Policy Paper

Migration and Development in the policies of the European Union: trends toward a cosmopolitan approach

by Flavia Piperno
Researcher CeSPI

November 2014

In collaboration with

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Since the early Seventies, the European countries prominently considered migration policy as a matter internal to each individual nation-state. The economic crisis, started, in Europe, with the oil crisis in 1973, pushed the countries traditionally receiving migratory flows to a progressive and unilateral closure towards new arrivals, ending therefore a time of intense foreign recruitment, based mostly on a system of bilateral agreements with the countries of origin (usually ex colonies).

It is only since the mid-Nineties that a heightened awareness of the big limitations of the unilateral approach – insufficient to manage a cross-border phenomenon as migration - brought the European States to create channels of dialogue and cooperation with the main countries of origin and transit of migratory flows: first bilaterally and then super-nationally (Pastore 2008, p.136; Van Selm 2002). This opening has launched a new phase of external projection (ED) of the migration policy of European Union (EU) and its member states.

As Pastore (2006 and 2009) highlighted, at EU level, the need for cooperative relations with sending and transit countries was first proclaimed fifteen years ago at the Tampere European Council (15-16 October 1999): Migration and Development (M&D) policy was immediately identified as a core path of the ED of migration policy.

Since then, the European position on M&D has rapidly evolved: however, this has not meant the substitution of a previous perspective with a later one, but rather the *coexistence of different perspectives*, sometimes in contradiction with each other.

In the first section of this paper, taking into consideration the main European documents on M&D[1], we will stress how the "narrative" (Boswell et al. 2011) and the policies of the European Union have rapidly changed during the last fifteen years.

In the second section we will stress the main differences between 'narrative' and concrete strategies.

Finally, in the third section, we will advance some proposals that hopefully could influence the EU policy on M&D. We are, in fact, totally aware that the European reflection on M&D is called to further evolve, in the near future, not only because of a new Commission Communication about it, due by the end of 2015 (as specified in the conclusions of the European Council on development issues of 12 December 2014 and that probably will be incorporated in the new European Agenda on Migration) but also because of the inclusion of migration within different targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the post-2015 Development Agenda of the United Nations (UN General Assembly 2014). At this regard, it is worth noticing that 'Harnessing the positive effects of migration' is one of the key components that, in the EU's vision for a post-2015 agenda, should form part of the global partnership (COM(2015) 44 final).

---

[1] In particular, I will consider: the Global Approach to Migration in 2005 (COM(2005) 390); the 2006 European Consensus on Development; the more recent Global Approach to Migration and Mobility adopted in 2011 (COM(2011) 743 final); the EU Position for the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (COM(2013) 292 final); the Communication on a Global Partnership for Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development after 2015 (COM(2015) 44 final)

1. THE MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT LINKAGE IN THE EUROPEAN POLICY: THE COEXISTENCE OF THREE DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

The European interpretation of the M&D nexus fast evolved in the space of a few years, giving place to the coexistence of perspectives that are different and, according to some analysts, contradictory with each other.

Some authors see the plurality of EU positions on M&D as the result of a scarce institutional coherence both at vertical and horizontal level. A recent report by ECDPM and ICMPD (2013, pp. 198-199) stresses that: "regarding coherence and harmonisation of individual EU Member States' policies in the area of M&D and respective vertical congruence with policy developments at EU level, EU migration policies are still characterised by significant inter-governmentalism. Policies of Member States often follow their own interest and logic, which at times runs counter to EU community level aspirations. With regard to the horizontal dimension of policy coherence, the European Union faced a dichotomy between a more liberal view on immigration management, represented by the Parliament and the Commission, and a more conservative approach held by the Council through the Member States. The Council of the EU traditionally prioritises irregular migration management and border control focusing on security issues. For this reason, the Commission has encountered a number of obstacles in translating its ambitions regarding development-friendly migration policies, including more open borders for temporary migration schemes, into legally binding instruments". The third challenge, according to ECDPM and ICMPD, is the lack of a coherent approach between different policy areas, which are often characterised by different values and interests relating to M&D. In this regard, Sterkx (2008) points to the different values and interests of the former DG Justice Freedom and Security and DG Relex as well as DG Development.

Other authors (Glick Shiller Faist 2010, p. 2; Delgado Wise - Màrquez Covarrubias, 2010; Harvey 2007) tend to see the different perspectives offered by the EU as different aspects of the same neo-liberal paradigm. On one hand, migrants are denigrated through restrictive border policies to make them more flexible to the requests of a globalised labour market; on the other hand, far from proposing structural and institutional changes, migrants are celebrated as agents of local development, to provide neo-liberalism with a "human face".

Here I embrace the first interpretation suggesting that we can follow the European narrative on M&D along three different and coexisting models of global policy (Held - McGrew, 2001, p. 210; Marchetti, 2014, p. 151): a stateliest/protectionist model; a neo-liberal one and a cosmopolitan one.

1.1. Migration and development as instrument of re-nationalisation and border control

As stressed by Pastore (2006, p. 2), at the time of the extraordinary European Council of Tampere – the first EU official meeting focused on migration in the history of European integration – the prevailing perspective was a mechanistic and naïve one: 'economic' migration (different from 'forced' one, imposed by conflicts, prosecutions or natural disasters) was seen as a consequence of poverty. This idea meant that development cooperation could and *should* address the "root causes" of emigration, therefore reducing the migratory pressure.

This paradigm - despite a progressive opening towards temporary flows or towards qualified workers from partner countries - can be put within the frame of a "stateliest" and protectionist approach (Held-McGrew 2001, p. 222) exalting a "securitarian tendency" (Pastore 2008), as well as a "re-nationalisation" (Ambrosini 2014) or a "severe regulation" (Hammar 1990) process. The national community is seen as a privileged place to organise security, labour and welfare of its own citizens, as well as a sphere where it is possible to guarantee the protection of a specific culture, tradition, language or religion (Held-McGrew 2001, p. 223). Migration, especially in times of economic crisis, is mainly described as a possible threat to such sphere: a threat that can be reduced 'helping migrants in their homeland'.

The principle of addressing the root causes of emigration, still present in the European Communication on Migration and Development of 2005 (COM(2005) 390), disappears in the following Communication on the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility - GAMM (COM(2011) 743 final). The aim of controlling and reducing the migratory flows through the cooperation with third countries stays, anyway, as a founding element of the European vision and it takes shape with the idea of "conditionality".

