eventually to look for other job in the country of destination.

Strengths and weaknesses: The quality of professional skills development programmes is dependent on the training institution implementing it (and for national institutions on their capacity). When they are not demand-oriented (i.e. linked to specific job opportunities and geared to the specifications of the employers), there is a risk that these programmes take on the weaknesses of the national education system. To the extent that these programmes are demand-driven, they feature a high rate of placement of beneficiaries.

As far as international traineeships are concerned, one common challenge to this kind of programmes is the question of how to combine training objectives with a sufficient level of attraction for employers, and their respective expectations. As for the training component, apart from language teaching, a frequent problem is the mismatch between migrants' qualifications and the traineeship curricula offered in the country of destination, which is often considered too basic (or too sophisticated). The over-qualification or under-qualification of migration candidates may create some maladjustment.

A more general challenge relates to the relevance of VET and even university curricula in the country of origin for the skill needs in destination (due to different economic and social context). Additionally, soft skills have proved to be crucial in all the experiences, but they are not easy to 'teach' within a short pre-departure training programme. Nevertheless, international internships have still the best potential to teach the candidates 'soft skills' directly in the workplace abroad

BOX 3.8 GIZ – LEGAL CIRCULAR MOBILITY OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED LABOUR FROM TUNISIA

As part of a more general 'Triple-Win' labour migration programme with the Philippines, Georgia, Vietnam and Tunisia, in 2012 and 2013 GIZ implemented a project to offer unemployed engineers six-month traineeships in Germany. This was conceived as a pilot project consisting of the selection of 130 young candidates aged 22-32, carried out in cooperation with the German International Placement Services (ZAV) and Aneti, of which 120 received a first training period of five months – mainly intensive German language course at the Goethe Institute in Tunis, plus two months of intercultural orientation. This was followed, for 101 of them, by a six-month internship in Germany during which the programme offered three additional months of continued training, provided support and administrative assistance and covered part of the salary of the interns. Some 27% of beneficiaries were women and 73% men. After the programme, 70 of the 100 beneficiaries received a work contract offer immediately and the rest were helped in finding a job back in Tunisia. The lessons drawn from this experience can be summarised as follows.

- The institutional setting is key for smooth legal labour migration; opening markets is not enough and substantial intercultural orientation assistance needs to be provided, including trust building measures.
- Employers in Germany, and in particular SMEs, are clearly not ready to pay for the costs of managed migration programmes (i.e. if the programme does not cover a substantial part of those costs). Therefore, cooperation funds need to be mobilized, but then, what is the level of priority of those programmes, and the cost-benefit rationale? Some 64% of participating employers indicated in a survey that financial support was one of their motivations and, for 48%, the support received from GIZ and the Federal Agency for Employment.
- Although it is not a major problem for a pilot project, the unit cost of the programme was huge. Despite success in terms of placement rates (71%), the cost for each of the work contracts obtained exceeded EUR 20,000, and the average cost for each beneficiary was EUR 15,000.
- One of the lessons drawn from the programme managers is the crucial importance of the intensive preparation of potential migrants, in particular in the language of the country of destination, complemented with intercultural preparation and integration support. This justifies the needs of MISMES for a successful migration cycle.
- German employers involved in the programme expressed their satisfaction with the level of qualifications of Tunisian candidates and the general setup of the programme. Indeed, the project is being replicated in 2015 and 2016, and extended to 150 other unemployed engineers with some minor adjustments. The challenge is the integration of the project into Tunisian institutions, and the sustainability of the funds required for its implementation.

Source: www.webmanagercenter.com/actualite/economie/2014/10/22/156006/formation-emploi-l-aneti-et-la-giz-concretisent-le-pacte-de-mobilite-germano-tunisien and www.cimonline.de/triplewin

Elements for assessment: The unit cost of this kind of programmes is often very high, to the extent that they cannot be funded by employers alone without being linked to international development cooperation funds. To this extent, these programmes are not properly a labour migration management tool, but rather international cooperation tools, and often have other goals beyond international placement of migrant workers. Among these goals, it may feature the strengthening of national VET systems and institutions, what can make out of them good models for 'skills partnerships' between countries of origin and destination.

As a matter of fact, two success factors identified in the assessment of these programmes are related to (i) the extent to which those MISMES are linked to employers in destination countries and concrete job opportunities (see Charpin and Aiolfi, 2011 in the context of the EU Thematic Programme on Migration and Asylum); and (ii) their integration into the national VET system and more specifically into an overall strategy of VET system reform and upgrade (including the upgrading of training curricula). The recent initiative for Global Skill Partnerships is based on the idea of letting training for foreign

employment of potential migration candidates subsidize the training for the national labour market (see Clemens 2014).

A thorough, recent review of migrant skill development programmes, their verifiability, replicability, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, ownership and effectiveness can be found at Chindea (2015, pp. 117-140).

Examples: Tunisia-Germany TAPIG (Transformation Partnership in the Healthcare Sector); Georgia-Germany GIZ circular migration programme; SALEMM (Solidarité avec les enfants du Maghreb et du Mashreq); India Centre of Vocational Training; Argentine: UOCRS Programme in the construction sector; Colombia: National Training Service (SENA) training programmes for migration. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.1.4 Facilitating access to labour market information and protection in destination countries (MISMES model 4)

The main goal of these MISMES is to protect the rights of migrant workers, supporting their smooth integration into the labour market in destination countries, not least in terms of wage and working conditions. In order to do this, some countries of origin have developed model employment contracts: in some cases in the framework of bilateral labour agreements or memoranda of understanding with countries of destination. The aim of these contracts is to establish a baseline or minimum terms for employment for their migrant workers abroad. Recruitment agencies are encouraged, and in some countries required, to use these model agreements, and keep a record of issued labour contracts.

The content of model employment contracts typically includes the job description for a particular profession and level of skills; salary; work hours; overtime; employment benefits (social welfare and retirement benefits, general medical care and health insurance for job-related injuries, emergency repatriation); and the number of rest days *per* week and holidays. In some cases, if there are bilateral treaties, employment contracts may also reflect bilateral agreements about the employment conditions of migrant workers in the host state, such as free transportation from/to employment sites, free food and accommodation (see Baruah and Cholewinski, 2006). They can also involve the participation of NGOs or migrant resource centres.

Another way to protect migrant worker rights is the compulsory registration of their contracts with public employment services in the countries of origin (in some cases like Moldova, the registration gives certain supervision of work conditions and social security rights); or the imposition of minimum contractual conditions by the country of origin before issuing a migration permit to the worker (such as in the Philippines, see **BOX 3.9**).

Strengths and weaknesses: The first challenge of these protection mechanisms is the enforcement of signed work contracts. Even in the framework of bilateral labour agreements, there are recurring cases of abuses, and preventing these abuses requires a good legal enforcement system. This may include specific labour inspection plans for migrant workers: in the bilateral labour convention between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, between 2010 and 2012 several joint labour inspections at migrant worksites were implemented with labour inspectors from both countries. This requires, in any case, direct cooperation between countries of origin and destination and a systematic follow-up of migrants.

BOX 3.9 MODEL EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The Philippines has a three-tier system that aims to ensure the protection and labour market integration of its migrants abroad. These three tiers are licensed recruitment agencies domestically, and labour attaché services in the consular services abroad and Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) services in settlements abroad.

Minimum wage abroad: The Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) drafts 'model employment contracts' that are both country-specific and skill-level specific. These contracts are issued to licensed recruitment agencies, migrant resource centres, labour attaches and other related entities. The job contracts specify a range of employment regulating issues, as stated above, and define the minimum wage of overseas Filipino workers (OFW). Specifically, Filipino migrant workers abroad cannot be paid less than the 'prevailing wage' in the Philippines; the remuneration abroad should be no lower than the wages paid for the particular level of skills in the host state. If there are bilateral agreements signed by the Philippines on migrant workers' wages in the host state, then the remuneration stated in the employment contracts cannot be lower than the remuneration of a particular level of professional skills defined by the treaty (Baruah and Cholewinski, 2006, p. 52). If the employer and the employee mutually agree on terms, the content of the contract may vary. However, the terms of the contract should abide by legislative norms, and foreign remuneration can still not be lower than that defined by the POEA.

Mandatory insurance from recruitment agencies: According to the Philippines regulation, only the POEA and licensed recruitment agencies and entities authorized by the government can recruit migrant workers for work abroad. Private employers cannot directly recruit migrant workers from the Philippines. Only some 10% of migrant workers from the Philippines are sent by the government abroad; the vast majority are hired through licensed private recruitment agencies (cited in Hayes 2009). If the overseas Filipino worker is recruited for work by a recruitment agency, then according to current (2014) legislation the recruitment agency is also required to provide the overseas Filipino worker (OFW) with insurance during the duration of the job contract abroad at cost to the migrant worker. Insurance should cover accidental death (for USD 15,000), permanent disability (USD 7,500), repatriation expenses, travel costs for no less than one week for a family member to visit the hospitalized OFW, an allowance (USD 100/month) for up to six months for an erroneous dismissal from work. This insurance, certified by the issuing insurance company, should be submitted prior to the departure abroad to the POEA and the OWWA.

Source: Embassy of the Philippines in Greece (n.d.)

Elements for assessment: This type of MISMEs are particularly effective in minimizing the opportunities for violation of the employment rights of migrant workers. They also contribute to the creation of conditions of legal employment, and in some cases to the prevention of the underutilization of migrant-workers' skills. However, their administrative cost is quite high (they are labour intensive), unless implemented in the general framework of country of origin public employment services and labour inspection. When countries of origin have labour attachés in the countries of destination (a typical situation with Asian countries, but also for Tunisia, for instance), they are in a privileged position to implement these MISMEs at a low cost. IOM (2014) reviews the supra-national, bilateral, national and non-governmental recruitment monitoring practices in Asia and which one have performed best in protecting migrant workers' rights.

Examples: Moldova registration of contracts; Morocco: Spain-Morocco standard contracts for seasonal farm workers; Costa Rica-Nicaragua bilateral labour convention (standard contract and signature of contract at the border at the time of departure in front of Nicaraguan officers); Jordan: Special Working Contract for Non-Jordanian Domestic Workers; México: Matrícula consular (Consular card) for Mexicans abroad; Nicaragua: Consular card for Nicaraguans abroad. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.2 During-migration MISMEMS

3.2.1 Programmes for capitalizing on skills across borders (MISMEMS model 5)

Promoting permanent return of high-skilled migrants

The main premise of these programmes is to facilitate the use of the skills of the migrant diasporas in homeland development. These programmes, such as the IOM's Return of Qualified Nationals (RQN) implemented in more than 11 African countries, focus on the permanent return of highly skilled and skilled professionals to the homeland. Such initiatives facilitate the return of these migrants to employ their skills in strategic sectors of the economy (such as local capacity building, creating joint enterprises, engaging diaspora expertise in strategic sectors of the economy, etc.)

Participating institutions in migrant-sending countries identify the range of skills and professions that they need to fill in specific vacancies that cannot be filled in locally. The roster of jobs is submitted to the IOM. The IOM advertises these jobs abroad among overseas migrants from a particular country, and compiles a database of interested overseas migrants (and their skills profile) who would like to return and work in the homeland. Then the list of qualified migrant-candidates is submitted to the participating institutions, which make the final choice for the vacancy (see the Jamaican example in **BOX 3.10**). In recent years the Return of Qualified Nationals Programmes mainly targeted post-crisis and recovery situations (after the end of armed conflicts), that as the IOM notes, make diaspora members more willing to return to the homeland to help (Pasha 2012).

BOX 3.10 RETURN AND REINTEGRATING PROGRAMME OF QUALIFIED JAMAICAN NATIONALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

This 30-month pilot project with a total budget of ECU 587,190 was funded by the EU and implemented by the IOM in 1994-96, targeting Jamaican highly skilled migrants. It prompted them to return to Jamaica and invest their knowledge and skills in homeland institutions (in this case 30 public institutions that submitted to the IOM a total of 121 job vacancies). Professionals in engineering, the health sector, managerial positions and in science were the most needed. In turn, the IOM identified more than 329 qualified overseas migrants, and submitted the profiles of 300 identified interested candidates to participating local public institutions. At the end, a vacancy match was found for only 39 Jamaican migrants. Upon signing the job contract, the IOM provided for the relocation expenses of the overseas migrants, and for some additional incentives to migrants and their family members. Assessments of this project praised the results and claimed that both return migrants and employers were content with the mutual collaboration, though return migrants often mentioned the lack of skills locally and the difference in management style among the problems they encountered in their work.

Source: IOM (2010a; and 2012b)

Strengths and weaknesses: These projects encourage the return of migrants from abroad, and facilitate finding employment prior to the trip home, thus, reducing the risks and uncertainty associated with return migration. Nonetheless, the IOM's initial projects aimed at the systematic and permanent return of highly skilled migrants did not produce many successful results, mainly because the economies of origin countries did not improve and emigration was recurrent. As a result, the shift was made from 'return' to 'circulation of skills' (see below). Additionally, at times the skills and qualification acquired abroad are not recognised in the origin country, thus, the application of these skills in the homeland became challenging (IOM 2012b). Given these challenges and sustainability concerns, in 2000 IOM expanded this initiative and transformed it into a multi-dimensional project known as MIDA – Migration for Development in Africa (IOM, 2004; 2009a; 2012c).

Elements for assessment: A survey conducted among returnees in Africa revealed that high living costs and low salaries are some of the obstacles to the integration of highly skilled migrants in the homeland (IOM 2012b). In terms of cost-effectiveness, such interventions have a high cost *vis-à-vis* the number of diaspora participants engaged. Low sustainability is a major issue for these projects since governments do not typically take on ownership for such programmes once the funding from international agencies ends (IOM 2000 cited in Wickramasekara 2003).

