

**MIGRATION
STRATEGY GROUP**
ON GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS



A REPORT OF THE MIGRATION STRATEGY GROUP 2013-2014

**CREATING A TRIPLE-WIN THROUGH
LABOR MIGRATION POLICY?
LESSONS FROM GERMANY**

Steffen Angenendt, Jessica Bither, Astrid Ziebarth*
January 2015

WELCOME

Designing and implementing coherent policies that unlock the full potential of migration is not an easy task to begin with. How to design these policies so that they may lead to a so-called “triple-win” migration — one where migration benefits the receiving country, the sending country, and the migrant alike — is even more challenging. The German Marshall Fund and the Robert Bosch Stiftung took on this task and created the Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness in 2013, which I was very happy to chair in its first year of activities. Sweden also held the chair of the Global Forum on Migration and Development from 2013-2014, and a key focus of ours was to incorporate the role and views of the private sector in discussions on migration and development — a topic that was also a key component in the fruitful discussions with the participants of the Migration Strategy Group (MSG). The MSG brought together key stakeholders and decision-makers from the public and private sector, across different ministries in Germany, the EU commissariat, and political departments, from migrant-sending and receiving countries on both sides of the Atlantic.

While the economic crisis in Europe has led to increased migration from Southern European countries to those in the North that are in need of labor, such as Sweden and Germany, it is estimated that in a few years, EU migration alone will not be enough to offset demographic shifts and shrinking workforces in some European countries. The hopeful estimate is also that countries like Greece, Italy, or Spain will be in need of their own workers once their economies have stabilized. Thus, it is imperative that we begin today to look into fair and ethical ways of attracting talent from third countries outside of Europe, with a view to maintaining a competitive edge vis à vis other countries and regions in the world that are also in need of labor.

This report summarizes the journey we embarked on with the Migration Strategy Group, providing information on the migration and development nexus, lessons learned from actual pilot projects already underway, and assessing future thinking that might guide policy thinking on triple-win migration in the future.

I hope that initiatives such the Migration Strategy Group continue, as the topic of designing and implementing fair and ethical labor migration policies is bound to remain a key policy issue in the years to come.



Tobias Billström

Chair

Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness

First Deputy Speaker, Sweden

Former Minister for Migration and Asylum Policy, Sweden

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive summary	04
2. Introduction: About the Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness	05
3. The Starting Point: Competing for Labor in a Mobile World – the case of Germany	07
4. Triple-Win Thinking and the Migration/Development Nexus: Lofty Ideal or Needed Framework?	12
5. Triple-Win Spirit? EU Mobility Partnerships and Pilot Projects	14
6. Thinking Ahead: Training Partnerships as a New Model?	20
7. Conclusion	22

.....

** The views expressed here are the views of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the position of the German Marshall Fund, the Robert Bosch Stiftung or of those who participated in the Migration Strategy Group activities.*

Steffen Angenendt works at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP). Jessica Bither and Astrid Ziebarth work at the German Marshall Fund of the United States.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The issue of managed migration and labor recruitment schemes has reached a new political salience in countries such as Germany. Demographic decline, critical labor shortages in certain sectors, and shifting global migration patterns have provided the impetus for legislative changes, making Germany one of the most open countries for certain groups of migrants. One key question is how new policies may be best designed and utilized for the maximum benefit of all actors involved, creating a so-called triple-win: for the receiving country, the sending country, and the migrant. Related is the question of how migration programs may best contribute to a positive development impact in countries of origin.

This report compiles the lessons learned from the Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness (MSG), a project of The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) and the Robert Bosch Stiftung, which brought together relevant stakeholders in various formats over the course of one year. The report highlights insights regarding policy tools and migration avenues and their potential for creating a true triple-win. It describes the background of a changed migration landscape in Germany, the genesis of triple-win thinking and the migration/development nexus, and the lessons learned from current policy tools: EU Mobility Partnerships and bilateral pilot projects. It further presents challenges and opportunities of the concept of training partnerships as a new migration model that could potentially offer a new way on combining migration and developmental policies creatively and effectively.

2. INTRODUCTION: ABOUT THE MIGRATION STRATEGY GROUP ON GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

THE THINKING BEHIND THE MIGRATION STRATEGY GROUP

Demographic change and growing global competition for an increasingly mobile workforce are charging policymakers around the globe with looking for solutions so their countries can stay competitive. Be it Japan, Germany, Sweden, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, or Canada, discussions abound in various industrialized countries on how to best utilize the potential of the domestic workforce, while efficiently attracting and managing labor migration from abroad to help fill shortages in sectors like healthcare or engineering.

While the future of a country's economic competitiveness also depends on functioning and coherent migration policies, discussions surrounding migration can also evoke unease. This is particularly pertinent for sectors such as health care, and when it involves migration from developing countries. Critics of importing labor from developing countries say that recruiting talent from abroad may increase brain drain, leading to a negative development affect for the sending country, which may face its own shortage of qualified workers. Government policies, say the critics, would do better to focus on mobilizing and developing the potential in the workforce already in the country.

Tapping into the domestic potential to address critical labor shortages is unquestionably one key component of managing demographic change. Alone, however, it will not suffice to counter shortages in the long run. Instead, the most promising way forward for countries such as Germany is a dual strategy of mobilizing domestic workforces while simultaneously recruiting from abroad. Moreover, development policies and migration policies should not be seen as separate policy fields. Rather, migration should also be seen as a force or enabler of development for the sending country and the migrant, and not simply as brain drain. Instead of negating or keeping the fields between migration and development strictly separated, policymakers and relevant stakeholders should come up with coherent policies and pilot projects on migration that also consider developmental benefits.

The German Marshall Fund and the Robert Bosch Stiftung launched **the Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness (MSG)** in 2013 in order to address if and how countries can engage in so-called triple-win migration, migration that benefits the receiving country, the sending country, and the migrant alike, without losing the competitive edge to other countries.

The activities and thinking of the MSG evolved around the following main considerations:

- I. **Theoretical and ethical framework:** What is the relationship between migration and development? Can a so-called triple-win migration truly exist and even present a competitive advantage in the quest for labor migration? Can remittances (the money that migrants send home), return migration, and the transfer of skills back to the home country be the main or only building blocks for such coherent policy thinking? Or is there a way to go beyond the current discussion on the development benefits of migration to policy models that explicitly address the developmental impact of migration in new ways? What are the interests of sending countries in all of this?
- II. **General Implementation:** Are migration management systems and legal processes in countries that are in need of labor adequately set up for the **three phases of labor migration recruitment**: 1) advertising and recruiting in sending countries and informing about migration opportunities and requirements in the future destination country; 2) matching prospective migrant profiles with skills needed by employers and getting their skills recognized; and 3) offering integration and inclusion measures to prospective migrants before departure and in the new destination country. Who are the relevant stakeholders involved in all three phases? Are processes coordinated and streamlined? How is the private sector, especially small- and medium-sized enterprises, involved and engaged in each phase?

III. **Practical:** Would the private sector be willing to engage in triple-win thinking and projects and if so under what conditions? Are there real life examples of such triple-win thinking put into practice on the national or supra-national level? What are their outcomes, strengths, and weaknesses?

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE MIGRATION STRATEGY GROUP

Innovative thinking in migration policy requires a process of coalition building — one that does not insist on consensus on all matters, but that does produce a reflective and coherent environment for inquiry across a wide variety of stakeholders. A coalition building process of this kind can allow people to develop insights and go beyond positional battles or low-level compromise by catalyzing strategic and creative thinking.