In 2002, the European Council of Seville put forward the formula of *negative conditionality*, clarifying that: 'in any future cooperation agreement, association agreement or similar agreement that the European Union or the European Community will make with any country, there will be a clause about the common management of migratory fluxes and of the obligatory re-admission in case of illegal immigration' (Council of the European Union 2002, point 33). In 2011, the GAMM foresees a principle of *positive conditionality*, that can be summarised in the 'more for more' formula with regard to the Mobility Partnerships (MP). As stressed by the EU Commission: 'The MP is tailor-made to the shared interests and concerns of the partner country and EU participants. The renewed MP offers visa facilitation based on a simultaneously negotiated readmission agreement. A 'more for more' approach, implying an element of conditionality, should continue to be applied as a way to increase transparency and speed up progress towards concluding these agreements' (COM(2011) 743 final, p. 11).

Within this perspective, the prevailing interest is on prevention, containment and repression of unauthorised immigration flows; the focus is on the protection of the domestic space of the receiving countries and the Internal Affairs Agenda is the leading political frame. The ED of migratory policy is bent to this scope, so that cooperation with countries of origin is interpreted as an instrument to reduce migratory flows, fighting the root causes and the "push factors" of migration.

1.2. Migrants as actors of local development: the neo-liberal paradigm

In the space of few years, the discourse on migration and development seems to acquire a new face [2]. As Pastore highlights (2006), the Commission's Communication on 'Migration and Development: some concrete orientations' (COM(2005) 390) appears based on clear awareness of the strong relationship between mobility (internal and international) of people and socio-economical development. In this new perspective, migration is not framed as a problem to be solved by fostering development in countries of origin. On the contrary mobility is recognised as an integral

---

[2] As stressed by de Haas (2012) the scientific debate on M&D shift has swung back and forth like a pendulum, from optimism in the postwar period to deep ''brain drain'' pessimism since the 1970s towards neo-optimistic ''brain gain'' since 2000. The new political attention on this issue thus followed a pre-existing debate.

part of development (Laczko-Lönnback 2013, p. 119; Black –Sward 2009). Therefore the objective of M&D policies is no longer to reduce migratory pressure, but rather to optimise the positive impact of migration on the contexts of origin.

Several authors (de Haas 2010 and 2012; Glick Shiller - Faist, 2010; Delgado Wise - Màrquez Covarrubias, 2010) frame this understanding of the M&D nexus within the neo-liberal paradigm. As stressed by de Haas (2012, p. 8 and p. 13), at the dawn of the new millennium, governments and international development agencies – such as the World Bank (Ratha 2003; World Bank 2007), the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank (IABD 2000) - have "discovered" the potential of migration and remittances to stimulate development in poor countries. Within this view, migration is celebrated as a spontaneous, bottom up, development mechanism for the countries of origin, shifting the attention away from structural development constraints and, hence, from the responsibility of states to pursue political and economic reforms[3]. Moreover, the movement of people from labour-abundant to labour-scarce regions and countries – along with a presumed transfer of capital in the opposite direction – is seen as a process contributing to a more optimal allocation of production factors, higher productivity and, therefore, better outcomes for all. From this perspective, the cooperation with third countries is interpreted as an instrument to promote the resources that migrants 'naturally' carry as leverage for local development.

The 2005 Communication (COM(2005) 390) carries out this paradigm focusing its recommendations mostly around three axes: 1) valorisation of the flux of remittances through safer, quicker and faster channels; 2) encouragement of the diaspora associations wishing to voluntarily contribute to the development of the country of origin; 3) promotion of virtual returns, temporary or definitive, as opportunities to invest the economic resources and the skills and competences acquired abroad by the migrant.

The same direction is taken by GAMM in 2011 that insists on the valorisation of remittances and of productive investments for local development, and recommends measures for compensating and fighting against the brain drain. More recently, the conclusions of the Council of the European Union on development issues (12 December 2014 – Presse 648), written by the Ministries of external relations, retrace this model, focusing the attention quite exclusively on the potential of migration for local development.

Differently from the previous vision, this approach is essentially focused on the contexts of origin and on their (economic) development and is driven by the Agenda for Development Cooperation, under the responsibility of the institutions that are in charge of external policies.

1.3. The global approach to migration and mobility: towards a cosmopolitan approach

The third vision concerning the M&D nexus is more visible in the narrative rather than in the operational strategy of the European Union and seems to open up to a more cosmopolitan direction. This perspective emerges for the first time in the 2011 GAMM (COM(2011) 743 final) and in its accompanying document (SEC(2011) 1353 final) and becomes stronger in the subsequent documents, in particular in the 2013 EU Position for the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (COM(2013) 292 final) and in the Communication on a Global Partnership for Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development after 2015 (COM(2015) 44 final).

---

[3] Obviously here the term 'reform' is not associated to the Washington Consensus

The issue of migrants' rights makes for the first time its way in the M&D discourse. Coherently with a cosmopolitan approach, rights are not seen through the exclusive lens of bounded community and territorial belonging (Rumford 2009; Fine 2009; Arendt 1979) but linked to the individuals (Benhabib 2006) and mainstreamed throughout the entire migration cycle (ECDPM-ICMPD 2013): they are therefore conceived in a transnational dimension.

As stressed by ECDPM and ICMPD (2013, p. 188) human rights protection is no longer conceived at national level nor it is focused on a single category of migrant (namely citizens moving from the South to the North). On the contrary, rights protection is conceived at transnational level ("*throughout the entire migration cycle*") and there is a more general attention to the 'wider category of 'citizen on the move'. In some passages, also the distinction between immigration and emigration fades: 'Integrating immigration and emigration aspects into development strategies at all levels is a vital first step to promoting governance frameworks for maximising the development potential of migration and mobility' (COM(2013) 292 final, p.8).

Different policy recommendations contained in the GAMM and in the following documents go in the direction of a "migrant centred and rights- approach" (ECDPM – ICMPD 2013, p. 188). One may quote the following: the accent put by the GAMM on the portability of social and security rights and education titles, as part of migration and development policies; the relevance given to transnational networks of social services as a means to concretely protect migrants' rights and foster their opportunities of socio-economic integration at transnational level (e.g. the *centres for human resources*, aiming at promoting processes of integration in the social and working environment at the two ends of the migration process); the attention to human rights as something to protect with transnational policies of cooperation, especially addressed to vulnerable categories; the emphasis on the processes of migrants' integration and reintegration as an important dimension of the migration-development nexus. This last point should be analysed also considering the novelties introduced by the 2011 European Agenda for Integration (COM(2011) 455 final) where integration, for the first time, is portrayed as a right to protect at transnational level - therefore before the departure, during the stay abroad and after return – and through the cooperation among EU (and its member States), transit counties and sending countries. These recommendations mean that concern for the human rights and well being of migrants cannot be decoupled from the role of migration as a development enabler (Laczko-Lönnback 2013, p. 122) and that social policy in a specific territory is no longer solely conceived as a matter related to the 'internal domain' but also as a transnational issue (Yeates 2004).

