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**Opening remarks by Dr. Dino Patti Djalal:**

* Good afternoon and Happy New Year! We are getting ready for an even busier year for 2020. I would like to welcome all the Ambassadors from Latin America. It is not very often we have an event where so many Latin American ambassadors attend.
* Indeed, FPCI is really keen to promote Latin America more this year. We have a plan to organize a working briefing between the Commission One of Parliament with Latin American Ambassadors. We look forward to working with all of you on that.
* It is a great pleasure for me to welcome Professor Arturo to Jakarta as well. The people in Indonesia are very much so like the people in Ecuador, you know. We smile a lot; we like to meet international guests and so on. But he is here today to speak about an important issue today, which is the global migration issue.
* I have an interest in it because I am also a chairman for the Indonesia diaspora global. We have about 6 million passport holders abroad and many more millions of Indonesians who have become migrants in different countries as well.
* The Indonesia diaspora is an old phenomenon but newly discovered. And this is happening elsewhere. I think there is one statistic that says that there is about 250 million people around the world who are born outside of their country where they are now citizens.
* Alright so, 250 million. That is about the size of Brazil.
* But global migration now is in the spotlight.
* First, because there is a global talent pool and competition. Everybody wants to get global talent. If you have talent, countries are going to want you.
* But there is also the question of what to do with the refugees, people who are fleeing conflict areas. And somebody says we have one of the highest number of refugees since World War II or even higher than what we had during WWII; I think Arturo can check some comments on that.
* But for us, at FPCI we hired two refugees from Afghanistan, who were in Indonesia. We hired them for a few months and now they are back in the camp where they have been from. These are nice people. Very good people who want the same things as we do. They are very nice, they work hard, they might not have the skills, but they want to do better with their lives.
* For FPCI it was an eye-opener for us. There are millions of people like those refugees who came and worked for us. But the world is not necessarily a welcoming place. And many do not have a solution to handle the millions of people who have refugee status.
* Now there seems to be some backlash, back migration. Not in every country but in some countries. I was just in two or three countries in the continent of Europe, I will not say where.
* But when I was there, clearly, there was a sense of, if you want to win the politics, if you want to win the election, you have to have a hard stance on migration. Because that is the populist sentiment at the grassroots in these two or three countries that I visited.
* There is some great potential, and competition for the talent pool. The diaspora is a global migration phenomenon, but there are some issues regarding refugees to find a home, a resolution for their plight.
* And how do we navigate those political hot waters surrounding the global migration issue.

**Professor Arturo Cabrera-Hidalgo:**

* [STATEMENTS OF THANK YOU]
* So, what is the state of global migration? From an academic point of view of global migration, several experts talk about the end of multilateralism, due to the shifting of global power, but it is a still a useful tool. We just have to continue to look at the number of new topics, in the current migration agenda.
* There are two global compacts; migrants and refugees. Ten years ago, these conversations would not have been allowed in the United Nations. Thus, it is necessary to look further into multilateralism, including new global actors.
* We must concentrate on migration and development, on incorporating more and more new actors into the conversation, which other than the states have a real role to play.
* It has to play the role of head for the process of implementation, the UN ‘Migration Network’ that the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) discusses. Unfortunately, in this process is the Convention for the Rights of all Migrant Workers and their Families (1990). The conditions are very comprehensive internationally. But at the time of its creation, there was the ratification of only 20/193 member states of the UN and it is important to note that no country from Europe or North America had joined the Convention except Mexico.
* Why had this Convention failed to attract more ratifications at the time? It was because it followed the old conventions of multilateralism which required the immediate implementation of its obligations.
* As such, state sovereignty needs more flexibility and responsibility.
* We have been able to see the process and I can speak as negotiator for my country, when you provide frameworks and goals to be reached at different dates… some dates are not part of the majority that did not happen with the Migrant Convention, they go even further than the conventions. Which were not necessarily binding unless the states accept.
* And the GFMD Summit will start soon in Quito, Ecuador later this year.
* Structure of the Migration and Development Summit is that it is a space for states and local authorities and academia to work together on the 2030 Sustainable Development agenda which was in charge of its review of the last ten years. Most importantly, the chief MD is a potential breach between the two compacts helping them give what they lack to ensure that no one will be left behind.
* Finally, the global forum is not in the UN structure. Within this office, special representatives do not exist anymore. The GFMD provides for the network an informant, a space for states to work together.
* The development actor, then the words migration and development would be just rhetoric. The ILO has a long history working in migration in natural disasters, climate change, migration and human rights, children and vulnerable migrants, migration of internal conflicts.
* The IDP is not considered in any of the two compacts, all of these and many more elements can be recognised as part of the 2030 agenda.
* The culmination of the process started some years ago with the first UN high level dialogue in 2006, and the events in Syria and the Mediterranean in 2016 changed the way the world speaks about migration. The mass displacement made the European countries focus on rehoming the displaced refugees.
* In September 2016, first meeting of the general UN assembly and the Summit resulted in unanimous adoption of the UN Declaration UN-IOM (2016), which is strong on principles but short on actionable items and non-binding agreements which are to be adopted at the end of 2018… 183 member UN states and for first time human rights was spoken about separately from the migrant condition, and proposed therefore the compacts.
* I can speak more detail later if we wish so, but annex 1 and annex 2 of this 2016 New York Declaration… which I the case of the refugee compact was just a comprehensive refugee response framework and a plan of action. Part of the answer is there, as it does not create new obligations of states, just already existing obligations of states. I think I already mentioned there were no negotiations at all as there was a unique negotiation which had three faces; consultation, global enrichment and diversity.
* What is the GFMD forum? It is the interplay between migration and development and it fosters practical and action-orientation programs and outcomes alongside policy discussions.
* It has supported policy and institutional coherence on international and national levels and other stakeholders and such is a voluntary nonbinding informal process open to all members of UN to share global migration and development experiences and become a special space to manage refugee development.
* One of the most of the important components of the GFMD is its ability to be a platform for conversations regarding global migration. The platform was launched in the Mexico 2010 Summit to encourage multi-stake holder partnerships. It allows face-to-face interactions on sharing experiences between governments and partners.

