

Lisa Bonfert\*

## International Migration Management for Poverty Reduction

How can international collaboration turn  
cross-border migration into a poverty  
reduction tool?

COMCAD Arbeitspapiere - Working Papers

No. 176, 2021

Bonfert, Lisa: International Migration for Poverty Reduction: How can international collaboration turn cross-border migration into a poverty reduction tool? Bielefeld: COMCAD, 2021 (Working Papers – Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development; 176.

The COMCAD Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of COMCAD. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among the worldwide community of scholars, policymakers and practitioners. They are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the COMCAD website.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. Comments on individual Working Papers are welcomed, and should be directed to the author/s.

Bielefeld University  
Faculty of Sociology  
Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD)  
Postfach 100131  
D-33501 Bielefeld  
Homepage: [http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ag\\_comcad/](http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ag_comcad/)

## Abstract

The present paper explores the connections between cross-border migration and the global goal to eradicate poverty in all its forms everywhere in order to identify the ways in which cross-border migration can support poverty reduction targets. Assessing perspectives of Germany and Nigeria as presented in secondary and tertiary literature, this paper concludes that collaboration between countries with different perspectives can contribute to turning cross-border migration into a poverty reduction tool. However, these case studies also uncover a lack of actual cooperation and policy integration, thus leaving potential cross-border migration benefits largely unexploited. Finally, based on the insights from these perspectives, this paper proposes a framework for assessing and evaluating potential policies that may help turn cross-border migration into a driver for poverty eradication. However, the proposed framework requires major rethinking of existing power imbalances in international cooperation.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	3
Table of Contents .....	4
1. Introduction .....	6
2. Literature Review .....	7
2.1 Cross-border Migration for Poverty Reduction? .....	9
2.2 International Migration Management for Poverty Reduction .....	11
2.3 Perspectives from Western Europe and Africa .....	12
2.4 Research Questions .....	13
3. Methodology .....	13
3.1 Data Analysis .....	14
3.2 Obstacles and Limitations .....	15
4. Cross-border Migration Impacts on Poverty Reduction .....	16
4.1 Benefits of Cross-border Migration .....	16
4.2 Costs of Cross-border Migration .....	18
5. Case Studies .....	21
5.1 Germany .....	21
5.1.1 Cross-border Migration Impacts: The German Perspective .....	21
5.1.2 Managing Cross-border Migration Towards Poverty Reduction: The German Perspective .....	23
5.2 Nigeria .....	25

5.2.1 Cross-border Migration Impacts: The Nigerian Perspective.....	25
5.2.2 Managing Cross-border Migration Towards Poverty Reduction: The Nigerian Perspective.....	28
5.3 Two Perspectives, One Approach? .....	29
6 Collaborative International Migration Management Towards Poverty Reduction .....	30
5.3 Indicators for Collaborative International Migration Management Towards Poverty Reduction .....	35
6. Conclusion.....	37
References .....	40

## 1. Introduction

In 2015, the UN adopted a 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda) as a “plan of action for people, planet and prosperity.” (UN, 2015, p.1) With a set of 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 associated targets, this Agenda suggests concrete actions to be taken in order to achieve Sustainable Development<sup>1</sup>. In this document, the UN acknowledged officially for the first time the impact of migratory movements on these goals (IOM, 2017; UN, 2015). In order to emphasise their commitment to create a beneficial relationship between migration and development, the UN adopted a Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (UN, 2018). According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), this Compact

[...] presents a significant opportunity to improve the governance of migration, to address the challenges associated with today's migration, and to strengthen the contribution of migrants and migration to sustainable development.” (IOM, 2021)

In the history of the so-called migration-development nexus, scholars have found various connections between development and migratory movements. On the one hand, differences in the distribution of resources and opportunities draw people to destinations with more promising prospects, especially with regards to education, income and well-being (Oltmer, 2015). In this context, the ability to afford moving and to access migration networks are important factors (OECD, 2016). On the other hand, mobility of human capital, commitment by the diaspora and financial remittances represent some of the ways in which migration impacts development goals (Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Fratzke and Salant, 2018; Kraler and Noack, 2017; Martin, 2004a; McKenzie and Yang, 2014).

In the light of persisting worldwide differences especially in terms of income and wellbeing, over 280 million cross-border migrants had left their origin countries to change their place of residence by 2020 (IOM, 2020). Therefore, the UN emphasise the important role of global partnership and international cooperation in order to promote the potential benefits of cross-border migration (UN, 2015; IOM, 2021). At the same time, however, politically powerful countries especially in North America and Western Europe have been repeatedly criticised to

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Brundtland Report referred to in the 2030 Agenda, the UN define Sustainable Development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” (UN World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, Art.27)

employ their disproportionate amount of global power to manage migration for their own benefit (Angenendt, 2012; Oltmer, 2015). As a result, interests of less powerful countries continue to be under-represented and even to be paternalistically implied (Angenendt, 2012; Oltmer, 2015).

According to the 2030 Agenda, “eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development.” (UN, 2015, p.1). Against this background, the present paper explores the connections between cross-border migration and SDG number one to “end poverty in all its forms everywhere” (UN, 2015, p.15). Therefore, a critical review of secondary and tertiary literature serves as a basis for discovering the impacting factors of cross-border migration on achieving the first SDG. For the purpose of considering distinct perspectives of both donor and target countries of development cooperation on these links, Germany and Nigeria serve as case studies. Based on their viewpoints, this paper proposes a framework with policy options for collaborative international migration management towards poverty reduction. Moreover, it introduces a set of indicators that allow for assessing the potential contributions that such collaborations can have for turning cross-border migration into a poverty reduction tool.

## 2. Literature Review

Over the last decade, perspectives on the connections between cross-border migration and development cooperation have seen a shift (Farrant et al., 2006; GCIM, 2005). Nearly 260 million people moving across borders have caused an increase both in scope and complexities of international mobility, which has increasingly directed global interest towards the role of international migration management for achieving development goals (Angenendt, 2009; IOM, 2020; UN, 2017).