This new attention might be summarized in the Commission recommendation for: 'broadening the traditional (migration and development) agenda, putting in place a more comprehensive framework to accompany and protect the migrant along his/her migratory route, which should also take into account the social consequences of migration' (SEC(2011) 1353 final, p. 19).

Moreover, in line with a cosmopolitan perspective, a growing emphasis is given to a strengthened cooperative approach, involving migrants' sending countries, in order to cope with *mutual* challenges and opportunities (Beck 1992; Beck – Grande 2007).

In the new discourse on M&D, this direction is associated with the concept of "*policy coherence*" meant as "mainstreaming migration in development policies" (COM(2013) 292 final, p. 8) at an inter-sectorial and transnational level (above all within regional cooperation). As stressed in the GAMM: 'Successful mainstreaming of migration in development thinking requires making it an integral part of a whole range of sectorial policies (on agriculture, health, education, etc.). In parallel, targeted migration-related initiatives should be promoted. The often still limited awareness, amongst practitioners, of the relevance of migration issues to development should be addressed, *both* in the EU and in its partner countries. In this regard, it is essential to integrate challenges

related to intra-regional migration as one of the issues under the GAMM, so that the potentially beneficial role of migration in regional cooperation and development can be properly identified and promoted' (COM(2011) 743 final, p. 19). As highlighted by ECDPM and ICMPD (2013, p. 25): 'the need to reinforce consistency between migration, development and other inter-related policies brings to the fore the concept of *policy coherence*. (…) Capacity-building emerges as a key element of the M&D nexus: the capacity of states and other stakeholders needs to be strengthened in order to enable them to design and implement *mutually* reinforcing M&D strategies'.

Differently from the two approaches mentioned above, within this political frame there isn't a one-dimensional focus on the internal dimension or on the external one, but a wider opening to an *'inter-mestic'* vision, where international and domestic policies, as well as the institutions entrusted with them, are better coordinated: 'Integrating foreign policy aspects into the EU migration policy and ensuring linkages between the internal and the external dimensions is vital. Home Affairs issues need to be embedded in the EU's overall foreign policy in view of facilitating reinforced dialogues and cooperation with third countries. In this vein, cooperation and coordination among the various stakeholders should be stepped up. The advantages offered by the EEAS (European External Action Service) overview of EU's overall external relations and the possible contribution of the EU Delegations should be exploited' (COM(2014) 96 final, p. 19).

An increased recognition of the inter-linkages between the internal and external dimension calls for a renovated commitment in bilateral or multilateral dialogues and partnerships with third countries that are supposed to pursue 'mutual benefits' and triple-win process, for the migrant, the country of origin and the country of destination. In this perspective, the idea of a common advantage is not linked, like before, to the migratory movement as a 'spontaneous' element of social and economical development for all the countries involved, but more to the need for cooperation and reciprocity stemming from the inter-dependence of the countries involved in migratory flows.

2. THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 'NARRATIVE' AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICIES

When switching from the analysis of narrative to the recommendations and operational interventions we see a strong resistance to translate a progressive cultural approach in an equally open and aware political practice.

Despite the rhetoric, the issue of migrants' rights remains substantially external to the M&D Agenda. As stressed by ECDPM and ICMPD (2013 p. 34) the focus is still mainly placed on the economic dimension of development, in contrast with a human development approach that should go beyond the advancement of economic wealth to focus on people's overall well-being, including personal safety, political and economic freedom, and respect for human rights.

As a matter of fact, with regard to the migratory policy, the EU conditionality policy, based on the idea of exchanging 'development' against 'control', overlooks the search for a smoother synergy among migration, development and human rights. EU governance mechanisms are not based on a hard core of common obligations based on the respect of human rights and the parties are not symmetrically bind to the respect of basic rights (Concord Italia 2014; Fanjul 2014, p. 24). As stressed by Gropas (2013, p. 1): 'It is time for a paradigm shift that will reshuffle priorities to make room for a rights-based, and not only a security-based, approach to migration, and one that will sit more comfortably on the migration-development nexus'.

Furthermore, the management of the social consequences of the migratory process is not thought in a transnational perspective considering the inter-play between countries of origin and destination. The Global approach extends the traditional Agenda on M&D taking into account the social consequences of migration in the countries of origin. This means that aid policies carried out by EU and Member States should address the negative social consequences of migration in the countries of origin. At the same time, the new Agenda on integration, endorsed by EU in 2011, recognises the role of third countries in the promotion of integration processes in the destination contexts. However, these two arguments are not connected within a single and comprehensive strategy able to watch, through a transnational perspective, to the challenge of integration and rights protection of citizens on the move.

The concept of "triple win" undergoes further contradictions. The principle of a cooperative and bifocal approach aiming to manage *mutual* opportunities and challenges – above all through the tool of Mobility Partnerships - is breached in the much stronger principle of "conditionality", which is expressed by the formula 'more for more' (more collaboration in the management of illegal flows for more cooperation and greater openness on entrance visas, however, in view of temporary stay).

The *'more for more'* perspective introduces a distorted perspective, because *it does not recognize the advantage of migration for the countries of destination*: it depicts the *interest of EU* as solely associated to the control and reduction of the migratory pressure, while the *interest of the countries of origin* is portrayed as associated to emigration (in order to get remittances and a lower pressure on local markets). The *need* of EU and rich countries to collaborate with southern countries in order to manage their own *internal* social and economic necessities is not recognised. On this regard, Fanjul (2014, p.2) argues that: 'the scarce value given to the positive impact of migration in the countries of arrival is generally connected to the attempt by political parties at both sides of the ideological spectrum to capture the electoral mood through a reconsideration of the very rules that inspired free

movement within the EU and basic levels of legal and social protection for all those residing in it, regardless of their legal status'. On the contrary, getting close to the concept of 'egoistic cosmopolitanism' (Beck – Grande 2007), Fanjul highlights the necessity of a 'coordinated and proactive discourse that uses a combination of ethical and self-interest arguments to set a different narrative of the migration experience' (Fanjul 2014, p. 21).

