

Measuring Progress: GCM indicators

Global Consultation for Stakeholders
28 March 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 consultations. Five regional GCM Talks on indicators were held in July 2023, followed by two global consultations - one each for Member States and stakeholders - in early 2024.

This report provides an overview of the Stakeholders' consultations on 28 March 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 GCM Talks ([summary report](#)) and an online survey on the subject ([summary report](#)).

Objectives

The global consultations for stakeholders had two main objectives:

1. Facilitate technical discussions involving statistical and policy experts.
2. Enable stakeholders 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?

Organization and speakers

The [global consultation for stakeholders](#) was convened virtually on 28 March 2024 (14:30 – 17:00 CET).

The consultation featured opening remarks from the Secretariat of the United Nations Network on Migration, 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. Clare Menozzi, Chief, Demographic Analysis Section, Population Division, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)
- Ms. Irene Schöfberger, Data and Research Officer, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

A keynote address on the overarching theme *“Towards GCM Monitoring: Challenges and Opportunities of Developing a Limited Set of Indicators for the GCM”* was delivered by:

- Ms. Ellen Percy Kraly, Colgate University and International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP)

The keynote address was followed by interactive discussions examining the proposed set of indicators for each GCM's 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:

- Ms. Irem Arf, Migration Policy Advisor, International Trade Union Confederation
- Ms. Nataliya Novakova, Europe Regional Manager, International Detention Coalition
- Mr. Rifat Hossain, Lead, Data and Evidence, Department of Health and Migration, World Health Organization
- Ms. Jenna L. Hennebry, Associate Dean at the Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada, and Founder of the Gender + Migration Hub

At the beginning of each cluster, representatives of one or more stakeholder organizations delivered brief interventions. Following this, other stakeholders joined the discussions. The brief interventions were delivered by:

- Mr. Paul Tacon, Labour Migration Specialist, International Labour Organization
- Ms. Claire Healy, Coordinator of the UNODC Observatory on Smuggling of Migrants, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- Ms. Paddy Siyanga Knudsen, Vice President, Global Research Forum on Diaspora & Transnationalism
- Ms. Michele LeVoy, Director of the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants
- Ms. Paola Cyment, Senior Project Coordinator and Advocacy Lead, Women in Migration Center
- Mr. Christian Wolff, Programme Manager, Migration and Displacement, ACT Alliance

Participants

The global consultation for stakeholders brought together a diverse group of stakeholders representing many expertise areas. In total, over 225 participants attended the consultation.

Feedback and recommendations from global consultation for stakeholders

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

A. Keynote speech

Ms. Kraly, the keynote speaker, commended the collaborative and iterative process behind the development of a proposal for a limited set of indicators, which involved Member States, national statistical offices, and various stakeholders, including civil society, who participated in regional consultations and an online survey and provided feedback to enhance the proposal's relevance and usefulness.

Ms. Kraly pointed out that the limited set of indicators proposed would not only improve the review of progress in implementing the GCM but also generate periodic and comparable data to inform evidence-based migration policies and programs at all scales: local, national, regional, and global.

Additionally, Ms. Kraly highlighted improvements in the revised proposal, such as the inclusion of key background statistics, and she acknowledged the complexity and multidimensionality of migration, and the importance of alignment with existing frameworks. She reflected on the main themes from regional consultations, such as environmental factors driving migration, gender and age characteristics, the need for disaggregated data, and building capacity.

Ms. Kraly welcomed the inclusion of Key Background Statistics as a significant enhancement to the proposal. She emphasized the importance of migrant flows and stocks as a basis for policy research and analysis. She advocated for expanding these statistics to include age and gender disaggregation to facilitate comparative analysis.

She underscored that disaggregated data are essential for comparative analysis, including comparisons between migrants and non-migrants in both origin and host communities. Ms. Kraly mentioned ongoing global research on migration simulation and the potential of GCM indicators to contribute to this field.

She suggested that international and intranational cooperation could address the challenges and help cover the costs of implementing the indicator proposal. She pointed out that Objective 23 of the GCM itself calls for strengthening such partnerships. She suggested strategically leveraging cooperation and collaboration to reduce costs associated with data collection. For example, Core Indicator 2 under Objective 8 could facilitate resource sharing between countries to help quantify the number of missing migrants.

Likewise, Ms. Kraly called for integrated migration systems that incorporated international migration and population movements into national accounting, census-taking, surveys, and civil and vital registration systems. This would require coordination within national statistical systems, as well as harmonization of concepts and definitions, and enhanced resource and information sharing.

Ms. Kraly concluded by empathizing that international cooperation and collaboration among all actors was key to realizing the GCM's objectives and principles and to support migrants and communities, all within the context of sustainable development and human rights.

