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FINAL REPORT
I. Introduction

In 2015, migration was, for the first time, officially included in the global development framework by the international development community. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which sets the development priorities to be achieved by 2030 contains a target specifically dedicated to migration under Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 10 on reducing inequalities: Target 10.7 calls for all countries to implement policies that “facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies”. Yet, no definition of “safe migration” has been commonly agreed upon, nor is it clear which indicators are required to measure it. In spite of the importance of reliable and timely migration data for effective policymaking, there are many gaps in the coverage of migration statistics and particularly in relation to irregular migration, as well as problems with quality, timeliness, and disaggregation. This impedes the analysis of migration trends as well as the possibility of monitoring the impact of policies.

On June 21-22, the International Organization for Migration’s Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) held the workshop “Understanding and Measuring ‘Safe’ Migration” in Nuremberg, Germany. This GMDAC workshop aimed to:

• Discuss what is meant by “safe” migration within the context of increasing, and increasingly dangerous, irregular migration to Europe;

• Bring together key migration data providers and users, as well as migration experts from government agencies, international organizations, research institutes and the civil society (see Annex II for list of participants), to assess the availability and quality of irregular migration statistics, and identify knowledge gaps, as well as understand how such statistics can be used and enhanced to better understand and measure safe migration;

• Assess which data exist on human trafficking in countries of origin, transit and arrival, which are the challenges related to data collection in this context and discuss how information on human trafficking could help defining and measuring “safe” and unsafe migration.

• Analyse the migration of children to Europe, as a group that is particularly vulnerable to the risks of unsafe migration, with emphasis on the data and indicators that focus on the vulnerabilities and risks migrant children face before, during and after their journeys to Europe.

This report briefly summarises the four sessions of the workshop, the respective discussions and the conclusions and recommendations identified by the participants during two days of constructive dialogue and exchange of information. The complexity surrounding the concept of “safe” migration and the challenges that authorities, agencies and organisations face in assessing how to measure it are highlighted; potential avenues to address these issues and contribute to the understanding and to the measurement of target 10.7 of the SDGs will be recommended.

Welcoming remarks were delivered by: Matthias Neske (Head of Migration and Integration Research division, Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Federal Ministry of the Interior in Germany) and Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM)

II. Setting the scene: Safe migration and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Chairperson: Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM) – Setting the Scene: Why Focus on “Safe Migration”? 

1 For more general information on the workshop, see the workshop agenda (Annex I).
The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was adopted in September 2015 at the UN Summit for Sustainable Development, as a new global development framework for the years 2015-2030. Poverty eradication was highlighted as the overarching goal of the agenda; 17 goals and 169 targets replaced the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and apply equally to the global North and to the global South, integrating and balancing economic, social and environmental dimensions. Migration is for the first time included in this framework at least in four ways: 1) the guiding principle of the agenda “leave no one behind” urges governments to address the critical situations and living conditions of special population groups, such as migrants; 2) migration is recognized as a positive phenomenon triggering inclusive and sustainable development; 3) migration is included in several goals and targets and in particular SDG 10.7 requires governments to facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies; 4) in the agenda, disaggregation of relevant variables by migratory status are highly encouraged.

The SDG goals and targets will be monitored and reviewed through a global indicator framework consisting in 230 indicators produced by the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and approved at the 47th Session of the Statistical Commission in March 2016. According to this framework, SDG 10.7 and thus also the concept safe migration will be followed up by two indicators:

- Indicator 10.7.1: Recruitment cost borne by employee as a proportion of yearly income earned in country of destination.
- Indicator 10.7.2: Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies.

Target 16.2, “end abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children”, and target 8.8, “protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious employment” also concerns safe migration. In this respect, the former will be monitored by indicator 16.2.2, which refers to the number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation, while the latter will be monitored by indicator 8.8.1, which concerns the frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries, by sex and migrant status.

The IAEG-SDGs is reviewing SDG indicators in relation to methodological development and data availability, classifying them into three tiers accordingly. Within this schema Tier I indicators have the most developed methodology and data, which are already available; Tier II indicators have an internationally agreed upon methodology but data cannot easily be gathered and Tier III indicators have not developed an internationally agreed upon methodology.