The scarce recognition of the advantage of migration for the countries of destination entails a second central ambiguity in the way M&D linkage has been framed until now. As stressed by ECDPM and ICMPD (2013, pp. 27 and 37), *the EU Agenda on M&D is mainly focused on developing countries* and the situation of destination countries tends to be left aside (either in terms of positive effects of migration for them either in terms of conditions at destination necessary to foster benefits at origin). On the contrary, a transnational and multifocal glance would require coordinated actions to be carried out simultaneously in the contexts of destination and origin. In the mobility partnerships, that should be the most advanced implementation of this strategy, the interventions of cooperation with partner countries are mainly calibrated on a concept of local development (in particular the actions of local capacity building or compensation to the brain drain), and only marginally centred on lasting reform processes able to affect simultaneously countries of origin and destination (e.g. portability of social and security rights and education titles; transnational networks of social services at the two poles of the migratory process; institutional building in-between countries of origin and destination; long term strategies for boosting employment, trade and internationalization through mobility, etc.)

Moreover, the "more for more" strategy introduces a *model of governance that is asymmetric and unilateral*. As Gropas (2013, p. 3) highlights: 'the EU has been consistently criticised for talking about 'dialogues' and 'partnerships' when in reality it engages more in a 'paternalistic monologue' and a conditionality-driven relationship with migration-sending or transit-migration countries'. The question of governance is also linked with how inclusive the dialogue and partnership process adopted in the EU is. The spaces for representation of different stakeholders at different levels are still narrow and, despite the EU rhetoric, non-state actors and diaspora associations are currently almost excluded from bilateral and multilateral dialogues on migration.

Unilateralism and lack of a real bifocal/multifocal perspective are also questions emerging from an examination of European funds. An analysis of the projects related to the implementation of the Mobility Partnerships in Tunisia, Morocco and Moldavia (Coslovi – Stocchiero 2014) shows that the most significant initiatives in financial terms are those aimed at border control and readmission; on the contrary, the financial effort for the management of legal channels - aimed at promoting *mutual* and shared benefits - remains in very short supply. The same imbalance recurs in the SOLID (Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows) programme. As highlighted by Amnesty International (2014), between 2007 and 2013, the 46% of the approximately 4 billion euro foreseen by the SOLID Programme was allocated for the External Borders Fund (EBF), 21% to the European Fund for the Integration of Third – countries nationals (EIF), 17% to the European Refugees Fund (ERF), 16% to the European Return Fund.

More generally, the EU allocations rarely allow to act simultaneously – and transnationally - on the contexts of destination and origin, in order to promote *common* goals and to comply with the transnational dimension that necessarily is associated to a migrant-centred perspective. As stated by the EU Commission (COM(2011) 743 final, p. 20): 'the future EU Asylum and Migration Fund and the Internal Security Fund (notably on border management) should also be able to cater for financing the GAMM. These funds will be of particular relevance for activities that primarily *serve the interests of the EU*, but are being implemented in a non-EU country'. The funds of the thematic program 'Cooperation with third countries in the areas of Migration and Asylum' (soon replaced by the program Global Public Goods and Challenges) and other financial tools supporting activities

related to migration (DCI, EDF, ENPI), led by EuropeAid, aim instead to 'integrate migration into development strategies and poverty reduction in third countries' (SEC(2011) 1353 final , p. 12).

The goal to "work on shared goals and priorities, strengthen regional and bilateral governance of migration, integrating migration into each other's development policies" (COM(2014) 96 final, p. 19) appears to be blunted in the repetition of a perspective that sharply divides the internal interests from those of third countries.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A COHERENT AND COSMOPOLITAN CO-DEVELOPMENT POLICY

All our recommendations are driven by the belief that a coherent, bifocal and systemic vision, which is the core concept of "co-development", should be re-boosted as a strategic axis for migration governance. As the Centre for Global Development underlines: we need a 'coordinated and proactive approach which combines ethical and self-interest assumptions in order to set up a different communication on the migration experience' (Fanjul 2014, p. 21). Besides, thinking of transnational migration leads to a necessary effort of reconciliation of extremes, such as integration strategies that encompass reintegration processes in origin countries or return strategies which are interconnected to mobility plans. Indeed, the tools and actions to be taken are often similar in both directions.

3.1. Integrating "co-development" in the post-2015 United Nations' Development Agenda

By September 2015, the Goals for Sustainable Development – that replace the Millennium Development Goals – will be approved.

The old Millennium Development Goals did not include any goal about M&D; this has been one of the factors that led to neglect migration in the context of national and international policies (Lönnback, 2014).

Moving from these considerations, we recommend that:

- Migration is included as a cross-catting issue in the various targets corresponding to the different goals: for instance, in relation to the goals of reducing poverty and hunger, promoting decent work, access to healthcare and education, reduction of inequalities between countries, reduction of all forms of violence (including that of human trafficking) (Civil society Stockholm Agenda 2014; Stocchiero 2014 a) .
- Migrants are included in post-2015 Agenda not only as vulnerable persons but also as promoters of development (Zupi 2014 a).
- The 17th Goal of the new Agenda ('Strengthening the means of implementation and revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development') fosters a reflection on the *Coherence of Policies for Co-development*. The 8th Millennium Development Goal (MDG) launched the concept of Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) focusing on the interconnection between the actions to achieve the goals of official development assistance (ODA) and other policies that have an impact on developing countries (including migration policies). The reflection on the *Coherence of Policies for Co-development* should allow to go beyond a M&D strategy solely centred on 'local development' and focus the attention on a decreased relevance of the dichotomy between developed and developing countries due to the interdependence between the global North and the South (Laczko – Lönnback 2013, p. 119).

3.2. Strengthening the coherence between 'narrative' and 'policy implementation' in the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility

In the Communication 'Maximising the development impact of migration', the European Commission highlights that: 'Maximising the positive impact of migration on development is an important policy priority for the EU' and that:'The impact of respecting human rights goes far beyond the individual migrant, as it also benefits both the home society and the society in which migrants live and work. Empowering individuals to access their rights is a winning strategy, both for effective migration governance and for sustainable development' (COM (2013) 292 final, p. 2 and p. 14).

With the aim of approaching narrative to real practice, the following recommendations call for a revision of the 4 axes of the global approach. We ask, in particular, to the European External Action Service to make substantial step forwards in this direction. As the Commission has often repeated, this is a strategic service to ensure: the coherence between internal and external dimension; a consistent use of the full range of policies and tools available to the EU for the development of strategies connecting migration and development; the implementation and evaluation of the Global Approach. We wish to emphasize that, in our opinion, the European External Action Service should be the first recipient of our recommendations, not only because it is the expression of the EU development cooperation policy, but also as it represents the main link between the EU and third countries. This means that it is in the best possible position to reframe the concept of M&D no longer solely as the tool for pursuing local development but also as the objet of multi-level and multi-stakeholder transnational partnerships for managing *mutual* challenges and opportunities.