Enhanced analysis of the migration-development links has resulted in a basic division between ‘optimist’ and ‘pessimist’ points of view (Adepoju et al., 2008). Optimists highlight the potential development benefits of cross-border migration, including financial flows and social transfers of knowledge and technologies through enhanced international networks and return migration, as well as an enhanced balance between supply and demand for labour in destination and origin countries (Adepoju et al., 2008; Landeszentrale NRW, 2011; McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Mutume, 2006).

Pessimists underline the potential risks, especially through loss of human resources, skills and tax revenues from potential high-earners in origin countries, as well as lack of infrastructure for sending and saving remittances, corruption, strong migration controls reinforcing undocumented and irregular migration, human trafficking and increased potential for conflicts and inequalities (Angenendt, 2009; McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Mutume, 2006; Newland, 2003).

Nonetheless, international agencies, government organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and researchers, whether optimistic or pessimistic, agree that adequate management can turn cross-border migration into a contributor to sustainable development (Fratzke and Salant, 2018; Martin, 2004; Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017).

The connections between development and migration were first acknowledged by the UN in the 2030 Agenda adopted in 2015, in which they introduced a set of 17 SDGs that are to be met by 2030 in order to achieve Sustainable Development (IOM, 2017; Martin, 2004; UN, 2015). To underline the global interest in promoting the migration-development links for pursuing sustainable development, the UN held a summit for large migratory movements in 2016 and adopted the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, in which they committed to developing a UN Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (Global Compact). This has been called a milestone in international migration politics (Angenendt and Koch, 2017). The Global Compact was signed by 212 UN member states in July 2018 and seeks to strengthen the positive contributions of cross-border migration to development (UN, 2018a).

The complex connection between cross-border movements and development are perceived differently in Western Europe and Africa. African countries are often a target of development cooperation and may thus be particular beneficiaries of the positive impacts cross-border migration can have on development. However, they also face particular vulnerabilities to the possible risks. Nine years prior to the UN, the African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) and the IOM for West and Central Africa already suggested that migration dimensions should be integrated into development policies for the benefit of poverty reduction (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007). They also highlighted the importance of global partnerships and cooperation for developing mutually beneficial strategies.

More recent research identifies education, income and employment benefits created through cross-border migration to be particular contributors to development (Akanle and Adesina, 2017; Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Bhattacharya and Moffitt, 2017; Fratzke and Salant, 2018; Martin, 2004; McKenzie and Yang, 2014). One of the most researched aspects is the remit-



tance volume generated by cross-border migration, which reached an estimated \$600 billion in 2017 three times all official development assistance combined (UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a). Because past development strategies are perceived to have failed, cross-border migration and remittance flows in particular appear to provide an alternative approach to development, with much stronger ownership of the target group (Mutume, 2006; UN, 2015). Empirical evidence published by the World Bank (2005) also indicates that cross-border migration can lead to a decline in the share of people living on less than \$1.00 per day (Adams and Page, 2005).

## 2.1 Cross-border Migration for Poverty Reduction?

One of the most common indicators for measuring progress in development is the number of people living in poverty (Ferreira et al., 2015). With its first SDG, the 2030 Agenda commits to “end poverty in all its forms” (UN, 2015). Despite its relevance for development strategies, clearly defining and measuring poverty remains a challenge (Ferreira et al., 2015).

In the 1960s, the basic understanding of poverty was focused on people’s standard of living determined by income per capita (Sumner, 2007). Based on this money-metric definition, the World Bank created the international poverty line expressed in US\$ to allow for cross-country comparisons and measurements (Ferreira et al., 2015). Using national purchasing power parities and the international poverty line of \$1.90, about 10 per cent of the world’s population currently live in poverty (UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, 2018).

With a shift away from purely economically driven understandings of development, however, poverty expanded beyond monetary measurement. With Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs and Sen’s (1993) capability approach, poverty was increasingly acknowledged as a multidimensional phenomenon that affects people differently in different contexts (Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative, 2015). Consequently, development was now understood as a strategy which enables people to fulfil their own needs (UN, 2015).

While the actual meaning of poverty remains contested and is not universally agreed, the 2030 Agenda uses both traditional income-based and multidimensional understandings of poverty for defining the targets associated with the first SDG (OPHI, 2015; UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, 2018). In order to measure multidimensional poverty, the Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI) with support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) developed the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), which uses flexible sets of poverty dimensions and indicators as well as deprivation cut-offs,

weights and poverty cut-offs for context-specific use in individual countries (OPHI, 2015, 2018). For the purpose of this paper, cross-border migration effects both on monetary and multidimensional understandings of poverty will be considered.

In order to assess impacts of cross-border migration on the first SDG, the literature emphasises the need to embrace all facets of this complex relationship, to collect more relevant data for better analysis, and to encourage better migration management (Newland, 2003; Fratzke and Salant, 2018). This literature review identifies three major shortcomings in this regard.

Firstly, analysis of costs and benefits of cross-border migration is often concentrated on economic dimensions surrounding remittances, while the multidimensional approach to poverty reduction requires a more holistic view of the different dimensions of poverty (Newland, 2003). This is also true for the empirical study undertaken by the World Bank (2005), which was based solely on monetary poverty measures and focused exclusively on economic benefits of cross-border migration.

Secondly, destination countries in Western Europe tend to perceive of development cooperation as a means to reduce migration from poorer countries (Angenendt and Koch, 2017). However, this perspective disregards both the fact that livelihood development tends to increase outmigration, and the potential value of promoting safe, orderly and regular migration for achieving the first SDG (Fratzke and Salant, 2018).

And thirdly, perspectives of origin countries in Africa, which are often a target of development cooperation, are largely ignored (Adepoju et al., 2008; de Haas, 2006). Even though the UN acknowledge a need to collaborate internationally both in the 2030 Agenda and the Global Compact, top-down approaches often taken in development cooperation combined with migration control disproportionately enforce interests of more powerful countries in charge of development cooperation. This should be overcome in order for all countries involved to take ownership in creating context-specific actions (see ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007; IOM, 2014). The diversity of cross-border migration impacts poses numerous challenges for countries and individuals involved, including matters of law enforcement, human and national security, multiculturalism and integration, among others (Mutume, 2006; Newland, 2003). In order to assess how cross-border migration affects poverty reduction and how this relationship can be driven by policy, the countries involved need to work together (Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Newland, 2003; UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a). Angenendt and Koch (2017) refer to this as 'global migration governance'.