Indicator 16.2.2 (number of victims of human trafficking) falls into Tier II, as a methodology exists to support this indicator but data are not easily available; indicator 10.7.1 and 10.7.2 (recruitment cost borne by employer and well-managed migration policies) fall under Tier III, as an internationally agreed methodology to produce data for these indicators has not yet been developed. The IAEG-SDGs has decided to consult with relevant agencies about the methodological development of all indicators that fall under Tier III. In this sense, the workshop, by focusing on understanding and measuring “safe migration”, could be seen as a contribution to the development and the definition of the indicators related to target 10.7 and, more generally, to all targets that relate to migration (hence, also Target 8.8 and Target 16.2 and corresponding indicators).
III. Defining safe migration

Chairperson: Ann Singleton (University of Bristol, GMDAC/IOM)

Speakers:

- Asmita Naik (Independent Consultant) – Concept of safe migration
- Bram Frouws (Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat) – Understanding irregular and unsafe migration from the Horn of Africa to Europe
- Michele LeVoy (Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants – PICUM) – Irregular migration – what would make it safe within an unsafe context?
- Sandra Dowling (University of Bristol) – Conceptualising safe migrations through the prism of disability

Although SDG target 10.7 urges countries to implement policies that “facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration”, there is no internationally agreed upon definition of safe migration. Participants of the workshop tackled this complex issue, contributing diverse experiences and expertise to the ongoing discussion.

An important point that emerged concerns the terminology used when talking about migrants and migration, and thus also about safe migration. A first concern was highlighted in relation to the terms “migration” and “mobility” which are sometimes used interchangeably and other times designate different forms and dynamics of movement. Furthermore, the term “mobility” can mean different things, depending on the context and region within which it is employed. In the European Union, mobility most often refers to the free movement of labour among EU MSs, and is an encouraged form of regular and safe migration; in the context of African migration towards Europe, mobility can imply secondary or tertiary movements by a migrant—that is, additional ‘legs’ of a journey—which are often irregular and may constitute “unsafe” migration. Another point was raised in relation to the terms “regular”, “undocumented”, and “illegal”, when used to refer to migrants and migration. As words play a clear role in shaping perceptions, opinions and discourses, it was thought by participants that the term “regular migration” should be used instead of “legal migration”. Similarly, the term “illegal” should not be used to indicate the “irregular” or “undocumented” status of migrants. Entering the more specific discussion on the meaning of safe migration, another consideration concerns the term “safe” itself, which might refer to both 1. The outcomes of migration and migration policies and 2. The intentions of migration policies. In the first instance, it was emphasized that the experiences of migrants should be closely examined, in addition to measuring the impact of migration policies and development programmes. In the second instance, the type of policies, procedures and infrastructures related to migration should be addressed, a methodological approach embraced by the IOM-commissioned report, “Measuring well-governed migration: The 2016 Migration Governance Index”, prepared by the Economist Intelligence Unit.

After raising these concerns, which were mainly of a terminological nature, the discussion narrowed to three main questions: Who among migrants is at risk of being or is unsafe and in which ways? When might migrants be safe/unsafe? Where are or might migrants be unsafe?

It was agreed that an exhaustive definition of safe migration should balance the needs of different categories of migrants—children, unaccompanied minors and women, as well as considering disability across all groups and categories—with due consideration for all types of factors that might contribute to an increase in the vulnerability of all migrants (e.g. limited access to services, health issues, traumatisation and various dimensions of social exclusion), regardless of group or affiliation. Forced migration was recognized as often challenging the well-being and compounding and multiplying the issues that vulnerable groups typically face. Migrants with disabilities and vulnerable migrants in
general require customized support and services in order to be safe during all stages of the migration process.

In fact, it was noted that it is important to take into account that migrants might find themselves in an unsafe situation at any point along their journey: before, during and after their arrival in their final destination. Safe migration must be considered both for internal migration (e.g. internally displaced persons and in instances of pre-departure) and international migration. Furthermore, people and communities left behind, hence those individuals who do not migrate, might experience higher levels of “danger” than those people who could (and decide to) leave. In this sense, when defining safe migration, it is important to take into consideration the entire migration “cycle” (from departure to the potential return) as well as all actors involved in it directly and indirectly (migrants themselves but also their families and communities left behind) and all the spaces through which migration happens (countries of origin, transit and destination).

The relationship between “regular” and “safe” migration, and between “irregular” and “unsafe” migration, needs to be considered when defining safe migration. “Regular” migration does not necessarily ensure “safe” migration; neither does “irregular” migration necessarily lead to “unsafe” migration. Migrants with irregular statuses may be at more risk than those migrating through regular channels. However it should be acknowledged that people migrating through regular channels can also be at risk of being trafficked or face risks of exploitation and abuse, at times only once they have reached their destination. Meanwhile, irregular migrants with irregular status might have travelled safely to their destination, avoiding exposure to major risks, even after arrival.