3.2.1. First Pillar: organizing and facilitating legal migration and mobility

As far as the first pillar is concerned, we hope progress will be made in at least two fields: the promotion of legal migration and the advancement of a bifocal vision able to inter-connect integration and reintegration strategies. Particular attention should also be devoted to strengthening the diaspora associations as important players for an active democracy. All these aspects should be considered as the indispensable basis for promoting M&D policies.

A - Promoting mobility and legal migration

Although it is not possible to completely and unconditionally open European borders, it is certainly necessary to give greater opportunities for legal mobility. In this regard, the Centre for Global Development notes that: 'an ethically questionable approach to migration can actually be self-defeating, since the rigidity imposed on migration flows might also reduce the social and economic gains of recipient countries (albeit not the political interests of their leaders). Therefore, a reform of the system based primarily on the enlightened concerns of rich countries could also be turned into a benefit for development, and vice versa: converting vicious circles of rigidity, vulnerability and constrained opportunities into virtuous circles of flexibility, dignified migration and unfolded common gains' (Fanjul 2014, p. 1).

To this end, we recommend:

- The introduction of Job-search visas and multi-annual permits in order to increase the regularity and the predictability of migratory channels.

- The guarantee of a second migration chance through the possibility of 'freezing' the unused residence and work permits in case migrants decide to try to return to their countries (Fanjul 2014, p. 25).

- The cancellation of obligations that limit the periods of absence or oblige uninterrupted stay in the destination country to maintain/get the rights of residence. The EC *long-term residence permit* and the Blue Card allow for limited periods of absence (respectively 12 and 18 months) without losing the right of residence. These are restrictions that, in any case, reduce the opportunities for circulation and must be deleted from all types of permit and criteria to renew them.

- Longer work permits, as defined in the Council conclusions of July 2012 (8361/12).

B - Promoting a better interconnection between integration and reintegration strategies

Europe recognizes the importance of cooperation with origin countries in order to ensure a more effective integration in the destination contexts and, in the meantime, it recognizes the need to extend the agenda on M&D in order to manage the social impact that emigration and returns entail in the origin countries. These two arguments should be connected within a single and comprehensive strategy.

In this context, we hope the following measures will be taken:

- The support to transnational networks of care services - at bilateral or regional level - that would promote the social and economic inclusion of migrants in both directions of the migration process and through coordinated strategies (Piperno – Tognetti 2012; Piperno 2013). We believe that transnational collaboration between services and the exchange of best practices would be especially necessary in the following areas: 1) Information, training and integration into the labour market of the countries of origin and destination (the promotion of the EU *centres for human resources* goes in this direction and in our opinion is an expression of this 'bi-focal' perspective); 2) Preparation and mediation for children' inclusion in the education system (the issue of children' integration in the school system is raising concern not only in the countries of arrival but also in many countries of origin because of the strong return flows due to the economic crisis); 3) Psycho-social support 'here' and 'there': especially in relation to the processes of trans-nationalization of families; 4) Care of the elderly and healthcare workers: the problem of elderly care is increasingly associated with migration and concerns not only the countries of destination (that are increasingly resorting to migrant care workers), but also a number of contexts of origin. In many source countries, above all in East Europe, the problem of an aging population is increasingly associated with the issue of the elderly who have been left behind and those who have returned but do not have pensions or social network to count on.

- A stronger commitment to the portability of social rights, the recognition of educational qualifications and professional experience. These are difficult reforms to be undertaken, but absolutely essential to promote human development and the agency of individuals, making them able to shape their own destiny and plan their future according to their wishes and expectations in a global world. This concern should be considered as the very heart of a M&D policy.

- The promotion of a progressive convergence of policies in the field of human rights. Two immediate steps forward in this direction should be: 1) a full implementation and the future

extension of the Directives on the Single Permit and on Seasonal Workers in order to obtain the guarantee of common rights to migrants residing in different European contexts (Fanjul 2014, p. 24); 2) The ratification of the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Family Members.

- The full recognition of the associations of the diaspora as fundamental players in the processes of participatory democracy and communication with local communities. The traditional Agenda on migration and development has generally insisted on the potential of the diaspora as an agent of development cooperation in the developing countries, whereas less attention has been given to the fundamental role played by associations in consultative and participated processes. Migrants' associations can foster integration and reintegration processes, increasing bi-directional dialogue between local communities and institutions in the contexts of destination and origin. Providing platforms for constant dialogue over time, as suggested by the European Commission itself (SEC (2011) 1353 , p. 9) is a fundamental step in this direction.

3.2.2. Second Pillar: prevent and reduce illegal migration and human trafficking

In this section we do not go in depth about irregular migration and forced returns but we simply point out the criticality of a vision that associates return policies solely to security, irregularity and border control, to the detriment of a broader vision on mobility and human development.

The European Commission, in its Global Approach, recognizes the transnational dimension of migration, making clear the need to manage migration while taking into account its various stages (departure, living, eventual return): these stages translate the transnational dimension of migration. However, in the Directive on returns, a unilateral approach is proposed, centred on the return of illegal migrants and voluntary returns as a strategy of removal[4].

In the current economic crisis, transnationalism - and therefore the possibility of living or envisaging to live and work simultaneously in two or more countries - becomes, for many migrants, an essential tool of their strategy: since employment opportunities have shrinked, migrants strive to multiply their chances by simultaneously trying to insert themselves in two or more different places. Today, migrants' return (which tends to grow in almost all member countries), is mainly an expression of this type of transnational strategy. When separating return from mobility, we do not take into account the current migratory trends and we actually hinder migrants' attempts to return in their countries of origin. Constraints, such as those relating to the obligation to renounce to residence permit in order to join programs of Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR), neglect the transnational dimension of migration and lead to the failure of the policies that have been promoted.

On the basis of these observations, we ask return is not designed as a stand-alone measure but, on the contrary, is integrated to strategies for mobility. We therefore propose:

- The adoption, at Community and individual Member States level, of integrated strategies for mobility *and* return, which reduce the legal obstacles to return (i.e. demand for uninterrupted stay or waiver of the permit) and rather create incentives for mobility (i.e. facilitating the re-entry, freezing of residence periods when not used).