Examples: Moldovan Overseas Graduates; Georgia: Turnaround Migration for Development; Promoting Return of Highly Skilled Migrants (CIM) (see country case studies); CIM (Centre for International Migration and Development, GIZ-German Federal Ministry of Employment); IOM's Return of Qualified Nationals (RQN) programmes implemented in more than 11 African countries, such as the South African Network of Skills Abroad (SANSA), the Return of Qualified African Nationals (RQAN) programme, or the Return of Qualified Afghans programme; Reintegration of Qualified Latin American Nationals (RQLAN); Colombia: COLCIENCIAS. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

Temporary stays of qualified migrants in countries of origin

Rather than emphasize permanent return, these programmes aim to achieve circular migration using the short-term visits of migrant diaspora members to their homeland; or by promoting exchange programmes where expatriates return home for short periods of time to contribute their skills to homeland development. For example, the Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals (TRQN) programmes are the second generation of programmes that were created by adopting the 'return of talent' paradigm linking it to modern realities of high mobility and migration of high-skilled migrants. The Temporary and Virtual Return programmes are a recent wave of projects implemented by the IOM, and are similar to the TRQN projects, with one additional flexibility: the selected diaspora participants can also do e-learning projects targeting education and civil society sectors.

Another example is the Diaspora Knowledge Networks (DKNs)/Professional Networks for the Circulation of Skills. These are platforms that allow high-skilled diaspora members – scientists, academics and professionals – to participate in homeland human capital development through short-term exchange programmes or short-term visits. Examples include helping set-up institutions, creating the road map to research and development centres and designing curricula. The objective is to create opportunities for the exchange of knowledge between the local populations and the diaspora & migrants abroad, and to help invest the skills and know-how of diasporas accumulated abroad for homeland development. These policy interventions bring the expertise of the qualified *permanent* diaspora (who are either citizens or permanent residents abroad) for curriculum development, teaching and training in their homeland.

The targeted beneficiaries are local institutions, such as governmental structures, academic institutions, and civil society organisations. The two main players in this field, meanwhile, are the UNDP (through the TOKTEN programme given below **BOX 3.11**) and the IOM, but many civil society and diaspora organisations are also involved. Actually, these programmes tend to become university cooperation or voluntary cooperation programmes rather than MISMES. The participation is on a short-term basis with an average duration of two to three months. All travel and accommodation expenses, plus a stipend to live and work in their homeland countries, are paid for by a selected highly skilled diaspora. These projects also often target young diaspora members who recently graduated from Western universities. The main modalities are the temporary/short-term return of migrants homeland; the virtual return (through e-learning projects); and Diaspora Knowledge Networks (DKNs)/Professional Networks for Circulation of Skills.

BOX 3.11 TOKTEN PROGRAMME – TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE THROUGH EXPATRIATE NATIONALS

The TOKTEN programme is a pioneering and long-lasting approach to exploit diaspora human capital resource mobilization. Initiated by the United Nations Development Programme in 1977 in Turkey, it was set up to counter the effects of ‘brain drain’ in developing countries by temporarily bringing back talented expatriate nationals to their homeland based on the spirit of volunteerism. TOKTEN consultants are expatriates from developing countries who volunteer to return to their country of origin for short periods (lasting between two weeks and three months) to share the expertise that they have gained abroad in research, academic, public and private institutions. TOKTEN consultants can work in a range of technical fields and specializations. Since 1994, the programme has been implemented by United Nations volunteers. Among the 35 developing countries where TOKTEN has been implemented over the years, some good results were found in Palestine and Afghanistan. However, and despite the voluntary basis of participation, the unit costs are quite high (travel allowance and *per diems*, plus the international staff managing the programme). TOKTEN has shown, too, a very low level of sustainability, as seen in the MISMEMS country case study on Morocco.

Source: TOKTEN factsheet, www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2008/TOKTEN_factsheet_01.12.2008.pdf

Strengths and weaknesses: Often diaspora members are not available due to their work commitments abroad. Temporary stay projects are also based on short-term assignments, and hence the type and depth of the provided expertise is restricted. On the other hand, the very shortness of assignments attracts qualified diaspora members. The skills and expertise needed by the local institutions may not be available among diaspora members, thus, there might be mismatch between expertise supply and demand. In some cases, there is lack of recognition of qualifications acquired abroad (IOM 2012b).

Elements for assessment: The objective of these programmes is the minimisation of the brain drain since the skills of diaspora and migrants who have left are now transferred and employed in the homeland. However, such interventions have a high cost *vis-à-vis* the number of diaspora participants engaged. The durability and sustainability of these projects is an additional challenge: national institutions are not always able or willing to pay high salaries (if applicable) and transportation/accommodation costs for participating migrants. On the other hand, these programmes typically involve local entities, so they should be better geared to local needs.

Examples: FINCOM Morocco; Georgia: Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals II and III; IOM MIDA projects; Nigeria: University programme; Thailand: Reverse Brain Drain Project; South African Network of Skills Abroad (SANSA); Return of Qualified African Nationals (RQAN); IOM’s Dutch-funded Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals (TRQN) to Afghanistan, Armenia, Cabo Verde, Georgia, Ghana, Iraq, Morocco, Somalia and Sudan; Temporary and Virtual Return; Arab Expatriate Scientists (AES) Network; Arab Network of Women in Science and Technology (ANWST). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.3 Post-migration MISMEMS

3.3.1 Validation and recognition of migrants’ skills and qualifications (MISMEMS model 6)

The non-visibility and the underutilisation of migrants’ skills both in the home and host countries are key issues requiring attention for facilitating labour migration (IOM, 2013b; Sumption, 2013), and one of the main reasons justifying the implementation of MISMEMS in the first place. However, the assessment and validation of skills is always problematic, as formal qualifications may fail to reflect the whole reality of the experience, while soft skills and skills learned on the job are difficult to assess though they are increasingly seen as being important (ETF, 2014). Nevertheless, the validation and

recognition of migrant skills and qualifications is necessary both in the pre-migration phase, mostly done by countries of destination according to their regulations, and in the post-migration phase, mostly done by countries of origin based on their own frameworks. Our focus in this respect is mainly on the countries of origin.

Recently systems for recognising foreign qualifications and/or validating skills without formal certificates¹⁰ have been put in place in many EU Member States, such as the 2012 Federal Recognition Act of Foreign Qualifications in Germany for equivalence assessment of over 600 occupations, including the Vocational Qualifications Assessment Law (BQFG) for dual system occupations¹¹. Furthermore, certain tools have been developed at the European level to facilitate regional mobility, e.g. European Qualifications Framework, EU directives on professional recognition of qualifications, Europass for increased transparency of qualifications¹² (see the example of the European Qualifications Framework and others in **BOX 3.12**). However, such initiatives of destination countries are widely missing in the other main destinations (Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Gulf region, etc.). There are also attempts to harmonise university degrees (the Bologna process) or to increase transparency and quality in VET (the Copenhagen process) that aim to facilitate easier recognition. Such initiatives in destination countries are often lacking in other destinations (Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Gulf region, etc.).

BOX 3.12 TRANSNATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORKS

An increasingly widespread tool in facilitating the ‘translation’ of national skills and qualifications for labour migration purposes are the transnational qualifications frameworks. These establish a set of common levels covering all possible skills and qualifications acquired throughout educational and professional life allowing for comparisons of skills and qualifications across countries.

The precursor of this tool is the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) established in 2008 within the EU as a common reference framework of qualification levels defined through learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills and competences (http://ec.europa.eu/eqf/home_en.htm). With seven levels of qualifications, it allows comparability in space and time, i.e. across countries and competence levels. In order to implement the EQF, each EU Member State should have a national qualifications framework, which is then to be linked to the EQF like a translation device.

The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has adopted a similar approach, with the development of an ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework and the commitment, in 2010, of its nine members to establish national skills frameworks. Other transnational qualifications frameworks being developed include the Caribbean Vocational Qualifications Network and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Qualifications Framework.

Source: ETF (2011a)

Similarly, the newly-gained skills, experiences and savings brought in by the returnees and diaspora must be recognised and put to good use in the domestic labour market by countries of origin. Recent studies confirm that these newly acquired skills (e.g. languages, vocational or technical skills learnt on-the-job) are not normally certified (ETF, 2013; and 2014). Countries of origin can use the validation of prior learning mechanisms as relevant instruments for returnees through creating national systems

¹⁰ The validation of non-formal and informal learning (or the validation of prior learning) includes non-formal learning that takes place outside educational institutions, often at work without formal certification; and informal learning that is part of everyday life and is not necessarily planned. Migration and working abroad are important life experiences in which many things are learnt in informal ways.

¹¹ This includes the following procedures: (i) review of formal education diplomas (VET and university degrees); (ii) review of non-formal education certificates (further training); and (iii) review of informal learning outcomes (occupational experience), also including in cases of lacking documents. For more information, please see the following internet portal: www.anerkennung-in-deutschland.de/html/en

¹² Europass includes the European CV, Language Passport, Europass Mobility, Certificate Supplement and Diploma Supplement.

accessible to all citizens. Complementing this, some countries are developing national qualifications frameworks (NQFs) and linking them to overarching transnational frameworks to address this in a systemic manner, e.g. the EQF. Indeed, many EU Mobility Partnerships signed with the Neighbourhood countries and/or the EU Association Agreements (with Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas) include provisions on transparency and recognition of qualifications¹³.

When it comes to international recognition, it is often called a 'jungle of recognition' as a dense portfolio of recognition tools exists, at least in the larger European region. However, these recognition tools have different scopes (for academic, professional or employment purposes) and do not always work in a coherent manner, e.g. the 1979 UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Higher Education Degrees and the 1997 Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) were followed later by the EU Bologna Process (1999) to increase transparency and recognition in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA, since 2010). Then there is the EU Copenhagen Process to increase transparency and quality in VET. In 1984, a network of the National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC) was created to improve academic recognition of diplomas, which was followed by the European Network of Information Centres (ENIC) set up to implement the LRC. **BOX 3.13** below gives more information on some aspects of these developments.

With the objective of maximising the labour market integration of migrants, governments in some countries, and in particular in Asia (such as in Sri Lanka, see Jayalath, 2011) assess the migrant's qualifications before and upon return from migration (soft skills, new skills learned...). Upon departure migrants receive some general assessment of their skills, which is used upon return as a baseline. Since the objective of recognition is optimizing the labour market outcomes of migrants, return migrants may also receive new skills on entrepreneurship. The institutional arrangement includes both migrants support services abroad and in consulates (welfare funds abroad in Asia), as well as recruitment agencies or migrant resource centres in the migrant-sending states.

At pre-departure orientation, potential migrants receive training on how to keep track of their work activities abroad and how to collect documentary evidence for new skills learned abroad. An advisor is appointed to help the (potential) migrant worker compile a portfolio of documents as evidence of acquired skills. The evidence might include written documents/statements from the employer about the skills learned; jobs done; photos of the workplace; equipment operated by the migrant; job description and products made by them; professional awards received; certificates from courses/trainings attended; as well as leadership and supervisory assignments the person has undertaken (as soft skills).

Strengths and weaknesses: An open and accessible system for the recognition and validation of migrants' skills and qualifications might greatly improve matching between available jobs and migrants' skills. Establishing such a system requires greater transparency and better quality qualifications from home countries along with effective cooperation with host countries. However, the transnational assessment, certification and validation of skills and qualifications have an inherent difficulty, namely the problem of evaluating skills acquired in an unfamiliar context, often with a different technological and cultural level.

Informal skills, meanwhile, despite being crucial for work performance, are the most difficult to evaluate and systematize. Often, they are not tested in the framework of national qualification

¹³ See for example the Association Agreements with Georgia (Chapter 16): 'Promoting progress towards recognition of qualifications and competences and ensuring transparency in the area'; with Ukraine (Chapter 23): 'Establishing a national framework to improve the transparency and recognition of qualifications and skills drawing, where possible, on the EU experience'; with Morocco: 'Encourager le rapprochement du Maroc avec les procédures en cours au sein de l'Union européenne en matière de reconnaissance des diplômes' (Plan d'action Maroc pour la mise en œuvre du statut avancé 2013-17, Conseil de l'Union européenne, p. 74).

systems. Encouragement should be provided for specific practices offering flexible options for aptitude tests and examination requirements; avoidance of an ‘all-or-nothing’ approach to certifying foreign professionals; and the creation of user-friendly procedures for the assessment of formal diplomas and the validation of prior learning (Sumption, 2013).

BOX 3.13 SOME EXAMPLES OF INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION TOOLS

Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC). ‘Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region’ was developed by the Council of Europe and UNESCO and ratified by 53 countries, including all EU Member States and many EU Neighbourhood countries. It is an important text not only for the academic purposes, but also for professional purposes as it changed the focus from ‘equivalency’ to ‘learning outcomes’ for the first time. As a result, countries are, in principle, to accept foreign qualifications as they are, and the difference to be seen as wealth (see www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/recognition/lrc_EN.asp).

Bologna Process. Launched in 1999, it has developed into a major voluntary reform process encompassing 47 countries now, endorsing the principles noted in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The reforms include the introduction of the three-cycle system (bachelor/master/doctorate), [strengthened quality assurance](#) and easier [recognition of qualifications](#) and periods of study. The aim is to connect diverse national systems, while the EHEA improves transparency between higher education systems and tools to facilitate recognition (see www.ehea.info/ and http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process_en.htm).

NARIC (National Academic Recognition Information Centres) network was created in 1984 to improve the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study in the EU, EEA (European Economic Area) countries and Turkey. The network is part of the Community’s Lifelong Learning Programme that stimulates the mobility of students and staff between higher education institutions. All member countries have designated national centres to assist in promoting the mobility of students, teachers and researchers. They do so by providing advice and information concerning the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study undertaken in other states.

ENIC (European Network of Information Centres) was created to implement the LRC and cooperates closely with the NARIC network. The Council of Europe and UNESCO jointly provide the Secretariat for the network, which is made up of the national information centres of the Parties to LRC, and provide information on the recognition of foreign diplomas and education systems in their own and foreign countries. An **ENIC-NARIC portal** was created as a joint initiative of the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO, primarily as a tool to assist the ENIC-NARIC networks in carrying out their tasks (www.enic-naric.net/).