The fluidity of the migration statuses “regular” and “irregular”, and the fact that they refer not to the risks incurred but to normative concepts and the perceived legal standing of migrants, further complicates the picture: a migrant may be considered “regular” on one leg of the journey and be exposed to great risks, while on a safer leg of this same trip the migrant may be considered “irregular”. The intentions of policies and procedures in relation to safe migration, and migrant “statuses”, might not correspond to the actual outcomes for migrants on the ground.

Nonetheless, what seems to be clear is that in the absence of legal/regular avenues to migrate, people will keep undertaking dangerous journeys and exposing themselves to a multitude of risks, especially if the only alternative to migrating means having to face even greater dangers and risks in their region or country of origin. For this reason, it was thought important to inform potential migrants and organizations about all regular channels through which migrants are, or might be allowed to, move more safely: e.g. humanitarian visas, students visas, family reunification programmes, seasonal work programmes, etc.

Presentations delivered by the Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (RMMS) on their 4Mi data collection system and by IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) demonstrated how conceptions of safe migration also need to account for the perspectives of migrants. As both presentations outlined, in general, migrants are usually aware of most of the risks they will encounter along their migration routes and should be seen as informed decision makers, rather than unaware victims. Data seem to suggest, however, that although migrants are usually well-informed about the risks they may face during their journey, they are significantly less aware of the potential risks present at their destination.

These considerations raise the question of who should be entitled to define safe migration and according to which parameters. Shall the definition be based on migrants’ subjective perception of safety and risk, on “objective” indicators and measurements proposed by external actors or on a balance of the two? In any case, which data and indicators should be considered? Direct indicators (such as figures on fatalities, severe injury/harm, human rights violations at different stages of the
journey, etc.) or proxy indicators (such as figures on missing persons, unaccompanied minors, irregular migrants, stranded migrants, etc.)?

In order to try to answer these questions and develop an operational definition of safe migration, it is necessary to look at which data are available and which data should be produced in relation to the concept of safe migration. The next session of the workshop addressed these points.

IV. Measuring safe migration: making the most of the data

Chairperson: Kristof Tamas (Director and Head of Secretariat of Delmi, the Migration Studies Delegation, Sweden)

Speakers:

- Piotr Juchno (EUROSTAT) - Measuring 'safe' migration - can Eurostat contribute with official statistics?
- Benedetta Cordaro (IOM/DTM Iraq) – Migration flows from Iraq to Europe
- Debora Tejero Gonzalez (IOM/DTM) – IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in the context of Migration Flows to Europe

Discussant: Steve Thorpe (Independent consultant)

Besides the UN monitoring activities of the UN legal instruments on international migration to ensure the safety and the protection of the rights of migrants and UNODC’s regular data collection activities on crime and criminal justice including the number of victims of trafficking in persons, a few other actors in recent years have collected data and developed indicators to monitor safe migration in the context of the SDGs. For instance, the International Labour Organization (ILO) recently launched a research programme to take stock of initiatives to measure forced labour, human trafficking and slavery. Another example is the development of the aforementioned 2016 Migration Governance Index, commissioned by IOM and designed by The Economist Intelligence Unit, which piloted in 15 countries a methodology to measure well-managed migration based on 5 policy areas.

Of course, thousands of other data collection activities implemented around the world could contribute to the measurement of safe migration in the context of the SDGs, but which ones and in which ways? The examples of data collection activities presented during the workshop shed light on some existing exercises that might contribute to this goal:

- The Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (RMMS)’s 4Mi project focuses on the Horn of Africa and investigates migrants’ profiles, migration drivers and experiences, including protection concerns, smugglers’ operations and migrants’ experience through the lens of observers who frequently interact with them.
- Eurostat gathers, compares and publishes data provided by the official statistical information offices of the European Union member states on 1) demography, migration and projections and 2) population census, migrant integration, asylum and managed migration (AMM).
- IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) focuses on monitoring population movement and displacement across and within 40 countries, including countries on the Western Balkan Route, Libya and Iraq: data regards migrants’ profiles, reasons for moving, area of origin, transit points, time of displacement, intentions and expectations, cost of journey, dangers along route, trafficking, vulnerabilities, education, priority needs.
- The Human Trafficking and Other Exploitative Practices Prevalence Indication Survey was introduced by IOM’s DTM in 2015 as a tool to quantify people’s experiences in relation to
human trafficking and identify the main trends and dynamics of trafficking in certain regions and in particular in Hungary, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Slovenia and Greece.

- The Gallup World Poll collects data worldwide through surveys, covering 98 per cent of the world adult population; in relation to migration the Gallup poll gathers a wide range of data on migration planning, migration desire, remittances, human trafficking.