---

[4] Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on common standards and procedures for returning illegally staying third countries nationals, December 2008; European Commission, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on EU Return Policy, COM(2014)199 final

- The inclusion of return projects in National Strategies for *voluntary* return in third countries. Several third countries, such as Albania, are provided with Action Plans for the management of the reintegration processes. In the absence of sufficient resources, however, many of the recommendations included in these strategies are likely to remain on paper; at the same time, return projects promoted by Member countries are often disconnected from each other and do not always fall within the priorities and the institutional framework set up by local governments.
- The promotion of more in-depth analysis on the impact of return on local welfare systems and the strengthening of on site services more involved in the reintegration process. The prototype of the 'successful migrant', who returns to invest in his/her origin country after acquiring capital and knowledge abroad, is nowadays far from reality. More often, those who return have lost their job in the host country and seek a new one in their origin country. New vulnerabilities and new social needs emerge in relation to housing, employment, inclusion in the health and education systems, policies for the elderly, etc. All this requires a careful analysis of needs, costs and reforms to be made.
- Reforming the tool of the Assisted Voluntary Return regulated by Directive 575/2007 in order to reach a higher number of beneficiaries, also those holding a residence permit.

3.2.3. Third Pillar: Promoting international protection and strengthening the external dimension of asylum policy[5]

The significant flow of refugees and people fleeing from war and socio-political crisis and environmental contexts places Europe, and Italy at first, in front of the complex challenge of ensuring the reception and security in the European space (against wars and not against migrants) and granting the respect of human rights to migrants, and in particular the right of asylum.

Within this frame, we propose to:
- Redefine the dialogues and partnerships on migration, both within the framework of bilateral agreements and within the euro-African and euro-Mediterranean policy, focusing on the protection of human rights. In the framework of the existing bilateral and regional dialogues, it is necessary to forbid any form of collective expulsion, to affirm the principle of non-refoulement and to include guarantees for access to asylum procedures, starting from the first host country.
- Reformulate cooperation with third countries in terms of *burden* sharing and not of *burden shifting* and *conditionality*. It is necessary to strengthen the mechanisms for asylum and integration implemented by origin and transit countries, by demanding and monitoring the full respect of human rights; at the same time, European countries should promote wider *resettlement* operations (together with greater opportunities for mobility within the EU), and testing of protected entry forms enabling the right of asylum application at consular authorities and embassies in origin countries. The measures for protected entry have, to date, proved impractical if carried out by a single country, but could be viable if implemented in most countries of origin and transit, through actions able to engage in a coordinated way all member countries. These measures should be adopted in association with other measures recommended in the present document (i.e. increase of legal migration, fight against *smuggling* networks,

---

[5] Many of the recomandations contained in this chapter have been elaborated thanks to the collaboration with Lorenzo Coslovi (CeSPI)

resettlement operations, etc.). At the same time it is necessary to pursue a real *burden sharing* in Europe, providing greater solidarity - in terms of economic and physical distribution of the holders of protection through the introduction of mandatory quotas - but also a cost sharing for social assistance throughout the European Union, for the entire period during which the foreigner is not self-sufficient.

- Maintain and defend the humanitarian approach in rescue and reception interventions. Although the promotion of legal channels to access protection represents the main priority, the capacity of intervention and rescue in the sea is a necessary requirement. It is necessary to: maintain rescue operations in international waters; promote synergy between national authorities and civil agents (fishermen in particular); facilitate the transfer of know-how gained in the search and rescue operations to third countries; support the continuity between rescue and first reception. The operation Mare Nostrum has represented a fundamental change of course compared to the control approach. In this regard, we deem necessary that the mission Frontex Plus/Triton, which currently seems to be centred on interdiction and contrast measures, will constantly ensure rescue and reception on a same ground as Mare Nostrum.

- Support and strengthen the role of EASO (European Asylum Support Office), promoting joint processing of asylum applications (Triandafyllidou 2014). This would boost the procedural safeguards and reduce time and costs of examining applications; it would also contribute to the establishment of a greater solidarity and confidence among the participating countries.

- Strengthening coherence among asylum management, mobility and return with a view to circulation for development and not only to fight against irregularities. Given the mixed nature of the refugees' flows (asylum seekers, people fleeing from political, social and economic crises), the asylum policies should be included in a global strategy that integrates the different pillars of the Global Approach and promotes a better synergy and coherence among migration policies, policies for the development and peace promotion policies. Refugees and beneficiaries of protection should not be seen solely as subjects of assistance but also as possible resources for new international relations, actions of *peace building* and human development projects[6].

- Give recognition to environmental refugees; promote initiatives that strengthen the contribution of the diaspora in the activities to improve the adaptive capacity of origin communities to climate change.

3.2.4. Fourth pillar: increasing the impact of migration and mobility on development

In a 2011 study, the OECD highlights the need to rethink the M&D nexus with a triple win view: 'The lack of cooperation on migration issues implies an opportunity cost for the countries that implement them. The lack of reciprocity regarding the benefits derived between low and high-income may be illusory, since immigration constitutes a potential response to problems of labour shortage and ageing populations faced by most OECD countries (OECD 2011, p. 29).

Based on these considerations, we propose to update the reflection on the relationship between migration and development by devoting a greater attention to the principle of "*policy coherence*"

---

[6] The Re-startup project, ended in June 2014, shows that it is possible to undertake actions in this direction. In a two-year period 11 new refugee-owned companies were set up and 243 refugees coming from Sub-Saharian Africa, the Middle East, East Asia benefited from an entrepreneurial training. The Diaspeace project, which was coordinated in Italy by CeSPI, and then the MIDA Somalia projects of IOM were instead focused on the potential of Somali, Ethiopian and Eritran migrants (who were often refugees and asylum-seekers) to play a key role in the peace-building processes in Italy and in the origin contexts, through a number of concrete cooperation initiatives.

and to the processes of reciprocity and *'mutual* benefit', especially as the mobility partnerships are concerned. On this base, we also propose to shift the attention from the objective of "remittances enhancement for local development" to the aim of "financial inclusion" at transnational level.

A - Increase *Policy coherence for Co-development*

In the framework of the PCD Policy, the European Commission recommends to *'mainstream'* migration in development thinking and development strategies. To date, the focus is primarily on the '*mainstreaming*' of migration in Poverty Reduction Strategies (ECDPPM - ICMPD 2013, p. 29). This commitment must be strengthened and accompanied by the '*mainstreaming*' of migration for development goals in other areas, *both* in the contexts of origin and destination, thus with a *co-development view*. This second orientation is better summarised in the more general concept of 'policy coherence' (COM(2011) 743 final, p. 19).