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

Stakeholders commended the inclusive consultative process in developing the proposal for a limited set of indicators, building on existing frameworks endorsed by Member States. They acknowledged the challenge of covering diverse GCM objectives and highlighted the importance of integrating indicators addressing climate change, displacement, and environmental degradation.

Participants praised the inclusion of indicators on adverse drivers, decent work, and migration pathways, particularly noting their relevance to GCM objectives 2 and 5. They suggested enhancing alignment with the GCM, especially to reflect those displaced by disasters or environmental factors as mentioned in those GCM objectives. Additional proposed indicators included those related to environmental degradation and access to land and property rights.

Regarding GCM objective 6, stakeholders emphasized the significance of core indicator SDG 8.8.2, on compliance with labour rights such as freedom of association. They advocated for including indicators on collective bargaining, social media reporting on labour rights violations, access to justice, and cross-border migration of indigenous peoples.

Participants proposed an indicator to assess the existence of efficient, affordable, and expedited access to justice mechanisms for migrant workers to address issues such as wage theft, exploitation, harassment, or job loss. They highlighted the importance of these indicators in shaping evidence-based public policies, especially given ongoing labour and social rights violations worldwide.

The need to view migration through a human rights lens was emphasized, advocating for indicators that referenced freedom of association and collective bargaining to support migrant workers. Participants also stressed the importance of clarifying who would follow up on the implementation of the proposed indicators in the GCM review.

Stakeholders underscored the need for promoting self-accountability among Member States in GCM implementation and review, and the crucial role of the judiciary in protecting migrants' fundamental rights. A call was made for a clear definition of "migrant" and external oversight of the indicators to ensure accountability.

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

Stakeholders highlighted the relevance of many objectives in this cluster to the issues of migrant smuggling and human trafficking, beyond just Objectives 9 and 10. They noted that the lack of legal identity documentation (Objective 4) was a key factor driving individuals to use smugglers and become trafficked. Regarding Objective 8, the dangerous nature of smuggling journeys and aggravated smuggling offenses were identified as significant risks to migrants' lives.

Stakeholders discussed the challenges in collecting data on migrant smuggling, emphasizing discrepancies in the implementation of international legislation across countries. These inconsistencies complicated the differentiation between smuggling cases and other instances of irregular migration. They stressed the need to distinguish between refugees and migrants when addressing smuggling issues. Additionally, stakeholders called for the

inclusion of indicators on provisions to prevent the criminalization of migrants and of the organizations or individuals providing humanitarian assistance to such migrants within the context of Objectives 8, 9, and 10.

For Objective 9, participants welcomed the distinction made between smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons in core indicator one. They recommended adding an indicator to determine if smuggling was criminalized in national laws and suggested that the indicator should reflect the prosecution, conviction, and arrest rates for smuggling offenses.

Additionally, participants proposed an indicator to assess whether prevention measures addressed potential drivers of smuggling, including corruption. They emphasized the importance of indicators that measured the protection of smuggled migrants from aggravated forms of smuggling and the financial aspects of smuggling, including illicit financial flows.

Regarding Objective 10, participants stressed the need for additional indicators that differentiated between domestic and foreign trafficking cases. They recommended focusing on criminal justice data, specifically the identification, prosecution, and conviction rates of traffickers. Another suggested indicator was the breakdown of trafficking victims by their migration status. Furthermore, participants proposed an indicator to assess the protection and assistance provided to victims of trafficking, ensuring that State' responses were adequately measured.

Participants appreciated the modifications made to the proposed indicators for Objective 13 and stressed the need to retain all current indicators. While acknowledging some Member States preference to limit the indicators to the points outlined in the chapeau of Objective 13, participants emphasized the critical importance of including indicators on child immigration detention. They argued that the GCM's list of actions was essential for operationalizing and measuring the chapeau, noting that the use of all indicators included in the proposal was voluntary.

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

Stakeholders called for retaining migrants' access to healthcare services as a core indicator within Objective 15, aligning it with SDG 3 on universal health coverage. Participants advocated for better data collection on irregular migrants' circumstances, recommending revising core indicator one to include "migrants regardless of status," instead of "non-nationals." This change was proposed to address the specific circumstances in EU countries where different statuses existed for EU citizens and third-country nationals. Participants highlighted the GCM's reaffirmation of migrants' rights. They also proposed an additional indicator on firewalls to prevent the sharing of migrants' personal information when accessing healthcare services.

Regarding Objective 16, participants noted that core indicators often present binary "whether or not" questions, which could be limiting. They acknowledged the benefits of deriving indicators from existing frameworks but stressed the need to address inconsistencies within those frameworks. Additional indicators were seen as valuable for covering gaps, especially those related to informal employment and labour rights' compliance.

