

Measuring Progress: GCM indicators

Global Consultation for Member States

6 February 2024

Summary Report

Background

The United Nations Network on Migration workstream on "Development of a proposed limited set of indicators to review progress related to the GCM implementation" was established in response to the mandate outlined in paragraph 70 of the [Progress Declaration](#) of the International Migration Review Forum (IMRF), where Member States requested the Secretary-General, in his next biennial report, to propose a **limited set of indicators**, drawing on the global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda and other relevant frameworks.

In line with its [workplan](#), the workstream organized several rounds of consultation. Following the five consultations at the regional level held in July 2023, two global consultations - one for Member States and one for stakeholders - were convened in early 2024.

This report provides an overview of the Member States' consultation on 6 February 2024, and showcases the workstream's activities, including the presentation of a revised proposal for a limited set of indicators building on the feedback from both the regional consultations ([summary report](#)) and an online survey on the preliminary proposal for a limited set of GCM indicators ([summary report](#)).

Objectives

The global consultation for Member States had two main objectives:

1. Facilitate technical discussions involving statistical and policy experts from interested government agencies.
2. Enable participants to provide feedback on the suggested indicators' relevance and measurability, and contribute to refining the selection of indicators.

In preparation for the consultation, a [discussion note](#) containing a revised proposal on a limited set of indicators was published on 6 December 2023.

To guide the discussions, participants were invited to reflect on the following guiding questions:

- Is the proposed limited set of indicators for the GCM suitable in terms of its relevance, scope, coverage, balance and ability to compare progress over time and across different countries and regions?
- Does the proposal align well with other global frameworks, such as the SDGs, while also reflecting migration dynamics?
- Among the suggested indicators, which ones should be retained as core and additional for effective monitoring of the GCM?

- How do these proposed indicators compare against the indicators currently in use in countries?
- Are there any additional specific migration dimensions or sub-regional variations that should be considered in the proposal?

Organization and speakers

The [global consultation for member states](#) was convened virtually on 6 February 2024 (14:30 – 16:30 CET).

The consultation featured opening remarks from the United Nations Network on Migration Secretariat delivered by:

- Mr. Jonathan Prentice, Head, United Nations Network on Migration Secretariat

The opening remarks were followed by a presentation on the process leading up to the revised proposal on a limited set of indicators, by the workstream co-leads:

- Ms. Irene Schöffberger, Data and Research Officer, International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- Ms. Clare Menozzi, Chief, Demographic Analysis Section, Population Division, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)

Keynote addresses on the overarching theme *“Towards GCM Monitoring: Challenges and Opportunities of Developing a Limited Set of Indicators for the GCM”* were delivered by:

- Mr. Diego Iturralde, Chief Director for Demography and Population Statistics, Statistics South Africa
- Ms. Karima Belhaj, Chief of the Population Policy Monitoring Department, High Commission for Planning of Morocco

The keynote addresses were followed by interactive discussions examining the proposed set of indicators for each GCM objective clustered according to the groupings of the International Migration Review Forum (IMRF) round tables. The four clusters were moderated by the following workstream members:

- Mr. Paul Tacon, Labour Migration Specialist, International Labour Organization
- Ms. Estrella Lajom, Statistics and Monitoring Specialist, IDAC Coordinator, UNICEF
- Ms. Paddy Siyanga Knudsen, Vice President, Global Research Forum on Diaspora & Transnationalism (GRFDT)
- Mr. Dominik Kneer, Human Mobility Specialist, Crisis Bureau - Recovery Solutions and Human Mobility, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

At the beginning of each cluster, representatives of one or more member states delivered brief interventions, as per prior agreement. Following this, other member states joined the discussions. The brief interventions were delivered by:

- Ms. Stefanie Scharf, Head of Division G20 – Policy Issues of Displacement and Migration, German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
- Mr. Eduardo Quá, Agency for Integration, Migration and Asylum (AIMA), Portugal

- Ms. Julibeth Rodríguez, Technical Advisor for Migration Project, Demography Subdepartment, National Institute of Statistics Chile
- Mr. Walter Schuldt, Minister at the Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the United Nations in Geneva
- Mr. Ulvi Aliyev, Chief of the International Cooperation Department of the State Migration Service of the Republic of Azerbaijan

The closing remarks were delivered by:

- Ms. Marina Manke, Chief of IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC)

Participants

The global consultation for Member States brought together a diverse group of over 140 participants representing a wide range of countries and areas of expertise.