## 2.2 International Migration Management for Poverty Reduction

Even though the role of management has been acknowledged as a key factor for cross-border migration to contribute to achieving the first SDG, limited availability of data and a continuous interest of many powerful countries to limit migration have resulted in a lack of attention for mutually beneficial policy-making (McKenzie and Yang, 2014). Angenendt and Koch (2017) identify a range of shortcomings in international cooperation towards global migration governance, including institutional fragmentation, insufficient compensation of power imbalances, lack of normative frameworks and integration difficulties, among others. In many cases, more powerful countries continue to promote migration policies that hinder mobility (McKenzie and Yang, 2014). The result is a somewhat paradoxical relationship between development efforts aiming to support poor countries on the one hand, and migration coordination putting development efforts at risk on the other (Newland, 2003). Despite growing interest in migration-development links, there are few policy actions initiated by governments of those countries which are the targets of development cooperation (McKenzie and Yang, 2014). Consequently, migration flows are insufficiently regulated in favour of potential migration benefits (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011). At the same time, countries initiating development cooperation and development organisations are showing increasing interest in policy options that enforce the possible migration benefits (UN, 2018).

The Global Compact “expresses [the UN’s] collective commitment to improving cooperation on international migration” for the benefit of the 2030 Agenda (UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a, p.2). The Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) established in 2007 annually discusses the links between migration and development and highlights a need for globally aligned policy-making (GFMD, 2018). The fact that the current chairmanship is shared by Germany and Morocco exemplifies the increasing acknowledgement that countries with different perspectives towards both migration and development need to work together to develop global migration governance and management that targets development goals.

However, global policy initiatives have been criticised for continuing to disproportionately reflect the interests of richer and more powerful countries, both in terms of development and migration (Newland, 2003). Such notions of post-colonialism highlight the problems inherent to power imbalances for pursuing mutually beneficial cooperation. If cross-border migration is to truly facilitate global development goals, policies need to represent the variety of perspectives equally (Fratzke and Salant, 2018).

In order to assess the potential of international collaboration for integrating cross-border migration and the first SDG, this paper thus examines the perspectives of Nigeria and Germany as examples of different viewpoints in Africa and Western Europe.

### 2.3 Perspectives from Western Europe and Africa

In Germany, cross-border migration has been the focus of policy debate for years, especially since the so-called 'refugee crisis' of 2015. Large immigration flows do not only affect national demographics, labour markets and social security systems, but also cooperation with partners in and outside the EU (Luft, 2016).

Over the last five years, the German government coalition put strong emphasis on development cooperation, undertaking the largest structural reform in the history of the country's international development assistance (Sturm and Winkelmann, 2015). Germany ranks fifth on the Commitment to Development Index, performing above average on aid and ranks first on the migration component of development (CDI, 2017).

Despite migration policies that indicate increasing acknowledgement of the benefits for national labour markets, German development initiatives have been largely centred on reducing emigration from African countries, neglecting the potential benefits Germany could enforce by taking a different approach to integrating development and migration (Focus Migration, 2007; Prague Process, 2013; Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017).

In Nigeria, the focus of international migration policy has largely been on preventing emigration to fight human trafficking and human capital loss (de Haas, 2006). Nevertheless, Nigeria remains an emigration country, with 1.3 million emigrants in 2017 (UN DESA, 2017).

The most populous country in Africa faces a range of obstacles to development, including structural, rural development, resource and institutional problems as well as social conflicts and inequalities (Handley et al, 2007). According to the World Bank and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) (2005), "a prosperous and growing Nigeria, moving towards reducing poverty [...] would translate into significant gains in social and economic development for the whole of sub-Saharan Africa" (p.53). However, conflict and violence cause people's movements to exacerbate poverty (UNHCR, 2018).

The impacts of cross-border migration on Nigerian development efforts are diverse, including economic, human and social development, health and the environment. In sub-Saharan Africa, Nigeria has been among the largest recipients of direct and in-kind remittances (such as

cars), ranking fifth worldwide according to World Bank estimates (de Haas, 2006; IOM, 2014). Considering the unknown number of unofficial remittances, Hernandez-Coss et al (2006) conclude that the actual remittance volume may be as large as US\$ 5 billion. At the same time, the International Migration Institute (IMI) identifies a lack of empirical evidence on the exact impacts that cross-border migration has on development in Nigeria (de Haas, 2006).

## 2.4 Research Questions

In summary, this paper means to contribute to better understand the role of international co-operation for managing cross-border migration towards poverty reduction. Case studies of Germany and Nigeria will provide insights on their diverse perspectives in order to develop policy options for collaborative international migration management. This paper focuses on the following research questions:

1. How does cross-border migration affect the first SDG?
2. How do Germany and Nigeria experience cross-border migration as an impacting factor on the first SDG?
3. How can international collaborations influence the ways in which cross-border migration affects the first SDG?

## 3. Methodology

This qualitative research is based on analysis of secondary and tertiary literature published between 2000 and 2018. Publications in the areas of cross-border migration and the first SDG were assessed to identify the connections. Books, articles, journals and reports were obtained from public databases such as Google Scholar and the University of London Online Library, as well as websites of national government institutions, UN agencies, independent organisations and individual academics conducting research in the fields of cross-border migration and poverty reduction.

Analysis of the different perspectives of Germany and Nigeria aims to provide an understanding for underlying policy requirements necessary to promote collaborative migration management.

### 3.1 Data Analysis

In order to identify cross-border migration aspects that impact specifically on the first SDG, the goal's individual targets were considered as poverty dimensions (UN, 2015; UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, 2018):

1. **Income:** Reducing the proportion of people who live below \$1.25 per day.
2. Reducing the proportion of people who live in poverty in all its dimensions, according to national definitions and poverty lines
  - a) **Education:** Years of schooling and school attendance
  - b) **Health:** Child mortality and nutrition
  - c) **Living:** Access to electricity, sanitation, drinking water, cooking fuel, floor, assets
3. **Social protection:** Increasing the proportion of people with access to social protection.
4. **Basic services and land rights:** Increasing the proportion of people with access to basic services and tenure rights to land.
5. **Disaster risk strategies:** Implementing disaster risk strategies.
6. **Disaster impacts:** Reducing disaster-related number of deaths, missing persons and economic loss.
7. **Poverty reduction programmes:** Increasing the proportion of resources allocated towards poverty reduction programmes and essential services.
8. **Government spending:** Increasing the proportion of government spending towards policy frameworks that support development strategies and poverty eradication.