Professional recognition of qualifications. For EU Member States, there are two types of recognition directives: sectoral and general. Sectoral directives refer to seven professions (doctor, nurse, dentist, midwife, pharmacist, veterinary surgeon and architect) that are automatically recognised across the EU. The recognition of other professions is not automatic and is covered by the **EU Directive 2005/36/EC**, which makes it possible for EU nationals who obtained their professional qualifications in one or more Member States to pursue their profession in other Member States. Diplomas for non-regulated professions are mostly evaluated at different levels, involving national recognition information centres such as ENIC-NARIC.

Copenhagen Process. Launched in 2002 to enhance cooperation in European vocational education and training, this voluntary cooperation process operates through a single framework for transparency, VET quality assurance, a credit transfer system, with validation of non-formal and informal learning and vocational guidance. Covering the EU Member States and candidate countries, [the European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for VET \(EQAVET\)](#) develop common quality standards, while the European Credit for VET (ECVET) facilitates the transfer and recognition of learning experiences (see http://ec.europa.eu/education/copenhagen/index_en.html).

Elements for assessment: Migration responds to an intrinsic difference in the economic, social and technological context between countries of origin and countries of destination. This means that even an efficient skills recognition system may have a very low impact on the labour market integration of returned migrants, to the extent that skills learnt abroad during migration are not relevant for the national labour market. Among the success factors for this MISMES, in particular for the recognition of skills in destination countries, is a thorough pre-departure evaluation and documentation of skills, as well as increased transparency and quality of education systems across countries. Additionally, special cooperation programmes between education and VET institutions of destination and origin countries (e.g. twinning, dual certification programmes, common curricula, student exchanges...) are the best framework in which to facilitate this kind of skills recognition.

A thorough, recent review of recognition of skills and qualifications as migrant support measures, in particular in the pre-migration phase, their verifiability, replicability, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, ownership and effectiveness can be found at Chindea (2015, pp. 174-195).

Examples: Georgia: Labour Market Integration Platforms for Returnees; Armenia: National Information Centre for Academic Recognition and Mobility; Morocco: Programme de formation qualifiante pour les jeunes Marocains résidant à l'étranger au chômage (Qualifying Training Programme for Young Unemployed Moroccans Abroad, see country case studies); Sri Lanka (implemented through Welfare Funds Abroad). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.3.2 Pre-return and return employment information platforms and call centres (MISMES model 7)

In order to support the return of nationals and facilitate their reintegration into the domestic labour market, different organisations and state institutions have created various information platforms and online websites, e.g. the IOM's IRRiCO – Enhanced and Integrated Approach Regarding Information on Return and Reintegration in Countries of Origin (see IRRiCO II at: <http://irrico.belgium.iom.int/>). There are also guidebooks, brochures and other media, call centres as well as employment- and skills-focused e-platforms such as job portals or job-fairs in destination countries.

Many of these platforms have a multi-dimensional integration objective and provide information about various issues in the country of origin: housing, education; medical systems; how to access labour market (such as recruitment agency links); unemployment benefits; transferring foreign pensions; recognition of qualifications; citizenship legislation; how to open a business, etc. These information platforms also contain contacts and website links. The Tunisian BLEDI portal (www.bledi.gov.tn) addressed to all Tunisians residing abroad is an example. BLEDI facilitates the administrative procedures of Tunisians abroad in relation to Tunisian institutions. It is a general information tool with no specific employment or skills focus.

Call centres are another way of achieving the same end. Call centres are typically organised within foreign affairs ministry bodies, such as the General Consular Directorate in Moldova, to help potential migrants and migrants abroad receive necessary consular information and advice (see **BOX 3.14**). They operate as an adjunct to consular services abroad and provide a wide range of information by phone and through electronic platforms (emails, Facebook) and printed media (leaflets). The information includes consular information (visa, passport, requesting administrative records); notary services; information on border control regulations; travel rules for return to the country of origin; and contact details of consulates abroad and of call centres. These centres also register complaints about abuses committed by host country authorities and refer cases to relevant institutions.

BOX 3.14 MOLDOVA CALL CENTRE FOR RETURNING MIGRANTS

As part of the 'Institutional Capacity Building of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration', a call centre for Moldovan migrants abroad was established (www.mfa.gov.md/centrul-apel/). With a very limited budget of less than USD 100,000, the project managed to provide, over the 2010-15 implementation period, free-of-charge assistance and information to more than 27,000 Moldovan citizens within the country and abroad, including labour migrants.

It was implemented by the United Nations Development Programme in Moldova, with financial support from the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA). Similar call centres were eventually opened with the financial support of the EU and implemented by the Swedish Public Employment Service and the National Employment Agency of Moldova. However, the financial sustainability of those centres is not secure. Another issue is the quality of information provided and public knowledge of their existence.

Source: MISMES country study Moldova, ETF (2015e)

Strengths and weaknesses: These information platforms typically exist in several languages (including the native language). This allows for a wider use not only among migrants, but also among the diaspora (permanent migrants and their children): these diaspora members may not speak the native language, and they may need preliminary information to estimate risks of return to the homeland. Call centres can be useful in countries that have limited financial resources to staff their consular services. However, despite their alleged efficiency, it is hard for developing countries to sustain these centres when funding ends.

Less positively, given the 'introductory' nature of the information offered in these platforms (such as the country-sheets of IRRiCO, but also handbooks for diaspora), one might guess that these platforms are tailored towards the diaspora (permanent migrants) rather than temporary migrants abroad. Temporary migrants, of course, are familiar with the basic socio-political and employment structure of their homeland. However, some information, such as on transferring pensions, qualification recognition, employment services and the contact websites, might be relevant to temporary migrants. In addition, these websites need frequent updates, absorbing important maintenance resources, or they risk becoming rapidly irrelevant.

Elements for assessment: One advantage is that they require a relatively small budget to implement (with the exception of job fairs, which are often expensive in relation to results). However, experience shows that the information provided is often outdated or too basic to be of any use to returnees. This suggests that their main objective might be institutional public relations rather than actually supporting returning migrants. In any case, policy practice indicates (IOM, 2010a) that return information platforms are more useful when they are tailored within or are incorporated into assisted return programmes (such as AVR), as a supplemental component they are designed to meet the needs of specific return-migrant groups. Countries of origin with effective Public Employment Services do not need these kind of platforms, since information and support to returning migrants can be provided by the services themselves.

As for 'job fairs' as a space for employers from countries of origin and migrant workers to meet and eventually strike return deals, they have proved very expensive and produce few concrete results. They have been replaced by electronic platforms (ideally in the framework of the national employment services of countries of origin) carrying out reverse job placement. In any case, countries of origin with effective public employment services do not need this kind of MISMES.

Examples: Tunisia: BLEDI Portal; Morocco: Maghribcom; Armenia: Handbook for Armenians Abroad; Moldova and Armenia Job Fairs (Targeted Initiatives); Georgia: IRRiCO II (see MISMES country case studies); IRRiCO II project. IRRiCO is a global database of 20 country guidebooks for return migrants

implemented by the IOM (<http://irrico.belgium.iom.int/>). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.3.3 Targeted entrepreneurship and income generating schemes for returnees (MISMES model 8)

One typical support measure for returning migrants is to provide some financial support and training for mobilising the migrant's own human and financial resources to create new income generating activities. This is often in the form of business start-ups. Normally, these kinds of programmes are open to all returning migrants and the support they provide is determined by the implementing entity or the donor: money is frequently given in relation to national incentives to investment, and not by the departing State as is the case in AVRR programmes described in the next section.

Grants can be in cash or in kind (production equipment, facility rent, furniture), and it is often conditional on some kind of training for business start-ups and/or to the approval of a business plan. There is sometimes also a requirement for co-financing or co-share investment by the beneficiary (which is usually not the case in the framework of AVRR). Some programmes focus on training activities, including capital raising for business creation (IOM 2010a).

Strengths and weaknesses: Entrepreneurship support and grants for business start-ups are one of the most popular support services among returning migrants, attracting far more interest than complementing vocational training programmes, for example. Given the particular problems experienced upon return by migrants, as well as savings and experiences accumulated during migration time abroad, this type of MISMES can provide livelihood to many migrants, while contributing to national development in countries of origin. The main challenge of these kinds of programmes is to equate the availability of capital for investment and training resources with the entrepreneurial nature of migrants (see **BOX 3.15**).

BOX 3.15 MITOS – MIGRATION TOOLS OPTIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY, AND 'BUSINESS IDEAS FOR DEVELOPMENT': TRAINING AND NETWORKING FOR SME CREATION

GIZ has developed a set of tools to assist migrants in creating small and medium enterprises in their country of origin. The 12 developed tools range from three information websites for migrant opportunities or loans to six different training schemes (on Migrant Investment Opportunities, Business Creation, Cash Flow Management or Online Business Plan Training) and three networking tools (for mentoring and 'partnerpreneurship').

In relation to MITOS, the Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM), a joint operation of GIZ and the German Federal Ministry of Employment, has also developed the programme 'Business Ideas for Development', which provides a series of free services to migrants, both in Germany and in their country of origin (but no capital or funding). The programme focuses on Morocco, Cameroon, Georgia and Indonesia. In Morocco, for instance, since 2010 it has launched 25 start-ups in different technological sectors (70% of the returning migrants are engineers) with a unit investment of between EUR 10,000 and EUR 1,200,000.

Source: GIZ and CIM (2014)

Indeed, the failure rate among income-generating support schemes for returnees remains very high (and is boosted by unfavourable tax systems or even corruption). Start-up grants, meanwhile, are often too small to make a meaningful contribution for entrepreneurship, let alone reach the efficiency threshold: this calls into question their relevance. Additionally, the eligibility criteria for a migrant to be able to benefit from those programmes limits potential beneficiaries dramatically. Finally, some equity issues arises in relation to the more favourable incentives to investment offered to returning migrants in relation to the local population.

Elements for assessment: As so often happens with MISMES, post-funding evaluation of business sustainability is very limited. Either it is not carried out at all or it is carried out only shortly after project completion, generally after six months. On the other hand, when a business grant is made conditional on participation in VET or a business-training course, it is far from obvious that we disaggregate the impact of each of the separate MISMES components (grant and training). In terms of factors contributing to a higher success rate with these initiatives, the following can be highlighted.

- Requirement for co-financing contribution increases the migrant's motivation level and hence their propensity to create sustainable businesses;
- Business consulting support beyond the typical beginners training in business skills increases the sustainability of new businesses;
- Returning migrants who have already been exposed to business management during migration are more likely to apply for these grants and are more likely to create successful businesses.

Examples: Moldova Pare 1+1; Georgia's Consolidating Reintegration Activities in Georgia (CRAG) project (Danish Refugee Council/International Centre for Migration Policy Development) (see country case studies); Returning Enterprising Migrants Adding Development and Employment (REMADE Ghana). For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.3.4 Assisted voluntary return and reintegration – AVRR (MISMES model 9)

The AVRR programmes are primarily used to accompany the readmission of irregular migrants (both rejected asylum-seekers and irregular migrants subject to deportation procedures) as well as for the repatriation of voluntarily returned migrants. They aim to achieve the sustained reintegration of returned migrants in their origin countries, and through integration, they help reduce their propensity to migrate. Most of these programmes have been implemented by the IOM for more than 30 years, helping more than 1.3 million migrants return to their origin countries (IOM, 2010a; and 2010b). By 2013 more than 20 AVRR programmes and 100 projects had been implemented worldwide, with an average of 30,000 migrants assisted per year (IOM, 2013d, p. 22).

Funding comes from destination countries in most cases, and IOM and its partners implement and monitor these programmes. In total, IOM has 70 AVRR programmes (including in 26 EU Member States). Between 2008 and in 2013 it assisted a total of 148,000 voluntary returnees worldwide. At the national level, they can be implemented by NGOs (e.g. international and local branches of Caritas); national bodies or regional branches (such as public employment services in Moldova, IOM, 2013d). In terms of procedure, the applicants fill out a form for 'Requesting Assistance for Reintegration', and to prove their eligibility they have to show a visa or a travel document (IOM 2010b).

Return migrants are offered a 'reintegration package' which includes medical help; training for writing business plans; start-up grants for entrepreneurship; grants for buying equipment; grants for vocational training and for other forms of education; and job placement assistance and counselling. Importantly, the grants are typically not given as cash to migrants (apart from sometimes the return ticket and some pocket money for the journey). Rather the implementing entity makes the payments on behalf of the return migrant once their needs (for business start-up, education training, etc.) are assessed and approved by the implementing entity.

Implementing modalities are defined by the countries of destination of the migrants (the donors) in each case and vary from country to country depending on the beneficiary group or other technical aspects of the programmes. For example, specific AVRR programmes exist for minors and young adults (up to 25 years old) to prevent them being 're-trafficked'. The technical aspects also vary, for example in relation to qualifying conditions, and the start-up grants included in the 'reintegration package' (see the example of Moldova in **BOX 3.16** below).

BOX 3.16 ASSISTED VOLUNTARY RETURN AND REINTEGRATION IN MOLDOVA

In 2011 Moldova started the project Support for Reintegration Mechanism in Moldova for Readmitted and Returned Moldovan Nationals, with a total budget of EUR 100,000. This was the third phase of two previous interventions carried out by the IOM; they were supposed to contribute to the implementation of the Readmission Agreement signed between the EU and Moldova. Over the 24-month implementation period, 50 return migrants benefitted from the programme. After this, 7 re-emigrated, 39 start-up businesses were either supported or created, and 31 of these businesses remained while monitoring continued.

The project provided airport assistance and transportation, temporary housing, reintegration grants (vocational training, business start-up grants or equipment, training on running a business), and instalment and emergency grants (cash grant upon arrival as an instalment, or emergency grants for medical need to vulnerable return migrants). In addition, information booklets were distributed about the project in the main destination countries. The beneficiaries of business start-up grants were monitored for six months.

Among other costs, about 50% of the project budget was spent on reintegration and accommodation grants to return migrants, 1.5% on the dissemination, 3% for trainings for governmental officials and NGOs, and 30% on human resources for the project. The evaluation of the project (Phase 1) revealed that when border-crossing police were in charge of disseminating the information booklet, the re-admitted migrants were more reluctant to commit to the reintegration plan. In subsequent phases, when the dissemination was carried out by the National Employment Agency and its 12 regional offices, and when the size of the support grants was increased (to 1,000 Euros), more beneficiaries came on board (IOM, 2013). Thus, the nature of entities involved in various phases of the project affects the outcome of the project.