These examples reaffirmed the challenges and gaps that exist in relation to measuring safe migration. It is clear that data exist on only certain migration dynamics, often covering discrete locations, even within the same region; these initiatives are often narrow in focus and scope and, with the exception of Gallup, collect the bulk of their data in regions where few official statistics are otherwise available, making it difficult to gauge how representative they are.

By sticking to the considerations proposed in Session 1 “Defining safe migration”, it is clear that the indicators chosen to measure safe migration should ideally monitor the safety of migrants throughout all stages of the migration process. This would include the situation of people in countries of origin. While a great amount of research and data collection projects monitor the situation of migrants in Europe and in general in the Western world, much less data is available on the situation of migrants (both living and in transit) in the global South, despite the examples listed above. For instance, regarding data available on migrants’ fatalities, it is clear that the currently available data collected are on migrants’ deaths during their journey (for example by IOM’s Missing Migrant Project), while much less information is available on migrants’ fatalities during detention, or upon return, or in relation to labour conditions. Moreover, in Europe, data are available mainly for what concerns the journey to Europe across the Mediterranean Sea; much less data are available on migrants’ deaths on other migration routes towards Europe (data availability at a global level is discussed in the IOM GMDAC Report Fatal Journeys 2).

Even where data exist, caution should be used in statistical representation and generalization of findings. For example, in the context of the DTM work in Iraq, the respondents are selected through a snowball technique, hence the findings cannot be generalized to the entire population. In other cases, especially in relation to human trafficking, identifying victims, or finding those willing to share their experiences, is extremely problematic. It was noted that subjects seem to be more willing to share the stories of others (of friends and family members) than their own; asking general, instead of very personal, questions about sensitive topics might encourage respondents to share information more freely. Conducting research among returnees (as has been carried out within some DTM activities, as well as by various research projects) might also be a strategy to contribute to the collection of data on all stages of the migration process. In general, qualitative studies conducted on a non-representative sample can still provide a lot of data to inform decisions about the choice of indicators to be further developed. Complementing data and figures with qualitative, in-depth contextual information enables policymakers to understand and interpret statistics more accurately.

Other important considerations raised during the workshop concerned data collection activities on the most vulnerable migrants, and in particular on victims of human trafficking, children and migrants with disabilities. Detailed data on vulnerable migrants are often unavailable, unclear or dispersed, even though they are considered essential to providing proper services to migrants, to informing policymakers and to monitoring safe migration within the SDG framework.

---

Protection and data collection issues concerning migrants with disabilities address especially vulnerable groups. According to the UN Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2008), people with disabilities are “those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others”. If migrants with disabilities need to be counted, data need to be collected at all stages of the migration process. However, as people move very fast and often do not want to be identified, it is extremely challenging to collect detailed and reliable data. In fact, those few data collected on disabilities among migrants are based primarily on visual, hurried and therefore inadequate determination processes. These assessments may fail to account for the need for specialized training, allocated resources and that disability also refers to traumatisation and mental, intellectual or sensory impairments. Follow-up and appropriate support services may also be underserviced.

Privacy protection concerns were also mentioned as being very important during the workshop, especially in relation to the most vulnerable groups. Although collecting detailed information is necessary to monitor, provide services and inform policies, it is important to reflect on when and in which ways data disaggregation might violate people’s privacy and on how and by whom data should be used. Data might indeed be interpreted in the “wrong way”, be used to spread false information, and even create further risks or unsafe situations for migrants.

Another important point to consider when measuring safe migration concerns the aforementioned gap between the intentions of policies and practices and the actual outcomes for migrants. The indicators and the data chosen to measure safe migration should bridge and monitor this gap.

V. Human trafficking and “unsafe migration”

Chairperson: Ann Singleton (University of Bristol, GMDAC/IOM)

Speakers:

- Harry Cook (Data Management & Research Specialist, Migrant Assistance Division, IOM) – IOM’s Human Trafficking and other Exploitative Practices Prevalence Indication Survey in Greece, Hungary and the Western Balkans
- Augustine Mopah Akanya (National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons, Nigeria) – Human Trafficking and “Unsafe Migration” the Nigerian Experience, NAPTIP Perspective
- Pablo Diego-Rossel (Gallup) – Measuring Migration and Human Trafficking through the Gallup World Poll