The activities of the Migration Strategy Group followed the principles of a stakeholder engagement process outlined above in order to advance the thinking on triple-win migration¹. GMF and the Robert Bosch Stiftung offered a neutral space for this dialogue so that stakeholders could meet informally and exchange openly. All activities were conducted under Chatham House Rules, meaning that participants are free to use information from discussions but cannot attribute it publicly to a specific person. Activities consisted of three interdisciplinary working group meetings held in Berlin and included both current German and international examples of labor migration practices as well as their challenges and pitfalls. The discussions and insights of the working group fed into a study tour of stakeholders to Morocco in February 2014, and ultimately into a policy conference in Berlin in April 2014. Two senior advisors to the MSG produced three accompanying background briefings: 1) January 2014: *Triple-Win Migration: Challenges and Opportunities*, by Steffen Angenendt; 2) April 2014: *The Employer Perspective: The Role of the Private Sector in the U.S. Immigration Debate*, by Tamar Jacoby; 3) June 2014: *EU Mobility Partnerships: The “Most Innovative and Sophisticated Tool” of European Migration Policy?* by Steffen Angenendt.

In 2013-14, the MSG activities focused on the German case. The study group examined in greater detail the migration ties and procedures between Germany and another country, Morocco. Germany was chosen as a fitting example of a country open to labor migration: economically stable, but with existing labor shortages on several skill levels in sectors such as healthcare, hospitality, or engineering. It has comparatively liberal migration policies, especially for the highly skilled, is involved in the EU Mobility partnerships, and is equipped with a general awareness of developmental aspects of migration, embodied within the migration unit of the development ministries operating arm, the GIZ (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*).

Morocco was chosen since it has been a traditional migrant sending country, is close to Europe, and has had longstanding labor migration ties with other European countries as well. About 10 percent of the Moroccan population resides abroad and remittances make up about 6.8 percent of the GDP, five to six times of the official development aid². The importance of the diaspora is reflected in current government policy and constitution of 2011, which created the Council for Moroccans Abroad, and highlights the strategy for the diaspora-development nexus: international cooperation with the diaspora community, including the promotion of skills transfer. In 2013, Morocco signed a Mobility Partnership with the EU, and MSG participants were able to get insights into this policy instrument in its initial phase of implementation.

The Migration Strategy Group was chaired by Tobias Billström, minister for migration and asylum policy in Sweden until September 2014 and chair of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in 2013-2014. Senior Advisors were Steffen Angenendt, senior associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) and advisor for migration and development to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, and Tamar Jacoby, president and CEO of ImmigrationWorks USA. Associated Advisors were Manjula

.....
¹ The MSG followed the Stakeholder Engagement Process as laid out by the Collective Leadership Institute in Potsdam, Germany (www.collectiveleadership.com).

² “Personal remittances, received (% of GDP),” The World Bank Data, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.TRF.PWKR.DT.GD.ZS>.

Luthria and Yann Pouget, both at The World Bank, Center for Mediterranean Integration (CMI), and Michael Clemens, Center for Global Development, in Washington, DC.

Activities were coordinated by Astrid Ziebarth, director for migration & society, and Jessica Bither, program coordinator, at GMF, and Otilie Bälz, head of section society and culture, and Melanie DENSE, program officer, both at the Robert Bosch Stiftung.

3. THE STARTING POINT: COMPETING FOR LABOR IN A MOBILE WORLD – THE CASE OF GERMANY

Most industrialized countries are currently experiencing profound demographic shifts toward more “mature” societies, with significantly aging and shrinking populations and work forces. Expected labor shortages are increasingly perceived as risks for economic growth and competitiveness. For example, in its skilled labor strategy, the German government assumes that the labor force potential will decline by 6.5 million people between 2010 and 2025 unless additional potentials are utilized³. Even assuming an annual inflow of 200,000 migrants per year from 2020 on, the German Federal Office of Statistics estimates that Germany will have 10 million fewer inhabitants by 2060⁴. Germany is one of the few OECD member countries in which the size of the labor force has already declined. The situation is only more dramatic in Japan and Italy. This trend will continue in coming decades, with serious economic, social, and political consequences. The shortage is to be counteracted by social reforms and making more effective use of the domestic potential, particularly by increasing the labor participation of women and older people and through training measures. However, this will not be sufficient in the long term to meet the demand for skilled workers nor offset expected challenges for the pension system with fewer working age inhabitants. Continuous immigration is needed in the future to at least dampen the impact of a declining and aging population as well as to safeguard growth and prosperity and guarantee the care of the rapidly growing number of senior citizens⁵.

Other countries are also grappling with aging populations, skill shortages, and challenging migration management systems that make it difficult for employers to find and employ the talent they need. Those countries and employers are in direct competition with Germany's quest for talent. According to a worldwide employer survey, 36 percent of global employers experience challenges to find talented people who have the skills needed for open positions⁶. Among U.S. employers surveyed, skilled trades and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) positions are the most challenging positions to fill⁷. In sectors like healthcare, registered nurse shortages also exist in countries like the United States, Canada, and Australia. These are all traditional immigration countries that have a competitive advantage over Germany, due to a better image as open and welcoming countries with fewer language barriers since English is the main lingua franca.

Moreover, in the health sector, national or sub-national actors in Canada and the United States do not necessarily follow the World Health Organization's (WHO) *Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel* from 2010. The code stipulates that countries should not pro-actively recruit trained health personnel from countries with a critical shortage in the health sector in order to prevent a severe lack of medical treatment there. While German actors and institutions follow the non-binding code of practice, actors in other countries do not – or may not

.....
3 “Fachkräftesicherung- Ziele und Maßnahmen der Bundesregierung,” (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2011)

4 “Bevölkerung Deutschlands bis 2060,” Statistisches Bundesamt (2009), www.destatis.de.

5 Jean-Christophe Dumont and Thomas Liebig, “Is Migration Good for the Economy?,” (Paris: OECD, 2014).

6 “The Talent Shortage Continues: How the Ever Changing Role of HR can Bridge the Gap,” (ManpowerGroup, 2014).

7 For a debate of the employer perspective in the U.S. debate on immigration reform, see Tamar Jacoby's MSG Framework paper “The Employer Perspective: The Role of the Private Sector in the U.S. Immigration Debate,” <http://www.gmfus.org/archives/the-employer-perspective-the-role-of-the-private-sector-in-the-u-s-immigration-debate/>

even be aware of it – as one survey suggests⁸. In Morocco, for instance, Canadian employers recruit nurses and health professionals, while German institutions and employers do not. Using the Code of Practice as a guiding orientation for recruitment has been criticized lately regarding both the methodology and data employed to construct the list of 57 countries with critical shortages in the health care sector, as well as the inherent contradiction between individual freedom of mobility of migrants and the request not to hire individuals from countries with critical shortages⁹.

All in all, Germany has become more pro-active and faster in recruiting from abroad, but so have others. For example, in January 2015, Canada introduced a new electronic system called Express Entry to expedite recruitment and the management of applications for permanent residence on both the federal and provincial levels for certain economic immigration programs. The system provides employers with more say in the process of selection and allows the government of Canada to be more responsive to shortages¹⁰.

