Stefano Manservisi[2]

Keynote speech

First of all I would like to thank Mr. Trócsányi and the University of Szeged for the invitation. It is a pleasure for me to be here because, as you know, we do politics on the institutional level but I am deeply convinced that in particular when we are talking about issues touching people it is extremely important to talk to people and in particular to those who are young, who are active, who are on the ground. So it is a pleasure but it is also a part of my duty to be part of this kind of discussion. I am very happy to share with you some of my experience and knowledge.

I say to share also my experience because now I am doing the job that was described but I was previously Director-General for Home Affairs and before that Director-General for Development. I also served for a short but quite intense period as an EU Ambassador

to Turkey so I can also see the role Turkey is playing in all this. I will try to connect so to say some dots. I will not have a speech but rather give a few elements so that you can understand and situate better what we are talking about and then to have a debate. I think it is probably a better way to organise our morning.

Migration and development or development and migration ... It is a long and old story, not easy, of the relationship of these two words. It is a story of substantial convergence but very often within a dividing framework. In another sense, we are talking about issues which were deeply linked to the development of people ending up to the aspiration of movement but very often managed by the development policy in a way that was much more defensive as if something was creating problem. It was a typical result of the old north-south debate where, after the decolonisation, in particular in the 70s, the theory and the practice of the new economic order were opposing the south to the north. Saying "Look, you exploited us, now you pay through development money, and you have to give to our countries, to our towns access to other markets, in order to do this". And on the other side there was a sort of defensive: "We pay but you stay where you live". And the key element which was unifying the debate on development and migration was to take care

not to affect the progress of education in the third countries and not to create a brain-drain effect. Therefore, for a long period, the two worlds were working on the same area but with two different narratives, very often opposing each other. But then, over the years, in particular in the globalised world, the issue of migration progressively turned into something which is better captured with another concept: mobility. Not only goods, capitals, industries are moving in a global world, but also people want to move, people from the south. Not just in the old-fashioned way of migration, pushed by poverty, which remains a key push-factor; not only people pushed by wars, which remains an important push-factor, but people simply aspiring - as ourselves, as Europeans did for years, - to be elsewhere, to do part of the studies, to do part of the professional life, to seek new opportunities somewhere else. So therefore the issue of migration is now more an issue about the mobility of people for different reasons, increasingly including climate change related issues - the way climate is changing and affecting the living conditions of people. Therefore it is more a phenomenon, a reality which must be taken in its complex way.

Facts show that the vast majority of migrants and the people in mobility are in the south. If you look at the number of refugees, if

you look at the number of migrants, if you look at the number of internally displaced people, these numbers are suggesting that the south is still hosting the vast majority of this phenomenon. But then there is also increasingly a movement towards the European Union since we are talking about the European Union now. But the key fact is that it is not a European issue, it is a global issue in which the south is already taking big part of the responsibility and burden.

Now, in terms of instrument, it is quite interesting, - coming closer to where we are now, in particular in the last 10-15 years - to see the two processes that have been managing the mobility factor from a European point of view: the development part and the migration management part. And they are quite interesting elements to have in mind. In the year 2000 when the UN agreed on the so-called MDGs (Millennium Development Goals) which were focusing on fighting against poverty in a measurable way, to organise the development policy, migration was not mentioned among the factors to be addressed. They were much more linked to poverty, to schooling, education, access to water, gender, etc. but migration was not there. In parallel, in the European Union, basically the same year, in 1999, the first ever programme of starting an integrated migration policy was contained in the so-called Tampere

Programme which was the first programme trying to integrate what at the time was the third pillar of the European Union into a policy, which was supposed to manage the internal space. But the two processes were quite separate: on one side, poverty driven, basically, on the other side, integrating the space of freedom for the Europeans - making this compatible with the Schengen acquis which was starting to take shape on the basis of an intergovernmental approach. But in spite of this, two years later the development community had to be immediately confronted with the mobility and migration factor.