Because these targets include both money-metric and multidimensional understandings of poverty, this research assessed cross-border migration impacts on both income and consumption, and on the multidimensional aspects of poverty. The latter is understood in terms of the MPI framework, which measures poverty based on indicators for health, education and living standards (OPHI, 2018).

This paper uses a qualitative research methodology with two country case studies in order to capture a snapshot of the different perspectives of countries providing and receiving development assistance. The aim was to review examples of the ways in which countries experience cross-border migration impacts on their development goals. Germany and Nigeria were chosen based on their strong interest in both policy fields and availability of data. Findings of current government approaches and critique from independent research institutions and

NGOs regarding the ways in which cross-border migration and poverty reduction are connected and managed were critically assessed.

Drawing from these findings, implications for international collaborative policy options to turn cross-border migration into a poverty reduction tool were evaluated. In order to provide a framework for future assessment of such policy options, this research developed indicators as an approach to measuring and analysing collaborative international migration management for poverty reduction. Such indicators provide a clear overview of the diverse perspectives and policy options of countries providing and receiving development assistance.

### 3.2 Obstacles and Limitations

As outlined by the Migration Policy Institute, the relationship between cross-border migration and poverty reduction is highly complex (Newland, 2003). The ways in which potential opportunities and risks of both cross-border migration and poverty reduction and policy approaches are presented may be biased towards political positions and policy goals. This needed to be critically analysed and considered.

Country case studies for evaluating the role of collaborations between recipients and donors of development assistance can only provide a snapshot of the complex realities surrounding cross-border migration patterns. While the two countries were carefully selected based on the nationally perceived importance of cross-border migration and poverty reduction, their existing migration relations and a current interest in changing approaches to cross-border migration patterns, their experiences cannot be generalised. Due to the limited scope of this paper, a larger range of examples could not be considered.

Finally, the majority of publications in this field was written and published by authors and institutions from Western Europe and North America. To avoid bias, I made an effort to draw from publications providing insights from African authors. However, such documents were more difficult to find, especially in English and German language.

## 4. Cross-border Migration Impacts on Poverty Reduction

With the 2030 Agenda, the UN commit to “end[ing] poverty in all its forms” to achieve sustainable development by 2030 (UN, 2015, p.15). In order to understand how cross-border migration may affect this first SDG, impacting factors need to be considered both as risks and benefits for achieving poverty reduction.

### 4.1 Benefits of Cross-border Migration

The possible benefits of cross-border movements for achieving the first SDG include aspects of financial and social transfers, employment, international relations and empowerment.

#### **Labour and Remittances**

Search for employment is the second most common reason for people to move abroad, after family reunions (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011). Migration can enable people to find employment or to earn higher incomes, providing the basis for people’s abilities to consume and accumulate savings (McKenzie and Yang, 2014). Hence, unemployment rates in origin countries can be reduced and qualified workers can contribute to the global economy (Angenendt, 2009). According to UN estimates, about 85 per cent of migrants’ earnings are spent in host communities and contribute directly to the local economy (UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018c).

The remaining 15 per cent of migrants’ earnings flow back to migrants’ families as remittances (UN, 2017). In 2017, this added up to about \$600 billion, \$450 billion of which were sent to countries which are also common targets of development programmes (UN, 2017; UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a; World Bank, 2017). This flow of money has been identified as an important contributor to economic growth and a source of income for families and their respective origin countries (Angenendt and Koch, 2017; World Bank, 2016). From the family’s perspective, the additional income can be invested in better housing, education, health services or self-employment activities and the creation of new businesses. Savings can serve as protection and insurance from unanticipated shocks and events, both for the household and for private businesses (Angenendt, 2009). Higher levels of income can thus influence several poverty dimensions for the people who migrate and for their families. Investments in local infrastructure and living conditions can benefit the wider community (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007; Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017).



The official remittance volume of 2017 alone was three times all official development assistance combined (Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017; UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a). In addition to monetary benefits, being able to work and earn a living can help migrants and their families to change their social status in their communities, with possible implications for their quality of life (Kabeer, 2015).

Since large parts of cross-border movements from countries which are targeted with development cooperation are comprised of well-educated young people looking for better employment prospects, destination countries can benefit from an increased and skilled labour force, especially where ageing populations increasingly experience demographic challenges and labour shortages (Angenendt, 2009; Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Bhattacharya and Moffitt, 2017; Landeszentrale NRW, 2011).

### **International Relations**

Movement of people can strengthen cross-border networks (Adams and Page., 2005; Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017). Such cooperation may stimulate financial flows, including Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs), trade and economic growth, tourism or philanthropy and fundraising from returning migrants or emigrants living abroad (Angenendt, 2009; McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Newland, 2003). Enhanced economic cooperation and active involvement of people from countries receiving development assistance could contribute to more equal participation in global markets and thus enhance access to resources in order to overcome unequal economic terms often favouring more powerful countries. Furthermore, enhanced global relations can encourage internationally integrated approaches to poverty reduction programmes and government spending on development (Bhattacharya and Moffitt, 2017).

Moreover, if people decide to change their countries of residence due to employment shortages and dissatisfaction with their future prospects, this may prevent local failures and conflict as potential root causes of poverty and thus contribute to global stability (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007).

### **Brain Gain**

As migrants will need to be able to compete in destination countries' labour markets to find employment, cross-border migration opportunities may serve as an incentive for migrants to invest in internationally relevant skills (McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017). While living abroad, migrants may further accumulate new skills (Angenendt, 2009). Strong ties with emigrants in the diaspora can promote knowledge transfer

back to their origin countries. If they return, imported know-how and technologies can be used to create new careers and promote innovative business solutions (often referred to as 'brain gain') (Bhattacharya and Moffitt, 2017; Mutume, 2006).