While the public mood in Germany is currently largely receptive to the need of skilled migration, recent figures showing increases in net migration could lead the public and policymakers to think that no further action is needed to recruit migrants and is only necessary regarding activating domestic potential. Migration to Germany has indeed increased significantly since 2009, and it is now the second-largest immigration country in the OECD, right behind the United States¹¹. For 2012, the net migration figure stood at 400,000, of which about 60 percent came from countries of the European Union¹². In 2013, Germany counted 884,493 foreigners entering and 366,833 leaving the country, adding up to a net inflow of 517,660 foreigners — a sharp increase compared to the average net immigration of about 100,000 foreigners throughout the previous decade. The number of asylum seekers has also increased and 110,000 people filed for asylum for the first time in 2013, up from 65,000 people in 2012¹³. While the processes and regulations are very different between migrants and asylum seekers or refugees, there is also a push to better assess and use the skills and qualifications that refugees bring with them for the German labor market.

In the public debate, all these recent inflows of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers are often mixed together. While it can be expected that asylum numbers will remain at the current level for some time, some researchers expect that the currently high inflow of other migrants is a “special effect” of the economic crisis in the southern European countries and the opening of the labor market to eastern countries of the EU¹⁴. Migration from these regions will most likely decline in the not too distant future, as it is in the interest of the EU to stabilize these countries economically so that young Greeks and Italians will have a future again in their own aging societies. Regarding activating the domestic labor force potential, others point out that even if wages were increased in a sector like caretaking to make the profession more attractive for domestic workers and if more support were given to increase the domestic potential for the profession, the shortage in this sector would not be filled and migration is needed — now and in the future¹⁵. EU migration for the health profession would also not suffice in the long run as the main source countries of caretaking migration, predominantly from eastern European countries, will also undergo aging processes and will be in need of their own workers.

.....
8 Steven J. Hoffman and Jennifer S. Edge, “Empirical impact evaluation of the WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel in Australia, Canada, U.K., and USA,” *Globalization and Health* (2013).

9 Steffen Angenendt, Michael Clemens, and Meiko Merda, “The WHO Global Code of Practice: A Useful Guide for Recruiting Health Care Professionals? Lessons from Germany and Beyond,” (Berlin: SWP Comments, 2014).

10 “Government of Canada,” <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/immigrate/express/express-entry.asp>.

11 Dumont and Liebig

12 Luise Brenning, “Wirkungsanalyse des rechtlichen Rahmens für ausländische Fachkräfte,” (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, 2014).

13 “Das Bundesamt in Zahlen 2013,” (Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 2014).

14 Reiner Klingholz, “Anleitung zum Wenigersein,” *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (May 6, 2014)

15 Grit Braeseke, “Migration — Chancen für die Gewinnung von Fachkräften in der Pflegewirtschaft,” (Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2013).

LAWS OF ATTRACTION: LABOR MIGRATION REFORMS IN GERMANY

As a response to the challenges posed by demographic change, the German government introduced a series of migration policy reforms in recent years. These reforms improved the migration schemes for skilled migrants, the opportunities for foreign graduates of German universities to remain in the country, and the opportunities for skilled personnel trained abroad, for instance by limiting hurdles and specifying criteria for the recognition of professional qualifications obtained abroad. According to the OECD, these changes have posited Germany firmly among those OECD countries with the fewest formal restrictions on labor migration for highly skilled occupations¹⁶.

The Recognition Act (Anerkennungsgesetz) came into force in April 2012 entitling migrants to claim a formal recognition of their qualifications for employment in Germany¹⁷. Introduced later that year, the "EU Blue Card" further offers much more lenient immigration options to highly qualified professionals, and foreign academics trained in Germany have easier access to the German job market. Particularly relevant to the development angle considered above, supply-side criteria were introduced in 2012 with the job-search visa (§18c of the Residence Act), breaking for the first time with the German migration principle that immigrants must have a concrete job offer before applying for a work permit. The scheme so far applies only to foreign academics, who now can come to Germany for up to half a year to look for a job. The Confederation of German Employers' Associations (BDA) has recently even called for lifting the six months' time restrictions for foreign academics and to extend the scheme to skilled professionals for non-academic shortage occupations¹⁸.

New employment regulation rules, adopted in June 2013, will have even more serious consequences for the partner countries of German development cooperation. These rules opened the German labor market even further to professionals from non-EU countries if they have at least two years of professional training in a qualified profession. With few exceptions, it had been almost impossible for such professionals from third countries to work in Germany. These exceptions pertained to domestic workers, seasonal workers and performers, and only under the condition that a so-called mediation agreement was in place with the employment services of the country of origin. Even in the cases where such an agreement existed, this option has rarely been used in practice. Since the recent EU accession of Eastern and Southern European countries, which made the mediation agreements with Bulgaria, Croatia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, and Hungary obsolete, such arrangements are only in force with the Philippines (since March 2013) and Bosnia-Herzegovina (since April 2013).

Against this background, the June 2013 employment regulation is a crucial reform, as it provides migration opportunities without the condition of a bilateral mediation agreement being in place. The only requirement is that the potential migrants have to prove that their qualification is equivalent to that of the German vocational training system. Thanks to the Recognition Act this requirement has now become much easier to fulfill. The prerequisite for such employment in Germany is that the Federal Employment Agency has identified a bottleneck in filling vacancies in the specific occupation, which it now lists semi-annually in a so-called whitelist (*Positivliste*)¹⁹. Labor market access for refugees was also facilitated and asylum seekers can now take up employment or training after nine months; a further shortening of the waiting time to three months is currently being discussed. In addition, new initiatives and information campaigns have been launched such as the internet portal "make-it-in-Germany.com" providing information on job opportunities in Germany via targeted consulting services in various countries such as India, Indonesia, and Vietnam.

Overall, Germany has facilitated immigration significantly through its reforms, setting it on a firm course of actively opening its doors for labor from abroad, including developing countries. While evidence suggests that there is ample room for improvement regarding the implementation of the new regulations — for example the total number of third

16 "Recruiting Immigrant Workers: Germany 2013," (Paris: OECD, 2013).

17 "Bericht zum Anerkennungsgesetz," (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2014).

18 "Zuwanderungsrecht auf langfristige Bedarfe ausrichten, Eckpunkte zur Gestaltung einer Potenzialzuwanderung," (Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände e.V., 2014).

19 "Positivliste / Whitelist," Bundesagentur für Arbeit,

country nationals that immigrated via the white list from January 2014-July 2014 stood at a meager 119²⁰ — the final verdict is still out on how attractive these reforms will make Germany as a permanent magnet for talent going forward.

GERMAN LABOR MIGRATION POLICIES AND DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS

It is still too early to assess the development impact of Germany's new migration policy. But it is clear that a major lesson was drawn from former migration policies: The 1972 recruitment stop had serious unintended consequences, first and foremost that many migrants who wanted to stay temporarily in Germany became permanent immigrants before being able to complete their personal migration project and earn enough for a decent return. At that time, the transformation from temporary to permanent settlers was barely supported by German legislation and administration, and in many cases, the migrants themselves — as well as the German public — were not prepared to accept the de facto immigration of millions of foreign workers. The key lesson learned was that limitations regarding the duration of stay that are too harsh end up being detrimental to individual migration projects and therefore may also reduce the potential developmental impact of migrants in their home countries. Accordingly, the recent policy reforms foresee transitional options between temporary migration and permanent immigration. This applies mostly to highly skilled migrants, but a visa status change is now also easier for students and immigrants who receive vocational training in Germany.

To find new ways to cope with the increasing demand for skilled labor, the federal government supports pilot projects to promote labor migration, e.g. with countries like Vietnam, India, and Indonesia. Various government departments and agencies are involved in designing and implementing these projects, inter alia the Foreign Office and the Federal Ministries of Economics and Labor and Social Affairs. Germany stands out in that it has a designated migration unit within the development ministries operating arm, the GIZ (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*) that often implements these projects. While the current migration pilot projects are primarily driven by economic and demographic needs, they attempt to adhere to the notion that sustainable migration programs must generate long-term positive effects for all stakeholders — countries of origin, host countries, and the migrants themselves. If current and new pilot projects will indeed get close to the concept of triple-win migration, Germany could potentially lead the way in the development of triple-win migration and define this approach as a competitive advantage vis-à-vis other labor recruiting countries that do not consider developmental aspects in the sending country.

