

G

Global Policy on Migration



Deniz Şenol Sert¹ and Fulya Felicity Türkmen²

¹Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of International Relations, Özyeğin University, Istanbul, Turkey

²College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

Synonyms

[Global Compact for Migration \(aka Global Compact on Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration\)](#); [Global Compact on Refugees](#); [Global Governance of Migration](#); [New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants](#)

Definition

Global policy on migration can be defined as the creation of a more or less formal set of norms and rules in a framework of multi-level policymaking by public and private actors, which involves and transcends national, international, and transnational policy regimes, to regulate the movement of people across borders (Betts 2012).

Introduction

No nation-state can successfully manage migration alone. Despite the challenges of cooperation and coordination on the issue, States often depend on each other for the governance of international migration. As Sasnal (2018) notes, “Politically, migration poses a twofold challenge: balancing security and freedom and harmonizing international obligations with domestic laws.” After the Second World War, States established an international organization with a mandate to manage cross-border migration. In December 1951, following the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, the Brussels Conference on Migration – organized by Belgium and the United States – established the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME) and later the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). The mandate of the ICEM was to manage the transportation arrangements of displaced persons in Europe and then extended to include new functions. As Ashutosh and Mountz (2011: 24) observe:

During the 1970s and the 1980s, the ICEM expanded beyond Europe with operations that included the resettlement of refugees from Bangladesh and Nepal to Pakistan during the 1971 Bangladesh War and Indo-Chinese resettlement in 1975. These activities were reflected in the 1980 rebranding of the ICEM as the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration and by the end of the decade, the IOM.

At the institutional level, the IOM was folded into the UN system in 2016. It is worth recalling Betts' (2010) categorization of migration based on the distinct patterns that inform it: "low-skilled labor migration, high-skilled labor migration, irregular migration, international travel, lifestyle migration, environmental migration, human trafficking and smuggling, asylum and refugee protection, internally displaced people, diaspora, remittances, and root causes." Each one of these is subject to different regulations at the national, regional, and global levels. These regulatory schemas can be located on a broad spectrum of "regulatory intensity," with a high level of international cooperation and formal institutionalization – such as on matters of asylum – at one end and deficient levels at the other, as with regulations on lifestyle migration. While many global issues have an established track record of intergovernmental governance – such as the many decades-old agencies of the UN – the management of global human mobility was only consolidated under the IOM mandate in 2016. Although the organization was founded in the 1950s, before 2016, it had served primarily as a service provider to States. Before 2016, only matters related to the protection of refugees were mandated to an international organization by the international community – the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The intensification of global human mobility in recent decades (and the challenges of effectively managing it) spurred states to work toward the first intergovernmental agreement – a Global Compact to cover all dimensions of international migration holistically and comprehensively – under the auspices of the United Nations. Table 1 presents the significant historical developments leading up to the decision to negotiate the Global Compact (Table 1).

Most importantly, Global Compacts are considered to be the components of a broader framework introduced by 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) previously preceded by Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that aimed to "eradicate extreme hunger and poverty, achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce

child mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, ensure environmental sustainability, establish global partnership for development" (UN 2016; United Nations Draft 2016). What MDGs lacked were the interactive connections between specific goals and migration-related issues and a special focus on migrants and refugees in a broader context (Skeldon 2008). In this vein, SDGs mark the introduction of issues relating migration to global development goals and policies for the first time. Migration is accommodated in various targets and indicators of SDGs and framed in ways to emphasize the interlinked nature of various SDGs that present challenges and proposed solutions in interrelated ways. SDGs also frame and present migration both as a critical issue in itself and as a tool to achieve greater goals targeted by SDGs by claiming that "migration can work for all in building more inclusive and sustainable societies" (Nijenhuis and Leung 2017). As a result, SDGs are related to migration with a focus on two broad concerns that are highly interacting with each other. These two concerns are (1) the management of migration and (2) the migration-development nexus. It is important to underline that these concerns have been brought up through a state-centered standpoint by excluding a much-needed migrant rights perspective, which is broader than the most severe forms of human rights violations such as human trafficking (Piper 2017).