Human trafficking is one of the most evident forms of “unsafe migration”. It involves threat, the use of force, violence and exploitation, and makes its victims particularly vulnerable. Human trafficking involves health risks, sickness and diseases, injuries, psychological and mental trauma and often is associated with or is thought to promote other types of criminality such as money laundering, drug trafficking and arms smuggling. Collecting data on trafficking is central to providing proper support to victims and facilitating safe migration. Although human trafficking happens in almost all countries of the world, information is scarce and dispersed. Among the existing sources, UNODC’s Human Trafficking Knowledge Platform is perhaps the most comprehensive. Other important sources of human trafficking data are collected, among others, by the Gallup World Poll and by IOM’s Human Trafficking and Other Exploitative Practices Prevalence Indication Survey, as part of the DTM’s Monitoring Surveys along the Western Balkan Route. Research and data collection projects on human
trafficking are increasing and providing increasingly rich sources of information. However these activities remain problematic for several reasons:

- Information on this topic is anecdotal as it refers to experiences and interpersonal relations; people involved in trafficking often do not have a proper or full understanding of what trafficking is. It is thus extremely difficult to quantify the problem;
- It is not easy to have access to the affected population as human trafficking activities are difficult to track and victims tend to avoid talking about their experiences because of the fear of being stigmatized, among other reasons;
- It is difficult to get a representative sample and thus generalize results;
- Privacy concerns are particularly problematic in the case of human trafficking, especially in relation to minors.

These challenges are evident in the context of the Nigeria’s National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP), which is responsible for coordinating law enforcement, protection and preventive initiatives in relation to human trafficking in the country. It was reported that data on human trafficking in Nigeria are currently scarce and unreliable. Statistics are reported on ad-hoc basis by stakeholders while some state and non-state actors are unwilling to share information. For these reasons, NAPTIP’s efforts to monitor the phenomenon, provide support and implement policies are unnecessarily hampered.

During the workshop, the following points were raised in relation to improving the collection of human trafficking data:

- It is essential to create and maintain national databases to manage data, which are currently scattered across different organizations and agencies, in order to foster national and transnational cooperation in information exchange;
- Capacity building workshops on the identification of trafficked victims should be organized in “hot-spot” locations, by and for those actors who might help to identify and monitor the phenomenon. In his context especially, the distinction between trafficking and smuggling activities should be made clear;
- Target 16.2 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development specifically calls upon countries to end “abuse, exploitation and all forms of violence against and torture of children”; Indicator 16.2.2, “Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation”, was proposed to monitor the implementation of Target 16.2. Human trafficking could also be considered, monitored and addressed under Target 10.7 as it fundamentally relates to the topic of safe migration.

VI. Case study: safe migration of children

Chairperson: Kristen Elsby (UNICEF)

Speakers:

- Ulrike Schwarz (Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees, B-umF) – Which factors could contribute to the vulnerability of children before and during the journey as well as after their arrival?
- Kristof Tamas (Director and Head of Secretariat of Delmi, the Migration Studies Delegation, Sweden) –Safer routes for Unaccompanied Minors in Europe

Discussant: Arezo Malakooti (GMDAC/IOM)
Children represent 40 per cent of the population that arrived to Europe during 2015. According to UNICEF, one in four of refugees and migrants who have arrived in Europe by sea in 2015 is a child; Germany, Hungary and Sweden were the European countries with the highest number of children asylum applicants during that same year. Children are among the most vulnerable migrants, especially because in many cases they arrive unaccompanied. Despite several international agreements and conventions establishing specific regulations in relation to the rights of the child, migrant children are extremely susceptible to abuse and exploitation in all countries of the world. However, specific data on the situation of migrant children are scarce, dispersed and often unreliable.

According to data collected by the German Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees (B-umF), many of the children who have recently arrived in Germany, and are now seeking protection, are unaccompanied. This can mean three things: they fled alone, they were separated from their parents/guardians during the flight or they arrived accompanied by someone who was not a direct member of their family or legal (documented) guardian. Each unaccompanied minor is entitled to have proper legal representation in Germany and to be assigned to a youth centre. However, as there is not a scientific, reliable system to assess the age of the migrants arriving, some children who look older than eighteen may not be granted access to these services. Moreover, even if they are assessed as children and obtain access to the youth welfare system’s services, obtaining legal support and a place in an official youth centre can take several months, if not years; meanwhile, family reunification programmes are equally slow-moving. In addition, there are children who simply are not counted upon arrival or during transit, or are counted at one border but not at another. In these situations and for these reasons many children end up being exploited or trafficked – again, data here are weak.