Source: IOM (2013d); ETF (2015e)

One of the important standard components of the AVRR programmes is the active information campaign among the diaspora and migrant communities abroad about the origin country. The IOM uses the IRRiCO platform to provide return information to potential returnees (see details in Information Platforms for Return Migrants).

Strengths and weaknesses: Upon completion of these projects, national governments do not have the financial and technical capacity to take over these measures. Thus, because financial issues are harder to solve, international organisations typically train national entities in providing return migrants counselling and training in SME skills to help return migrants in the local labour market (IOM 2010b, 2013d). Additionally, due to the small capacity of these projects to provide start-up grants for entrepreneurship (one of the most attractive components of this programme to return migrants), the implementing entities typically do not publicise themselves excessively through national radio or TV channels. They have, after all, only a limited capacity to help a larger pool of potentially eligible applicants.

Elements for assessment: The measure is implemented on the assumption that beneficiaries will successfully re-integrate (through skills and education improvement, or business start-up support) and this will hinder their re-emigration propensity. Assessments have revealed that readmitted migrants are both less reluctant to engage in such interventions, and are wary of law enforcement authorities. Thus, for example in Moldova, dissemination of project information through airport police turned out to be unproductive. When the National Employment Agency took charge of dissemination, the number of interested beneficiaries increased.

While the cash/grant for business start-ups seems the most attractive component of such interventions for return migrants, it does not necessarily encourage migrants to return. The AVRR for Afghanistan did *not* find evidence that offering potential return migrants in Norway additional cash grants increased their propensity to return. Most migrants returned voluntarily due to dignity concerns and at being

apprehended or they were anticipating that they could be apprehended soon and forcibly returned, or were frustrated from how long it took authorities in the host state to process their asylum applications (Strand et al., 2008).

In terms of cost-effectiveness, an assessment of such initiatives globally has revealed that the country context (war for example) and the beneficiary group (forced or voluntarily returned) shape the cost-effectiveness of the project. In Afghanistan, economically impoverished from war and from internal political instability, many of the business start-ups could not sustain themselves. They either closed after a couple of months or continued to exist only on paper (Strand *et al.* 2008). Additionally, return migrants often used the AVRR to gain cash: for example, while AVRR provided return migrants with equipment and furniture for their start-up business, upon completion of the project some return migrants sold the equipment/furniture for cash to other businesses (Strand et al., 2008).

Examples: All the EU Mobility Partnership countries have AVRR programmes (see MISMES country case studies); Caritas' Strengthening Tailor-made Assisted Voluntary Return Project (STAVR) in fourteen target countries. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.4 Multi-dimensional MISMES

Many MISMES are actually 'packaged' as part of integrated programmes dealing with migration issues from a multidimensional perspective. As both literature and practice reveal, this combination may be one of the defining factors of success of MISMES: bilateral labour agreements, for instance, often have a mix of migrant support measures, combining mechanisms for: pre-selection of candidates for migration and job matching; pre-departure orientation; measures to protect the rights of migrant workers (such as model contracts or contract registration systems); and support measures for returning migrants. However, for the purposes of our study, such measures have to be assessed separately.

This notwithstanding, a few consolidated or emerging models of multi-dimensional migrant support measures merit specific attention from an employment and skills perspective. This type of MISMES involves different types of measures and intervenes at different migration stages that cannot be lumped together under one stage. In some cases, those integrated programmes may include policy development and institutional capacity-building aspects as well. Below two such models are explained: migrant resource centres and migrant welfare funds.

3.4.1 Migrant resource centres (MISMES model 10)

Migrant resource centres (MRCs), migrant service centres (as they were denominated in the Western Balkans) or mobility centres first emerged in the 1970s, and have been increasingly developed as a migration management tool in many countries of origin. Recently the EU also supported those centres through funding, even within the framework of Mobility Partnerships (e.g. Mobility Centre in Georgia). Indeed ETF country case studies confirm their existence almost in all countries with an EU Mobility Partnership (ETF, 2015b; 2015c; 2015e; 2015f). They have become a standard policy intervention widespread globally, with the objective to become a resource and information hub for migrants at various stages of migration from departure to return (IOM, 2009b; 2015a).

These centres can be opened both in migrant-sending countries and abroad by various entities in charge of ensuring the labour market integration and protection of migrants in the host state (as was the case in the 1980s with the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Resource Centres). They provide services online, in person, through personal visits to migrants, via printed media, etc. Institutional arrangements typically include the close coordination and involvement of national authorities, often physically adjunct to governmental entities dealing with migrant workers or their employment issues (IOM, 2009b; 2015a).

MRCs provide potential migrants with information about the risks of irregular migration; skills assessment; pre-departure orientation; job counselling and job-matching services; recruitment related abuses; and procedures and opportunities for legal migration. For migrants who intend to return or who have returned, these centres provide information on employment opportunities in the country of origin; requalification trainings; various forms of support for reintegration, including training and support for entrepreneurship (see the Armenian example in **BOX 3.17**).

BOX 3.17 MIGRANT RESOURCE CENTRES IN ARMENIA

In January 2013, an EU-funded project 'Support of Circular Migration and Re-integration Process in Armenia' started to be implemented by two NGOs (People in Need, Armenian Relief Society), State Employment and the Social Service of Armenia. The objectives of the project included increasing awareness among potential migrants about legal migration, the risks of irregular migration and about the rights of migrant workers abroad. There was also the aim of promoting the re-integration of return migrants and the use of any skills acquired abroad. The project has opened migration resource centres (MRCs) in four regions of Armenia, which were hosted at the local branches of the State Employment Service of Armenia. Each MRC staff included four social workers, a programmer and an employment counsellor. Upon completion of the 2.5-year project, the MRCs will be transferred to the government bodies to continue this operation.

For *potential and seasonal migrants*, the MRCs organise pre-departure orientation on the risks of irregular migration; on maintaining legal employment and legal status abroad; as well as on providing information about the services of relevant civil society organisations abroad. For *potential return and return migrants*, the MRCs provide information on Armenia and its relevant legislation, counselling on employment, and on mandatory military service. Skills enhancement and requalification training courses are also organised for both potential and return migrants. Additionally, to assist in reintegration, return migrants are eligible for start-up business grants amounting to EUR 3,000-10,000. Importantly, all potential applicants for start-up grants must also participate in a 10-day training course on how to start a business. Training modules include writing a business plan, taxation regulation and related legislation, financial reporting, entrepreneurship risks and anti-crisis management.

Source: www.arsarmenia.org/index.php?act=programs&op=viewitem&itemid=174&langs=am, www.migrant.am/s/index.php/en/eu-program-2013-2015, ETF (2015b)

Strengths and weaknesses: Bringing all types of services and information on migration under one delivery point (one-stop-shop) is an effective way of addressing the needs of different types of migrants (IOM 2015a). The two main challenges of MRC services are the often-low numbers of users and the relevance and added value of their services. To the extent that they are bundled into a single centre, it is impossible to assess the impact of each service separately.

One specific activity which is often associated to migrant resource centres (or to pre-departure training programmes) is the elaboration of migrant country guides in disseminating information on destination countries. They are a compilation of resources and practical information on different aspects of destination countries addressed to would-be migrants. They are often drafted by external experts and published in a paper format. As such, they are expensive to produce and they rapidly become outdated. Dissemination is often poor. However, such guides continue to be widely produced, and actually very often for the same countries of destination. Beyond the efficiency issues that they raise, there is also the question of their relevance. For literate migrants, a good internet resource centre is much cheaper to produce, easier to update and friendly to use, and for illiterate migrants such paper guides are useless.

Elements for assessment: In terms of efficiency, the direct costs of MRCs are often limited thanks to hosting in governmental offices and sometimes the secondment of public officers to serve them. However, the indirect costs can be very high, and compare unfavourably with online information

services. The bundling of services makes it very difficult to isolate the cost-efficiency of each of them. To the extent that they act as a 'one-stop shop', they are convenient for beneficiaries to use.

The major player on MRCs globally is IOM, although ILO also manages a number of centres in Asia (mainly in the framework of the GMS Triangle Project). IOM (2009b) published an assessment including fiches of fourteen such centres. Among the best MRC practices identified were a needs assessment before establishing a MRC; ensuring networks of contacts with other actors and institutions; and integration into governmental structures to ensure sustainability. However, there is no study assessing the impact of MRCs on the labour market outcomes of beneficiaries. According to some client surveys, the most desired MRC services are grants to business start-ups (and less so information, consultation or orientation services) (IOM, 2015a). A thorough, recent review of migrant resource centres, in particular in the pre-migration phase, their verifiability, replicability, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, ownership and effectiveness can be found at Chindea (2015, pp. 196-238).

Examples: Georgia: Mobility Centre; Armenia: migrant resource centres; Moldova: IASCI-Nexus project in Moldova; Tunisia: migrant resource centres in Tunis, Le Kef and Sfax; for migration guides: Handbook for Armenians Abroad; Sri Lanka: Migrant Services Centre; Lebanon: Caritas Lebanon Migrant Centre; Colombia: América-España Solidaridad y Cooperación; Tajikistan: Information and Resource Centres for Labour Migrants; Mali: Centre d'information et de gestion des migrations; Albania: Sportel e Migracioni, Sarande; Democratic Republic of Congo: Maison des Congolais de l'étranger et des migrants; Tripartite Action to Protect the Rights of Migrant Workers within and from the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS TRIANGLE project): MRCs in Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao, Myanmar and Vietnam. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

3.4.2 Migrant welfare funds (MISMES model 11)

Migrant welfare funds exist in Asia and are intended for migrants at vulnerable times. The Philippines (Overseas Workers Welfare Administration, OWWA), Sri Lanka (Overseas Workers Welfare Fund, OWWF), Pakistan (Overseas Pakistani Foundation) and Bangladesh (Wage Earner's Welfare Fund) are the main implementers of Migrant Welfare Funds. The objective is to support migrant workers abroad during the employment or health and accidental injury, help finance repatriation or involuntary return if the employment contract has been terminated due to violation of rights of the migrant.

These funds operate as governmental or as semi-governmental bodies. In these countries these funds are integrated and linked to a governmental body that manages the foreign labour migration of its population, and works with migrant workers to meet their needs: this includes recruitment, monitoring work contracts, wages, employment abuses abroad, support in court applications of migrant workers, etc. This exerts additional monitoring on the employment conditions of migrant workers abroad: who are the beneficiaries of the Fund's services of they receive job-site injuries, or if their rights are violated and the contract has to be terminated and they will be forced to return, etc.

Activities of these funds are paid from the contributions of migrants. Potential migrant workers contribute a fixed fee to the Fund before departure, usually between USD 25 and USD 80 per contract period (two years). Migrant workers abroad may also join the Fund. All categories of migrant workers, regardless of likelihood to death or accident, skills level or profession, pay the same fixed fee, which also automatically entitles them to death and accidental insurance. The benefits of the Fund are uniform for all categories of migrants, regardless of profession, pay or skill level.

These funds provide, too, support to migrant families in terms of: bank credit for starting a business; funds for education of migrant children; as well as loans for housing and for departure if needed; or a fixed compensation for injuries and damages incurred during employment abroad. In some countries the Fund handles migrant insurance claims itself (e.g. in the Philippines), whereas in other states the insurance schemes are processed through insurance companies (e.g. in Sri Lanka and Pakistan). In

Sri Lanka the Fund also provides business loans for return migrants (see the example in **BOX 3.18** below).

BOX 3.18 SRI LANKA OVERSEAS WORKERS WELFARE FUND (OWWF)

In 1985, the Sri Lankan government decided to make foreign employment and remittances from migrants abroad one of the pillars of its economic development strategy. To implement this policy, it established the Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE). Its main mandate was to promote the social welfare and protection of Sri Lankan migrant workers abroad through the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), established in 1994.

All departing migrant workers are required to participate in pre-departure training, which provides them with a certificate they present when registering at the SLBFE. Migrant workers who fail to register at the SLBFE can be imprisoned. Once registered at the SLBFE, migrant workers should also pay for the mandatory social insurance (about USD 25 for membership for typically a two-year contract). The SLBFE uses 70% of the money for visa paperwork and training programmes, whereas the remaining 30% is the actual budget of the welfare insurance fund. In 2006, the insurance fund offered accidental death insurance (equivalent to USD 10,000), disablement insurance (USD 1,000-5,000), and covered travel expenses (USD 2,500). The fund also offers scholarships to migrant children left behind, loans for housing and for departure to families of migrants. Migrant workers are eligible to enjoy the benefits of the insurance upon return for six months. However, if the migrant gets a new job upon completion of the previous job, and if the migrant fails to register at the OWWF and to return home to claim previous benefits, then insurance benefits expire.

One of the strengths of this model of welfare funds is that they are part of a larger and integrated migrant support measures. And, indeed, the SLBFE is also responsible for: licensing employment agencies domestically; providing a job bank of vacancies abroad for potential migrants; setting minimum requirements for employment contracts; providing pre-departure training and orientation, offering, too, language training, skills enhancement courses; maintaining labour attaches offices; and maintaining a database on migrant workers abroad.

Financial sustainability has been one of the major challenges of the OWWF. Data indicate that the OWWF receives less premium payments than it spends to pay for the claims, which in the late 2000s had led the Sri Lankan government to make an open tender to find an insurance company that would offer more sustainable and beneficial terms for the Fund's functioning. Experts have also noted that as per 2006, the OWWF did not provide a sustainable social security scheme, such as a social pension scheme, for long-term migrants who had worked most of their life abroad.

Source: Rosario (2008)

Strengths and weaknesses: The main challenge has again been the financial sustainability. Due to poverty in migrant-sending countries, countries have kept the membership fee at low levels, which, leads to financial shortages at the Fund when complaints/claims cost more than the sum of membership fees, as has happened in Sri Lanka. In the Philippines this was the reason that prompted authorities to increase the membership fee.