The European Commission adopted a communication in 2002 which was one of the first attempts to see that migration and mobility are not addressed in the MDGs and in the main narrative. But it is a fact which we are confronting every day and therefore we have to see how we can deal with that. So it was a first attempt to organise our thinking in policy-making at the European Union level. It is quite interesting because by doing this, pushed also by the UN process, the high-level dialogue on migration and development, were the key concepts around which the Commission and then the European Union - because all this ended up with council conclusion to have an agreed policy - was to try to identify the key areas through which development policy could find some point of

convergence. The fact was acknowledged that the remittances of migrants from Europe to the country of origin represented financially speaking a mass at the time almost equivalent to the development aid which was put into the circuit. At the time almost equivalent, today by far much bigger. Point number two: to realise that the community of migrants established legally in a country in the European Union could be or could have been a tool to reach out for the country of origin and therefore to be a partner in carrying out development activities particularly in the field of education, training, exchange of information about opportunities. Third: with a very politically correct concept to think in terms of facilitating circular migration. Circular migration is a nice concept because it is migration yes, but it is circular - implying that people come but also go back. It is clear that at the moment when Europe was still on the basis of the Tampere process of building itself a space of freedom, it was quite difficult to take up migration immediately as a component of this free space, rather there were efforts to make it compatible. We have to be aware that we do not have a migration policy in full. Let us think in terms of circular migration: people coming, going back, addressed with a visa policy and then integration still at the beginning in terms of EU policy. And last point: consolidating the basic concept which was to mitigate the adverse effect of brain-

drain, so avoiding that European Union was absorbing the majority of what the still fragile education system in the developing countries was producing. I recall an interesting story from a certain point of view: at that time there were more Swazi doctors in London than in Swaziland for example. Just to show the perverse effect of brain-drain, where, with development money, we were supporting the creation of universities, of capacity building but on the other hand we were also taking it back. This was in the first phase, which was then development policy in the European Union, further consolidated in what is called the European Consensus of Development in 2005. Without addressing migration again as a major policy, it underlined the necessity of the concept of policy coherence, i.e. to avoid destroying with policies driven by our interests - mainly migration policy - what we were achieving through development policy, i.e. creating capacities in the developing countries. So this was what they could call phase one of this sort of process; MDGs, European Consensus, Tampere and then phase two of our integration in terms of migration in the space of freedom and security. The Hague Programme which is the follow-up of the Tampere Programme - all the time, driven by this objective of creating space for the European Union: external border, common visa, Schengen, etc. But as on the development policy side,

communication tried to capture the key concept also on the internal policy side, there was the first attempt to capture in this context, in the framework of the implementation of the Hague Programme, the first element of integrity through the so-called Global Approach on Migration. The Global Approach on Migration is another document which was adopted in 2006. But this time from the internal affair side, trying to tell the story from another point of view. From the point of view of how migration can contribute or affect the process of integrating the home affairs matter, basically security, border management, the freedom of movement inside. And for the first time an official document acknowledged the reality that the European Union has to face immigration. The balance was positive immigration. The focus was put on Africa in particular, the big provider of migrants, and on the Mediterranean, mainly in the framework of neighbourhood policy and therefore the idea was to create some form of integrated approach. Then mirroring what was done in the development policy, some other concepts were put into the pipeline to set up migration profiles to understand - in particular from key African countries but not exclusively - what are the key features: who is migrating to the European Union, what are the potentialities and the risks? All this, in order to have a shared knowledge of facts, a shared knowledge of people. And this fostered

immediately some programmes of capacity building. Not in development terms but in terms of managing the phenomenon of people leaving Mali, typical example in which we set up programmes for the first time connecting these two worlds. It was a very difficult problem, talking to each other at the very beginning. Then the so-called migration centres were set up in Mali - centres to allow legal migration in an informed way, to organise training, to organise the connection with the labour market of the country in which candidates to migration were attracted. In order to avoid the intermediation of traffickers exploiting both sides. Then the concept of making legal migration easier and more transparent and then fighting against traffickers of human beings was a third pillar of this global approach on migration. And then the facts underlined that there were not only economic migrants but also people in need of protection. And taking this not only from the point of view of the European Union as destination for protection but also supporting capacities in the developing countries to host people in need of protection. And even without thinking about the Geneva Convention to enhance the standards in order to have a shared agenda and to support these countries to deal with refugees in need of legal protection, but staying also in several African countries.