MSG insights: the three phases of labor migration

The Migration Strategy Group used recent pilot projects on labor migration to discuss main points to consider for the three phases of the labor migration process for Germany: 1) advertising and recruitment, 2) matching of employers needs and candidates skills, and 3) integration measures pre-departure and within the destination country.

.....
20 "Arbeitsmarkt in Zahlen – Zustimmungen für Drittstaatsangehörige nach Verordnungsgrundlagen," (Düsseldorf: Statistik der Bundesagentur für Arbeit, August 2014)

ADVERTISING AND RECRUITMENT	MATCHING	INTEGRATION MEASURES: PRE-DEPARTURE AND IN DESTINATION COUNTRY
<p>Involve employers early and often, right from the beginning and throughout the process</p> <p>Connect destination country stakeholders abroad (embassies, cultural institutes, chambers of commerce) with foreigners office (Ausländerbehörde) more efficiently to supply coherent information on migration process to prospective migrants and about the living situation in Germany</p> <p>Establish certification process for private recruiters to ensure ethical recruitment and to prevent the exploitation of migrants and spread of misleading information (see the International Organization for Migration's International Recruitment Integrity System, IRIS)</p> <p>Manage expectations carefully and provide transparent and fair information for prospective migrants and employers</p>	<p>Raise awareness and sensibility among employers about the cultural aspects of a migrant sending country and about the education and qualification system of a sending country in specific sectors</p> <p>Specify and clarify the needs of employers regarding qualifications, experience, and skill level needed with facilitation partners to avoid misunderstandings</p> <p>Select facilitators for recruitment carefully to ensure that private recruiters deliver all information needed to prospective migrants</p> <p>Provide fair and adequate information to prospective migrants about working and living conditions in the destination country, prospective city and regional setting, and specific sectors and employers (e.g. health sector) to prevent disappointment and early return back to home country</p> <p>Provide certainty and transparency on type of residence/work permit, visa etc.; skills recognition; and potential further training needed to fulfil recognition process according to the differing state level requirements</p>	<p>Ensure basic language training in a sending country (minimum of 6 months and B2 level), potentially modules tailored to job profile</p> <p>Promote fair understanding of roles and service delivery in the integration process among state and private actors and civil society</p> <p>Provide additional job-related training before departure as well as intercultural training, for instance by returnees or diaspora community (Germans abroad)</p> <p>Establish mentoring system between migrants and volunteers who have concrete experience in sector of the mentee; the Canadian Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC) could serve as a good model</p> <p>Provide mentors for everyday questions at work place and potential additional mentors from civil society (also for external monitoring & supervision of situation of the migrant)</p> <p>Facilitate active engagement by employers such as "Integration Managers" in companies</p> <p>Build networks among companies to provide integration services, in particular for small- and medium-sized enterprises, who can pool resources to ensure affordability</p> <p>Ensure regular intercultural training for all employees to foster better understanding and prevent discrimination</p> <p>Foster social cohesion, stress importance of business goals and how everyone in the workforce contributes to it, irrespective of nationality (employers)</p>

4. TRIPLE-WIN THINKING AND THE MIGRATION/DEVELOPMENT NEXUS: LOFTY IDEAL OR NEEDED FRAMEWORK?

For decades, a broad consensus prevailed in national and international politics to consider migration from poor countries as an obstacle to development. The effects of migration were mainly perceived as a risk, the so-called “brain drain,” and it was a widely shared principle not to encourage migration — especially that of health care workers. It was acknowledged that remittances could have positive effects, but it was argued that they would mainly affect consumption and not have a sustainable impact on development. Vice versa, there was a similar reluctance to include development thinking in national migration policies, and **most industrialized countries strictly distinguished between their labor market needs and development goals**. However, during the last decade, the debate on migration and development has shifted significantly toward a much more positive assessment of the development impact of migration.

This shift has also become visible at the UN level. While the first (2006) UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (HLD) was still dominated by complaints of developing countries on the “neo-colonial exploitation” of their work force through the migration policies of industrialized countries, during the second HLD in October 2013, the same governments requested more opportunities for legal migration²¹. This paradigmatic shift concerning the discourse on migration and development is far from accidental, and is grounded in at least three fundamental changes concerning global migration²².

- › First, migration is gradually shifting toward mobility²³. The traditional view of migration as a permanent settlement is largely obsolete. Integrated markets, new communication techniques, and inexpensive travel all promote internal and international migration and contribute to the increasingly temporary or circular character of contemporary migration. Living temporarily in another country has become easier and more affordable, and lacks the heavy personal toll of permanent emigration. Temporary migration has become the fastest growing migration pattern, and the global financial and economic crisis only slightly attenuated this trend²⁴.
- › Second, remittances to developing countries have increased significantly. According to recent World Bank estimates, in 2014 migrants will transfer about US\$414 billion to developing countries, three times greater than the amount of official development assistance. According to the World Bank, remittances could rise to \$540 billion in 2016²⁵. In addition, remittance transfers have proven to be remarkably resilient to economic downturns or crises. For some countries of origin, they have become an important source of income, accounting for up to one-third of GDP²⁶. However, critics warn of painting too positive a picture of remittances, in particular relating to their contribution to development, pointing to the fact that since remittances are private money, they are always vulnerable to taxes or fees in the destination country. Furthermore, they are not reliable forms of income, because they might decrease during a recession and the disposition of migrants to send money back home may diminish over time. Finally, remittance flows alone cannot cause significant changes in countries of origin as these must always be accompanied by functioning local level institutions and policy interventions²⁷.

.....
21 *“International Migration and Development, Report of the Secretary-General,”* (New York: United Nations, 2013).

22 *“International Migration Outlook 2013,”* in UN DESA, *World Migration in Figures*. (Paris and New York: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2013).

23 *“Temporary and Circular Migration: Empirical Evidence, Current Policy Practice, and Future Options in the EU Member States,”* (Brussels: European Migration Network, 2011).

24 *“International Migration 2013: Migrants by Origin and Destination,”* in *Population Facts* (New York: UN Population Division, 2013).

25 *“Migration and Remittances: Recent Developments and Outlook,”* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2014).

26 Michael A. Clemens and David McKenzie, *“Why Don’t Remittances Appear to Affect Growth?”* in *World Bank Policy Research Paper 6856* (Washington DC: World Bank, 2014).

27 Tasneem Siddiqui, *“Impact of migration on poverty and development”* in *Migration Out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium, Working Paper 2* (Brighton: Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex, 2012).

- › Third, transnational diaspora networks are growing in size and density, offering new opportunities for cooperation between home and host countries. Well-organized and interconnected diasporas can encourage investment in home countries; contribute to the improvement of infrastructure, knowledge, and technology transfer; and facilitate foreign direct investment²⁸. They also have the potential to play an active role in the recruitment of foreign workers, for instance for newly established companies in the countries of origin, but also acting as an intermediary or agent for companies in the host country²⁹.