Experts suggest that the Fund's insurance mechanism be modified and migrant workers be given an option to purchase an additional insurance, besides the baseline support already provided uniformly by the Funds to all migrants. This might help workers more adequately address any losses (terminated contract, health injury, etc.) that they incur on the job (Baruah and Cholewinski, 2006). IOM (2015b) reviews the performance of different services provided by migrant welfare funds in Asia and their pros and cons versus private insurance schemes.

Elements for assessment: Since these funds have been established in Asia for more than 20 years, the governments have conducted regular assessments to find their strengths and weaknesses. These funds have been found to be effective when they are part of an integrated labour migration management system, and are linked to a governmental agency monitoring the needs and risks of

migrant workers abroad. In the Philippines, the pioneer of migrant welfare funds in Asia, these Funds are part of the three-tier system of labour migration management. This system includes licensed recruitment agencies in the Philippines; labour attachés in the consulates; and the Funds itself, the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) services that operate abroad in cities with large Filipino migrant communities.

In terms of cost-effectiveness, these funds not only help protect the rights and welfare of migrants abroad, they also serve as a secondary mechanism for monitoring the gaps in other components of the integrated migrant protection system. For example, by monitoring expenditure for paid claims by claim category (e.g. job-site injury coverage, or payments for return amidst terminated contracts etc.), one can find the gaps in migrant rights' protection. It is also possible to track at what phases of migration (at pre-departure training and orientation, recruitment and contract, etc.).

Examples: Philippine Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), Sri Lanka Overseas Workers Welfare Fund (OWWF), Overseas Pakistani Foundation); Bangladesh Wage Earner's Welfare Fund. For more examples, see the Excel file on the web.

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INVENTORY RESULTS

The European Neighbourhood countries are in their majority emigration countries due to many factors including difficult labour market conditions. This high labour mobility across borders increasingly puts education systems under pressure to produce qualified human resources both for domestic and foreign labour markets. On the other hand, imperfect labour markets and asymmetric information prevents the full use of migrant skills both in countries of origin and destination. Therefore, migration policies need to take into account 'skills and employment' aspects in both countries of origin and destination. Calls are already made for the more efficient use of migrants' and returnees' labour and skills (OECD and EU, 2014; and 2015), and the new European Agenda on Migration highlighted again the need for facilitating job-matching for third country nationals and recognition of migrants' qualifications (European Commission, 2015).

Within this context, MISMES has emerged and expanded as a policy category. Alongside MISMES, the EU has been developing a series of Mobility Partnerships that aim to bring coherence and stability to migration from important sending countries within its framework of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (European Commission 2011). Initially piloted with Cape Verde, the Mobility Partnerships now include Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Morocco, Tunisia, and Jordan, and are seen as an important factor in the general direction of EU migration policy¹⁴. However, they are not static arrangements, as noted in a report by Angenendt (2014), 'ultimately, mobility partnerships can be seen as institutionalized dialogue processes in which objectives, methods, and reviews must be constantly renegotiated'. All these justify more attention to MISMES as one of the tools in facilitating migration management.

This study presents the findings of a global analytical inventory of migrant support measures implemented in countries of origin from an employment and skills perspective (MISMES). This is the first attempt to compile, classify and assess these migrant support measures in terms of cost-effectiveness and in terms, too, of the outcomes of the migration process. The report presented an overview of 11 MISMES models based on the compilation and analysis of 300 projects; structured around four phases of migration (pre-migration, during-migration, post-migration, multi-dimensional). This chapter starts with summary findings from the 11 MISMES models identified, continues with the broader policy conclusions on MISMES as a policy tool, and develops a series of recommendations for the future design and implementation of MISMES.

4.1 Summary findings from the 11 MISMES models

Specialised (public) international placement agencies have proved their effectiveness in different contexts and for different kind of migrants (highly skilled in Tunisia, unskilled in Asia) in prospection of job opportunities, pre-selection and job matching. They are sustainable (and often self-financing) and specialise precisely in optimizing the skills and labour market outcomes of migrant workers, establishing standard mechanisms to ensure that they protect their rights. They compete effectively with private recruitment agencies, develop economies of scale and pursue the public good. However, they do not always take into account development considerations, since very often, their main objective is to maximize the number of placements abroad. Despite their unbeatable position, they rarely undertake tracing studies of their 'clients' or 'beneficiaries'.

¹⁴ Negotiations with Belarus and Lebanon to sign Mobility Partnership declarations were ongoing at the time of writing.

The development of specific databases/labour information systems for pre-selection of migrant, sometimes even in the language of the destination countries, is a common strategy for public employment services: these services are seeking to establish themselves as intermediaries in international migration. However, such databases are very expensive to develop and show a high rate of failure and low sustainability. This may be due to a lack of supporting infrastructure; to technical obstacles; or to the fact that they are not adapted to the interests of both parties. Countries where public employment services use their general job-seeker databases to respond to international job offers, sometimes establishing special procedures for it, have been much more successful in developing effective job matching systems. Clearly, international job matching and national job matching can reinforce each other.

Pre-departure orientation is maybe the MISMES reaching the largest number of potential or would-be migrants, and is widely used, in one way or another, in many countries of origin. However, it is difficult to judge to what extent the orientation (or 'training course') provided is relevant and useful for migrant workers; or whether this is part of a package including the possibility to migrate, and hence basically supply-driven. An evaluation of the EU-funded programmes in this field produced 'mixed results', according to a comprehensive evaluation carried out in 2011 (Charpin and Aiolfi, 2011). Social networks in destination countries might be an effective substitute for pre-departure orientation, at least for permanent migration. It rarely entails (with the exception of Asian countries) a real professional training component. Rather, it focuses on cultural orientation and practical information. In any case, its effectiveness seems dependent on the extent to which it is linked to concrete job opportunities, and hence to the knowledge of the context, the sector and the occupation in which the migrant will go.

Model employment contracts are clearly a cost-effective, easy-to-implement and straightforward way of protecting migrant workers' rights, in particular for most vulnerable, non-skilled migrants, at least in its non-mandatory variety. The **registration of contracts** of migrant workers in the public employment services of countries of origin is another effective, complementary way of protecting their rights; this is particularly true, if it is also used in the framework of the recognition of acquired skills or social security rights, as is the case in some countries.

Professional skills development for migration depends to a high extent, as far as its impact on labour market integration is concerned, on the quality of the training provided. To the extent that labour market needs can be integrated into the training programme, this kind of MISMES feature a high rate of placements. The involvement of employers in destination countries and the integration of those programmes into wider reform plans of national vocational training institutions (i.e., their level of embedment into national policies) are key success factors. **International traineeships** are an effective way of developing the skills of would-be migrants and pre-selecting them. However, they are often too expensive to implement; they are largely limited to qualified or at least skilled migrant workers; and they face substantial language, cultural and administrative barriers, which impose substantial costs for any upscaling.

Promoting the permanent return of high-skilled migrants is a strategy designed to win back national talents through a reverse brain drain process. At face value, this MISMES aims to optimize skills and match them to the needs of the national labour market. As in many other MISMES, the issue is to what extent the incentives required to let this happen exceed the benefits of this kind of policy intervention. They are often linked to targeted initiatives to promote the creation of small and medium enterprises in countries of origin.

Programmes for the temporary stay of qualified migrants in countries of origin have a long tradition, in particular in Sub-Saharan Africa and in sectors like health or education (both basic and university education). They have proved useful in transferring knowledge back to countries of origin. However, even if the qualified migrants work on a voluntary basis, they are often expensive (in terms

of travel expenses and other costs). Ultimately, only when they are clearly targeted (in terms of the sector and the objectives of the process) do they produce a positive cost-benefit ratio.

Validation and recognition of migrants' skills and qualifications. This is necessary both in a pre-migration phase, mostly done by countries of destination according to their regulations, and in a post-migration phase, mostly done by countries of origin based on their own frameworks. In particular, the validation of (non-formal) skills learned abroad is an obvious mechanism to capitalize on the migration experience. However, two issues undermine this MISMES: the difficulties in defining and testing acquired non-formal skills in the framework of the national qualification system (which is not necessarily acquainted with such skills); and the relevance of those skills for the national labour market (where they may not be demanded). As a general rule, the validation of migrant worker skills only make sense in the framework of more general systems to validate practical skills in the national labour market: the level of embedding in national policies is key.

Pre-return and return employment information platforms have the advantage of requiring relatively low budgets (with the exception of job fairs, where cost-effectiveness is dubious). As all online information services, they are effective means of provide information and hence improve the match of migrant workers or returnees (both in terms of skills use and of labour market integration). However, the relevance and update of information is often a major issue, so this kind of MISMES is more effective when addressed to specific groups of migrants. The relatively small number of beneficiaries is another frequent issue with this kind of measure.

Targeted entrepreneurship and income generating schemes for returnees often combine some form of grants and training programmes. They feature a high rate of failure and have proved useful only for the returning migrants who were already exposed to business management during migration and who can contribute co-financing capital. The business environment in the country of origin is determinant in the success prospects of these initiatives.

Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVVR) programmes are one of the most widespread and most standardized support measures found in our search. Despite their name, they often help forced return migrants expelled from countries of destination or receiving incentives to leave said countries. Though a whole set of entrepreneurship support and reintegration initiatives are showcased in this framework, often AVVR barely qualifies as a MISMES: they are rather a social benefit to ease transition back into the country of origin. There is no question that they contribute to the reintegration process and can enhance the prospects of setting up a successful business.

Migrant resource centres (MRCs) or mobility centres are becoming the visible 'window' of many migration policy interventions, including MISMES. The idea of combining all services and information relevant for potential or returning migrants is, of course, rational. The question is the rate of use (often there is no data on the number of beneficiaries, but there is anecdotal evidence of some cases of low rates of use). There is also the relevance of some of the services or 'products' offered. Being a package, it is difficult to differentiate those elements that have a positive impact from those which do not. A good example of this are migration guides, which are very popular in many MRCs (because they are visible and tangible). These are expensive to produce and print, and can be better replaced by on-line information resources (which can be more easily updated, much cheaper to collect and produce and accessible to anybody who can read). They are more effective to the extent that they are embedded in national public employment services or other public bodies.

Migrant welfare funds are a combination of an insurance scheme and a holistic and integrated intervention model aiming at assist migrant workers from pre-departure to reintegration through a holistic approach. They are based on a pay-as-you-go system, which proves effective as a redistribution mechanism for most vulnerable migrant workers. This raises, however, some issues of sustainability over time.

4.2 Broader policy conclusions on MISMEs as a policy tool

MISMEs have been a marginal tool in migration management. Despite the recently increasing number of MISMEs, its value is largely underestimated in the management of labour migration by policy-makers in the European Neighbourhood: this is true both of countries of origin and of destination. They are sometimes used for ‘social or public relations’ objectives rather than for labour market integration and skills utilisation. As a result, the number of beneficiaries is extremely low for many such measures, both individually and in aggregated terms. It is common that the direct beneficiaries of job matching systems, skills enhancement or entrepreneurship support measures for returning migrants is in the hundreds, sometimes even in the tens. Even if pre-departure orientation reaches higher numbers of potential or would-be migrants, all MISMEs together typically reach only a small share of total (labour) migrants. The only exception seems to be mandatory schemes, such as pre-departure orientations in the Philippines or Sri Lanka. This makes MISMEs a relatively marginal tool in migration management today.

MISMEs have been largely donor-driven and have not been integrated into national systems. Many MISMEs are designed and funded by donors, often reflecting the priorities of destination countries and having time-bound project rationale. They are frequently grant-call driven, i.e., they focus on topics more likely to attract funding, such as trafficking, without taking into account the real MISME needs of the countries of origin. For this reason, they tend to fund post-migration MISMEs (see the MISME country case studies on Moldova, Georgia and Armenia, in particular); whereas countries of origin tend to focus on pre-migration MISMEs (see the country case studies on Morocco and Tunisia). Most often, there is no coordination among these different schemes or MISMEs with national migration strategies. Overlaps and repetitiveness is common with MISMEs, particularly in published guidebooks, brochures and booklets designed for pre-departure training and return orientation.

Sustainability of MISMEs has been a major weakness as a result. Continuity after the project’s end is by far the most important challenge for almost all the policy measures we have examined, and the project rationale prevailing in many of them further endangers this. Since the funding for such measures is largely provided by donors, it is difficult for developing countries with limited budgets to sustain these measures after funding is over. Projects either end, or are transferred to national authorities and run in a half-hearted way, given the lack of funds. This suggests that donor organisations should have a stronger emphasis on the sustainable aspects of any project, and funded projects should allocate some of their funding as reserve funds for assessing the success of the sustainability strategy: this would be a more realistic way of getting to grips with the challenges of sustainability and project impact.

MISMEs seem to have high operational costs and low cost efficiency (at least on the basis of casual observations). MISMEs are often a labour intensive policy intervention and unit cost (*per* beneficiary) seems to be very high whenever we have data to calculate it. This is even truer in MISMEs implemented by international organisations and involving international staff: this is quite frequent in many countries and means high transaction costs. Therefore, in many cases the amounts spent are difficult to justify in terms of the number of beneficiaries, unless there are significant positive externalities in the policy interventions. Thus the threshold of efficiency (under which the unit cost justifies the measure in itself) is seldom reached.

As mentioned before, cost-effectiveness is hard to assess because typically policy interventions target not one but many objectives. These include not only employment or skills support measures, but also the capacity building of national agencies dealing with labour migration, organising trainings for governmental officials, etc. In other words, projects are complex. Thus, unless one has a detailed budget of policy measure implementation – breaking down the costs for the implementation of the

particular measure – the reliable and direct assessment of cost-effectiveness of the measure will be hard to achieve.

Most MISMES has a bias on targeting certain migrant groups. Indeed we have noted the strong focus of projects either on ‘highly-skilled migrants’ or on ‘unskilled/ irregular migrants’: the first mainly interests countries or origin, the second countries of destination. In reality, most migrants do not belong to either group: most are medium-skilled migrants, so not many measures exist for the majority of migrants. More attention is needed for this large group as part of mainstreaming MISMES in regular services.