In the European context, data availability on child migrants (accompanied and unaccompanied) is patchy, making it difficult to monitor the number of child migrants in the EU, and thus whether they are receiving the appropriate protection services or if they are in dangerous situations. These limitations can open the data up to misinterpretation. The best example of this occurred in January 2016, when data released by Europol was used by journalists to show that there were 10,000 refugee children who had entered Europe, were entered into care by authorities, and subsequently gone missing; the media’s conclusion was that they had all fallen victim to organised trafficking syndicates. Experts present at the workshop put this into context: the vast majority of these 10,000 missing children most likely continued their journey and/or absconded from government care to be with relatives or friends of family. Still, it was pointed out that an unknown proportion of these “missing” children probably did find themselves in dangerous situations; however small the figure, and the fact that the exact figure remains unknown, does constitute a failing.

Drawing on the above, and from the fact that children, according to the Convention of the Rights of the Child, should be granted protection independently from their irregular/regular status, participants to the workshop stressed that it is particularly important to:

- Conduct more research to understand the scope of migrant children’s travel, intentions, expectations, and strategies of resilience;
- Strengthen data collection systems on children and develop regional frameworks to monitor children rights. The main organizations implementing data collection activities on migrant children should cooperate to this end most importantly with the aim of registering the arrival of migrant children in reception centres throughout Europe and to monitor their movements;

---

• Broaden the focus to include countries outside of Europe; hence, to monitor the situation of migrant children in countries of origin and transit, particularly in relation to detention and child labour exploitation.

• Monitor the situation of children at all stages of the migration process, taking into consideration all aspects of their health, their ability to access health services (including psychological care) and education, etc.

VII. Concluding roundtable discussion: conclusions and recommendations

Chairperson: Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM)

Speakers:

• Anne Nielsen (DG Research) – Migration Research in the EU Framework Programme
• Stephane Savarimuthu (UNHCR) - Challenges, possibilities and needs for improving existing policy: Defining and Measuring safe migration and mobility

Discussant: Thomas Barbas (DG Joint Research Centre, European Commission) – The European Commission’s science and knowledge service

The workshop “Understanding and Measuring ‘safe’ migration” aimed to discuss 1) what “safe” migration might mean in a context of increasing and increasingly dangerous irregular migration to Europe and 2) to assess the availability and quality of irregular migration statistics that could be used and enhanced to better understand, measure and monitor safe migration.

The discussion highlighted several resource challenges and limitations in relation to these two points. The tension between outlining an operational definition of safe migration and accounting for the complexity of such concept was clear throughout the workshop. On the one hand, participants recognized the need for agreement on definitions and on specific indicators to monitor the level of safety and unsafety faced by migrants during the migration process. On the other hand, they stressed how the many facets, risks and variables involved in the migration process make it difficult to identify a limited number of exhaustive measures and indicators to monitor safe migration. Presentations iterated that existing research and data collection projects provide extensive information, which does (and should) contribute to the understanding and measurement of safe migration. What is lacking however is the organization, categorization and analysis of these data, which would make them more accessible to governments and other stakeholders. Areas where data are especially lacking were identified as regions outside European countries (countries of origin and transit) and on the most vulnerable groups. In relation to these general considerations, the participants agreed on the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. The indicators chosen to measure safe migration should account both for the outcomes for migrants as well as for the intentions of policies and procedures to implement safe migration;

2. The definition and the measurement of safe migration should encompass all stages of the migration process: country of origin, transit countries, country of first asylum, and country of destination and include also the people “left behind”, and thus those who do not finish their journey or could not migrate in the first place;

3. Monitoring the intentions of policies and procedures should concern countries’ actual implementation of safe avenues for migration and mobility: labour migration schemes, study visas, family reunification, humanitarian visas, etc.;
4. The use of standardized registration data systems in different countries could improve the quality of the data collected and thus enable better comparison activities (see UNHCR’s ProGres system, which is a global standardized registration, case and beneficiary management database and IOM’s DTM);

5. Governments, agencies and organizations collecting data related to safe migration should collaborate more: data should be easily accessible and ready to share;

6. It is necessary to collect more and better data, particularly on the most vulnerable groups of migrants (and especially on children, victims of human trafficking and migrants with disabilities) while making sure migrants’ privacy is well protected (e.g. through anonymized sample based surveys). Hence, data need also to be “safe, regular and responsible”;

7. Eventually a “migrant” category should be included within the Humanitarian Profile framework in order to better monitor and support migrants during and after their journey;

8. Each country/region should develop their own indicators to monitor safe migration according to local/regional context, risks, migration dynamics, and available data, in addition to the internationally agreed indicators;

9. Governments, organizations and agencies collecting quantitative and qualitative data on migration and particularly on safe migration should consider ways to provide information to migrants about networks of support, facilities and safe migration practices to protect human rights while collecting data.