The Global Compact on Safe, Regular, and Orderly Migration and the Global Compact on Refugees

The need for a global agreement arose from the obvious limitations of ad hoc and often disjointed migration policies and practices among States. Before 2016, only the EU, through the Common European Asylum System (CEAS), had managed to develop a relatively unified policy framework at the regional level, but even then, differences and conflicts among the Member States were rife (European Parliament COM/2008/0360 final). As a result of dialogue and deliberations among heads of States and governments at the UN

Global Policy on Migration, Table 1 Essential developments in the history of global migration governance

International Labour Organization (ILO)	1919
IOM	1950
UNHCR	1950
First “Regional Consultative Process” – IGC	1985
UN Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers	1990
International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo	1994
“Doyle Report” on International Migration	2002
Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM)	2003–2005
First UN High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development	2006
First Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)	2007
The launch of the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) “Conversations”	2009
Second UN High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development	2013
New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants	2016

Source: Betts 2012; Betts and Kainz 2017; UNGA 2015

General Assembly on 19 September 2016, the Global Compact on Safe, Regular, and Orderly Migration was agreed. It establishes framework guidance for the management of migration policy coordination and cooperation between States on a bilateral basis. As a result, the UN General Assembly decided to adopt the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, which provided stakeholders with a 2-year window to begin negotiations for a Global Compact on Refugees. The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) was included as an annex to the New York Declaration, and the UNHCR was further involved with the process to lay the ground and accelerate pilot projects and to monitor the progress toward a comprehensive Compact proposal in 2018. By the time of the UN conference held in New York in September 2018 – at which a formal agreement on a platform for responsibility- and burden-sharing was set to be agreed – 193 UN Member States had completed the necessary groundwork to finalize negotiations (UNGA 2017a).

The Compact entails two elements: (1) a Program of Action that establishes the abovementioned platform for responsibility- and burden-sharing and (2) a Comprehensive Regional Response Framework. The program of action lays out the operational game plan of the Global Compact, with a particular emphasis on the development of refugee capacities for self-

reliance in host countries and the establishment of secure and durable pathways for permanent settlement, such as expanded resettlement programs. This framework designates the UNHCR as the principal actor to coordinate and coalesce state action, as well as to facilitate, monitor, and evaluate other stakeholders, i.e., the private sector, civil society, and the academic community (UN 2017). It is important to note the Modalities Resolution, which is an essential aspect of the Compact, steering parties toward a transparent and inclusive process by enabling a healthy dialogue among all stakeholders during the intergovernmental meetings and preparation period. For this purpose, the Modalities Resolution acts as an outline and timeline for the entire process (UNGA 2017b).

Timeline and Phases of the Global Compact

Consultation Phase: In this phase, the emphasis is on the issues of human rights for all migrants, the drivers of migration, international cooperation, migration governance, the contribution of migrants and diasporas, regular and irregular migration pathways (including smuggling and trafficking), and contemporary forms of slavery. This phase sees a strong emphasis on extensive data analysis, with a focus on disaggregating top-line migration data under all of these subcategories. Moreover, national institutions are encouraged to work on the data available to

them for capacity building activities, especially to gather more information and knowledge about the contribution of migrants and diasporas in host societies, and the key drivers of migration.

Stocktaking Phase: This phase focuses on the development of an open platform for the Member States and other stakeholders to meet to shape a shared vision for the Global Compact. These meetings will be framed by the value and importance of human beings and the communities they live in at the local, sub-national, national, regional, and global levels.

Negotiation Phase: This phase comprises the intergovernmental negotiations and puts heavy emphasis on collection, analysis, and sharing of disaggregated data.

Although stakeholders have an essential role and say in the planning and implementation processes, States have the final verdict. The Compact does not aim to legislate any new laws, and any additional provisions it proposes must be in line and consistent with existing international human rights law.

The Significance and Main Aims of the Global Compact for Migration and Refugees

The significance of the Global Compact is its focus on reemphasizing the importance of making migration and refugee-related issues a more significant part of the international agenda and reaffirming the determination of Member States toward global cooperation and coordination in the matters of cross-border human mobility. The Global Compact on Refugees has four main priorities, which are to:

1. Share and lighten the liabilities of countries that welcome and host refugees
2. Restore and enhance the agency and autonomy of refugees
3. Extend pathways for refugee resettlement in third countries
4. Cultivate the required conditions to accelerate refugees' voluntary return to their home countries

These main priorities are also embodied in the commitments that the Member States have agreed under the broader Global Compact, which are to:

1. Ensure the security, dignity, and fundamental rights and freedoms of all migrants, regardless of their migratory status.
2. Support States receiving and hosting large numbers of refugees and migrants in maritime rescue operations.
3. Facilitate migrant integration by acknowledging their needs and agency as well as those of receiving communities through sustainable humanitarian and development assistance.
4. Combat xenophobia, racism, and all forms of discrimination toward all migrants.
5. Develop non-binding principles and voluntary guidelines for the Member States on the treatment of migrants in vulnerable situations.
6. Enhance global governance of migration, by consolidating the IOM's incorporation into the UN system and reinforcing the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration. This latter priority has already been materialized with the inclusion of the IOM into the UN system.