Additionally, returning migrants may also bring back ideas that encourage innovation. Old systems and strategies in areas of education, health and risk insurance might thus be reconsidered and improved (McKenzie and Yang, 2014). Access to knowledge and technologies can also contribute to empowering people to improve their own livelihoods (Kabeer, 2015). At the same time, existing social institutions and norms that favour discrimination and contribute to persisting poverty among certain social groups might be questioned and rethought.

### **Empowerment**

Incomes as well as financial and social transfers could represent a form of grassroots empowerment as opposed to planned development interventions aiming at reducing poverty. The latter tend to perpetuate the idea that people living in poor countries are helpless victims and have failed to break down the very structures that maintain inequalities favouring poverty (de Frece and Higgs, 2017). Cross-border migration might also initiate and strengthen social movements that seek to challenge existing structures and policies in order to reduce inequalities in favour of development and poverty reduction (de Frece and Higgs, 2017).

## **4.2 Costs of Cross-border Migration**

In addition to the potential benefits, there are also concerns about the risks of cross-border migration for eradicating poverty.

### **Brain Drain**

Thousands of qualified people leave their origin countries every year (Mutume, 2006). This loss of human capital, including loss of tax revenues from potential high-earners, significantly affects local labour markets and economies (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011; Newland, 2003). This is particularly problematic in origin countries where education is publicly funded and thus expensive for the government, as leaving graduates do not invest back in the system (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007). Local professionals who promote innovation are key to improving the quality of education, health and living standard for reduced poverty rates (McKenzie and Yang, 2014).

### **Documentation**

As long as differences between demographics and economies persist, people will keep searching for better opportunities in more promising parts of the world. Nonetheless, many destination countries continue to enhance border protection and immigration control (Angenendt, 2009). As a result, rates of undocumented migration, human trafficking and human rights abuse are rising (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011; McKenzie and Yang, 2014). In some cases, lack of documents denies immigrants legal access to education, employment and social security in destination countries, enhancing their risk to live in poverty (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011) Moreover, this reduces opportunities to accumulate savings and knowledge that could benefit migrants' families and origin countries.

The majority of cross-border migrants are accepted by countries in which rates of poverty are often already high (Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Landeszentrale NRW, 2011). This phenomenon increases as many transit countries on the way to Western Europe become destination countries, often due to increasing immigration control on site (Angenendt, 2009). Bad governance, corruption and low capacity to manage immigration and poverty can contribute to destabilisation and conflict, putting poverty reduction efforts at risk and causing numerous countries receiving development assistance to focus on limiting immigration as well – with further implications for undocumented migration and human trafficking (Angenendt, 2009).

### **Social Inequalities**

Problems of rising social inequalities arise in both origin and destination countries. If remittances benefit only a number of families in a given community, this can increase local inequalities. Whether remittances can contribute to poverty reduction depends largely on the ways in which markets and governments work in each context (Angenendt, 2009).

In destination countries, undocumented migration and lack of integration can favour unemployment and poverty among immigrants. This often gives rise to fear of 'foreign criminality' and extremism on the one hand, and xenophobia and associated crimes on the other, which can intensify marginalisation and social inequalities (Angenendt, 2009). Additionally, increasing immigration often causes local communities to fear for their own jobs, which can further enhance the social division between immigrants and non-migrants.

The findings above show that cross-border migration can be both cause and effect of poverty and that the risks and benefits can strongly influence each other in a number of ways. Table 1 below provides a summarising overview of how cross-border migration can affect the first SDG. In the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, the UN emphasise that migrants can positively contribute to achieving the SDGs, if migration is managed and regulated towards safe, consistent and responsible movements of people through global long-term

strategies (UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a,b). The resulting question is what actions need to be taken in order to achieve this for the benefit of all parties involved.

<b>Impacting Factor</b>	<b>Poverty Reduction Implication</b>
<b>Income</b>	
<b>Employment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source of Income</li> <li>• Empowerment to escape poverty</li> <li>• Balancing demand and supply of labour</li> </ul>
<b>Remittances</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source of Income</li> <li>• Empowerment</li> </ul>
<b>International Relations</b>	
<b>Networks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced economic cooperation</li> <li>• More equal participation in global markets</li> <li>• More equitable access to resources</li> <li>• Enhanced development cooperation</li> <li>• Enhanced security</li> </ul>
<b>Diaspora Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source of Income</li> <li>• Empowerment</li> </ul>
<b>'Brain Gain'</b>	
<b>Knowledge and innovation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced entrepreneurial opportunities</li> <li>• Innovative solutions for education, health, risk disaster prevention and insurance</li> </ul>
<b>'Brain Drain'</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of human capital</li> <li>• Loss of tax revenues</li> </ul>
<b>Undocumented migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human trafficking and rights abuse</li> <li>• No access to public social protection and services</li> <li>• No access to regular income</li> </ul>

Impacting Factor	Poverty Reduction Implication
<b>Social inequalities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Share and use of remittances as income</li><li>• Criminality and marginalisation</li></ul>

---

Table 1: Overview of possible cross-border migration impacts on the first SDG

## 5. Case Studies

In the following, Germany and Nigeria serve as case studies providing insights on two distinct perspectives towards the connection between cross-border migration and the first SDG. While Germany is a common receiving country of cross-border migration and donor of development initiatives across the globe, Nigeria's viewpoint is one of a sending country, which is often a target of development cooperation.

### 5.1 Germany

Germany is a member state of the EU and has about 82.7 million inhabitants. With 18.6 million citizens with a migration background<sup>2</sup> and 10.6 million people with exclusively foreign passports, Germany is a net immigration country (German Federal Statistical Office, 2018; Zandonella, 2003). Its perspective in the context of this paper is thus one of a migration destination country in Western Europe.

#### 5.1.1 Cross-border Migration Impacts: The German Perspective

Population declines, decreasing birth rates and increasing life expectancy have caused Germany to increasingly rely on immigration to fill labour gaps (Focus Migration, 2007; Zandonella, 2003). Statistical data confirms this development, as 20 per cent of the employed in Germany are people with a migration background (German Federal Statistical Office, 2018).