No systematic information collection and evaluation exist on MISMES. As already mentioned many times in the report, our knowledge base for a scientific assessment of MISMES results is extremely limited. This is due to the lack of systematic monitoring and follow-up mechanisms and impact assessments of migrant support measures. European LFS include very few migrants in their samples (with no specific information) and do not ask questions on participation in any kind of migrant support measures. A systematic oversampling of migrant communities would be required in order to reach representative sample sizes, and some additional questions would need to be included. Similarly the LFS of origin countries may include more migrants/returnees in their sample and ask questions on their participation in migrant support measures.

Tracing studies of migrant workers, finding their labour market performance in destination countries or upon return and correlating it to their participation in MISMES are necessary for a proper assessment. Some pilot tracing studies could be implemented to gain insights from migrants (through surveys and interviews) whether: the training and learned skills were useful abroad; to what extent migrants ended up using and benefitting from the knowledge and skills delivered during trainings; as well as specifying at what stage of migration the learned skills and trainings were most beneficial. This has to take into account the in-depth analysis of specific MISMES and the contextual factors affecting their implementation, with interviews with all the stakeholders involved and direct observation. The country case studies carried out in the framework of this project have included a first country approach to this end.

The existence of a certain ‘evaluation fear’ among practitioners and implementers in relation to MISMES must be reported. The assessment of the success/failure of policy measures should differentiate outcomes (short-term and immediate) from the impact (long-term, at the societal level). Typically, the success of policy interventions is measured by various indicators, such as the number of beneficiaries, the number of trainings organised, the number of publications (brochures, TV announcements, leaflets, etc.) produced, whether capacity building objectives were met (such as establishing a centre, drafting a policy document, a memorandum, etc.) and more. However, evaluations, conducted shortly in the aftermath of the project are capable of capturing only the immediate outcomes of the project. Thus, commitments should be made by donors and practising implementers to return to these policy interventions (and one-time projects) to check for their longer-term impact for the beneficiaries, at the community and societal level. External, independent evaluations are much more useful in drawing lessons and feeding a virtuous learning circle.

Despite wide transfer of practices, limited global learning curve exists from experience. The global review of MISMES highlights a high degree of mimesis in MISMES across countries and contexts. Practices and models are transferred and replicated from country to country in a mechanical way (often by global actors, often in the framework of response to a call for project proposals): this is done without a previous analysis of their effectiveness or impact, and without them being adapted to local contexts. Failures and challenges are replicated in this process. Our examination of various assessments of relevant policy measures (often conducted by consultants hired by the project implementers themselves) revealed that when certain phases of the project implementation are not smooth – such as the project starting with delay, or with inadequate personnel, or when there are

problems with inter-agency coordination, which are all indicators of bad technical implementation of the project – consequences are not drawn from such evidence.

Evaluations of such projects often recommend further renewal or additional funding for the project in order to close the gaps that were present in the past implementation. These make it more expensive and less efficient without necessarily making it more successful in its impact. This study should help minimize the uninformed mimicking of policy measures globally, and may foster innovative adjustments by future borrowers of such measures in order to cope with expected failures: from the past experiences of other organisations. In general, this will help improve the efficiency and the impact of any policy measures implemented. It should be noted that there are a plethora of pilot MISMES initiatives carried out without any systematic effort to assess their success; the factors that lead to success; and their replicability or upscalability. The findings of the studies and evaluations are rarely operationalized; the inertia of business as usual prevails over the learning-by-doing approach.

4.3 Recommendations for future MISMES design and implementation

Greater interest and funding for MISMES can be used for better migration management. There is an increasing interest and availability of funds across the countries of origin and destination, including within the EU and in the European Neighbourhood region after the development of Mobility Partnerships. Considering the fact that migration is here to stay and that we need to make the best of it, MISMES can be one of the tools in the management of legal and circular labour migration. Countries of origin who are increasingly interested in investing in their migrant populations can learn tremendously from the past experiences of MISMES, in terms of design, implementation, as well as evaluation.

Combination of different measures in one package is the most effective approach. Both the literature review and our limited observations point to more successful labour market outcomes for migrants and for host and sending states when several migrant support measures are combined and implemented together, e.g. the combination of coordinated language and pre-departure training; adequate and cost-efficient qualification recognition and job matching; work exchange programmes and training on the job, etc. Thus, while these measures should, as noted above, be evaluated for their internal efficiency, their impact on labour market outcomes depends on how integrated they are with other relevant migration support measures, as well as contextual factors and institutional arrangements.

MISMES should be integrated into the national systems of origin countries. There is a wide consensus and some evidence of the importance of institutional and political factors. The better integrated MISMES are with the general institutions and the policies of the countries of origin, the more effective they will be. In other terms, migration policy interventions need to be embedded in national policies (in terms of vocational training and skills development, job intermediation services or promotion of entrepreneurship). Local public institutions are better placed to ensure the sustainability of MISMES, but they are often weaker in institutional and financial terms: this makes a strong case for capacity building programmes; or for the inclusion of capacity building components in MISMES programmes. There should be more capacity building programmes in the institutions of origin countries, especially those dealing with vocational training and skills development, job intermediation services and the promotion of employment and entrepreneurship.

Another institutional factor that enhances the impact and effectiveness of MISMES is the existence of bilateral labour agreements between countries of origin and destination. This can be an effective enabling framework to protect migrant's rights and to optimize the outcomes of all stages of migration. They offer a natural legal-institutional setting to design and implement MISMES in all stages (pre-migration, during migration and post-migration), and they usually include MISMES-like measures geared to migrant worker needs. Some examples have been highlighted in the country case studies

(Spain-Morocco) and in this inventory (Costa Rica-Nicaragua or the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Philippines). For the same reason, but at national level, **multi-sectorial partnerships and social dialogue** seem to be contributing factors to the successful implementation of measures. They should potentially reinforce the sustainability of policy interventions beyond funding by pushing various interest groups to commit to their part of the execution: examples from the country case studies are the Targeted Initiative and the Swedish SIDA activities on legal labour migration in Moldova.

Public-private balance is necessary in MISMES actions and capacity building. Our study confirmed again how important it is to consider contextual factors and to measure the impact of all policy measures in the context of country's migration dynamics. While implementation may be successful and the impact of the measure on direct beneficiaries may be high, if the country migration dynamics run against the project it will ultimately be ineffective. For example, in one of the assessments of the IOM AENAES projects the evaluator made an interesting point. Despite the successful implementation of the project and its impact on beneficiaries, including the capacity building of governmental personnel to regulate overseas employment, less than 1% of migrant workers in Asia (Bangladesh, and Pakistan) and only 10% in the Philippines are sent overseas through governmental agencies. A much larger portion of potential migrants workers rely on the private recruitment agencies for overseas employment (Hayes, 2009, p. 7).

Thus, strategic cooperation with the government should not 'overshadow' targeted capacity building and engagement with private sector actors. Though public-private partnerships do not always work well, in particular in the case of public and private employment agencies, both of them are extremely important for migrants. In many countries of origin, a substantial part of migrants are actually placed through private employment agencies; this makes it vital to find mechanisms to encourage them to enter into the migration business under certain standards and let them benefit from public-funded MISMES.

The greatest dividends seems to come from 'investment in skills development' in all migration phases. Attention to migrants' skills and skills-related MISMES is crucial for any labour migration policy interventions. In particular, professional skills development for migration and job-linked training programmes feature a high level of success in terms of labour market integration. They remain a key instrument to overcome widespread skills mismatches between countries of origin and destination, which is one of the main factors repressing the benefits of migration. In more concrete terms, this mismatch often leads to a lack of suitable candidates for international job vacancies (a frequent problem even when job opportunities abroad are available). In particular, programmes which combine training investment with migration prospects in regions with high migrant outflows can help likely migrant populations to develop, use, enhance and renew skills with longer-term social benefits to the region.

Despite the consolidating discourse on the link between migration and skills, examples of MISMES focused to enhance the skills of potential migrants or to ensure the use of their skills in destination countries or upon return are very few in relative terms: at least they are compared, for instance, with pre-departure orientation or support for entrepreneurship upon return. The only exception is Asia, e.g. the Philippines, Nepal and Sri-Lanka. Here where migration authorities are investing heavily in the skills of even unskilled labour migrants (in the domestic or the hotel sector, for instance) before departure and recognising their skills upon return. They are doing so in the framework of their national qualification systems, and hence without introducing any distortion into their labour markets.

There are a few golden rules for the success of MISMES projects. The first and foremost is regular dialogue and cooperation between countries of origin and destination, and in particular the direct **involvement of employers** from destination countries. The latter has been found to critically increase the positive impact of MISMES, in particular when linked to concrete job opportunities. The

second such golden rule is specific attention to the migrant's qualifications level in the design and implementation of any MISMES programme.

Therefore, there should be higher attention to international transparency and quality of education and training systems across countries, a quasi-compulsory pre-departure evaluation and documentation of migrant skills. In general skills should be **more visible, readable and portable** internationally regardless of where and how they were learnt. The third and last rule is the importance of **expectations management** on both sides during the implementation of MISMES; namely 'potential migrants', 'prospective employers' and 'returnees'. Many MISMES are designed and implemented without proper consultation with these groups and may create unexpected consequences if no attention is given to their expectations. It is also important to buy their active participation and collaboration in any programme.

Promising examples of 'skills partnerships' between countries of origin and destination could be replicated. This inventory found some interesting skills partnerships which combine international development cooperation with migration management policies. Although these two policy fields usually have nothing to do with each other, there is an added value in combining them in certain sectors with high labour mobility. For example, interesting projects with good potential development effects include investing in schools from likely emigrant regions to learn, use and renew skills (e.g. the Italian Fayoum project in Egypt); or creating international traineeships for professional skills development across countries (e.g. German triple-win project). As noted by Clemens (2014), global skills partnerships can provide a common cooperation ground to the countries of origin and destination for migration management.

Recently adopted EU conclusions on migration have already called for mainstreaming of migration policies with the development cooperation and neighbourhood policies and tools, and adequate funding for the implementation of relevant policies. 'Coherence and synergies between different policy fields, such as common foreign and security policy, justice and home affairs, human rights, development cooperation, trade and employment, is key' (Council of the European Union, 2015). As promoted by Clemens (2014), global skills partnerships can provide a common cooperation ground to the countries of origin and destination in migration management.

Therefore, **linking migration management with international development cooperation** might be an interesting approach. There is certainly a need for more investment in the education and training systems of origin countries, and more cooperation programmes between education and VET institutions of origin and destination countries (e.g. twinning, dual certification programmes, common curricula, student exchanges). If these focus first on the sectors with high labour mobility and migration, this would be beneficial for both sides. Given the importance of economic inequalities, unbalanced social and territorial development patterns and lack of jobs prospects leading to emigration, there is also a strong need for more support in job creation and entrepreneurship opportunities in countries of origin. This has the potential to tackle with the root causes for the prevention and orderly management of migration, and initiate a 'virtuous cycle' for a win-win-win situation for all.

Some easy policy measures can encourage the creation of more evidence and independent analysis of MISMES. We know too little of MISMES, their benefits for migrant workers in terms of skills utilization or labour market integration and their relative cost-effectiveness. We have too little systematic information available to expand our knowledge. As a consequence, this study recommends that national governments and international donors (in particular EU institutions, EU Member States and the European Neighbourhood countries) take two concrete research-related actions: (i) the development of a 'global repository of MISMES' hosted and coordinated by a voluntary centre; and (ii) the implementation of a mandatory MISMES information template and post-MISMES evaluation for all funded and implemented MISMES programmes.

Global MISMEMS Repository: As noted many times in these pages, information is so scattered that any systematic analysis has to deal first with the challenge of data and information compilation. An electronic platform, systematically compiling MISMEMS worldwide, their main characteristics, links to relevant information and project assessments when available, would be most useful in achieving evidence-based policy in this field. Such a repository would be systematically updated and might integrate all the main global actors in this field. The best institutional arrangement would be to host it at an independent research institution and to configure it as a partnership with the main global actors in this field. Since the global actors in MISMEMS implementation are a limited number of countries and organisations, their commitment would greatly facilitate this task. Such a project could be a priority for EU action in this field, for instance in the framework of the new Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme 2014-20.

Mandatory MISMEMS Information Template and Evaluation: Current project evaluations do not provide the basic information required to assess the cost-effectiveness and impact of MISMEMS. Some general rules, then, on the information to be made public by project implementers might dramatically improve the knowledge base for policy interventions. In the same way that *ex-ante* project fiches are increasingly standardised, the production of a standard *ex-post* project fiche with data about the allocation of a budget across different components of the project and elements for assessment could be envisaged at least in the framework of large programmes like the former Thematic Programme on Migration and Asylum 2007-14. In the framework of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation adopted in 2011 (South Korea), the EU has committed to ‘strengthen transparency and approve a common standard for the electronic publication of data on development cooperation’, a commitment to be fully operational by 2015.

This standard could make the evaluation and assessment of the impact of such cooperation possible. The information required in the MISMEMS project questionnaire might serve as a guide for this. Besides the standard project evaluation reports, a post-MISMEMS evaluation, conducted after two years of MISMEMS implementation, should be required by donors (and designated as a mandatory part of grant proposal budget of implementing entity). In this way there will be a follow up and a progressive accumulation of evidence on which type of MISMEMS works in which contexts and for which categories of migrants.

Finally, as labour migration becomes more and more important, labour force surveys in countries of destination and origin could make a systematic oversampling of migrant/ return communities to reach representative sample sizes and include some additional questions on the participation in migrant support measures.