As discussed above, many development actors today assess the consequences of migration more positively than in the past and call for closer links between migration and development policies³⁰. In fact, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) explicitly recommends a “migration for development” strategy, and to increase the education and training of potential migrants as well as a reintegration of returnees in their countries of origin. However, a fundamental conflict between migration and development policies still exists. **While migration policy from the perspective of host countries is intended to bring people into the country for labor market-related, demographic, or other needs, development policy is still targeted at helping people in partner countries to surmount poverty and structural deficits in developing countries themselves.** These different goals make it difficult to link the two policy fields conceptually, although there are numerous overlaps in practice. Migration always also fosters the development of receiving countries. Migration is especially attractive to potential host countries if migrants have the specific skills they are in need of, and this skill level is often only achieved at a higher level of economic development in the sending countries. Therefore, a certain level of development is usually a necessary precondition for migration³¹. Overall, in many international fora migration is now perceived as a main driver (“enabler”) of development. This has, for example, become visible in the current debate on the future of the global development goals (“post-2015”).

EMBEDDING “TRIPLE-WIN” IN MIGRATION POLICIES

The recent international debates in the UN framework and other international and regional processes illustrate the degree to which “triple-win” thinking has been “mainstreamed” in the current migration and development debate. A far more positive assessment of development outcomes of migration prevails these days, replacing outdated and too-simplistic assumptions about the negative impacts of migration, especially on countries of origin. This paradigmatic change could serve as a strong driver toward more realistic and pragmatic migration policies. It may also become an incentive to better use the immense potential of well-managed migration for poverty reduction and sustainable development.

The migration and development debate generally seems to swing back and forth between gloominess and embellishment — and the paradigmatic shift outlined above stands on weak ground. There is still a significant shortage of solid and comparative data and a very few triple-win projects actually implemented.

Experience needed to fill this gap can only be gathered from additional projects. Therefore, the main conclusion with regard to the triple-win debate so far is to develop and implement more pilot projects. Such projects are complex, and they require the political will of all stakeholders involved including employers, in sending and receiving countries. They also need specific management capacities and sufficient funding. More importantly, triple-win projects should not be misunderstood as a tool to provide employers with cheap labor.

.....

28 Dovelyn Rannveig Agunias and Kathleen Newland, “*Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development: A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries*,” (Washington, DC: International Organization for Migration and Migration Policy Institute, 2012).

29 Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, “*Globalization, Brain Drain, and Development*,” in IZA Discussion Paper Nr. 5590 (Bonn 2011).

30 Siddiqui, “*Impact of Migration*.”

31 “*Contribution of Migrants to Development: Trade, Investment, and Development Linkages*,” (Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 2009).

Figure 1

MSG Insights: Four Key Lessons for Fostering Development through Migration Programs

I. Fair bilateral and regional frameworks

Triple-win projects should have a bilateral and regional framework securing a fair consideration of the interests of all actors involved, including those in sending countries. Only fair and balanced agreements will secure the necessary compliance of partner countries. It will be of crucial importance not only to follow a rights-based approach and to ensure the social, economic, and human rights of migrants, but also to assure that the migration programs enhance the economic and social development of the source countries and do not foster brain drain. Mainstreaming development aspects in labor migration policies is not a dilution of economic migration goals. It is a vital precondition for any future coherent, effective, and sustainable migration policy.

II. Flexible migration programs

Mobility must be fostered, and unrealistic political assumptions, for example, that the time limits of temporary migration programs can be fully enforced should be avoided. Individual migration strategies may change over time, employers might be interested in keeping temporary migrants in their companies, or economic conditions in the country of origin may worsen, making return migration difficult or impossible. Therefore, migration programs should be flexible with regard to the duration of workers' stay, and temporary migration schemes should always provide opportunities for a permanent residence.

III. Imperative to include integration measures

Integration measures should always be included — even in temporary migration programs. For instance, a lack of integration policies turned out to be the main failure of Germany's former guest worker recruitment.

IV. Intensive process for private sector

As far as the private sector is concerned, employers should be aware that the recruitment of qualified migrants is neither a cheap nor simple way to fill short-term labor demands, and that a sustainable migration-related human resources strategy needs substantial and enduring engagement and cooperation with labor market authorities at home and abroad.

5. TRIPLE-WIN SPIRIT? EU MOBILITY PARTNERSHIPS AND PILOT PROJECTS

In recent years, multilateral policy frameworks — such as the EU Mobility Partnerships — and bilateral pilot projects between countries have emerged that attempt to emphasize triple-win thinking. The experiences from these different types of policy tools present valuable learning opportunities to determine the potential and challenges of any new labor recruitment efforts, in particular in the way they may explicitly address the development of sending countries. In this manner, a more detailed evaluation of the EU Mobility Partnerships and German pilot projects 1) offer lessons from both their successes and failures and 2) in doing so, highlight the importance of conducting and supporting new pilot projects in the first place, as they may serve as a basis for evaluation and best practices for future migration schemes. The following section summarizes the key findings of the MSG discussions on the EU Mobility Partnerships and selected bilateral projects.

EU MOBILITY PARTNERSHIPS

In 2005, the EU launched the Global Approach to Migration as an overarching framework to foster a common and comprehensive European migration policy. Within this framework, Mobility Partnerships between EU member states and third countries are supposed to better link migration and development and to foster a more efficient and coherent EU policy. In May 2007, the European Commission introduced the concept of Mobility Partnerships as “the most innovative and sophisticated tool” of the Global Approach. According to the Commission, these flexible partnerships will play a key role in future EU migration policy. They are intended to ensure greater policy coherence, to strengthen the external dimension of migration policy, and to create “triple-win” situations by offering legal opportunities to migrants, supporting the development of countries of origin, and supplying EU member states with much needed skilled labor. Mobility partnerships have thus far been established with Cape Verde, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Morocco, Azerbaijan, and Tunisia, and new partnerships are currently under negotiation.

Concept and Potential

In general, the concept of EU Mobility Partnerships foresees obligations for both the respective partner countries as well as for participating EU member states in four key areas: legal migration, migration management, preventing brain drain, and the issuing of visas.

- › Concerning **legal migration**, partnerships include clauses on both labor migration and migration for study and training purposes, whereas EU citizens still receive priority in terms of the former. Regarding workers from partner countries, two specific avenues for legal migration exist. Member states can either submit a joint offer for employment-related immigration from a partner country or a Mobility Partnership can provide favorable entry conditions for labor migrants from that country.
- › In terms of **migration management**, member states and the Commission can facilitate exchanges on information regarding the labor demand of participating EU countries. For instance, they can establish a joint “cross-border job placement service,” foster the reintegration of returning migrants, and reduce the costs of remittances. EU countries can also assist the partner countries in better managing their own inflows of immigrants. As many potential Mobility Partnership countries record considerable immigration themselves, assistance may be offered in managing these inflows as this may affect the implementation of the Mobility Partnership as a whole.
- › The **prevention of brain drain** is a main development goal of the Mobility Partnership. Next to EU Commission suggestions of avoiding the recruitment of labor in those sectors in which there is a significant labor shortage in partner countries, as well as support and incentives for voluntary return migration, the Commission emphasizes the fostering of circular migration schemes. The underlying assumption is that migration schemes that allow for a certain degree of legal mobility (return) between two countries — which is the Commission’s understanding of circular migration — would offer an opportunity to use the knowledge and the networks of migrants to foster domestic development.
- › The last area of Mobility Partnerships concerns the **issuing of visas**. Within Mobility Partnerships, EU member states can offer visa facilitation, as well as an improvement of consular services. Waiting times can be shortened and access to the respective consulate improved. Opening times of the consulates can be extended, staff capacity strengthened, and consular cooperation deepened. In addition, visa facilitation for certain occupations or skills can be agreed upon. In contrast to the EU Commission, the EU Council has repeatedly emphasized that visa facilitation should be conditional upon concluded readmission agreements (“conditionality”) — although it is now also convinced that certain “incentives” such as legal migration opportunities must be offered to the partner countries to secure a proper implementation of the readmission agreements. However, the issue of conditionality is a controversial one, and there is currently no consensus on whether such conditionality is appropriate and whether it should relate to labor migration or visa issuing.