10. These findings and perspectives should be shared more broadly; to this end, it is aimed that a special edition of Migration Policy Practice, dealing with the theme of “safe migration”, will be published ahead of the United Nations General Assembly’s Summit on Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants in New York on 19 September.

---

4 The humanitarian profile is an attempt endorsed by The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) to account for, on an ongoing basis, the number of people having humanitarian needs arising from a given emergency. For more information about the Humanitarian Profile see https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/applications/tools/category/humanitarian-profile.
ANNEX I

Understanding and Measuring “Safe” Migration
Workshop, 21-22 June 2016
Venue: Le Méridien Grand Hotel, Nuremberg – Germany

Provisional Agenda

In 2015 migration was, for the first time, officially included in the global development framework by the international development community. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which sets the development priorities to be achieved by 2030 contains a target specifically dedicated to migration under Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 10 on reducing inequalities: Target 10.7 calls for all countries to implement policies that “facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies”. Yet, no definition of ‘safe migration’ has been commonly agreed upon, nor is it clear which indicators are required to measure it. In spite of the importance of reliable and timely migration data for effective policymaking, there are many gaps in the coverage of migration statistics and particularly in relation to irregular migration, as well as problems with quality, timeliness, and disaggregation. This impedes the analysis of migration trends as well as the possibility of monitoring the impact of policies.

In response, the IOM workshop, ‘Understanding and Measuring “Safe” Migration’, aims to:

- Discuss what is meant by “safe” migration within the context of increasing, and increasingly dangerous, irregular migration to Europe;

- Bring together key migration data providers and users, as well as migration experts from government agencies, international organizations, research institutes and the civil society, to assess the availability and quality of irregular migration statistics, and identify knowledge gaps, as well as understand how such statistics can be used and enhanced to better understand and measure safe migration;

- Assess which data exist on human trafficking in countries of origin, transit and arrival, which are the challenges related to data collection in this context as well as discuss how information on human trafficking could help defining and measuring “safe” and unsafe migration.

- Analyse the migration of children to Europe, as a particularly vulnerable group to the risks of unsafe migration, with emphasis on the data and indicators that focus on the vulnerabilities and the risks migrant children face during and after their journeys to Europe.

For more information on the workshop please check the GMDAC webpage http://www.gmdac.iom.int/ or contact gmdac@iom.int
### Day 1 – Tuesday 21 June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
<td>Welcoming remarks by Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM), Matthias Neske (Head of Migration and Integration Research division, Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Federal Ministry of the Interior in Germany) / Tour de Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>Introduction: Setting the scene</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe migration and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This introductory session will outline the need to define and measure safe migration in light of the SDGs and recent migration trends to Europe. Why and how has safe migration been included within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and what does this mean for policy-makers? How is the concept of safe migration linked to irregular migration to Europe? Why does an analysis of existing (and non-existing) data and indicators on current migration flows to Europe contribute to the discussion on safe migration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keiko Osaki-Tomita (UN DESA, Statistics Division) - <em>Safe migration in the context of SDGs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Peter Bonin (GIZ, Head of the Migration and Development Sector Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Defining safe migration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which factors and dynamics should be considered when conceptualizing and defining safe migration to Europe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before and during their journey to Europe, as well as after their arrival, refugees and migrants are exposed to a range of risks, which may result in, for instance, death or being trafficked or exploited. This session will focus on examining which factors, situations and dynamics should inform a working definition of safe migration by looking at ‘unsafe’ migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following questions are among those proposed to guide the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we define safe migration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the risks that migrants and refugees might face during their journey to Europe, after their arrival, and, in cases of forced or voluntary return, in their country of origin upon return?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How is unsafe migration linked to the vulnerabilities of various migrants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do migrants perceive and experience different types of risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What constitutes a ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ migration to Europe? And what does it imply in terms of migration management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Ann Singleton (University of Bristol, GMDAC/IOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asmita Naik (Independent Consultant) - <em>Concept of safe migration</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bram Frouws (Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat) - <em>Understanding irregular and unsafe migration from the Horn of Africa to Europe</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 2: Measuring safe migration: making the most of the data

**14:00 – 15:30**  
Which existing (and non-existing) data and indicators might help in measuring safe migration in the context of recent migration flows to Europe?

Bringing together leading European migration data collection agencies, this session will aim to define which of the existing data and indicators on irregular migration to Europe could be used to measure safe migration (as defined in the previous session), as well as to discuss how data gaps could be addressed.

The following questions are among those proposed to guide the discussion:

- Which indicators should frame the measurement of safe migration? Are some indicators more informative than others?
- How can migration risks be measured?
- Which data and indicators exist and which should be collected/developed?
- How can the perception of risk that migrants and refugees have be accounted for?
- What steps could be taken to produce better data on this key migration target in the SDG framework?