With these commitments, the international community agrees to protect displaced populations by recognizing their fundamental rights and freedoms within a framework of global responsibility- and burden-sharing. Moreover, displaced persons' agency is recognized by facilitating their participation in migration governance networks while ensuring the accountability of all actors in international refugee protection. These commitments and priorities are fleshed out as two main aims of the Global Compact and put into action through the New York Declaration, which builds on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and the Declaration of the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development adopted in October 2013: to build a platform through which UN Member States can come together and create a common ground for coming up with alternatives for irregular

migratory movements by engaging in a constructive and positive dialogue.

The Global Compact has been designed concerning target 10.7 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that aims to facilitate orderly, safe, and responsible migration and mobility of people, through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies. The Global Compact's aims and scope are sketched out and defined in Annex II of the New York Declaration as well. Accordingly, the Global Compact intends to:

1. Address the different dimensions of international migration, including the humanitarian, developmental, and human rights-related aspects, among others
2. Make an essential contribution to global governance and enhance coordination on international migration
3. Present a framework for comprehensive international cooperation on migrants and human mobility
4. Establish a range of actionable commitments, the means of implementing them, and a framework for follow-up and review among the Member States regarding international migration in all its dimensions
5. Proceed in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda
6. Remain informed by the Declaration of the 2013 High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development

Key Issues

Migration Data

The "IOM Vision on the Global Compact on Migration Report," published in April 2017, outlines the main debates on the Compact in the form of reaffirmations and recognition as well as progressive provisions and highlights. First, the document puts a great emphasis on discourse of migration under the title of "Evidence-based and Whole-of-Government Approaches" by stating that "the global compact could help to clarify

essential concepts and terminology relating to migration and propose ways of improving data collection and analysis" (IOM 2017). Assistance from the IOM Global Migration Data Analysis Centre is offered to shed light on inaccurate perceptions, stereotypes, the ongoing misleading use and representation of migration data, and the necessity of adopting a whole-of-government approach to migration policy, given the interdependent and interrelated nature of numerous migration issues. However, as Gilbert (2018) also suggests, data collection and statistical analysis on migration-related issues are challenging tasks for various reasons. In this vein, the development of specific indicators for measuring the compliance and implementation of the principles laid by the Global Compact stands as a challenging task. Gilbert (2018) lists the main possible challenges of collecting and analyzing data for the development of indicators as "the lack of a precise, pre-existing legal framework makes the establishment of detailed indicators, underpinned by robust, non-existence of relevant datasets, use of datasets gathered for different purposes, disaggregated data on the number of refugees, the speed at which events change during displacement." Therefore, both the data collection and analysis process that the Global Compact highly prioritizes and the development of indicators that is necessary for the measurement of support, compliance, and implementation of the parties remain as crucial yet difficult tasks ahead.

Burden- and Responsibility-Sharing

Second, under the title of "Fostering and Relying on Strong Partnerships," a new approach and framework are presented for what used to be known as burden-sharing but is now mostly referred to as responsibility-sharing. What is responsibility-sharing in general, and what does it entail? According to Carens (2013), there are three rationales behind states' decisions on taking on their responsibility toward refugees. In some cases, all three of the rationales might be observed at the same time, but only one of them is enough to justify the state's duty to admit refugees. The first one is called causal connection, and it refers to the situations in which the conditions in a home