Last point: for the first time, to look for money. Development policy and development assistance have always been reluctant to take migration on the forefront. But the combination of these two processes immediately pushed the internal filière to ask for more money. We had to look how we could deal with that, how we could put our instruments to the service of this. And therefore we started a debate on how we can use development money for migration related purposes. With the immediate reappearance of this dividing line, development people say "Okay, but development policy is to help them, while migration policy is to protect us". This is the contradiction and the debate is also going on right now. I hope at the end I will show some examples which are now better putting together these two aspects. So at the time - mid 2000 - we invented the specific dedicated instruments, the thematic development programme on migration and development but also using the dialogues we had with particular African countries, the African Union, etc. to start integrating some programmes linked to managing migration, capacity building, essentially into the development programme. This was, let us say, phase one where these two worlds discovered each other through different paths but all trying to define a common agenda. Then in the year of 2007 came the first big crisis, the flood of people arriving to Spain. Big shock; where the common

reality of development and migration appeared on the daylight. Daylight, because they got together the problem of the push-factors, poverty, push-factor crisis management, looking for protection, but also the management of borders. It was a credibility test for the area of freedom, security and justice just under construction. How to deal with that? This was a powerful shock and our agencies were also mobilised. A decision had to be made on how to do it: by border management and therefore just rule of law keeping them out, or development policy which by definition has a long term perspective intervening on the root causes. Fine. But now in the meantime which financial means, what to do with these people, for example who were and partly still are in Morocco, how to regulate the flows? All these questions emerged suddenly. This obliged us to review the toolbox and connect these two columns further, around a certain number of initiatives. The first one is the Rabat Process. So for the first time to have a process integrating countries of the European Union and countries of the big route of migrants, central and western Africa in particular, into a process talking at the same time about development and managing of the flows. Trying to put in concrete operation is part of the concept but also investing with ECOWAS for example, the Western Africa community, investing with the countries, investing in border management, fighting against

traffickers, hosting refugees but also creating perspectives for legal migration.

And then the wave of agreements started on the so-called mobility partnership composed by more opportunity but also a shared agenda of managing irregular migration for the sake of people themselves. Again, a combination which was difficult to set up but at that moment the development programme in bilateral assistance, in regional assistance were also put to contribution. There was the moment in which 3% of the financial envelope of the neighbourhood instrument was dedicated to deal with migration in a way or another. Then to discuss in particular with our partners in the African Union in the first ever joint EU-Africa strategy - one of the pillars was migration and employment. Putting together the two concepts is sometimes seen as toxic today because there are some problems of acceptability. But the challenge was taken; some money was put to the service of this. And the next phase was driven by on the internal affairs side by the so-called Stockholm programme in 2009, which was the last programme of integration of the old third pillar into the European Union policies and on the development side, reflecting on whether migration can be a factor which is creating development. And for the first time in a policy document of the

Commission called Agenda for Change, we presented the issue under another light, stating that migration could be an enabling factor for development. Turning radically the approach and saying: no, these two words are not conflicting. Certainly they could conflict but the essence is that they can produce development. Migration can produce development if it is well managed, meaning if we are not only able to put money into it but also to set up policies including access to the labour market. On one side there was the Agenda for Change which was suggesting this path, and on the other side there was another document called Global Approach for Migration and Mobility. There was a second "M" added, because the concept of mobility was now taken as systematic. There was not just the old way of seeing people arriving from the south and therefore managing them in one way or another but it was the concept of mobility to be one of the key elements of dealing with in creating these two policies.