Recent Experiences and Key Areas for Improvement

A review of existing Mobility Partnerships — in particular with Armenia, Cape Verde, Georgia, and Moldova — provides indications of where Mobility Partnerships have been most successful and in which areas their use as a policy tool for triple-win migration can be improved. All pilot project countries emphasized that the partnerships were helpful to prepare their association to the EU. In addition, the Eastern European partner countries Moldova, Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan highlighted that the Mobility Partnership had improved contacts and exchanges with the EU, deepened knowledge about the functioning of the Union, and accelerated reforms of national administration and political institutions. Moreover, the Mobility Partnerships had strengthened regional cooperation and increased awareness of the importance of migration for development. All pilot countries were particularly positive about the flexibility and the adaptability of this instrument to their specific needs.

In this respect, it was regarded as very helpful that Mobility Partnerships are not rigid instruments, but rather “living documents.” In addition, the Mobility Partnerships have also served to improve cooperation between EU countries themselves (for instance by establishing contact points in all relevant institutions), as well as improve cooperation between member states and the EU Commission.

However, the Migration Strategy Group also identified and discussed four areas for improvement that would make Mobility Partnerships more efficient and could enhance a triple-win situation: 1) more thoughtful selection of partner countries, 2) greater clarity regarding policy goals, 3) better coordination between EU countries and stakeholders within the same country, and 4) stronger content of the actual partnership projects (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

MSG Insights: Four Areas for Improvement to Enhance a Triple-Win with EU Mobility Partnerships

I. More thoughtful selection of partner countries

A future selection of partner countries should better comply with the criteria originally laid out by the EU Commission, namely that selected countries should be a relevant source of migration to the EU, that they are willing to actively cooperate with the EU, and that EU countries in turn have a genuine interest in cooperating with partner countries. For example, Cape Verde was surely not a main source country of migration to the EU, and countries like Ghana were not too interested in establishing a close migration cooperation with EU member states. A future selection of partner countries should better comply with these criteria, and additional criteria should be considered. Special attention, for instance, could be given to development aspects by selecting partner countries with a particularly high proportion of young adults with a good formal education but no prospect of decent employment in their country.

II. Greater clarity regarding policy goals

In the currently running partnerships, different priorities between EU countries and the partner countries or between EU member states themselves have resulted in a lack of clarity regarding the main policy prerogatives. Moldova, for instance had a particular interest in support for the return of its citizens, while Cape Verde aimed for visa facilitation. And while EU countries have placed a particular importance on the prevention of irregular migration, it remains unclear what importance this goal has in relation to those related to labor market and development policy. In general, interest in cooperation is low if there are no sufficient incentives, e.g. migration programs and mobility schemes. Ideally, the partnerships would be so attractive that proper implementation and sufficient compliance can be expected. Further, EU member states have, up to now, set major obstacles blocking a comprehensive policy. Since many member states are still fighting high unemployment, they are currently against opening up additional immigration channels. However, this would be necessary to make Mobility Partnerships a tool that links migration and development issues to a coherent, effective, and pro-development policy.

III. **Better coordination between EU countries and stakeholders within same country**

While Mobility Partnerships foresee a dual coordination process 1) between member states and the Commission through “task forces” and 2) with the partners countries through “cooperation platforms,” experience has shown coordination weaknesses on both levels that manifested themselves when it comes to local-level implementation. In this manner, reporting by EU countries has often been inadequate and the EU Commission has repeatedly complained that they do not have a sufficient overview of the actual course of the various pilot Partnerships and therefore cannot coordinate them in a proper manner. On the local level, EU delegations should be strengthened in order to be able to cope with the increasing need of coordinating the Mobility Partnership activities of the EU member states.

Further, better coordination between political stakeholders within the participating EU countries is needed. Frequent controversies between ministries and government agencies on their respective roles and responsibilities prolong the process of formulating coherent national positions and coordinating at the EU level. However, this internal consultation is necessary, so enough time should be allowed for this when negotiating new Mobility Partnerships. Also, the clear leadership of a national ministry is important for implementing these processes.

IV. **Stronger Contents**

In principle, Mobility Partnerships offer great flexibility in terms of adapting the content of each individual partnership to the specific needs of participating parties. However, this flexibility bears the risk that already established cooperation projects are simply “relabelled” and introduced as supposedly new activities. This was partly the case in the pilot Partnerships with Cape Verde and Moldova, leading to the overall impression that the partnerships did not offer substantially new opportunities for migration cooperation. Instead, it would be important to develop more “flagship projects,” that is, visible and compelling projects that can provide inspiration for other Mobility Partnerships. At the beginning of negotiations with interested potential partner countries, it would be useful to compile “wish lists” to make the expectations of stakeholders as clear as possible. These lists should contain proposals for projects and programs. Existing Partnerships often did not adequately develop such lists.

BILATERAL PILOT PROJECTS ON LABOR MOBILITY

Concomitantly to migration cooperation on the multilateral level through the EU Mobility Partnerships, there have been an increasing number of bilateral pilot projects underway that offer concrete insights into the crucial aspects of managing the different phases of labor migration. As outlined above, in the face of demographic changes and looming labor shortages in key economic sectors, Germany has implemented significant reforms concerning labor migration. Against this backdrop, there are a number of recent bilateral migration projects, both state-organized and private, and since 2008, several pilot projects were implemented. While it is still too early to assess the concrete development impact of the new German migration policy, these individual projects and other international experiences provide evidence as to what successful pilot projects will require and, by extension, what sustainable labor migration programs must incorporate³². Not all pilot projects work out as originally intended or designed. It is especially in those cases that the MSG participants derived important lessons for future pilot projects so that mistakes made in the past were not in vain and serve to develop guidelines for the next generation of pilot projects.

.....
³² Michael A. Clemens, “Global Skill Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World.” CGD Policy Paper 40. (Washington DC: Center for Global Development, 2014)

Examples of Recent Migration Pilot Projects

GIZ Pilot Project on Legal Migration — Engineering Sector, Germany-Tunisia, (2012-13)

The GIZ pilot project in the engineering sector was financed by the Federal Foreign Office within the framework of the transition partnership with the Arab world, here between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Tunisia, and was conducted under GIZ leadership. Its core idea was an internship placement program that could potentially lead to full employment and followed a detailed labor market survey of the North African Region and labor sectors. As part of the pilot project, 120 Tunisian engineers (of which 30 per cent were women) were placed in German enterprises. The recruitment and selection was conducted jointly by the Tunisian employment agency and the Federal Employment Agency (BA/ZAV) in cooperation with the GIZ. A total of 56 German businesses participated, mostly in Southern Germany, 23 of which were interested in building up or maintaining ties with Tunisia or other countries in the Arab-speaking world. In over 70 percent of cases, the internship placement led to full-time employment. The project was funded by a grant of €2.7 million from the Federal Foreign Office (excluding contributions by the participating employers, a minimum salary of €300 per month). The project officially came to a close in December 2013.