For Objectives 19 and 20, participants suggested expanding additional indicators to better understand the conditions of migrants and diasporas. For Objective 19, this included exploring multiple citizenship, recognizing foreign-acquired skills, and evaluating countries' engagement policies with their diasporas. For Objective 20, some participants also called for

analyzing remittances in terms of financial inclusion and assessing the portability of social security benefits, considering both host and origin countries' responsibilities.

Participants also highlighted key issues for migrant workers' well-being, emphasizing the need for health insurance covering basic healthcare, accident insurance for high-risk jobs, and provisions for funeral expenses in case of death. They urged clear and mandatory requirements for destination countries to ensure these essential protections.

Several participants raised questions about data collection and information accessibility once the indicators proposal was finalized. One participant proposed establishing independent working groups in countries to ensure accurate reporting, analysis, and feedback, and mitigating potential biases in progress reports.

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

Stakeholders emphasized the critical role of Objective 1 in achieving all subsequent GCM objectives through the collection and use of disaggregated data for evidence-based policy making. They supported leveraging existing frameworks, such as the SDGs, to measure GCM progress and stressed the need to disaggregate data by age, sex, race, and disability to address diverse migration characteristics effectively. Additionally, they emphasized the importance of ensuring that indicators were representative of different migrants' realities.

Participants highlighted the need for gender-responsive indicators in line with the GCM's guiding principles. They called for disaggregating all indicators by sex and incorporating standalone gender equality indicators as core indicators. Participants recommended using SDG indicator 5.1.1 on legal frameworks promoting, enforcing, and monitoring equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex as a core indicator for Objectives 7 and 17, to avoid linking women solely with vulnerability. They also proposed including SDG indicator 5.3.1 for public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment as a core indicator under Objective 16.

Additionally, participants proposed retaining existing core indicators related to gender, such as access to justice for survivors of gender-based violence under Objective 7. They suggested maintaining the core indicator already established for Objective 1, focusing on whether governments had mechanisms to ensure that migration policy was informed by appropriately disaggregated data, including disaggregation by sex. Participants also recommended extending the inclusion of SDG indicator 5.2.2 on violence against women and girls beyond Objective 10 on eradicating trafficking to also cover Objectives 7 and 2, addressing vulnerabilities and adverse drivers.

They welcomed the inclusion of new gender-responsive indicators on information provision to newly arrived migrants under Objective 3 and migrant-inclusive accessible service points at the local level under Objective 15. Participants appreciated the intersectional approach of these indicators and advocated for this approach to be applied to other indicators. They suggested incorporating human rights instruments as sources of indicators, providing examples based on CEDAW and the ILO Violence and Harassment Convention (No. 190), as well as including indicators on violence against women and laws prohibiting violence and harassment in the workplace.

Participants also proposed supplementing core indicators with continuous measures to comprehensively evaluate policy implementation and impact, addressing the limitations of binary indicators. They noted that while additional indicators partially addressed this concern, their status as additional could negatively impact their use. Participants stressed the importance of data disaggregation, including by migration status, to address discrimination.

They suggested an indicator to assess States' review of policies to prevent migrant vulnerabilities under Objective 7 and recommended amending the core indicator on equal access to justice to better capture the actual availability and adequacy of such access for migrants. One participant proposed amending indicator 6 to refer to “deaths and disappearances in the broader context of migration” so as to cover scenarios occurring after reaching international waters or in detention facilities.

Participants stressed the need for clarity on implementation and follow-up mechanisms, including establishing baselines and synchronizing data collection schedules. Finally, they proposed further guidance and support for Member States in using the indicators, emphasizing the importance of inclusive participation from all regions to ensure consistent reporting standards globally.

Overarching conclusions and next steps

In the concluding remarks, the co-leads expressed gratitude to all participants, moderators, and speakers for their contributions. They noted that the discussion had been rich and detailed, and encouraged stakeholders to submit their written comments.

The co-leads highlighted the importance of follow-up and states' ownership in the process. They emphasized building upon existing indicator frameworks, particularly those endorsed by intergovernmental bodies, to facilitate adoption and streamline data collection, avoiding additional burdens on countries with limited capacities. They also pointed out that many of the indicators were already publicly accessible through various platforms, underscoring the critical point of member states having ownership of the data.

They addressed the challenge of balancing the proposal for a limited set of indicators, as requested in paragraph 70 of the IMRF Progress Declaration, with the broad objectives and principles of the GCM. The co-leads acknowledged the difficulty of this task and noted that while the workstream had worked hard, some aspects of the GCM might not have been fully captured.

Furthermore, they reiterated the importance of viewing this proposal as complementary to other indicator tools and frameworks focusing on thematic, regional, and country-specific aspects. The aim was not to replicate or duplicate but to provide complementary and comparable information that could serve different purposes in various contexts.

Finally, the co-leads stressed the significance of coordination and cooperation, as highlighted by other participants. They recognized the current momentum in the field of migration statistics and expressed optimism about future advances in this area.

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](#).