---

<sup>2</sup> According to national definition, a person has migration background if they themselves or at least one of their parents has not obtained German citizenship through birth (German Federal Statistical Office, 2018).

A range of initiatives suggest acknowledgement of this immigration potential. Recruitment agreements and a Green Card System introduced in 2000 have simplified international recruitment procedures (Focus Migration, 2007; Zandonella, 2003). Moreover, the current coalition partners SPD, CDU and CSU have committed to create a guideline for managing immigration and integration for the benefit of labour markets and economic development, while counteracting undocumented migration (German Federal Government, 2018, Art.4820-4824; 4839-4841).

Germany's projected continuous demand for immigration, especially to fill labour gaps, suggests that the country can enforce possible cross-border migration benefits for poverty reduction (Zandonella, 2003). Employment opportunities allow immigrants to earn a living, to accumulate savings and knowledge, which they can transfer to their origin countries (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011). Whether Germany will be able to continue attracting labour migrants depends on future levels of economic growth and the specific opportunities for immigrants to work (Heise, 2017).

While residing and working in Germany is fairly easy for EU citizens, people without European citizenship face complex and often difficult processes for obtaining visa and work permits and require a range of documentation on qualification and language skills (BAMF, 2018; Zandonella, 2003). Opportunities differ for different citizenships, for persons seeking political asylum, refugees and for family members of people residing in Germany.

Despite its demand for immigration, Germany has promoted increasingly restrictive immigration policies. The new Immigration Act (also referred to as the Residence Act) adopted in 2005 introduced new measures to control and manage immigration (German Federal Foreign Office, 2018). In the current coalition agreement (2018, Art.4718-472), the German government commits to further controlling immigration to Europe and Germany.

Moreover, integration represents another challenge for Germany to tap into possible immigration benefits. The fact that around 42 per cent of the unemployed registered in Germany are people with a migration background indicates that immigrants are insufficiently integrated in the labour market (German Federal Statistical Office, 2018). Among employees, the proportion of people with migration backgrounds is largest among low-earners, making up 32.4 per cent of workers with a monthly net income below 500 Euro<sup>3</sup> (German Federal Statistical

---

<sup>3</sup> The average is about 2,700 Euro (German Federal Statistical Office, 2018).

Office, 2018). This does not only indicate immigrants' vulnerability to live in poverty, but also often represents cases of 'brain waste', as many immigrants are unable to contribute their full range of expertise (Angenendt, 2014).

Differing languages, ethnicities and values as well as discrimination can give rise to social conflicts and criminality, which is often accelerated by the retraction of immigrants into ethnic groups (Landeszentrale NRW, 2011). At the same time, a peaceful environment that embraces diversity is a precondition for people to stay and contribute to the local economy and hence to poverty reduction long-term.

Integration policies have gained strong emphasis over the past ten years. With the introduction of a Federal Integration Programme, a National Integration Plan and targeted courses, integration is recognised as a task that demands not only careful planning and evaluation, but also the active engagement of civil society (Bendel, 2014). The coalition agreement (2018) highlights that people with migration backgrounds are perceived as an integral part of German society, and commits to introducing a nationwide integration strategy to enhance immigrants' inclusion in the German society (Art. 4847 ff.)

### 5.1.2 Managing Cross-border Migration Towards Poverty Reduction: The German Perspective

German migration policy is increasingly mixing with development cooperation. In 2017, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) had a budget of 8.5 billion Euro for 'Combating Causes of Displacement' (Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017). The coalition agreement (2018) further highlights the role of development cooperation for controlling immigration (Art. 4741; 7585-7590).

While promoting sustainable development has been identified as an important measure for combating irregular migration, using development cooperation as a tool for migration control more broadly has been found to threaten development cooperation's legitimacy (Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017). Development programmes pursuing migration regulation disproportionately represent the interests of more powerful countries in Western Europe. Furthermore, aid resources often urge their recipients to collaborate on national interests of the donors, who often seek to manage and control migration (Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017). With its increasing focus on restrictive migration management including measures of development cooperation, Germany thus threatens to undermine sustainable development goals.

While approaches to both development and migration policy remain under national sovereignty, EU measures head in a similar direction (Utermoehlen and Wirsching, 2017).

At the same time, Germany has committed to collaboration and “a global partnership [...] in which all actors are equal”, enhanced standards for international trade and the promotion of peace and security to achieve the SDGs and to “leave no one behind” (BMZ, 2017). In 2013, Germany invested 14.05 billion Euro net in public development cooperation, with an Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) rate of 0.38 per cent of Gross National Product (GNP) (Sturm and Winkelmann, 2015). In addition to tackling the causes of flight, Germany’s development policy promotes more equitable forms of globalisation based on fair trade and employment as well as sustainable opportunities for the future more generally (UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, 2016; German Federal Government, 2018). On the CDI (2017)<sup>4</sup>, Germany ranks 5th and takes the lead on the migration component, which the CDI describes as “potentially the most powerful tool for poverty reduction and income redistribution [...]”

In order to manage immigration in favour of the first SDG, Angenendt (2014) suggests two strategies. Firstly, managing forced migration should indeed focus on reducing causes of flight, because they represent cases of crisis and pose risks to local and global security. Germany thus needs to offer support in areas of humanitarian aid, conflict prevention, voluntary returns, resettlement and political dialogue (Angenendt, 2014; Angenendt and Harild, 2017; Angenendt and Koch, 2017). This includes reconsideration of its involvement in conflicts, for example through export of weapons. Migration and development policy are thus inclusive and need to consider both the risks that migration can pose to achieving development goals, and the opportunities that development creates for people - including opportunities to move. Secondly, voluntary migration management should focus on legal migration pathways that protect migrants’ rights and promote fair agreements between origin, transit and destination countries in order to contribute to the first SDG (Angenendt, 2014).

Additionally, adequate integration policies can reduce immigrants’ vulnerability to poverty and alleviate national labour shortages, boosting the economy and contributing to social welfare systems. Furthermore, successful integration helps to promote the potential of active diaspo-

---

<sup>4</sup> A measure introduced by the Center for Global Development that ranks 27 high-income countries on their commitment to policies that benefit the poor.



ra engagement and targeted return migration for the benefit of poverty reduction in origin countries (Bendel, 2014).