In this respect, we recommend that:

- The Council invites EU Member States and the European Commission to draw up a work program on Policy coherence for Co-development, similar to what was done for the PCD.
- The Commission launches a consultative process, in the framework of the existing dialogues with third countries, which will lead to a Communication on the Policy coherence for co-development.
- In the programmes negotiated by Member States with the European Commission for the obtention of the Structural Funds, a set of mandatory indications are included on how to improve the coherence between development goals and governance of migration.
- The main programs and funding that allow to invest on the management and development of migration processes (Thematic Programme 'Global Goods and Challenges', International Migration and Asylum Fund, Cross Border Cooperation within IPA and ENI instruments, etc.) comply with the criterion of transnational coherence making it possible to operate *simultaneously* in the contexts of emigration and immigration in order to improve the management of migration and achieve *mutual* benefits.
- The EU Delegations assess the bi-directionality, bi-focality and transnational coherence of the M&D policies/projects through monitoring and periodic reports.

B - Promote effective reciprocity in Mobility Partnerships[7]

The mobility partnerships are the most advanced tools and at the same time a showcase of the Global Approach. As stated by the European Commission, they are: 'The bilateral dialogues in their rich variety provide a useful channel for strengthening cooperation, addressing relevant, and at times sensitive migration and mobility issues of mutual concern, and for building trust between partners'(COM(2014) 96 final, p. 9).

In order to effectively implement what has been stated, we need to:

- Re-build mobility partnerships on a hard core of common obligations based on the respect of human rights, with mechanisms of monitoring, control and resolution of conflicts.

---

[7] Wider suggestions concerning Mobility partnerships can be found in: Concord Italia (2014) and in Coslovi - Stocchiero (2014)

- Rebalance Partnerships' priorities: from an approach focused on security and border control to a growing importance of the axis on M&D and on regular mobility. Today, the easing of the visa regime concerns only temporary migration or certain categories of selected migrants (i.e. students, researchers) but not long-term visas.
- Abandon the perspective of conditionality which subordinates the application of the partnerships to the signing of readmission agreements by third countries. The reciprocity of interests should prevail over unilateral conditioning. In this regard Fanjul (2014, pp. 23-24) notes that: 'the very Mobility Partnerships and dialogues that have been opened with a series of developing regions might provide a good basis to start from. But the challenge is to go beyond the narrow limits of the current approach and consider a system in which all three parties (origin and destination countries, as well as migrants) have more to gain than to lose. Only this way they will be willing to comply with its rules, controlling and self-restricting irregular migration in exchange for expanded and safer opportunities for temporary mobility'.
- Encourage an approach that is truly shared, mutual and able to work at transnational level. It is necessary to provide agreements or paths of reform and innovation involving simultaneously origin and destination countries; their aim should be the promotion of *mutual* benefits and the management of *common* challenges; for instance: transnational networks of services; extension of programmes for transnational learning and employment mobility - as Erasmus Plus, Erasmus young entrepreneurs, Your first EURES - to the partner countries; institutional building in the origin *and* recipient countries for the development of common strategies with regard to the enhancement of migration in relationship with trade, foreign investment, transnational entrepreneurship, etc.
- Ensure consistency among strategic actions, which today are an amount of projects rather than parts of a comprehensive and long-lasting strategy.
- Communitarize the Mobility Partnerships: all member states and not just some of them should participate to them.
- Widen the spaces for representation of different stakeholders at different levels, involving non-state actors and diaspora associations which, despite the EU rhetoric, are currently almost excluded from these processes.

C - Strengthening financial inclusion and the impact of remittances[8]

Traditionally, the European Commission has promoted the valorisation of remittances' flow - through safer, quicker and faster channels – as a tool for leveraging development in the South.

Such policies are certainly useful to free resources but are not sufficient to generate triple winning processes. In our opinion, it is necessary to adopt a bi-focal and transnational perspective that includes also countries of arrival, boosting the objective of *transnational financial inclusion*. Only by ensuring an effective transnational financial inclusion – through strengthened connections between the financial systems at the two poles of the migratory process - it will be possible to allow migrants to achieve an adequate power of allocation, control and management of their savings. In fact, the more resources pass through formal channels, the higher the possibility for financial institutions to get information and grant loans and mortgages. Moreover, the greater the transnational links between financial institutions, the greater the possibility of offering services that meet the needs of transnational migrants (remittances *in prims*), the higher the attractiveness of savings in formal channels, and therefore the financial inclusion. In this way, productive investment

---

[8] This section was drafted with the scientific supervision of Daniele Frigeri. Further inputs can be found in Frigeri (2012).

opportunities of migrants will increase (both in the contexts of destination and of origin), as well as the economic and social planning of families at transnational level.

We therefore think it is necessary to:

- Strengthen the links between financial systems and financial operators bilaterally to allow for transnational financial inclusion. The financial platforms promoted by CeSPI in Ecuador, Peru, Senegal follow this direction, thanks to the definition of joint financial services that facilitate the transfer of remittances, attract and enhance the savings (in Italy or in the contexts of origin) and guarantee, at the same time, support to local financial institutions (micro-finance institutions in Senegal and savings and credit cooperatives in Latin America).
- Focus attention and resources on the goal of financial inclusion in the contexts of destination and origin. A person that is financially included multiplies the opportunities for savings, credit and investment as well as the possibilities of generating development for him/herself, for the countries of origin and those of destination. The monitoring of these processes is strategic, as evidenced by the practice of the National Financial Inclusion of Migrants in Italy managed by the Italian Home Affair Ministry in collaboration with CeSPI.

REFERENCES

Ambrosini, Maurizio, *Non passa lo straniero? Le politiche migratorie tra sovranità nazionale e diritti umani*, La cittadella, Assisi, 2014.

Ambrosini, Maurizio, *Migration and transnational commitment: some evidence from the Italian case*, in "Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies" published on line 6 Sep 2013.

Amnesty International, The human cost of Fortress Europe. Human Rights violations against migrants an refugees at Europe's borders, 2014

Arendt, Hannah , *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1979.

Beck, Ulrich, *Risk society. Towards a new modernity*, Sage, London, 1992

Beck, Ulrich - Grande, Edgar, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, Polity, Cambridge, 2007.

Benhabib, Seyla, *Another cosmopolitanism*, OUP, Oxford, 2006.

Black, Richard - Sward, Jo, *Migration, Poverty Reduction Strategies and Human Development.* in: *Human Development,* Research Paper (HDRP) Series , Vol. 38, No. 2009, 2009.

Boswell et al., *The role of narratives in migration policy-making: a research framework*, in "The British Journal of politics & International relations", 13(1), 2011.

Concord Italia, *Migrazioni e Sviluppo nel Mediterraneo*, Lampedusa, 4 October 2014.

Council of the European Union, Development Issues, (Presse 648), 12 December, 2014.

Council of the European Union, *Presidency Conclusions, Seville European Council*, (13463/02), 21-22 June 2002.

Council of the European Union, *Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council,* 15-16 October 1999.