The GAMM (Global Approach for Migration and Mobility) was articulated around four pillars. The first one is to make legal migration credible. Visa policy, circular and not only the circular migration and access to employment. Why? Because the acknowledgement of the fact - even if with great difficulty - that in

the European Union, we like it or not, there will be more migrants in future, not less, for demographic reasons, so there is a need for changing the labour market structure. I would say, since we are at a university, to remain competitive in the world market of talents (which in turn replaced the brain-drain starting concept) it is more dynamic and it is suggesting that the European Union should be appealing for migration in legal terms, in manageable terms. Second pillar was, this is possible only if the rule of law is implemented and therefore if irregular migration is combated not only by the European Union but combated by the countries themselves. Border management, institutions which are credible, fighting against traffickers... This is a shared agenda, not just our agenda, a sort of tit for tat for more money but a common agenda. If we recognise mobility as an enabling factor for development, well we must be equipped on both sides. The third pillar is about refugees. Refugees were also acknowledged to be the key points on which we are to set up a shared agenda. It is a common issue; it is not just an issue on the north, this is another challenge that we have to take together. The last pillar was the benefits of migration for developing in a structured way. Money, mainstreaming into projects, setting up dialogues, in each dialogue with countries not only in Africa but also in the east and building solid processes. Not only the Rabat Process

but the Budapest Process which was the one linking all the countries of the eastern route which now create a lot of problem particularly due to Syria, but not exclusively. So therefore we have all these processes: getting together our experiences, Member States, EU institutions, money and the countries of origin to manage that in a proper way. Arab Spring, 2011 added a further challenge on this, how we can do it in a smaller circle of countries which are close to us. You remember the big images from Tunisia in particular, people leaving, then replaced by the disaster of Libya, once the Libyan state disappeared. And then the issue how we can manage that and how we can manage something which is getting out of the framework, even if facing difficulties, we are increasingly trying to set up in conceptual terms, in financial terms, in policy terms.

Now, from this point of view, we are ending up with another policy document in 2013, a communication to set up the common position in the UN, in particular in the High-Level Dialogue for Migration and Development which was preparing what we called in development terms the post 2015. What is to come after the MDGs, what is to come after the Millenium Development Goals, that as I said, did not cover migration in the beginning? What is the outcome of all this? This is the SDGs, the so-called Sustainable Development

Goals which are in a sense the best example of this path - starting separated and now converging because of migration. But first SDGs are not objectives for the developing countries but are objectives for all of us. Showing that when we are talking about this and other things, including development at large, we are talking about common agenda not "we and them" - we pay, they develop. We are bound by the same challenges, therefore SDGs are the best evidence of this convergence. And migration is the element of mobility which is a pillar in the global world where mobility after all is the human face of globalisation, not only goods and money. This is the process which has driven also on the internal side to maybe work in a different way. I would like to say even more in these days, after the big push from Libya, after the big push from the east, it has shown that there is one agenda. Even if it is difficult, there is one agenda. It is not anymore we and them, it is not anymore them and us, it is a common agenda, which implied a certain number of tough choices. It means to deal with the mobility issues in a different way, to deal with the border management in a different way.

In order to deal at least for the part concerning Africa, the EU was able to set up some instruments by now. We have set up a Trust Fund which would eventually be finalised and adopted in Valletta in

the big conference putting together African states and the European Union states, in the value of 1 billion 800 million in addition to money which is spent already and possibly completed by money coming from the Member States. Why? Because this is the scale of investment that we have to do. Not just more programmes here and there. It is an issue which we have to address. This sort of permanent - not problem but - common opportunity, if badly managed, turns into a problem. If it is well managed, it turns into an opportunity. We have to do it with policy clarity, with money, with the instruments, and with the support of the public opinion. I dare say we are not there yet. I think now the emergency is overstretching everything, which is understandable. But we have to be particularly clear, to set the thinking in the long term that our future is to manage that for the better, for both and not just believe that we can get rid of them. Our society is changing, we are getting older. The labour market is transforming. We need talents. These are facts and our policy is not just a question of policy coherence but the question of policy definition - putting this together around the SDGs. So therefore the Trust Fund.