Participants included 61 Member States, the European Union as an observer to the United Nations, and representatives of the UNNM workstream on indicators. Several government delegations included representatives from relevant ministries, national statistical offices, and Permanent Missions in Geneva and New York, in line with the whole-of-government principle of the GCM.

Table 1. Member States that participated in the global consultation for Member States, by region

Africa	Arab States	Asia and the Pacific	Europe and Northern America	Latin America and the Caribbean
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Botswana • Burkina Faso • Ghana • Malawi • Sierra Leone • South Africa • United Republic of Tanzania • Zambia • Zimbabwe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algeria • Egypt • Iraq • Morocco • Saudi Arabia • Jordan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australia • Brunei Darussalam • Malaysia • Myanmar • Nepal • Philippines • Thailand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belgium • Canada • Croatia • Cyprus • Denmark • Finland • France • Germany • Greece • Italy • Malta • Netherlands (Kingdom of the) • Norway • Portugal • Slovakia • Spain • Sweden • United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland • United States of America 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argentina • Bahamas • Brazil • Chile • Colombia • Costa Rica • Ecuador • El Salvador • Guatemala • Mexico • Panama • Peru • Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

Feedback and recommendations from global consultation for member states

The sections below summarize the main observations, comments and recommendations from the global consultation for member states.

A. Keynote speeches

The keynote speakers provided insights into the complexities of the process of identifying a proposal of a limited set of indicators to review progress on the Global Compact. Their recommendations underscored the importance of considering migrants' perspectives, enhancing data disaggregation, strengthening institutional capacities, and fostering international collaboration to ensure the effective review and implementation of the GCM objectives.

Mr. Diego Iturralde, Chief Director for Demography and Population Statistics at South Africa, acknowledged the balanced coverage of thematic areas around migration, and welcomed the addition of a section on key background statistics, as well as conventions and legal instruments. Mr. Iturralde also reiterated the importance of strengthening the capacity to collect migration data, especially data on flows, in countries where such capacities were limited. He emphasized the importance of considering indicators disaggregated by citizenship and suggested leveraging existing frameworks such as the Migration Governance Indicators (MGI), SDG Indicator Framework and the International Data Alliance for Children on the Move (IDAC) while noting the indicators have been selected after a rigorous selection process made of nine comparison criteria. Mr. Iturralde also stressed the importance of improving data disaggregation, particularly at the local level, and the need for investment to enhance the use of administrative data so that they can be more relevant for migration governance and policymaking. He called for establishing a global capacity-building programme to address capacity gaps, while also advocating for better coordination between national statistics offices and line departments. Finally, he emphasized that each country possesses ownership of the indicators and data. The purpose is not to compare countries' implementation of the GCM but rather to reflect their policies. The selected indicators should track the effectiveness of the policies developed and implemented over time by countries.

Ms. Karima Belhaj, Chief of the Population Policy Monitoring Department, High Commission for Planning of Morocco, stressed that while the proposed indicators met the needs for reviewing progress at the national level, their relevance at a more micro level - that is to capture individual migrants' experiences - should be assessed. She underscored the need for indicators to reflect migrants' access to essential services and their social and economic integration, emphasizing the importance of addressing obstacles faced by migrants in enjoying their rights. Ms. Belhaj highlighted the role of indicators and data collection processes in enhancing the positive contributions of migrants for both host countries and countries of origin and underscored the importance of aligning such indicators with local contexts and regional specificities. She emphasized the challenges associated with identifying a limited set of indicators to review the implementation of the GCM and collecting the relevant data, including political will, institutional coordination, and data quality issues. Finally, Ms. Belhaj recommended capitalizing on the skills and resources, that many national statistical offices possess and leveraging that expertise, through international support, to rollout the indicators and build capacity and strengthen analysis and research capabilities in other countries where that capacity was weaker.