country become unsafe and insecure for the refugees due to the direct or indirect actions and involvement of another country. The second source of duty for admitting refugees arises from humanitarian concern, and it suggests that refugees require safety and security and many countries on Earth can provide these for them due to their resourceful, privileged, and widely influential positions in the global order. The third source of the duty to admit refugees is the normative presuppositions of the modern state system, i.e., the post-Westphalian world that is occupied by sovereign nation-states and requirements and necessities of territorial sovereignty that give states the right to control the individuals' entries and exits into and from their borders. In this vein, each person must be tied to a state with a corresponding citizenship. It is observed that most of the states act according to the first two sources of duty for shouldering their part of the responsibility and neither of them speaks to the potentially positive aspects of the issue. The liability model of responsibility falls short of explaining or advancing these arguments and becomes less useful when the complex nature of conflicts, such as the Syrian civil war and alike, involving multiple parties with different levels of responsibility is considered. Concerning the complex and multidimensional nature of the conflicts that lead to mass displacement, the focus and the kind of work international organizations carry out, such as of UNHCR, also go under transformation in a way to accommodate broader schemes of responsibility- and duty-sharing (Barnett 2009).

Therefore, the Global Compact tries to change the perceptions on global responsibility-sharing by distancing it from the burden rhetoric. The report stresses the need for a balance between coordinated governance and the interests of origin and destination countries and calls on States to recognize that migration can be "potentially mutually beneficial to all parties involved." According to Turk and Garlick (2016):

States bearing the "burden" may see themselves as passive recipients of those arriving and seeking protection; while "responsibility" can be seen to imply legal obligations and a requirement to take affirmative action. This would appear to provide a

more constructive basis for discussions on different approaches to sharing of responsibilities, combined with efforts to involve a more comprehensive set of non-State actors.

Thus, the IOM envisions a Global Compact in which the discourse on migration takes a positive turn that evaluates migration through the lens of all the possible advantages and benefits it offers – to States as well as refugees and other migrants.

Better Protection and Cooperation Without Exclusion

The related documents and the Global Compact itself reinforce the need to collect accurate data on people on the move – especially those individuals in large and mixed movements – to ascertain their nationalities and accurately identify who is most in need. Some groups of migrants and refugees are especially vulnerable due to the risks associated with unsafe migratory routes, and so it is vital that these dangers are fully explored and uncovered. Other categories of migrants – women, children, and LGBTQ+ – are vulnerable no matter how they travel, given they may face abuse and exploitation in contemporary forms of slavery and gender-based violence. Compacts also recognize the discrimination against refugee and migrant women and girls as a distinct and intersecting form of discrimination together with the vulnerability of children on the move – especially unaccompanied children – regardless of their status. Migrant and refugee identities and agencies are further recognized in the related documents by stating:

Migrants can make positive and profound contributions to economic and social development in their host societies and global wealth creation. They can help to respond to demographic trends, labor shortages and other challenges in host societies, and add new skills and dynamism to the latter's economies. (UN 2016)

The Global Compact preparations have repeatedly highlighted the importance of cooperation on border-related issues positively, but actors' positive statements are open to other interpretations, as there are no explicit mentions of current policies of border externalization and deterrence adopted mostly by the West. As Appleby (2017) points out:

The use of deterrence strategies to discourage large movements of refugees and migrants has become a widespread practice in developed nations. Australia has interdicted boats at sea and used offshore detention sites, where refugees have languished. The United States has deployed a deterrence strategy against Central American refugees marked by detention and interdiction. Finally, the European Union entered an agreement with Turkey to return Syrian refugees in 2015, causing refugees to take more dangerous routes to Europe. European nations are pressuring African nations to prevent their citizens from leaving their countries.

Moreover, these intensifying practices of deterrence and externalization of borders have been coupled with political and financial incentives that are utilized as leverage against the States in the developing and less developed world to corral them into erecting walls and barriers against migratory movements toward more developed parts of the world. Therefore, it is argued, the Global Compacts should use more descriptive and detailed language to set the ground every time there is a mention of issues such as sharing of migration data among States and cooperation in border management. Otherwise, it would be at best naive to expect that States will by themselves end their increasing efforts and attempts to guard their borders at any expense and act based on good faith and universal human rights principles (Rother 2018; Bloom 2015).