**Chair:** Kristof Tamas (Director and Head of Secretariat of Delmi, the Migration Studies Delegation, Sweden)

**Speakers:**
- Piotr Juchno (EUROSTAT) - *Measuring ‘safe’ migration - can Eurostat contribute with official statistics?*
- Benedetta Cordaro (IOM/DTM Iraq) - *Migration flows from Iraq to Europe*
- Debora Tejero Gonzalez (IOM/DTM) - *IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in the context of Migration Flows to Europe*

**Discussant:** Steve Thorpe (Independent consultant)

### Session 3: Human trafficking and “unsafe migration”

**16:00 – 17:30**  
Human trafficking happens in almost every country of the world and it can be seen as one of the most evident forms of “unsafe migration” as it involves threat, the use of force, violence and exploitation. This session will focus on data available on human trafficking to look at how these could be useful to define and measure ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ migration.

The following questions are among those proposed to guide the discussion:

- Which risks, vulnerabilities and forms of exploitation are involved in human trafficking? How are these identified and measured?
- Which indicators and existing data on human trafficking can be useful to measure ‘safe’ migration?
- Which are the obstacles and the limitations involved in data collection in the context of human trafficking? Do human trafficking data gaps relate to these limitations?

**Chair:** Ann Singleton (University of Bristol, GMDAC/IOM)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Harry Cook (Data Management & Research Specialist, Migrant Assistance Division, IOM) - *IOM’s Human Trafficking and other Exploitative Practices Prevalence Indication Survey in Greece, Hungary and the Western Balkans*  
| - Augustine Mopah Akanya (National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons, Nigeria) - *Human Trafficking and “Unsafe Migration” the Nigerian Experience, NAPTIP Perspective*  
| - Pablo Diego-Rossel (Gallup) - *Measuring Migration and Human Trafficking through the Gallup World Poll* |  

### Day 2 – Wednesday 22 June 2016

#### Session 4: Case study: safe migration of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>09:00 – 10:30</th>
<th>How shall the discussion on safe migration be framed in relation to particularly vulnerable groups? The case of child migration to Europe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In 2015, one in five migrants arriving to Europe via the Mediterranean Sea was a child; tragically, one in three of the recorded fatalities and disappearances in the Mediterranean in the same year were of children. According to the IOM and UNICEF data brief, “Migration of Children to Europe,” children are also among the most vulnerable to illness, injury, violence, exploitation and trafficking. This session will look at why and how safe migration in relation to children should be defined and measured. How can this be used to better inform policy and practice to help protect child migrants?

The following questions are among those proposed to guide the discussion:

- Which factors could contribute to the vulnerability of children before and during the journey as well as after their arrival?
- Which data should be particularly looked and collected when trying to address children’s safe migration?
- How do migrant children perceive risk? Which strategies of resilience do they develop during their journey?
- How should statistics be used to better inform policy and practice to help protect child migrants?
- How are data used and misused, especially in the context of the migration of children and the media?

Chair: Kristen Elsby (UNICEF)

Speakers:

- Ulrike Schwarz (Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees, B-umF) - *Which factors could contribute to the vulnerability of children before and during the journey as well as after their arrival?*
- Kristof Tamas (Director and Head of Secretariat of Delmi, the Migration Studies Delegation, Sweden) - *Safer routes for Unaccompanied Minors in Europe*

Discussant: Arezo Malakooti (GMDAC/IOM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:30 – 11:00</th>
<th>Coffee break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Concluding roundtable discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11:00 – 12:30</th>
<th>Challenges, possibilities and needs for improving policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The final session will summarize the workshop findings. It will conclude with recommendations for different actors about ways to improve the collection and the sharing of data on safe migration and their impact on policy development.
The following questions are among those proposed to guide the discussion:

- Which data and indicators should be included in an exhaustive definition of safe migration? Which groups of people should gain particular attention?
- What research needs to be done, which data need to be collected and by whom?
- How can data on safe migration become more accessible, especially for policy makers?
- What is the role of international organizations and how can they assist governments in developing safe migration policies?
- What policies and practices could better encourage safe migration?
- Which indicators could be used to inform on safe migration?
- Recommendations.

Chair: Frank Laczko (Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, IOM)
Speakers:
- Anne Nielsen (DG Research), Stephane Savarimuthu (UNHCR) - EU’s Priorities on Migration Research - Horizon 2020
- Stephane Savarimuthu (UNHCR)
Discussant: Thomas Barbas (DG Joint Research Centre, European Commission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Workshop
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