

**Intervention by Helena Olea during Stake Holder Hearing of the IMRF**

United Nations, NY

May 16, 2022

Thank you for the opportunity to share some ideas in this intervention assigned to civil society. I am honored to be able to participate on behalf of Alianza Americas, a network of migrant organizations from Latin America and the Caribbean in the US. We are members of networks and coalitions committed to the success of this process. My comments are based on such encounters and joint efforts. Our voices as organized migrants are essential to this process.

I would like to present 10 ideas on how to strengthen the implementation and the participation of relevant actors:

1. I wish to acknowledge the work of my brothers and sisters, colleagues from civil society organizations from all over the world who are here, as well as those who were unable to travel because they were unable to obtain their visas timely. These deliberations are deprived of their leadership and valuable contributions. It is necessary to undertake the necessary actions and steps to ensure the participation of all stakeholders in the regional consultations and in the IMRF.
2. The report of the Secretary General is a useful starting point that outlines progress and shortcomings. Differences in the approach to migration and migrants are one of the greatest challenges. Understanding human mobility as a threat, a force impossible to reckon with, as an adaptive response inherent to the human condition, or as an opportunity, results in very different public policy responses. The implementation of the GCM needs discussion and analysis spaces around these visions on migration, and their reflection in legal frameworks and public policies. Narratives around migration are fundamental for migration governance. This is a debate in which all stakeholders can contribute, and that should take place at the national level, and afterwards, in the regional consultations and in the IMRF.
3. In most States, there is a division between entities responsible for migration governance and a significant dispersion among actors responsible for the integration, inclusion, and protection of migrants, according to their conditions and needs. This results in an emphasis on the GCM as an instrument to legitimate immigration enforcement actions, and its ignorance by most public and local entities responsible for the integration, inclusion, and protection. In other words, the pan-governmental approach is not a reality yet.

To overcome this division, we need national leaderships that integrate these two elements. It is necessary to call on States to create and determine responsibilities around migration and migrants on a public official or entity, with collaboration and management capacity with other public entities. Examples such as those of the national mechanisms for women in the implementation of CEDAW, or children protection agencies for the

Convention of the Rights of the Child illustrate this point. These public officials or entities would be the direct interlocutors of the UNNM, the agencies that constitute it, and the stakeholders that work towards the implementation of the GCM.

4. Even though civil society has dedicated significant efforts to education around the GCM, promotional activities lead by the UN and the States are needed. We must make the GCM be known and used, so that it becomes the route map for public policy definition and implementation. The UNNM can play a fundamental role with a global campaign on migration, migrants and the GCM. This campaign must showcase the links with international instruments and other UN efforts and campaigns.
5. Spaces for dialogue and collaboration are closing in many States. The UN agencies can identify specific actions and programs for the implementation of the GCM, promoting the articulation and participation of diverse actors, to achieve a pan social approach. The challenge must widen from champion countries to include all countries.
6. National debate on the implementation is particularly useful and it should be the first stage, before regional consultations and the IMRF. However, this necessary and valuable exercise is only taking place in a few countries. States and other social actors benefit from discussing the outcomes and shortcomings at the national level, identifying opportunities to advance in the implementation.
7. The regional consultations and the IMRF are opportunities to make visible the relationship between the GCM and the international instruments listed on paragraph 2. The documents adopted in the review process of the GCM should reinforce the standards developed by the respective supervision bodies. For instance, the respect for workers' rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining, independent of their immigration status, and without fear of reprisals should be reiterated in the Progress Declaration.
8. The champion country initiative needs dynamism with concrete actions and continuous activities that enable to showcase significant progress towards the implementation. Also, projects funded by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund should be presented at the IMRF as an accountability exercise and opportunity to share lessons learned.
9. The participation of non-European states in the regional consultations' responsibility of UNECE is problematic because it is unfamiliar with migration patterns and regional contexts very relevant for migration. The participation of this States must be reviewed, and they should be reassigned to their region or contiguous region.
10. The [12 Key Ways Document](#) is a contribution from civil society in the identification of the priorities in the implementation of the GCM. I invite you to review it during this IMRF and during your work in the coming years.