**Questions:**

**Q: With all respect, how effective is the GFMD to be implemented down to the people and how can the mechanisms can tackle a lot of issues in the local level?**

**A:** The way to get to the ground is to go to a regional level, a local level, and put all stakeholders together. Only actors and in some way or another are involved in the migration process need to express what the views and needs are. Some of the people do not think that the business society for Indonesia to help refugees. The important thing is to not be surprised but to ask why and why they think it affect them. And find out how to put in different actors’ face to face to process that information to get us all better understand our decisions.

Sometimes it has to do with the personal level. In the case of my country, we see thousands2 citizens from Venezuela and it does not matter too much what the government policies are. Sometimes it has to do with you at a personal level. There are people who have been driving buses from the border from Colombia to Ecuador and Ecuador to Peru because they need to arrive to their families. Family unification is from a personal level. This is one of the ways in which we can arrive at the level of thinking on the needs and views and narratives that exist on migration and providing the right information on the needs of migration and refugees.

This is not something new, all migrants since the beginning. We used to say we are all migrants when I was head of migrants. We would not ask anything for our citizens abroad that we are not ready to give citizens in our own country We need to developmental policy, immigration, bring all actors to discussion. And there is someone from UNICEF and IOM here, too. We have the most advanced law for human mobility. We talk about human mobility because we do not think we can adjust. If you are not a refugee you are a migrant. If they are a migrant they do not need international protection.

**Q: My question is, what do you mean about the narrative itself. Do you want to reconstruct the narrative or are you posing the narrative that they are positive for the host countries?**

**A:** We do not have to think about migration as something good or bad. It is something natural. And will continue to exist. Now, if migration is good or bad it depends on how you manage it. It could be a win-win situation. The Germans, how many thousands of people do they need to help their economy because it is not possible for them to continue at this level. The Canadians were telling us they are putting so much into their technology and their industry, but they do not have enough scientists to the people who are keeping up with the factories, so they are empty. They can not keep growing and developing their technology otherwise. Same with their universities.

They are developing all of this but who is going to be doing their research? It is a good thing but only if it managed. We put together the people who have needs, and people who have other needs, it is a win-win situation. You bring in people from Ecuador and you bring in people from Turkey and Australia and you start to make agreements that can be followed-up, so you give some consistency to that. It is also important to have coherence. Not only at an international level but a local level. Coherence between different industries.

Supporting other countries to join in Marrakesh they could not approve it, and it is because people said no. They said no because they think that negotiation. There was no coherence on the institutions and stakeholders at the international level. It is not a problem it is a situation that needs to be managed. 10 years ago, if you try to talk about migration at the UN people will laugh at you and leave. There is nothing to talk to my neighbor about who goes into my house. There is evolution in the way we work together to provide peace and development to the world.

**Q: In your opinion, we know that Germany and other European countries have been more hostile to new immigrants’ arrival. Migrants issue and domestic issue//very sensitive. What is the latent state of play you can see regarding GFMD on today’s status in Europe?**

**A:** We need to differentiate. When we talk about Germany, we need to talk about how Germany has done more than for other countries than others. Understanding that not just the Syrian crisis but any movement in the world needs to be managed in connection with your neighbors. The countries migration as well. Anti-immigrant groups are minorities, but they know how to use social media. The numbers and the reality are very easily influenced by hate groups. In 2011 there are many things that affect the narrative. At the same time, there are many elements that are not considered. When you analyze the facts in Europe and the United States. When you talk about terrorist attacks, if the information has not changed, none of the attacks have been from an immigrant in that nation. They are 2nd or 3rd generation who have been easily manipulated to be acting in that way. That narrative and social media more than ever need to be taken into consideration. That is why I give a lot of emphasis to academia that can analyze those things.