The next case study introduces Nigeria and its perspective on the ways in which cross-border migration is linked with the first SDG.

## 5.2 Nigeria

Nigeria is the most populous country on the African continent, with an estimated 160 million inhabitants (de Haas, 2006; Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics, 2012). With leading roles in the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the young democratic republic has become a key figure in international cooperation and development efforts (de Haas, 2006; Handley et al, 2007). While being a popular migration destination country, higher numbers of people emigrate from Nigeria (IOM, 2014). Its perspective in the context of this paper is thus mainly one of a sending country in Africa.

### 5.2.1 Cross-border Migration Impacts: The Nigerian Perspective

Despite its oil wealth, Nigeria continues to struggle with high poverty rates (Anger, 2010). Corruption, poor leadership, lack of basic infrastructure, rapid population growth and lack of a comprehensive national approach to poverty alleviation are among the major reasons for continuing poverty (Edoh, 2003). Cross-border movements have created both challenges and opportunities for Nigeria's fight against poverty.

Emigration does not only reduce pressure on weak labour markets and public services, but represents a source of financial and social transfers that can directly affect infrastructure and the quality of public services in Nigeria. Increasing emigration has resulted in growing remittance flows, making Nigeria the largest recipient of remittances in sub-Saharan Africa (IOM, 2014). Akanle (2017) found that Nigerian households benefit specifically through enhanced access to education, business opportunities and housing, as well as food, healthcare and social functions. Additionally, Nigerians in the diaspora contribute to enhanced flows of technology and trade between their destination countries and Nigeria (IOM, 2014). A programme called LEADS enables Nigerian scientists living in the United States to support postgraduate programmes and to improve Nigerian teaching, research, employment satisfaction and collaborations (IOM, 2014).

Returning migrants especially from the United States, where employment, education and training prospects are particularly promising, bring back accumulated skills and encourage new businesses and innovation (IOM, 2014). The IOM (2014) highlights that many returning Nigerian doctors have started their own private practice and spread new procedures and training in the area of healthcare and services. As national unemployment increased from 12.7 per cent to 23.9 per cent between 2007 and 2013, entrepreneurial skills imported by returning migrants may have important implications for business and employment creation.

Skilled immigration is another possibility for Nigeria to benefit from ‘brain gain’ opportunities, if it can promote improved economic viability of traditional sectors and entrepreneurship, while considering the demand for specific labour and skills (IOM, 2014).

For Nigeria, as well, options to tap into such migration benefits largely depend on legal migration options. The IMI underlines that increasing immigration restrictions promoted in Europe have not resulted in decreased emigration from Nigeria, but in increased undocumented movements with higher vulnerability to exploitation and poverty (de Haas, 2006). Since the 1990s, this has given rise to human trafficking and prostitution recruitment mainly to Italy, the Netherlands and Spain (Carling, 2005). Undocumented people’s movements specifically in combination with sex trafficking raises the possibility of disease transmissions to Nigeria, including HIV (IOM, 2014). Moreover, undocumented migrants cannot legally access public services and have difficulties to regularly send remittances, accumulate knowledge and return safely to their origin countries.

Nigeria has shown strong interest in improving legal mobility options to regulate migration. Within West Africa, the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons allows citizens of member states to enter and stay without visa for up to 90 days and thereafter apply for permanent residency and work permits (de Haas, 2006; IOM, 2014). In 2015, Nigeria adopted a National Policy on Migration which includes legal frameworks for monitoring and regulating migration, collecting related data, addressing diaspora mobilisation, border management, treatment of migrants and the role of civil society (IOM, 2015). Current anti-trafficking policies, however, have not shown to measurably decrease human trafficking (de Haas, 2006).

Conflict and security pose another challenge for Nigeria to benefit from cross-border migration. Numerous religiously, ethnically and economically motivated conflicts threaten Nigeria’s stability and favour criminality, human trafficking and extremism (German Federal Foreign Office, 2018; Angenendt, 2014). National conflict dynamics may spread to neighbouring countries, with further implications for national and regional security. As conflicts in neighbouring states continue, increasing numbers of people, especially from the Democratic Re-

public of the Congo, seek refuge and asylum in Nigeria, amounting to 284,400 refugees in 2017 (Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics, 2017; IOM, 2014). Such unexpected and often large additions to an already rapidly growing population combined with a weak economy and little government capacity strongly increase the pressure on already scarce and contested resources and infrastructure, favouring further conflict (Angenendt, 2014).

Another factor potentially exacerbating instability are remittances, which only benefit a number of receiving families often living in already more populated and relatively developed provinces in Southern Nigeria where the majority of emigrants come from, potentially enhancing income differentials and social inequalities (Adepoju, 2004; de Haas, 2006; Hernandez-Coss et al, 2006).

The 'brain gain' benefits for reducing poverty are in stark contrast to the costs of 'brain drain'. More than half of Nigerian emigrants move to more industrialised regions in search for better education and employment prospects (Adepoju, 2004; IOM, 2014). A lack of tertiary education institutions and employment opportunities for skilled Nigerians especially cause well educated professionals to leave the country (Adepoju, 2004; Hernandez-Coss et al, 2006). The healthcare sector is already suffering from 'brain drain', having lost 2,701 trained doctors between 2009 and 2012, with implications for infant, child and maternal mortality (IOM, 2014). The fact that increasing numbers of Nigerian emigrants settle permanently in their destination countries reduces chances of return migration to offset the 'brain drain' related loss (de Haas, 2006).

Consequently, Nigeria has put strong emphasis on the potential 'brain gain' benefits (IOM, 2014). The Labour Migration Policy and policies for diaspora involvement and return migration address these exact issues by promoting financial and social transfers from the diaspora, enhanced trade and international cooperation and improved inclusion of immigrants in the national labour market. At the same time, weak banking structures with high transfer fees and little international engagement represent an obstacle to making efficient use of remittance flows (de Haas, 2006).