TAPiG —Transformation partnership in the healthcare sector, Germany-Tunisia (2012-13)

The TAPiG project was initiated within the framework of Germany's transition partnership with the Arab world, here between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Tunisia, and was partly funded by the Federal Foreign Office. The central facilitator for its implementation was TAPiG Project Management & Brückenschlag e.V.; the employer was Asklepios hospital group. The project was geared toward 150 Tunisian graduates to arrive in groups of 25 every six months and was designed to be in three progressive stages: 1) a six-month "welcome" stage; 2) three years of training, and 3) an employment stage generally lasting at least five years. TAPiG was funded by a grant of €950,000 (particularly, a welcome program and basic language courses) and included a planned contribution by participants of approximately €3 million (€20,000 per participant). The salary and training cost for employers was anticipated to be approximately €10 million. The project ended prematurely in August 2013 (please see figure 3 for explanation).

Blue Birds — Pilot Project on Circular Migration, The Netherlands — Indonesia & South Africa (2009-11)

The Blue Birds pilot labor migration project was an initiative by the Dutch Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice, and Social Affairs and Employment. HIT Foundation was commissioned by the Dutch government to execute the project and the World Bank was in charge of its evaluation. The Blue Birds pilot project was designed to provide 80 professionals from South Africa and 80 from Indonesia the opportunity to work in the Netherlands for a period of two years. A sector analysis identifying actual and anticipated labor shortages identified the following sectors for placement: the metal industry, the food industry, agribusiness, and logistics. The project design included three phases: 1) a pre-departure phase (including recruitment & selection process), 2) a work and learn phase in the Netherlands (including professional training and monitoring), and 3) a reintegration preparation and post-return phase (including a return network and employment market mediation in the country of origin). The pilot project ended prematurely in 2011 (please see figure 3 for explanation)..

Other projects, particular in the health care sector, are currently in progress. In 2013, 100 young Vietnamese were trained in elderly care. After a six months pre-departure German language training in Vietnam, they are being trained for a permanent stay in Germany. However, the Vietnamese government expects a transfer of income and knowledge, and is interested in a later return of the nurses. Another pilot project is the "triple-win project" of GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency. In 2013-14, 2,000 nurses from Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Philippines, and Tunisia are to be recruited for temporary work in Germany. This migration program is based on bilateral "mediation agreements" between the Federal Employment Agency and its partner institutions in the respective country of origin. Key conditions are that the countries of origin have no critical shortage reported of health workers (according to World Health Organization standards) and that the migrant's skills meet the requirements of the German employers. The nurses must have completed a professional training in their home country and must have professional experience. They also receive a pre-departure language training, as well as a training in German standards for care, hygiene, and documentation, as well as information about career opportunities, and they are supported in recognition

of their professional qualifications. Employers pay about €3,700 per person for vocational and language preparation and assistance with integration in Germany. The project was preceded by a preparatory pilot measure with 80 nurses mostly from Bosnia-Herzegovina. All participants have reached German certification in health and nursing within one year; the average certification time was about seven months. According to GIZ, both the employers and the migrants assessed the project positive in principle, the latter especially emphasizing that they were able to expand their professional and personal perspectives.

It remains to be seen how these bilateral pilot projects withstand the scrutiny of skepticism regarding their developmental impact and whether the true triple-win potential is utilized and improved. On the practical implementation side, however, they already provide valuable lessons in which key elements must be considered to ensure their success — the nuts and bolts for ensuring maximum benefits for the receiving country, the sending country, and the migrants themselves.

Figure 3

MSG Insights: Five Key Lessons Learned from Recent Pilot Projects

I. Expectation Management

In the projects reviewed, it became clear that expectation management, especially concerning candidates, was a crucial component to the success (or failure) of the program. This includes issues surrounding the living and working conditions in the receiving society and transparency surrounding the exact conditions of the contract. In the TAPiG project, for instance, recruits questioned certain terms of their contract, in particular related to the personal financial contribution to their training, as well as certain working conditions within the hospital, which together significantly contributed to the premature termination of the project. The issue of transparency also came up regarding other actors affected by the pilot project. For example, the TAPiG project was confronted with tensions with the German work council regarding certain benefits allegedly only offered to the foreign recruits. Expectation management and coordination among involved government actors is crucial as well: the project design of the Dutch Blue Birds project incorporated competing goals of different ministries leading to unclear priorities in the implementation phase³³.

II. Employer Involvement

Another key factor concerned the involvement of the employers in all phases of the labor migration process, from recruitment, to matching, to selection, placement, and finally, in the integration phase within Germany. One key lesson of the GIZ project in the engineering sector was, for instance, that a detailed review with potential employers regarding the desired qualifications of candidates, as well as an active involvement of companies in the selection of recruits, is crucial to ensuring that candidates who are selected for the program are placed appropriately. Another experience from the GIZ project was that many such programs must be tailored more to the purpose of small and medium enterprises (SMEs). It is already apparent that often SMEs may have a substantial demand of foreign labor, but just such employers may not have the means to organize recruitment on their own. The needs of these smaller enterprises, in turn, may be more difficult to cater to than to large companies. Herein seems to lay an untapped potential for such programs.

33 Melissa Siegel and Vivianne van der Vorst, "Evaluation of the 'Blue Birds' Circular Migration Pilot in The Netherlands," (Maastricht: Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, 2012).

III. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Conducting international pilot projects can be very cost intensive and usually involves public contributions by federal or state agencies, contributions by the employers, sometimes significant investments by the migrants themselves, or some combination of the above. The pilot projects reviewed revealed the great complexity concerning the financing structure: for example, currently in Germany there are no loans available for migrants during their training period, which in the TAPiG case made it necessary to add an additional component of risk insurance to the loan financing mechanism. Further, while federal funds may be able to finance certain components of the original pilot project, such as the Federal Foreign Office did in the above outlined examples, the long term viability of labor migration schemes must involve a mid- to long-term financing model that is sustainable and acceptable to all parties involved.

IV. Qualification of Candidates

Any new labor migration program should include clearly defined skill requirements and be very specific regarding the qualification and education level of candidates. Employers must be clear what type of qualification level they want and need. During the recruitment and selection process, these requirements must be communicated and agreed upon with the counterparts in sending countries. In the GIZ project, it became very clear during the process that each employer had very specific needs regarding what type of qualifications the internship candidates should possess. In the TAPiG program, most candidates had qualifications and work experience higher than originally envisioned: while TAPiG aimed for recent school graduates with no further education, the Tunisian Health Ministry raised the qualification bar for candidates higher than planned (also to ensure that those who came back to Tunisia would have a qualification to fall back on). Disagreement or lack of clarity regarding qualifications can lead to risks related to expectation management described above, or contribute to poor matching and placement practices. Similarly, the evaluation of the Blue Birds pilot suggested that the project would have benefitted from a stricter focus on a particular sector and skillset³⁴.

V. Contingency Plans

Particularly for pilot projects, it is important to build in contingency plans in the initial design of the project in case of unexpected challenges. These contingency plans can pertain to exit strategies for migrants and employers in case the project is ended prematurely or individuals cannot complete the program as planned. As some new projects involve significant financial investments made by participating parties, a detailed risk assessment and explicit provisions for alternative scenarios should be made.

6. THINKING AHEAD: TRAINING PARTNERSHIPS AS A NEW MODEL?

The general appreciation of the benefits migration may have for the development of sending countries has undoubtedly grown. However, assumptions regarding these benefits often center around the role of remittances and that migrants will return home — be it temporarily or permanently — and thus transfer skills and ideas. However, neither of these two development factors can be mandated, and, in the end, rest on the individual actions of migrants as well as on the decisions their families take at home on how to spend the remitted money.