B. Cluster I: Objectives 2, 5, 6, 12, and 18

Participants emphasized the importance of the proposal for a limited set of indicators to assess progress on the implementation of the GCM. They stressed the need for identifying appropriate and meaningful indicators for policy planning, disaggregated as necessary, and aligned with existing data and statistics to avoid overburdening capacities. Member States noted that the revised proposal reflected these principles well and recognized the workstream's responsiveness to past survey feedback, particularly regarding the inclusion of additional indicators addressing gender-responsive migration policies. Appreciation was expressed for the participatory approach adopted by the workstream in developing the proposal for a limited set of indicators.

Member States provided examples of national data collection practices, such as migrant observatories, which systematically collect information on migrant integration from various line ministries. They also highlighted the importance of assessing migrants' positive contributions to host societies, including those of migrant women. Several Member States, including some GCM Champion countries, welcomed the proposal for a limited set of indicators and noted its relevance for supporting national GCM implementation and review processes and for benchmarking progress and identifying best practices in migration policies. Participants stressed the need for coherence between the proposal and international human rights conventions and SDGs.

Member States acknowledged that there were still some technical details to be addressed and highlighted the importance of maintaining a reasonable number of indicators to prevent overburdening countries with limited statistical capacities and resources. They reiterated their commitment to the GCM and its review process and to participating in both political and technical discussions on its implementation. Clarification on the timeline for finalizing the proposal was provided by the co-leads upon participants' request.

C. Cluster II: Discussion on Objectives 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 21

Member States underscored the importance of data-driven approaches in addressing migration challenges and review progress towards GCM objectives. Participants appreciated the collaborative approach taken by the workstream in formulating the indicators and stressed the importance of data disaggregation. Concerns were raised regarding the challenges in measuring certain indicators, such as recruitment costs and migrant deaths or disappearances. Recommendations included further refining the wording of certain indicators, clarifying their applicability, and addressing methodological challenges. Additionally, suggestions were made to leverage existing indicators and indicator frameworks wherever possible.

Member States presented national efforts to consolidate data from various domestic institutions to bolster migration statistics. They stressed the importance of evidence-based policymaking and highlighted national initiatives and policies aimed at enhancing data collection and analysis, improving the harmonization of cross-cutting concepts and clarifying reporting mechanisms.

Participants noted that most of the indicators in Cluster II met the nine criteria established by the workstream and were drawn from existing indicator frameworks. They also suggested that the key background information section would benefit from a common conceptual framework, such as the revised conceptual framework adopted by the United Nations Statistical Commission at its fifty-second session through its Decision 52/109. Some Member States proposed adjustments to the additional indicators for some objectives, suggesting changes

to their quantity or formulation, clarity in their applicability in a way that is comparable between countries.

For instance, they proposed amending one of the proposed indicators for Objective 4 (on legal identity and adequate documentation) to add aspects such as “regardless of place of parental birth country” or “irrespective of migratory status”. They also stressed the difficulty of measuring Objective 8, which focuses on saving lives, and suggested including an indicator to assess whether the country had access to death and cause of death statistics, while noting the relevance and contribution of the four additional indicators. Regarding Objective 10, one participant suggested incorporating variables such as country of origin and nationality into some of the additional indicators to analyze trafficking flows, stressing the need for enhanced coordination systems between states to collect such data. The issue of comparability across countries was also raised, citing differences in legal frameworks regarding detention based on migratory status.

Several participants emphasized the potential of the limited set of indicators to improve data consistency and comparability, stressing its utility for regional and global reviews of GCM implementation. Member States commended the workstream’s efforts in promoting transparency and a collaborative approach in developing the proposal, as well as for incorporating the GCM’s cross-cutting principles, especially regarding gender responsive indicators. Participants inquired about the effective integration of the indicators into Member States’ review processes, considering the diverse contexts and reporting mechanism in each state. They also offered to explore ways to utilize the proposed indicators for their domestic reviews of GCM implementation, focusing on indicators for which data was already collected.

Some participants proposed that certain indicators could be improved by disaggregating them based on migratory status. For example, the indicator related to the proportion of informal employment under Objective 2, which focuses on minimizing adverse drivers, could be disaggregated accordingly. Other participants highlighted methodological challenges in measuring some of the indicators, such as recruitment costs and the number of migrants who died or disappeared during migration. Some Member States requested further guidance to address these challenges and proposed reclassifying some of these indicators as additional rather than core until methodological issues had been fully addressed.