ANNEX: LIST OF INTERVIEWS, REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Interviews held in Brussels and Geneva

- Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Europe, Elizabeth Collett, Director, and Maria Vincenza Desiderio
- European Commission, DG Home, Andre Rizzo, Jordan desk
- International Organisation for Migration, Anna Platonova, Regional Labour Migration/Migration and Development Specialist for Europe, and Jennifer Hollings
- European Commission, DG DEVCO B.3., Camilla Hagstroem, Head of Sector, Isabelle Wahedova, Morocco desk
- IOM Human Development Department, Tauhid Pasha, Senior Specialist, Labour Migration/Migration and Development
- ILO Migrant Team (Christiane Kuptsch, Gloria Moreno and Samia Kazi)
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Shabarinath Nair, Programme Officer, International Dialogue on Migration and Development
- Piyasiri Wickramasekara, Vice-President at Global Migration Policy Associate
- Pindie Stephen, IOM-Geneva (by Skype)
- Natalia Popova, ILO-Geneva (by Skype)

Institutions that completed the MISMEMS questionnaire

- International Centre for Human Development (ICHD), Armenia
- Republican Union of Employers of Armenia (RUEA)
- Armenia Relief Society (ARS)
- OFII: Targeted Initiative for Armenia (TIA)
- Caritas Armenia office (Sustainable Reintegration after Voluntary Return)
- French Armenian Development Foundation
- Unicef Armenia office
- State Migration Service of Georgia (Pilot Circular Migration Scheme)
- Danish Refugee Council – Georgia office
- GIZ/CIM-Georgia office
- Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (Promoting well managed migration between the EU and Georgia)
- IOM Mission in Georgia (Reintegration Assistance for Returned Migrants)
- Caritas Georgia office
- People in Need Armenia office
- International Agency for Source Country Information (IASCI)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Moldova (Building Institutional Capacity of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration)
- IOM-Ukraine office
- ILO-Asia office (3: ASEAN Triangle, GSM Triangle, Promoting Decent Work Sri Lanka)

- IOM-Ghana (AENEAS 2006 Labour Migration Project for West Africa)
- International Centre for Migration Policy Development Tunisia (Projet de coopération technique UE-Tunisie en matière de migration)
- IOM Tunisia (2): YEM Project and AVRR Switzerland
- Stephan Hildebrand (TAPIG Germany-Tunisia: Transformation Partnership in the Health Care Sector)
- GIZ (Promotion of the legal mobility of highly qualified labour from Tunisia)
- IOM-Morocco (E-Bosla)

People who helped disseminate the MISMEMS questionnaire or provided information

- Brahim Abidar, Morocco's Ministry of Employment and Social Affairs
- Nilim Baruah, Heike Lautenschlager and Sally Barber, Labour Migration Specialist, ILO Regional Office, Bangkok
- Donna Cabrera, IOM Colombia
- Haykanush Chobanyan, State Migration Agency of Armenia
- Christophe Franzetti, IOM's Evaluation Unit
- Madeleine Sumption, Migration Policy Institute, Washington
- Cecile Riallant, Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI)
- Kojo Wilmot, IOM-Ghana
- Sami Zouari, High Institute of Industrial Management Technopole of Sfax, Tunisia
- Hanna Vakhitova, Ukraine
- Tsira Meskhisvili, Association 'Toleranti', Georgia

Country experts who contributed to the MISMEMS study and helped with information and/or the dissemination of the questionnaire

- Nastassia Bobrova
- Jasmina Gavrankapetanovic-Redzic
- Maria Teresa Guillaume
- Katya Ivashchenko
- Olga Kupets
- Vladimir Mukomel
- Olex Poznyak
- Sergey Rumyansev
- Larisa Titarenko
- Irina Badurashvili
- Valeriu Mosneaga
- Mohamed Bensaid
- Larabi Jaidi
- Mohamed Kriaa
- Mohamed Alaa Demnati

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AENEAS	EU programme for financial and technical assistance to third countries in the area of migration and asylum
Anapec	Agence nationale de promotion de l'emploi et des compétences (Moroccan public employment service)
Aneti	Agence nationale pour l'emploi et le travail indépendant (Tunisian public employment service)
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ATCT	Agence tunisienne de coopération technique (Tunisian Agency for Technical Cooperation)
AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration Programme
CIM	Centre for International Migration and Development
ECU	European currency unit (the predecessor of the euro)
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ENIC	European Network of Information Centres
EPS	Employment Permit System (South Korea)
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ETF	European Training Foundation
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
EURES	European Job Mobility Portal
FOIL	Fortalecimiento de sistemas integrados de Formación, Orientación e Inserción Laboral (Strengthening Integrated Systems of Training, Orientation and Labour Insertion, Central America)
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMIS	Integrated Migration Information System
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IRRiCO	Integrated Approach regarding Information on Return and Reintegration in Countries of Origin
LFS	Labour force survey
LRC	Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997)
MIDA	Migration for Development in Africa
MIREM	Migration de retour au Maghreb (Return Migration in Maghreb)
MISMES	Migrant Support Measures from an Employment and Skills Perspective
MITOS	Migration Tools Options for Sustainability
MRC	Migrant resource centre
NARIC	National Academic Recognition Information Centres (European Union)
NGOs	Non-governmental organisations

OWWA	Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (the Philippines)
OWWF	Overseas Workers Welfare Fund (Sri Lanka)
POEA	Philippines Overseas Employment Administration
SENA	Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje (National Training Service, Colombia)
SLBFE	Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
TOKTEN	Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals programme
TRQN	Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals
TVET	Technical and vocational education and training
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
USA	United States of America
USD	US dollar
VET	Vocational education and training
ZAV	Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung (International Placement Services of the German Federal Employment Agency)

REFERENCES

- Abella, M. (1997), *Sending Workers Abroad: A Manual on Policies and Procedures of Special Interest to Middle and Low Income Countries*, ILO.
- Agunias, D.R. (2011), *Engaging the Scientific Diaspora: Examples from the International Community*. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.iom.int.vn/joomla/files/Events/Background%20papers%20-%20Engaging%20the%20Scientific%20Diaspora%20_ENG.pdf
- Agunias, D.R. (2013), *What We Know About Regulating Recruitment of Migrant Workers*, Policy Brief, 6 September 2013, Migration Policy Institute.
- Agunias, D.R. and Newland, K. (2012), *Developing a Roadmap for Engaging Diasporas in Development: A Handbook for Policy-Makers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries*, International Organisation for Migration and Migration Policy Institute.
- Amir, S. (2002), 'Overseas Foreign Workers in Israel: Policy Aims and Labour Market Outcomes', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 36, pp. 41-57.
- Angenendt, S. (2014), *Triple-Win Migration: Challenges and Opportunities*, Framework Paper, Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness.
- Arif, G.M. and Ahnaz, L. (2000), 'Emigration and Skills Acquisition: An Evidence from the Two Surveys of Pakistani Migrants Returned from the Middle East', *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 35, No 2 (Winter 2000), pp. 215-240.
- Baghdadi, L. and Chepte, A. (2010), 'Migrant Associations, Trade and FDI', *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, No 97/98, pp. 71-101.
- Basilio, L. and Bauer, T. (2010), 'Transferability of Human Capital and Immigrant Assimilation: An Analysis for Germany', *IZA Discussion Paper*, No 4716, Institute for the Study of Labour, Bonn.
- Benson-Rea, M. and Rawlinson, S. (2003), 'Highly Skilled and Business Migrants: Information Processes and Settlement Outcomes', *International Migration*, 41, pp. 59-79.
- Boyd, M. (2013), 'Recruiting High Skill Labour in North America: Policies, Outcomes and Futures', *International Migration*. doi:10.1111/imig.12139
- Bristol, M. (2010), 'Brain Drain and return Migration in CARICOM: A Review of the Challenges', *Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 38, No 1, pp. 129-146.
- Cerase, F.P. (1974), 'Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the United States to Southern Italy', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 8(2), pp. 245-262.
- Charpin, A. and Aiolfi, L. (2011), 'Evaluation of the concrete results obtained through projects financed under AENEAS and the Thematic Programme for Migration and Asylum', European Union DCI-MIGR Programme, IBF International Consulting.
- Chindea, A. (2015), *Headstart to Integration: A Global Review of Pre-Departure Support Measures to Migrants*, International Organisation for Migration. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/index.php?main_page=product_info&cPath=47&products_id=1498&language=es-
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012), *Evaluation of the Overseas Orientation Initiatives*, Evaluation Division.
- Clemens, M. (2014), 'Global Skill Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World', *CGD Policy Paper*, 040, Centre for Global Development. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/clemens%20global%20skill%20partnerships%20cgd%20web.pdf
- Connell, J. (2013), 'Local Skills and the Global Markets? The Migration of Health Workers from the Caribbean and the Pacific Island States', *Social and Economic Studies*, Vol. 56, No 1/2, pp. 67-95.

Cortés, P. and Pan, J. (2013), 'Outsourcing Household Production: Foreign Domestic Workers and Native Labor Supply in Hong Kong', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 31, No 2 (April 2013), pp. 327-371.

Council of the European Union (2015), 'Council Conclusions on Migration', *Press Release*, 606/15, 20 July 2015. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at:
http://dsms.consilium.europa.eu/952/Actions/Newsletter.aspx?messageid=1170&customerid=21027&password=enc_3641314633313836_enc

Czerniejewska, I. and Goździak, E.M. (2013), 'Aiding Defeated Migrants: Institutional Strategies to Assist Polish Returned Migrants', *International Migration*. doi:10.1111/imig.12145

De Haas, Hein (2012), 'The Migration and Development Pendulum: A Critical View on Research and Policy', *International Migration*, Vol. 50(3), pp. 8-25.

Di Bartolomeo, A., Kalantaryan, S. and Bonfanti, S. (2015), 'The Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the EU: A Comparative Multidimensional Approach', forthcoming.

Embassy of the Philippines in Greece (n.d.), *Philippine Overseas Labor Office (POLO)*. Last accessed 20 February 2014 at: www.philembathens.gr/facts/view/10

Embassy of the Philippines in London, United Kingdom (n.d.), *Labour and Welfare*. Last accessed 20 February 2014 at: <http://philembassy-uk.org/labor-welfare>

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2011a), *Transnational Qualifications Frameworks*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at:
www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/Transnational_qualifications_frameworks

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2011b), Bardak, U. (Ed.), *Labour Markets and Employability: Trends and Challenges in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at:
www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/Labour_markets_&_employability_eastern_partners_EN

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2012), Martín, I. and Bardak, U., *Union for the Mediterranean Regional Employability Review*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/UfM_regional_employability_review

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2013), Collyer, M., Bardak, U., Jansova, E. and Kärkkäinen, O., *Migration and Skills in Armenia, Georgia and Morocco: Comparing the Survey Results*, ETF, Turin. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at:
www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/Migration_and_skills_Armenia_Georgia_Morocco

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2014), Bardak, U., 'Migration and Skills Development Agenda in Partner Countries', ETF Position Paper, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015a), *Migrant Support Measures from an Employment and Skills Perspective (MISMES): Methodological Note for the Country Studies*, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015b), *Migrant Support Measures from and Employment and Skills Perspective (MISMES): Armenia*, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015c), *Migrant Support Measures from and Employment and Skills Perspective (MISMES): Georgia*, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015d), *Mesures de soutien aux migrants en matière d'emploi et de compétences: Maroc*, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015e), *Migrant Support Measures from and Employment and Skills Perspective (MISMES): Republic of Moldova*, ETF, Turin.

ETF (European Training Foundation) (2015f), *Migrant Support Measures from and Employment and Skills Perspective (MISMES): Tunisia*, ETF, Turin.

European Commission (2010), *An Agenda for New Skills and Jobs: A European Contribution Towards Full Employment*, COM(2010) 682 final, Brussels.

- European Commission (2011), *The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility*, COM(2011) 743 final, Brussels. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0743&from=EN>
- European Commission (2013a), *Maximising the Development Impact of Migration: The EU Contribution for the UN High-level Dialogue and Next Steps towards Broadening the Development-Migration Nexus*, COM(2013) 292, Brussels.
- European Commission (2013b), 'EU Thematic Programme for Cooperation with Third Countries in the Area of Migration and Asylum: overview of projects funded in 2007-2013'.
- European Commission (2014), *Report on the implementation of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility 2012-2013*, COM(2014) 96 final, Brussels. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/international-affairs/general/docs/gamm_implementation_report_2012_2013_en.pdf
- European Commission (2015), *A European Agenda on Migration*, COM(2015) 240 final, Brussels. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf
- Fandrich, C. (2009), *Facilitated Egyptian International Migration and Development: The Integrated Migration Information System as Case Study*, American University in Cairo.
- Fernandez, B. (2013), 'Traffickers, Brokers, Employment Agents, and Social Networks: The Regulation of Intermediaries in the Migration of Ethiopian Domestic Workers to the Middle East', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 47(4), pp. 814-843.
- Findlay, A. and McCollum, D. (2013), 'Recruitment and Employment Regimes: Migrant Labour Channels in the UK's Rural Agribusiness Sector, from Accession to Recession', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 30, pp. 10-19.
- Forde, C. and MacKenzie, R. (2010), 'The Ethical Agendas of Employment Agencies Towards Migrant Workers in the UK: Deciphering the Codes', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 97, pp. 31-41.
- Frank, K. (2013), 'Immigrant Employment Success in Canada: Examining the Rate of Obtaining a Job Match', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 47, pp. 76-105.
- Gamlen, A. (2006), *Diaspora Engagement Policies: What Are They, and What Kinds of States Use Them?*, Working Paper No 32, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford.
- GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) (2013), *Skilled Labour Migration from the Perspective of Partner Countries: Towards a Development-Oriented Migration Policy*, Bonn.
- GIZ and CIM (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit and Centre for International Migration and Development) (2014), *Migration as a Driver for Private Sector Development: guidelines for practice*, 2014. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.giz.de/fachexpertise/downloads/giz2014-en-guidelines_private_sector_development_and_migration_web.pdf
- Glitz, A. (2012), 'The Labor Market Impact of Immigration: A Quasi-Experiment Exploiting Immigrant Location Rules in Germany', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 30(1), pp. 175-213.
- Global Migration Group (2007), 'Migration and Development Projects and Activities' (Inventory of Studies).
- Global Migration Group (2010), *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-Makers and Practitioners*, International Organisation for Migration.
- Grabowska-Lusinska, I. (2012), *Migrant ow scie zkizawodowe bez granic*, Warsaw.
- Harrison, G. (2013), "'Oh, you've got such a strong accent": Language Identity Intersecting with Professional Identity in the Human Services in Australia', *International Migration*, Vol. 51, pp. 192-204.
- Hawthorne, L. (2005), "'Picking Winners": The Recent Transformation of Australia's Skilled Migration Policy', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 39(3), pp. 663-696.