The question therefore remains whether there may be another way to explicitly factor in a development component in the initial design of new migration programs. Both the multilateral framework of the EU Mobility Partnerships and bilateral pilot projects are policy tools that have the potential to incorporate the main ethical and practical considera-

³⁴ Melissa Siegel and Vivianne van der Vorst

tions embodied in the triple-win concept. While they already provide valuable lessons, it is also clear that there is no golden standard for what makes for a perfect labor mobility model. This is a clear opportunity for innovation in terms of managing the global mobility and supply of skilled labor and ensuring a clearly defined win for the sending country.

The MSG discussed in depth one such innovative model, that of the Global Skill Partnership developed by economist Michael Clemens (Center for Global Development) and The World Bank. The premise of this Skill Partnership is to find a model to address global skills shortages through skilled labor migration while maximizing the benefits to the countries of origin, and actively incorporating developmental aims in the initial design of pilot projects. The below briefly summarizes the premises of the model as well as some key considerations the MSG deemed important when translating the model to the implementation side.

GLOBAL SKILL PARTNERSHIP

The basic structure of the global skill partnerships is a bilateral governmental agreement with a two-track training school in the sending country: one international track, where students are trained for work abroad, and a domestic track, where students are trained for employment in the domestic market. The financing mechanism of the model is based on the premise of an international arbitrage opportunity in the cost of training, which can be significantly less expensive in low-income countries of origin. The cost saved could help subsidize the training of students in the domestic track if companies are required to pay for one-and-a-half students. Employers in the receiving countries would coordinate on the exact training curriculum in order to guarantee an easy skills recognition process and a training standard equivalent to the training at home. As additional components, parts of studies such as language training could be financed by countries of destination. Regular internships in the receiving country could ensure compatibility and familiarity with the domestic procedures and needs.

In terms of concrete benefits addressed in the model design, **receiving countries** would gain skilled workers, affordable training, and easy recruitment directly at the training institutions; **sending countries** would gain a greater pool of skilled workers, paid-for training, and improved training or education institutions; and **migrants** would benefit from free or subsidized training, assistance in greater mobility, appropriate skillset, and a significant gain in earnings.

Training Partnerships for Germany?

Under the auspices of the MSG, practitioners examined the propositions of the model in greater details, in particular whether and how it could be translated to the German context. The key challenges identified focused mainly on financing and the standards of training as well as on the necessity of having on-site training with companies that may be potential future employers³⁵.

Regarding the **financing mechanism of the model**, the question remains of what the main incentives for employers would be to pay for a training program that subsidizes training for the domestic market in the country of origin and whether or not public finances would be necessary to boost attractiveness for employers to participate. Further, **domestic and sector specific considerations** must be taken into account: training in the German health care sector, for instance, is in part financed by social security revenue, but only when conducted in Germany itself. Another key issue was how to ensure that the **standards in training** within the country of origin will in fact meet those of the destination country. For example, the lauded benefits of the German dual vocational system, such as on-site training and direct contact with companies, may prove hard to reproduce abroad and may require that part of the training is completed in the destination country. In addition, there would be a need to reconcile training requirements in both participating countries in order to ensure that local system requirements and structures are accommodated.

While the group critically assessed the model of the Global Skills Partnership and there might be more questions than answers at the moment, the model undoubtedly possesses potential for new thinking for labor migration partnerships and is definitely worth pursuing further.

³⁵ Michael A. Clemens

CONCLUSION

The Migration Strategy Group on Global Competitiveness set out to explore the possibility and feasibility of triple-win thinking in labor migration programs. Using Germany as a case study, it explored how and under what conditions the receiving country, the migrant, and the sending country could all benefit from migration. On that intellectual journey, the MSG also discussed and evaluated current procedures and actual implementation challenges of labor migration to Germany to enhance Germany's competitiveness in the future vis-à-vis other labor recruiting countries. The MSG took current and past pilot projects into consideration, debated and exchanged experiences across different sectors nationally and internationally, and explored a sending country's perspective first hand on a study tour to Morocco. As one participant put it, "This group really is like its own interdisciplinary think tank."

Over the course of a year, the exchanges highlighted the challenges but also promises of triple-win thinking in combining development and labor migration policy. One conclusion that emerged was that Germany is in fact at the forefront of this thinking in comparison to other countries, owing to the window of opportunity presented by the need to think about new labor migration programs due to demographic needs, shortages in specific professions, and a stable economy. Whether triple-win migration programs can, however, really present a competitive advantage, making it more attractive for sending countries to engage and enter into labor agreements with Germany and German employers, cannot be answered conclusively for now. However, all pilot projects assessed highlighted that it is crucial to include the employers and their needs right from the beginning — something that may seem very obvious but was not necessarily done in the initial design of some pilot projects. Assessing pilot projects turned out to provide the most effective learning tool as it is here that challenges in implementing all three phases of labor migration — recruitment, matching, integration — become most obvious. Thus, the MSG concluded that pilot projects, even those that failed, are important tools to refine and improve Germany's labor migration processes for all actors involved.

With regard to the actual development impact of triple-win pilot projects on sending countries, pilot projects so far strive to mainly achieve a triple win through remittances or return migration. While the positive influence of both aspects on development is undoubtedly true, the MSG went one step further to see if there could be an institutionalized triple-win model that could contribute to development beyond private remittances and the individual decision to return by the migrant. The Global Skill Partnership served as a good starting point for such thinking, and The World Bank and the Center for Global Development will continue to strengthen the model, including the private sector's ideas and suggestions to make such models economically viable — hopefully by putting it to a test with its own pilot project.

Finally, the exchange with all actors and institutions was open and characterized by a trustful atmosphere. The feedback of participants that engaged along the journey showed that such stakeholder processes and neutral platforms for exchange serve an important purpose in policy development and allow for a frank exchange that goes beyond simply representing long held institutional positions. While some stakeholders initially were skeptical and thought that the MSG might duplicate initiatives already in place (within and across ministries or between other political stakeholders), the MSG process that rested on learning from actual models current policy developments and on a continuous exchange among a smaller group proved to be very valuable. We wish to thank everyone involved for their contributions and time.

The Robert Bosch Stiftung

Established in 1964, the Robert Bosch Stiftung GmbH is one of the major German foundations associated with a private company. It represents the philanthropic and social endeavors of Robert Bosch (1861-1942) and fulfills his legacy in a contemporary manner. The Robert Bosch Stiftung works predominantly in the areas of international relations, science, health, education, society and culture. Under "Migration and Integration" the Robert Bosch Stiftung seeks to emphasize the cultural and religious plurality of society, as well as migration for humanitarian reasons and immigration of skilled workers. Along these lines, the strategic goals of the foundation in the area of Migration and Integration rest on three pillars: Securing skilled workers and making labour immigration easier, recognizing the potential of refugees, shaping Germany's plurality and giving Muslims a home. Since 2005, more than €20 million have been spent to achieve this aim.

The German Marshall Fund of the United States

The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) strengthens transatlantic cooperation on regional, national, and global challenges and opportunities in the spirit of the Marshall Plan. GMF does this by supporting individuals and institutions working in the transatlantic sphere, by convening leaders and members of the policy and business communities, by contributing research and analysis on transatlantic topics, and by providing exchange opportunities to foster renewed commitment to the transatlantic relationship. In addition, GMF supports a number of initiatives to strengthen democracies. Founded in 1972 as a non-partisan, non-profit organization through a gift from Germany as a permanent memorial to Marshall Plan assistance, GMF maintains a strong presence on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to its headquarters in Washington, DC, GMF has offices in Berlin, Paris, Brussels, Belgrade, Ankara, Bucharest, and Warsaw. GMF also has smaller representations in Bratislava, Turin, and Stockholm.