Coslovi, Lorenzo – Stocchiero, Andrea, *Migranti e diritti tra Europa e Mediterraneo. Dal salvataggio dei migranti a nuove misure per la mobilità e il ritorno in un'ottica di sviluppo*, CeSPI - Istituto Internazionale di diritto umanitario, 2014

De Haas, Hein, *The migration and development pendulum. A critical view on research and policy,* in "International Migration", 50 (3), 2012.

De Haas, Hein, *Migration and development: a theoretical perspective*, in 'International Migration Review', 44 (1), 2010.

Delgado Wise, Raùl – Màrques Cavarrubiàs, Humberto, *Understanding the relationship between migration and development: toward a new theoretical approach*, in Glick Shiller, Nina – Faist, Thomas (edited by), *Migration, development, transnationalization. a critical stance*, Berghan books, New York – Oxford, 2010.

ECDPPM - ICMPD, *Migration and Development Policies and Practices. A mapping study of eleven European Countries and the European Commission*, SDC, Bern, 2013.

European Commission, *A Global Partnership for Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development after 2015*, COM(2015) 44 final, 2015.

European Commission, *Report on the implementation of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility - 2012-2013*, COM(2014) 96 final, 2014.

European Commission, *Maximising the development impact of migration*, COM (2013) 292 final, 2013.

European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Paper "Migration and Development" accompanying the document Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility,* SEC(2011) 1353 final, 2011.

European Commission, *European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals*, COM(2011) 455 final, 2011.

European Commission, *The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility,* COM(2011) 743 final, 2011.

European Commission, *Migration and development: some concrete orientations*, COM(2005) 390 final, 2005.

Fanjul, Gonzalo, *Europe beyond Aid: assessing European Commitment to Migration*, Center for Global Migration, 2014.

Fine, Robert, *Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights: Radicalism in a Global Age*, in "Metaphilosophy", vol.40, no.1, 8-23, 2009.

Frigeri, Daniele, *Rimesse, inclusione finanziaria e sostegno alle istituzioni di micro-finanza. Un modello pilota tra Italia e Senegal*, in Ceschi, Sebastiano, (edited by), *Movimenti migratori e percorsi di cooperazione. L'esperienza di co-sviluppo di Fondazioni 4 Africa-Senegal,* Carocci, Roma, 2012.

Glick Shiller, Nina, *A global perspective on Migration and Development*, in Glick Shiller, Nina – Faist, Thomas (edited by), *Migration, development, transnationalization. A critical stance*, Berghan books, New York – Oxford, 2010.

Gropas, Ruby, *The migration-development nexus: time for a paradigm shift,* Notre Europe - Eliamep, February 2013.

Hammar, Thomas, *Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens, Denizens, and Citizens* in a World of International Migration, Aldershot, Avebury, 1990.

Harvey, David, *Neoliberalism as a creative destruction*, in "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science" 610 (1), 2007.

Held, David - McGrew, Anthony, *Globalismo e antiglobalismo*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2001.

IADB, Capitalizaciòn de remesas para desaròllo economico local, 2000.

Laczko, Frank – Lönnback, Lars J., Migration and the United Nations post-2015 development agenda, IOM, Geneva, 2013.

Lönnback, Lars J., *Integrating migration into the post-2015 United Nations Development Agenda*, IOM-MPI Issue Brief n°10, September 2014.

Marchetti, Raffaele, *La politica della globalizzazione*, Mondadori, Milano, 2014.

Maroukis, Thanos - Triandafyllidou, Anna, *Mobility partnerships: a convincing tool for the EU's global approach to migration?,* Notre Europe - Eliamep, February, 2013.

OECD, *Tackling the policy challenges of migration: regulation, integration, development*, OECD Publishing, 2011

Pastore, Ferruccio, *The global approach under stress*, paper presented at the workshop on *EU external relations and migration. Sustainable implementation of the global approach*, European Policy Centre (EPC), Bruxelles, 13 maggio 2009.

Pastore, Ferruccio, *Il vincolo interno. Immigrazione e relazioni esterne,* in Gualtieri, Roberto – Pastore, Ferruccio (edited by), *L'Unione Europea e il governo della globalizzazione. Rapporto sull'integrazione europea*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2008.

Pastore, Ferruccio, *Transnazionalismo e co-sviluppo: concetti utili o aria fritta? Riflessioni a partire dall'esperienza di ricerca del CeSPI*, CeSPI Working Paper, February 2006.

Piperno, Flavia - Tognetti Bordogna, Mara. (edited by), *Welfare transnazionale. La frontiera esterna delle politiche sociali*, Ediesse, Roma, 2012

Piperno, Flavia, *Migrations and Care Services: Strategic Options for a Social Co-Development Policy in Albania*, CeSPI Working Papers 78/2013.

Ratha, Dilip, *Workers' Remittances: An Important and Stable Source of External Development Finance* in World Bank, *Global Development Finance 2003*. World Bank, Washington D.C., 2003.

Rumford, Chris (edited by), *Cosmopolitanism and Europe*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2009.

Sterkx, Steven, *The External Dimension of EU Asylum and Migration Policy: Expanding Fortress Europe?*, in Jan Orbie (edited by), *Europe's Global Role – External Policies of the European Union*, Ashgate, Surrey, 2008.

Stocchiero, Andrea, *Migration Default in Post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals*, GCAP Italy, Discussion Paper, July 2014a.

Stocchiero, Andrea, *La coerenza delle politiche e le migrazioni*, Concord Italia, 2014b.

Triandafyllidou, Anna, *Managing migration and asylum in Europe. Three proposals for Europe 2020*, European University Institute, Issue 2014/01, 2014

Van Selm J., *Immigration and asylum or foreign policy: the EU's approach to migrants and their countris of origin*, in Lavenex Sandra - Uçarer Emek (edited by), *Externalities of integration: the wider impact of the devoping EU migration regime*, Lexington Books, New York-Oxford, 2002.

WorldBank, *Final Report of the International Working Group on Improving Data on Remittances*. Washington, DC: World Bank with input from the International Monetary Fund, 2007

Yeates Nicola*., Globalizzazione e politica sociale,* Centro Studi Erikson, Trento 2004.

Zupi, Marco, *Per una nuova "Vision on the post-2015 development agenda*", Osservatorio di Politica Internazionale, September, 2014 a.

Zupi, Marco*, Migrazioni, diritti umani e libera circolazione dei lavoratori*, in Zupi, Marco (edited by), FOCUS Migrazioni internazionali, Osservatorio trimestrale N. 3, CeSPI/Osservatorio di Politica Internazionale, Parlamento italiano, October – 2014 b