But now there is another phenomenon. You remember that I said managing migration but also refugees which is now

overwhelming everything, which is the massive inflow from the east, from Syria basically. The root causes are not long-term symptoms of poverty in terms of aspiration to mobility. The root causes are even longer term because we are talking about peace and a sustainable and credible peace, not a sectarian one for everybody in Syria and the Middle-East. Long term, but we have to create it right now, and at the same time we have to assure two things. One: to protect these people because they are in need of protection. And second: to manage our borders in a credible way is equally important because otherwise we will not be able to have the public opinion on our side. And you know it very well in Hungary, as this is a country that debates all of this. But it is a different story to manage a migration crisis and to manage a refugee crisis. These are two different issues. At the end, there is the mobility of people. At the end, there is the question of regulating entry. At the end, there is an issue of the integration of people entered but the phenomena are different. And therefore on one side we have to help those who are in need but at the same time we also have to share this with the countries of origin and transit. And what we have been doing so far in creating pillars which are about protection should also help this. It should help our dialogue with Turkey, with Lebanon, with Jordan, in order to manage the high number of refugees, much higher than we are

hosting in the European Union: 1 million 300 thousand in Turkey, 1 million in Lebanon, almost 1 million in Jordan. I think we have to work with these countries, not just to keep them away but because we said it was a common challenge. We must help each other. We have to be clear. This is now accepted by the development and refugee world: those who are in need are eligible to our scheme. Those who are not in need, respecting their human rights, but will be helped in going back and they will be returned. Returning is not expelling, is not getting rid of them, return is to accompany people to look for a better life where they are coming from. We have a programme in Pakistan, we have programmes in many countries, and it is not easy because at the beginning there are personal stories, the story of aspiration, the story of promotion, which is defeated basically. You must take care of this. And again, how? Not alone, not unilaterally. In partnership.

The issue of the basic division, which was at the beginning of our story, that development policy after all, is seen as a unilateral policy. We give because there is a difference, because we created this difference by colonisation, because we were exploiting them. There was this sort of revendication. Development was a unilateral policy at its beginning: we help, they have to develop and we help

them in developing. Migration management is, in any case, bilateral. We have to convince everybody that we have a common interest because we have a common point. At the beginning it was not so easy because developing countries were mainly saying: "You are basically doing your job and asking us to help do your job". At the beginning this was true but now if you look at all the paths we have done together you say that SDGs on one side, refugee crisis on the other side. The acknowledgement of mobility, and transformation put mobility and migration at the heart of our common policy. Well, at least we have a common ground. Let us use it, let us use it wisely. Let us use it in involving, reaching out, and building dialogue. It is not something we must do alone. By the way, if we do it alone, it will be a failure. It is a question based on solidarity. Solidarity built on common interest. I am not talking about sentiments, I am talking about common interests and this is the only way. At the same time it is important also not to put at risk all what the "columns" of Tampere, the Haag, Stockholm, Schengen are built on so far. To strengthen both is a big challenge of course, because these are hard times for everybody. But this is the only way, this is a sort of convergence of these two worlds, which were so separate. Money matters. The issue of the Trust Fund for Africa is one thing but we also have a Trust Fund for Syrian refugees. So far it is up to half a

billion, but which should reach one billion. In order to do what? To help countries hosting refugees to keep them, not as a sort of a unilateral gesture but if they want to be one of us, like Turkey, they want to be a credible partner, they have to do it and we have to help them. If you think of the ratio of inhabitants and refugees in Lebanon and the European Union, you can easily make the calculations. This does not imply that we do not have a problem. We have a problem. But managing should suggest that the idea of unilateralism should be off and the way of establishing common interests including making the law respected and credible, is also part of the story.

This is not outside development anymore; this is part of development now. This is the big change which has been done over these fifteen or so years, which are also suggesting some actions on the ground and on an institutional level. These are eventually actions to integrate more into the European Union also and to be more effective all together. These are the small aspects that I wanted to give you just as a reference in this complicated domain, trying to put together these two stories.

Thank you very much!