- Hugo, G. (2009), 'Best Practice in Temporary Labour Migration for Development: A Perspective from Asia and the Pacific', *International Migration*, Vol. 47, pp. 23-74.
- ICHHD (International Centre for Human Development) (2013), 'Report on interstate agreements on job-matching: international developments and prospects for Armenia's Policy', produced in the framework of Work Exchange Strengthening Evidence-Based Management of Labour Migration in Armenia 2011-2013, funded by the European Commission (in Armenian).
- ICMPD and ECDPM (International Centre for Migration Policy Development and European Centre for Development Policy Management) (2013), *Migration and Development Policies and Practices: A Mapping Study of Eleven European Countries and the European Commission*.
- ILO (International Labour Office) (2005), *Labour Migration Policy and Management: Training Materials*, ILO International Migration Programme and Subregional Office for East Asia, Bangkok.
- ILO (International Labour Office) (2009), *Migration and Development: Armenia Country Study*, ILO Subregional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia.
- ILO (International Labour Office) (2010), *International Labour Migration: A Rights-Based Approach*, ILO, Geneva. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2010/110B09_59_engl.pdf
- ILO (International Labour Office) (2013), Gallotti, M. and Mertens, J., 'Promoting Integration for Migrant Domestic Workers in Europe: A Synthesis of Belgium, France, Italy and Spain', *International Migration Papers*, No 118, ILO, Geneva. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/publication/wcms_222301.pdf
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2000), *IOM Migration Policy Framework for Sub-Saharan Africa*, MC/INF/244, pp. 14-22. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/en/council/80/MC_INF_244.pdf
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2004), *MIDA-Mobilizing the African Diaspora for the Development of Africa*.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2009a), *The MIDA Experience and Beyond*. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/MIDA_2009.pdf
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2009b), 'Migrant Resource Centres: An Initial Assessment', *IOM Migration Research Series*, No 40, IOM, Geneva. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.headstartproject.eu/index.php/resources?download=12:migrant-resource-centres-an-initial-assessment
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2010a), *Practical Guide on Information Provision Regarding Return and Reintegration in Countries of Origin*, IOM, Brussels.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2010b), *Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration: Annual Report of Activities 2010*, IOM, Geneva.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2012a), Platonova, A. and Urso, G. (Eds), *Migration, Employment and Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union*, IOM, Brussels.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2012b), *Temporary and Virtual Return*, Presentation at the IOM MIDWEB conference, 13-14 November 2012, Sarajevo. Last accessed 31 December 2013 at: www.migrantservicecentres.org/userfile/Gulam%20Zia.pdf
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2012c), *MIDA Ghana Health Project*, IOM, The Hague. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/Country/docs/MIDA-Ghana-Health-Project-2012.pdf
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2013a), Desiderio, M.V. and Schuster, A. (Eds), *Improving Access to Labour Market Information for Migrants and Employers*, IOM, Brussels.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2013b), Schuster, A., Desiderio, M.V. and Urso, G. (Eds), *Recognition of Qualifications and Competences of Migrants*, Independent Network of Labour

- Migration and Integration Experts, IOM, Brussels. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.labourmigration.eu/research/report/20-recognition-of-qualifications-and-competences-of-migrants
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2013c), 'Diaspora and Development: Bridging Societies and States', Diaspora Ministerial Conference, 18-19 June 2013, International Conference Centre Geneva.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2013d), Craievschi-Toarta, V., 'Degree of implementation and effects of the project "Support to Reintegration Mechanism in Moldova for Readmitted and Returned Moldovan Nationals": Good Practices and Lessons Learned', Evaluation Report, Chisinau.
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2015a), Pillinger, J. (Dr), *Running an Effective Migrant Resource Centre: A Handbook for Practitioners*, IOM, Budapest. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.headstartproject.eu/
- IOM (International Organisation for Migration) (2015b), Jones, K. (Dr), *Recruitment Monitoring & Migrant Welfare Assistance: What Works?*, IOM, Dhaka. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.iom.int/sites/default/files/migrated_files/What-We-Do/docs/Recruitment-Monitoring-Book.pdf
- Jayalath, J. (2011), 'Recognition of the Skills of Returning Migrant Workers', Presentation of the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Skills Development, 4-5 August 2011, Colombo, Sri Lanka.
- Khadria, B. (Ed.) (2009), *India Migration Report 2009: Past, Present and the Future Outlook*, International Migration and Diaspora Studies Project, Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- Kim, N.H.-J. (2008), 'Korean Immigration Policy Changes and the Political Liberals' Dilemma', *International Migration Review*, Fall 2008, Vol. 42(3), pp. 576-596.
- Koser, K. and Kuschminder, K. (2015), *Comparative Research on the Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Migrants*, International Organisation for Migration, Geneva.
- Kuznetsov, Y. (Ed.) (2006), *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills: How Countries Can Draw on Their Talent Abroad*, WBI Development Studies, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Li, M. and Campbell, J. (2009), 'Accessing Employment: Challenges Faced by Non-Native English-Speaking Professional Migrants', *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 18(3), pp. 371-395.
- Lowell, B.L. and Findlay A. (2002), 'Migration of Highly Skilled Persons from Developing Countries: Impact and Policy Responses – Synthesis Report', *International Migration Papers*, No 44, International Labour Office, Geneva. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/publication/wcms_201706.pdf
- Marchetti, S. (2012), 'Together? On the Not-So-Easy Relationship Between Italian Labour Organisations and Migrant Domestic Workers' Groups', *ICDD Working Paper*, No 3, International Centre for Development and Decent Work, Kassel. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.uni-kassel.de/einrichtungen/fileadmin/datas/einrichtungen/icdd/Publications/ICDD_Working_Paper_No.3_Marchetti.pdf
- Martín, I. (2011), *Labour Market Information Systems and Labour Migration Information in Six Developing Countries: The Challenge of Integration. A Comparative Study of Colombia, Costa Rica, Ghana, Nicaragua, Senegal and Tunisia*, International Organisation for Migration.
- Martin, P. (2006), 'The Effects of Migration on Sending Countries: A Comparison of Mexico and Turkey', *Well-being and Social Policy*, Vol. 2(2), pp 89-101.
- Martin, P. and Abella, M. (2009), 'Migration and Development: The Elusive Link at the GFMD', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 43(2), pp. 431-439.
- Martin, P., Abella, M. and Midgley, E. (2004), 'Best Practices to Manage Migration: The Philippines', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 38, pp. 1544-1559.

- Martin, P., Martin, S. and Pastore, F. (2002a), 'Best Practice Options: Albania', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, pp. 103-118.
- Martin, P., Martin, S. and Weil, P. (2002b), 'Best Practice Options: Mali', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, pp. 87-102.
- Martin, P. and Straubhaar, T. (2002), 'Best Practices to Reduce Migration Pressures', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, pp. 5-23.
- Meyer, J.-B. (2001), 'Network Approach versus Brain Drain: Lessons from the Diaspora', *International Migration*, Vol. 39, pp. 91-110.
- MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan) (2013), *IOM Program for the Return and Reintegration of Qualified African Nationals-Phase 3: Project / Program Summary*, [online]. Last accessed 31 December 2013 at: www.mofa.go.jp/region/africa/ticad2/list98/privatesec/2_1_35.html
- Muschkin, C. (1993), 'Consequences of Return Migrant Status for Employment in Puerto Rico', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 27(1), Spring 1993, pp. 79-102.
- NYU Wagner (2013), *Beyond Skill Visibility: A New Framework for Migration and Development Policy*, New York University Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) (2008), 'Return Migration: Part III', *International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI*, Paris.
- OECD and EU (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and European Union) (2014), *Matching Economic Migration with Labour Market Needs in Europe*, Policy Brief, OECD/EU. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.oecd.org/migration/mig/OECD-EC%20Migration%20Policy%20Brief%2009-2014.pdf
- OECD and EU (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and European Union) (2015), *Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015: Settling In*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264234024-en>
- Olesen, H. (2002), 'Migration, Return, and Development: An Institutional Perspective', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, pp. 125-150.
- Oucho, J. (2008), *African Diaspora and Remittance Flows: Leveraging Poverty?*, Paper prepared for the African Diaspora Yearbook 2008. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/crer/afrobrain/oucho/publications/african_diaspora_and_remittance_flows_11.pdf
- Papedemetriou, D.G. and Martin, P. (Eds) (1991), 'Introduction', *The Unsettled Relationship: Labour Migration and Economic Development*.
- Pasha, T. (2012), *Overview of Skills Transfer Programmes: IOM Perspective*, Presentation in Sarajevo, 13 November 2012, IOM, Geneva. Last accessed 31 December 2013 at: www.migrantservicecentres.org/userfile/Tauhid%20Pasha.pdf
- Pellegrino, A. (2001), 'Trends in Latin American Skilled Migration: "Brain Drain" or "Brain Exchange"', *International Migration*, Vol. 39, pp. 111-132.
- Stephen, P. (2014), 'Lessons Learnt from Global Pre-Departure Orientation and Migration Training Programmes', Presentation at the Headstart workshop, 24 September 2014, Rome.
- Preibisch, K. (2010), 'Pick-Your-Own Labor: Migrant Workers and Flexibility in Canadian Agriculture', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 44, pp. 404-441.
- Robertson, S. (2008), *Bringing Diasporas to Market: Leveraging Talent (and Patriotism) for Nations' Economies*, Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies, University of Bristol, UK. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: <https://susanleerobertson.files.wordpress.com/2009/10/2008-sabour-diasporas.pdf>
- Rosario, T. (2008), *Best Practices in Social Insurance for Migrant Workers: The Case of Sri Lanka*, International Labour Office.

- SciDev.Net. (2005), *The Struggle to Connect Female Arab Scientists*, [online]. Last accessed 31 December 2013 at: www.scidev.net/global/gender/feature/the-struggle-to-connect-female-arab-scientists.html
- Shachar, A. (2006), 'The Race for Talent: Highly Skilled Migrants and Competitive Immigration Regimes', *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 81, pp. 148-206.
- Siddiqui, T. (2005), *International Labour Migration from Bangladesh: A Decent Work Perspective*, Working Paper, No 66, ILO.
- Siew-Ean, K., McDonald, P., Voigt-Graf, C. and Graeme, H. (2007), 'A Global Labor Market: Factors Motivating the Sponsorship and Temporary Migration of Skilled Workers to Australia', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 41(2), Summer 2007, pp. 480-510.
- Sintov, R. and Cojocar, N. (2013), *Assessment of Links between Education, Training and Labour Migration in Moldova*, International Labour Organisation, Budapest.
- Smith, C. (2012), 'The Impact of Low-Skilled Immigration on the Youth Labor Market', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 30(1), pp. 55-89.
- Stier, H. and Levanon, V. (2003). 'Finding an Adequate Job: Employment and Income of Recent Immigrants to Israel', *International Migration*, Vol. 41(2), 2003, pp. 81-107.
- Sumption, M. (2013), *Tackling Brain Waste: Strategies to Improve the Recognition of Immigrants' Foreign Qualifications*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.emnbelgium.be/fr/node/2156
- Sumption, M., Papademetriou, D.G. and Flamm, S. (2013), *Skilled Immigrants in the Global Economy: Prospects for International Cooperation on Recognition of Foreign Qualifications*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC.
- Sun, W. (2013), 'The productivity of Return Migrants: The Case of China's "Sea Turtles"', *IZA Journal of Migration*, 2, p. 5
- Thomas, K.J.A and Inkpen, C. (2013), 'Migration Dynamics, Entrepreneurship, and African Development: Lessons from Malawi', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 47(4), Winter 2013, pp. 844-873.
- Thomsen, S.L., Walter, T. and Aldashev, A. (2013), 'Short-term Training Programs for Immigrants in the German Welfare System: Do Effects Differ from Natives and Why?', *IZA Journal of Migration*, 2013, 2, p. 24.
- White, A. (2013), 'Double Return Migration: Failed Returns to Poland Leading to Settlement Abroad and New Transnational Strategies', *International Migration*. doi: 10.1111/imig.12138
- Wickramasekara, P. (2003), 'Policy Responses to Skilled Migration: Retention, Return and Circulation', *Perspectives on Labour Migration*, 5E, International Labour Office, Geneva. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2003/103B09_184_engl.pdf
- Wickramasekara, P. (2009), 'Skilled Labour Mobility: The Resurgence of the "Brain drain" Debate', *International Migration Papers*, No 100, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Wickramasekara, P. (2011), 'Labour migration in South Asia: A Review of Issues, Policies and Practices', *International Migration Papers*, No 108, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Wickramasekara, P. (2012), 'Something is Better than Nothing: Enhancing the Protection of Indian Migrant Workers through Bilateral Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding', Migrant Forum in Asia, Manila.
- Williams, A.M. and Baláž, V. (2005), 'What Human Capital, Which Migrants? Returned Skilled Migration to Slovakia from the UK', *International Migration Review*, Vol. 39(2), pp. 439-468.
- World Bank (2011), 'Harnessing the Diaspora for Development in Europe and Central Asia: Migration and Remittances Peer Assisted Learning (MIRPAL)', *Discussion Series*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

World Bank (2012), 'Reviewing the Functioning of Bilateral Labor Agreements: Insights from the French Tunisian Agreement and Other Prominent Schemes', Policy Note, Marseille Centre for Mediterranean Integration.

World Bank and ETF (European Training Foundation) (2010), *Migration and Skills: The Experience of Migrant Workers from Albania, Egypt, Moldova, and Tunisia*, World Bank, Washington, DC. Last accessed 3 August 2015 at: <http://issuu.com/World.Bank.Publications/docs/9780821380796>

Zietsma, D. (2010), 'Immigrants Working in Regulated Professions', *Perspectives*, Statistics Canada.



CONTACT US

Further information can be found on the ETF website:

www.etf.europa.eu

For any additional information please contact:

European Training Foundation

Communication Department

Viale Settimio Severo 65

I - 10133 Torino

E: info@etf.europa.eu

T: +39 011 6302222

F: +39 011 6302200