D. Cluster III Discussion: Objectives 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 22

The discussion highlighted the importance of minimizing the burden to Member States and better differentiating indicator types based on their relevance and regularity of reporting. Some participants voiced concern regarding the alignment of certain indicators with the text of the GCM, emphasizing the need for greater consistency. Recommendations included providing technical guidance to clarify indicators, reporting processes, and ensuring alignment with international human rights standards and guiding principle such as gender responsiveness.

Commenting on Objectives 14 and 15, one State expressed support for the proposed indicators, and underscored it was technically appropriate the clarifications included in the footnote, considering the need to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. They also underscored the significance of national dialogues on migration policies and emphasized inclusion for all, including returning nationals. On Objective 22, some participants remarked on the pertinence of proposed indicators noting that some of them were covered by

international and bilateral conventions to prevent double taxation for migrants and ensure pensions.

Additionally, some Member States suggested streamlining the indicator proposal, including by reducing the number of indicators to alleviate the burden on countries and by further differentiating indicators based on relevance. They also suggested identifying a baseline to assess progress and encouraged the workstream to elaborate technical guidance on the proposed indicators. Member States congratulated the workstream on maintaining a balanced vision for the GCM's application and reaffirmed their commitment to a human rights-centric approach in their national work. They invited all States to provide their views and positions on the proposal to ensure its successful implementation.

As part of the discussion, a joint statement on behalf of several Member States was delivered. While acknowledging improvements made to the revised proposal, particularly in the incorporation of diverse indicator frameworks, the statement underscored the need for further scrutiny regarding certain indicators and their alignment with the GCM text. The statement stressed the need for further refinement to ensure comprehensive coverage and fidelity to the GCM's negotiated language. Specifically, the relevant Member States emphasized their understanding that the GCM recognized State competency regarding the provision of services beyond basic services to migrants, based on their legal status. The statement also cautioned against elevating actions included under GCM objectives as indications of successful GCM implementation, viewing them instead as examples of good practices. Finally, they requested more clarity on the utilization, measurement, and evaluation of the indicators and collected data within the framework of the International Migration Review Forum (IMRF) and GCM progress evaluation, with a willingness expressed to engage further on the topic.

Other participants emphasized the pivotal role of indicators in reviewing GCM implementation, noting their alignment with existing tools and instruments such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Member States also reemphasized the importance of a human rights-centered approach and underscored the critical role of data and indicators in informing policy decisions. Additionally, participants commended the comprehensive and balanced coverage of GCM objectives in the proposed limited set of indicators. They suggested enhancements, such as disaggregation by migratory status and age, to improve understanding of migration dynamics. They also suggested reinforcing gender and vulnerability aspects, particularly for GCM Objective 7. Furthermore, participants highlighted the necessity of expanding and refining additional indicators under GCM Objective 2 to ensure a more effective measurement of progress.

While acknowledging the current lack of global data on voluntary and forced returns, there was a call for the collection and availability of such data in the future. Member States reaffirmed their commitment to actively contribute to the proposal's finalization. A GCM Champion country expressed its readiness to establish national working groups in the medium term, collaborating with other relevant institutions possessing statistical data to facilitate reporting on these indicators.

E. Cluster IV: Discussion on Objectives 1, 3, 7, 17, and 23

Participants emphasized the importance of leveraging administrative data and endorsed the categorization of the proposal into core and additional indicators. They emphasized the importance of evidence-based policymaking in migration governance, and the need to disaggregate data, particularly by gender and migratory status. Member States acknowledged

the progress made in developing the proposal for a limited set of indicators and emphasized the crucial role of coordination and collaboration among stakeholders in ensuring comprehensive migration data collection and dissemination. Some Member States also stressed the need for enhanced interagency coordination and improved integration of migration data sources, with a specific focus on administrative data.

Participants provided insights into some of their national practices, such as decentralized migration information systems for data collection, underlining the importance of accurate and disaggregated data for evidence-based policies. Some participants suggested further refinement of the indicators, particularly those concerning capacity-building under Objective 1, and proposed adjustments to the number of additional indicators for Objectives 3, 7, 17, and 24. Member States expressed their readiness to cooperate in achieving these objectives.