Challenges against the recognition of the displacements driven by disasters and climate change are among the contemporary critical issues addressed by the Global Compact as one of the primary commitments. However, during the negotiation phase of the Global Compact, there has been resistance against the acknowledgment of the needs of disaster-affected countries and the people who become displaced as the direct and indirect result of the effects of climate change and disasters. Different perspectives and arguments of states on this issue also give great insight into how many critical issues on migration and displacement are in competing positions for agenda setting and prioritization. Kälén (2018) explains why the inclusion of this issue by the Global Compact has significant importance by stating:

Acknowledgment of the fact that people may be forced to move when they are exposed (or expect to be revealed) to a sudden-onset natural hazard or slow-onset process of environmental change, and lack the resilience to withstand its impacts, open up multiple areas for policy intervention and action. Strengthening the resilience of people at risk of displacement by integrating human mobility considerations into disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation strategies, programs, and projects helps people to stay. Exposure can be reduced by measures such as planned relocation and the provision of pathways for regular migration which allow people to move out of harm's way before disasters strike or to cope with the impacts of such disasters.

Future Directions

Migration is a constant in human life. While there have been many attempts to balance responsibility-sharing among States, the effects of these measures are quite limited as the data on refugee-hosting States and resettlement schemes demonstrate. Thus, the visions of the Global Compact should be carefully examined at the beginning stages to avoid the mistake of creating another document that is long on promises and short on outcomes at the global level. In light of the recent conflicts that produced crises of mass displacement in the Middle East, it has become apparent that countries, such as Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon, which are not party to the 1951 UN Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol lack coherent and sustainable practices and policies about refugees and their rights (Canefe 2018). In the same vein, the forms of state cooperation – which typically takes the form of standardization and coordination on a global scale – are also under transformation, and an increasing number of states introduce externalization practices such as readmission agreements to their migration regimes through bilateral and multilateral agreements and regional cooperation. For instance, in the past three decades, the EU has adopted new externalization policies and practices by devising various bilateral and multilateral agreements with migrant-sending countries in the Global South, particularly countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin

America. Analysis of these agreements leads to the conclusion that these were made with a focus on the issues related with irregular migration and readmission and are still far from offering fair mutual gains and reciprocal opportunities for the countries in the Global South.

In this light, the specific emphasis of SDGs and the Global Compacts on migration-development nexus would open up new spaces for the discussions on the prospects of new forms of international collaborations that would put countries of the Global North and South on equal footing to create genuine win-win solutions in the long term instead of re-importing the problems of irregular migration to the South through tools of externalization of border security (Adepoju et al. 2007; Zaiotti 2016). While collaborating in the past, States have more often than not paid scant attention to prefacing conditions for the maintenance of dignified human life for migrants, such as a secure vision for the future, decent work, and schooling, family unification, etc. Global Compacts' role of connecting migration with other SDGs and related goals offers a possibility for introducing a more integrated approach for improving the life chances and conditions of migrants. However, the world has faced many different forced migration events and patterns, each with their unique characteristics and implications. The variety and complexity of these flows are not reflected enough in the standard tools and definitions of the international asylum system. This situation also paves the way for States to maneuver around legal and humanitarian obligations per their changing concerns and interests in the arena of global politics. More recently, it has been evident that a firewall between enforcement and protection must be built to balance States' goals and interests and the well-being of migrants. Perhaps, the Global Compacts can act as a guide for these kinds of mechanisms as well as a platform for the negotiation and bargaining processes of States.

In October 2018, the negotiation and bargaining processes concerning the Global Compacts had shown worrying tendencies, including statements that limit – rather than widen – the understanding of refugee protection and

resettlement on the grounds that these limit state sovereignty and particular national interests, most notably seen in the withdrawal of the United States. A lack of interest and reluctant attitude toward the efforts for greater cooperation to achieve the objectives of the Compact are still dominant among states located in the wealthiest parts of the world. The UNHCR together with the other UN agencies and stakeholders aims to find a long-lasting and effective solution to the refugee and migration-related problems of the world with an ambitious agenda built around sustainability, inclusion, and development, but states show more interest for preventive measures against migration by framing the related issues around migration security nexus (Mitchell and Jones and Fluri 2019). Therefore, after 2 years what appears is a possible pitfall in the form of yet another ineffective UN document that calls upon States to “coordinate and cooperate” rather than compelling them to shoulder their share of tangible responsibility through a framework built around state obligations and liabilities.

Following Trump administration's announcement of the United States' withdrawal from the Global Compacts, similar reactions and debates on whether the Global Compacts are legally binding take place across the globe. Australia, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic stated concerns regarding national interests and security. It seems that there are a lot of misguidance and disinformation about the scope, content, and legal status of the Global Compacts and these are used to support anti-immigration or nationalist agendas of some parties in Europe, specifically before national elections and European Parliament elections in 2019 (Carrera et al. 2018).