**Q: It seems very sensitive in the UN. What makes countries change their minds about migration**

**A:** The fact that they cannot manage unilaterally or bilaterally. They need to work together in order to manage migration in an orderly and safe way. That is what gives the new idea of multilateralism. If you put just one line and said all countries will move from here forward. In the case of Latin America, you would be moving backwards in the matter of human rights. For countries like Ecuador, we are the first recipient of refugees in the whole of Latin America. 50 years of war in Colombia. We have inclusion and not assimilation. If someone asks you to assimilate to that a society, you are doing it wrong. You will have that feeling of rejection.

**Q: How do we connect all the migrants that are moving in?**

**A:** Latin partnerships the private sector and the business sector has to be involved. In some cases, you have too many nurses or doctors so it is a matter of working together in some multilateral, flexible way. There are some things that cannot be said at a UN human rights assembly but can be said at the GFMD. In some special meetings they use general house rules. So in these places where you can really say how you really feel, it helps to put all the stakeholders in the same place.

Dr. Dino Patti Djalal Questions

1. **On multilateral action on climate change, we see the global community coming up with solutions that are quantified base. So, we know how much emission should be saved in the next how many years. They tried to have a quantified formula. You reduce by this much, etc. 2030 similar as well. I know it is too early to tell but the point is there is a qualified formula. For Global migration crisis specifically for refugees, during these GFMD is there an approach for a similar quantified resolution?**
2. **The second question is the United States during the Vietnam War took a lot of refugees from Vietnam, Australia did too. It was morally the right thing to do “I got involved int his mess and I will take a lot of room” it seems ironic that that mindset is missing now. The invasion of Iraq is one of the causes for which we have a lot of refugees. But at the same time the country that is partially responsible for that is the one that is accepting the least. The agreement from Obama was dissolved by President Trump.**
3. **Why is there migration issue a political issue in Europe. Of course, there is a crisis, but why is it such a big crisis. He said usually not but because it happened too fast and there is too many of them it provokes a very different political reaction in Europe. I was wondering if you would agree to that.**

**A:** People believe that migration is bigger than any other moment in history. If you analyze the academics, you will see that migration in the world has always been around 3.5% of the world population. The population has increased but war it is 4 or 5% during the second world war. The Ottoman Empire, for example. Of course, at that moment there was no social media, or you do not know what is happening at this exact second so the way in which people are informed and process information is also different at this time. Among these myths that academics talk about, it is migration of people from Africa to Europe. The question is at that moment where is that place where Africa is migrating the most? The answer is Europe. Africans are migrating inside Africa; it is something that is not being studied until recently. The majority of migrants from Africa go to other countries in Africa. The myth is that they go to Europe. You use Google and you put Africa migration you will get it birds migrating from the south to Europe and according to the weather. No one talks about how they are migrating inside Africa. It is not easy and the way that information is managed makes it also not very feasible to work.

Too much, too fast may not be exact. What is happening in Europe at this moment is that there is political reappearance of nationalism. There is an increasing theme of nationalism that has to do with politics, and we go back again to social media. Which needs, in some way, to have control, without taking back our rights. That is a part of the problem. There is research to follow up on to the implementation. They have to be plans that will be taken at the regional level and the local level. Countries that are committing themselves to these implementation processes are different. The GFMD is completely open. The compact is a list of actionable commitments in which you can get involved by committing to them. Some people will do choose and pick, then let us take it and go forward. We need some research mechanism to follow up on what each of the countries have committed to do. It is something that is finally happening. One of the countries who has not committed is the United States.

They were very interested in participating in the compacts, but they left early in the negotiation for the migration compact when it took place. For some people, it was a disaster. This was a very important actor in the migration field. Some people thought it was good. If the US stayed in the end, we will have a document so mutilated and they would not even adopt it. They allowed other countries to work in a constructive way and there is a hope that someday they will join. The US is not a part of the 1982 on the Law of the Sea. However, the US has customary law. Law and international politics have to be involved. It is important to mention that they left the compact discussion. They are very active, but they left the migration compact.

There is no quantitative goal as there is at climate change. We want to arrive at that place, and we will never be exact because it is not something you can measure mechanically or physically. Migrants are becoming refugees and refugees are becoming migrants. You are even a migrant when you become a tourist. It is not exact, it needs a lot of work, it is not easy. There is no global quantitative way to say this is what we need here, and this is what we have there. We would hope that as the process develops. We would like to have more information that is clear and easy to use for these purposes.