At the conclusion of the global consultation, the co-leads expressed gratitude for the comments provided by Member States and informed them the workstream would consider the feedback collected during the global consultations and through the online survey for the revision and finalization of the proposal. The co-leads highlighted synergies between the proposed indicators and the 2030 Agenda, emphasizing the need for alignment with existing reporting mechanisms such as the SDG indicator framework. Furthermore, they acknowledged the value of developing a technical guide to clarify indicator definitions and data collection methods. Addressing concerns raised regarding reporting mechanisms, the co-leads acknowledged the challenges associated with data collection for certain indicators, including recruitment costs and migrant deaths in transit, and offered to explore options to address some of these.

The co-leads reiterated the workstream's attention to data disaggregation, particularly with regards to migratory status, gender, and age, referencing Annex VI of the revised discussion note and highlighting that the workstream would develop a strategy for migration data disaggregation in the following months. Feedback collected through the survey, particularly regarding the need for balance in reflecting the guiding principles of the GCM and an increased focus on women, children, and gender in the proposal, had been incorporated. The co-leads invited Member States to reach out to the workstream regarding any remaining concerns or issues, expressing their openness to bilateral or group discussions to address them comprehensively. Regarding the disaggregation of access to services for migrants by legal immigration status, the co-chairs acknowledged the request for clarification and expressed readiness to explore solutions collaboratively. Additionally, they acknowledged the importance of keeping the indicator set limited and of ensuring the proposal's feasibility by considering the varying capacities of Member States. They echoed sentiments voiced by participants regarding the potential for leveraging the proposal to enhance statistical capacity and coordination efforts.

In her closing remarks, Ms. Marina Manke, Chief of IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC), expressed gratitude for the insightful discussions and feedback received during the consultation and encouraged continued engagement and collaboration to ensure the success of the initiative. Additionally, she extended an invitation to Member States and stakeholders to submit their written feedback to the survey on the revised proposal. Ms. Manke emphasized that the ultimate decision on how to utilize the proposed limited set of indicators would rest with individual countries and reiterated the Network's commitment to providing support to Member States upon their request in line with paragraph 70 of the IMRF Progress Declaration. She assured participants that all suggestions and ideas put forth would be carefully reviewed and integrated into the final proposal.

Overarching conclusions and next steps

The consultation for Member States provided a useful space for the workstream to share progress on the development of the revised proposal for a limited set of indicators and showcase the approach followed. The consultations also gave Member States the opportunity to express their views on the process and identify areas for further refinement in the revised proposal. Participants, including Champion countries, welcomed the progress made in developing a proposal for a limited set of indicators.

The Network acknowledged that the proposal should be seen as a starting point to be adjusted over time based on Member States' needs and experiences and that Member States will have the authority to decide on the use of the indicators.

The discussions highlighted the significance of aligning the proposed indicators with the 2030 Agenda and building on existing reporting frameworks such as the SDGs. Challenges pertaining to specific indicators, and those concerning data collection and reporting mechanisms, were noted. Member States emphasized the importance of maintaining a limited number of indicators and of ensuring appropriate data disaggregation, particularly concerning migratory status, gender, and age. Additionally, there was consensus on the need to ground the proposal in existing indicator frameworks wherever possible, to minimize the burden on States.

Regarding data quality and feasibility, several suggestions were made, including the need to explore collaborative solutions, provide technical support, or refine some of the proposed indicators. The discussions also underscored the need to clarify the concepts and definitions for some of the indicators and better describe the data collection methods, with some proposing the development of a technical guide for this purpose. The need to enhance statistical capacity and coordination was also raised. Member States expressed their commitment to ongoing engagement and collaboration to address the remaining concerns comprehensively. Overall, the consultations facilitated a robust exchange of ideas and perspectives, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of migration challenges and the review of GCM objectives.

The workstream co-leads reiterated that the feedback received through the global consultation for Member States, the global consultation for stakeholders, and through a survey conducted between December 2023 and February 2024, would help refine the proposal. The proposal, reflecting those comments and feedback, will be finalized and submitted to the Executive Committee of the UN Network on Migration. In addition, starting in April, the workstream will commence work on the second deliverable, the Migration Data Disaggregation Strategy.

The summary of this GCM Talk was prepared by the workstream co-leads and the UN Network on Migration Secretariat. It does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Network members. As a summary, it is not a verbatim transcript. Watch the full recordings [here](#).