States' responsibilities toward refugees within their borders are rather clearly defined, whereas there is not a clearly defined scheme for states' responsibility toward refugees that live in other countries. When the number of refugees and consequently the related costs for the hosting states increase, the crisis of global responsibility-sharing becomes more visible. The recent responsibility-sharing crisis triggered by the mass displacement of Syrians manifested that states remain rather reluctant toward fulfilling their responsibilities

toward refugees by not contributing enough through resettlement quotas they set or as donors providing monetary aid. As Betts (2018: 1) argues, although international law has acted as a powerful tool to define state responsibility and positively impacted the asylum regime in general, it is rather politics that shape and define states' commitments on responsibility-sharing. Therefore, there is also a need for tools of soft power such as the Global Compacts, which can be interpreted both as above and below the law. In a sense, it is above the law because it tries to deepen the commitment of states on the issue in a way that law cannot mandate. At the same time, it is below the law as it is non-binding on the parties, and it does not have the sanctioning power that laws on asylum have. Moreover, the Global Compacts have arisen in a political climate marked with populist movements, nationalism, and increasing levels of racist and anti-immigrant attitude among individuals all over the world. Thus, it can be claimed that the Global Compacts take on an uneasy task during very turbulent times concerning immigration politics and policymaking.

While acknowledging the difficult task of persuading those States with more resources to do their part in consolidating the global protection regime, there are core values that cannot be open for negotiation – namely, meeting the most emergent resettlement or residency needs of refugees in a rights-based framework (Guild 2019). Attempts to tone down and reframe migration-related issues also manifest in the discursive differentiation of “migrant vs. refugee” – that is, “the [problematic] demarcations of the ‘refugee turf’ in international relations from the ‘migrant’ one, together with the limitation of mobility to these two categories” (Nair 2018). The reason behind this problematic distinction is the fluctuating nature of human mobility. Neat categorizations and labels do not negate this essential feature of migratory movements. The Global Compacts have some innovative elements concerning going beyond the fundamental distinctions among migration statuses, yet it still shies away from securing some basic guarantees for all migrants. For instance, while the Global Compacts suggest that social

services should be provided to all migrants, including the undocumented migrants, regardless of their statuses, it does not mention the necessity of the establishment of “firewalls between immigration enforcement and public services” (Crépeau 2018). The threat of being compromised to immigration enforcement agencies and the constant threat of deportations make migrants more vulnerable by restricting their access to essential social services. Therefore, the Global Compacts should address the importance of the detachment of immigration enforcement agencies and social service providers when migrants need social services.

What should be expected as the final outcome of the Global Compacts? Will the international community treat it as a guiding document to be relied on for tackling the legal, political, and policy-related dilemmas surrounding the debates on refugees and migrants and make necessary adjustments accordingly, or will the Global Compacts serve as another somewhat hollow and limited commitment by States? Apart from these questions, the Global Compacts are already creating an impact on much-needed practices of good governance in migration management by encouraging a multi-stakeholder dialogue. Indeed, it may be that non-state organizations utilize this structure better than the States to build a more systematic and coordinated network outside the remit of States for the benefit of migrants and refugees everywhere.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Cultural Diversity](#)
- ▶ [Global Citizenship](#)
- ▶ [Human Capabilities Approach](#)
- ▶ [Human Rights Policy](#)
- ▶ [Labour Migration](#)
- ▶ [Responsible Migration and Mobility](#)

References

- Adepoju, A, van Naerssen, T, & Zoomers, A (Eds.) (2007) International migration and national development in

- sub-Saharan Africa: viewpoints and policy initiatives in the countries of origin. Brill, Leiden
- Appleby K (2017) Strengthening the global refugee protection system: recommendations for the global compact on refugees. *J Migr Hum Secur* 5(4):780–799
- Ashutosh I, Mountz A (2011) Migration management for the benefit of whom? Interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration. *Citizsh Stud* 15(1):21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.534914>
- Barnett M (2009) Evolution without progress? Humanitarianism in a world of hurt. *Int Organ* 63(4):621–663
- Betts, A. (2010) Global migration governance—the emergence of a new debate. International Migration Institute Policy Brief. Oxford, University of Oxford.
- Betts A (2012) Global migration governance. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Betts A (2018) The global compact on refugees: towards a theory of change? *Int J Refug Law* 30(4):623–626
- Betts A, Kainz L (2017) The history of global migration governance. The Refugee Studies Centre (RSC) Working Paper Series
- Bloom T (2015) The business of migration control: delegating migration control functions to private actors. *Global Pol* 6(2):151–157
- Caneve, N (2018) Death of the Refugee: The Silence of Numbers. In: *Migration, Refugees and Human Security in the Mediterranean and MENA* (pp. 21–49). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham
- Carens JH (2013) The ethics of immigration. Oxford University Press, New York
- Carrera S, Lannoo K, Stefan M, Vosyliūtė L (2018) Some EU governments leaving the UN Global Compact on Migration: a contradiction in terms? CEPS Policy Insights No 2018/15, November 2018. [Policy Paper]
- Crépeau, F (2018) Towards a mobile and diverse world: ‘facilitating mobility’ as a central objective of the global compact on migration. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(4), 650–656.
- European Parliament (2008) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic, and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions - Policy plan on asylum - An integrated approach to protection across the EU {SEC(2008) 2029}; {SEC(2008) 2030}
- Gilbert G (2018) Indicators for the global compact on refugees. *Int J Refug Law* 30(4):635–639
- Guild E (2019) The UN Global Compact for safe, orderly and regular migration: what place for human rights? *Int J Refug Law* 30(4):661–663
- IOM (2017) IOM vision on the global compact on migration. Available at: https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ODG/GCM/IOM-vision-on-the-global-compact-on-migration-13April2017.pdf. Accessed 30 Mar 2020
- Kälin W (2018) The global compact on migration: a ray of hope for disaster-displaced persons. *Int J Refug Law* 30(4):664–667
- Mitchell K, Jones R, Fluri JL (2019) Introduction to the handbook on critical geographies of migration. In: *Handbook on critical geographies of migration*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham
- Nair P (2018) Beyond mapped horizons: reflections on the model international mobility convention. *Columbia J Trans Law* 56(2):248–256
- Nijenhuis G, Leung M (2017) Rethinking migration in the 2030 agenda: towards a de-territorialized conceptualization of development. *Forum Dev Stud* 44(1):51–68. Routledge
- Piper N (2017) Migration and the SDGs. *Glob Soc Policy* 17(2):231–238
- Rother S (2018) The Global Forum on Migration and Development as a venue of state socialisation: a stepping stone for multi-level migration governance? *J Ethn Migr Stud* 45(8):1258–1274
- Sasnal P (2018) Domesticating the giant: the global governance of migration. Working paper. International Institutions and Global Governance Program, Council on Foreign Relations. Available from <https://www.cfr.org/report/domesticating-giant-global-governance-migration>. Accessed 10 Aug 2018
- Skeldon R (2008) Migration policies and the millennium development goals. Progressive Governance, London
- Turk V, Garlick M (2016) From burdens and responsibilities to opportunities: the comprehensive refugee response framework and a global compact on refugees. *Int J Refug Law* 28(4):656–678. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eww043>
- UN (2016) The sustainable development goals and migrants/migration regarding the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda Relevant SDGs, Implementation Actions, Realization Measurement Indicators and Rationals for Inclusion. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/events/coordination/14/documents/backgrounddocs/GMPA_14CM.pdf. Accessed 19 Feb 2019
- UN (2017) Stocktaking phase|refugees and migrants. <https://refugeemigrants.un.org/stocktaking-phase>. Accessed 20 May 2018
- UNGA (2015) Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, A/RES/70/1. Available at: https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1andLang=E. Accessed 15 Mar 2019
- UNGA (2017a) Global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration final draft. Available at: https://refugeemigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/180711_final_draft_0.pdf. Accessed 22 Mar 2019
- UNGA (2017b) Modalities for the intergovernmental negotiations of the global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration, A/RES/71/280. Available at:

- https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ODG/GCM/A-71_280-E.pdf. Accessed 20 Mar 2019
- United Nations Draft outcome document for 19 September 2016 High-Level Meeting (2016). Available at: <https://www.un.org/pga/70/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2015/08/HLM-on-addressing-large-movements-of-refugees-and-migrants-Draft-Declaration-5-August-2016.pdf>. Accessed 1 Aug 2018. Accessed 15 May 2018
- Zaiotti, R (Ed.) (2016) Externalizing Migration Management: Europe, North America and the spread of remote control practices. Routledge, New York