Lastly, growing cross-border mobility impacts strongly on the environment with implications for poverty reduction goals (IOM, 2014). Climate related disasters may further increase the number of displaced persons, which will, in turn, impact on the environment through resource exploitation and waste disposal, creating a vicious circle.

## 5.2.2 Managing Cross-border Migration Towards Poverty Reduction: The Nigerian Perspective

In Nigeria, cross-border migration benefits for poverty reduction were long associated mainly with return migration, while emigration as a whole was regarded generally as a development failure, resulting in a policy focus on migration prevention. However, the country has increasingly recognised that weak institutions and security conditions, rather than emigration, are responsible for high poverty rates (de Haas, 2006). As a result, emigration benefits are now recognised and have been included in formal development strategies, particularly with regards to Nigerians in the diaspora and return migration.

The national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) promotes incentives for diaspora engagement and return migration to strengthen cooperation, encourage businesses and trade through better management of the national economy and improved investor confidence, among others (Nigerian National Planning Commission (NNPC), 2004). Presidential dialogue with Nigerians living abroad is aimed to enhance the inclusion of the diaspora in national development strategies (de Haas, 2006). The Nigerians in the Diaspora Organization (NIDO) encourages Nigerians in the diaspora to participate in national affairs, to share and exchange their experience, to facilitate networking and to build a database with information on the profiles of Nigerians living abroad. In regular meetings, the diaspora is encouraged to create collaborative development projects (de Haas, 2006). The government agency Nigeria National Volunteer Services (NNVS) encourages the diaspora to contribute their expertise and engage actively in national capacity building initiatives through temporary visits and training for Nigerian institutions (de Haas, 2006). International return programmes such as the UNDP's Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Networks (TOKTEN) can further help facilitate contributions to poverty reduction targets (van Hear et al, 2004).

In the meantime, Nigeria has focused its emigration strategy more strongly on promoting legal migration options for development benefits, which is also reflected in the National Policy on Migration adopted in 2015 (IOM, 2015). For this to continue, Nigeria can improve information and preparation for people who wish to move abroad, combat human trafficking and protect migrants' rights (see UN Refugees and Migrants, 2018a). Better banking structures and formal remittance systems can improve the development potential of financial flows, while targeted migration programmes in addition to the Linkages with Experts and Academics in Diaspora Scheme (LEADS) agreement can improve local education systems and create employment opportunities (Akanle and Adesina, 2017).

However, corruption and security remain major challenges (de Haas, 2006). An important requirement for Nigeria to use cross-border migration for poverty reduction is thus the reduction of uncertainties associated with a weak economy, low employment prospects and security issues as well as institutional change. These very development issues have been addressed in Nigeria's National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) in 2004, which includes goals of creating wealth, generating employment and reducing poverty (Anger, 2010; Geoff Handley and Sharma, 2007). The strategy proposes to establish new agencies and strong partnerships as well as empowerment and improved governance. Nigeria will be able to meet its development targets only if such strategies are truly implemented and the underlying reasons for persisting poverty can be sustainably tackled (Geoff Handley and Sharma, 2007). Involving Nigerians in the diaspora and returning migrants as well as skilled immigrants in this process can enhance cross-border migration's contribution to this process.

Strict immigration control in destination countries limits people's options to move and reduces Nigeria's individual scope of action, creating additional dependencies (de Haas, 2006; IOM, 2014). This may be one of the major reasons why emigration to Europe is relatively unpopular.

### 5.3 Two Perspectives, One Approach?

The above sections identified the different ways in which Germany and Nigeria experience and perceive cross-border migration as an impacting factor on the first SDG.

In Germany, the wish for effective migration control has resulted in development cooperation that aims to reduce immigration, rather than promoting the contributions that migration can make to poverty reduction. In Nigeria, on the other hand, recognition that emigration can contribute to improving the systemic structures that are at the core of development problems have resulted in a range of policies that promote cross-border migration benefits for poverty reduction. However, continuous dependence on policy-making in destination countries circumscribes Nigeria's options to tap into these opportunities.

As a result, development cooperation initiatives appear to diminish the development opportunities of cross-border migration for their recipients. If cross-border migration is to contribute to poverty reduction, Germany and Nigeria need to find ways to work together as partners to integrate development cooperation and migration policies. While targeted development cooperation can support Nigeria to implement necessary reforms and establish a stable envi-

ronment, international migration cooperation can provide legal migration pathways and facilitate diaspora engagement and return migration for financial and social transfers to further encourage poverty reduction and sustainable development. This requires Germany to rethink the meaning and measurement of ‘development’ and to discontinue relationships of dependence (Bruns, 2015).

If development and migration cooperation are to be integrated for international movements to contribute to poverty reduction, Nigeria and Germany need to have equal opportunities to benefit from cooperation of this kind. In the following section, the different perspectives of Germany and Nigeria will be used to identify policy implications for promoting international migration management towards achieving the first SDG.

## 6 Collaborative International Migration Management Towards Poverty Reduction

### **Legal migration**

For both sending and receiving countries to benefit from cross-border migration, migrants need legal ways to move across borders (Newland, 2003). Collaborative policy-making could harmonise the requirements for documentation on the one hand, and access to necessary documents and preparatory information on the other. Studies conducted in the Philippines found that preparatory measures do not result in migration humps, but would at most create a trickle of additional emigration (Beam et al., 2013). Moreover, politically powerful receiving countries such as Germany need to encourage safe and regular migration in order to combat human trafficking and allow immigrants to access public services such as healthcare, education and employment as major conditions to reduce vulnerabilities to poverty and enhance their abilities to contribute to development efforts themselves (Fratzke and Salant, 2018; UN, 2018).

In the final draft of the Global Compact (2018), UN member states commit to providing all individuals with access to legal identity and documentation, to creating flexible pathways for regular migration and to promoting internationally coordinated border protection in favour of safe and regular migration. Calls to action include improved civil registry systems, harmonised travel documents and cross-border mobility agreements, among others. Since the Global Compact is not legally binding, however, it remains to be seen how far such commitments will go.

## **Employment**

When migrants can legally move abroad, another important step is for them to find employment. Policies directed towards international recognition of migrants' skills along with frameworks and incentives to provide employment can accelerate this process, including job fairs, cooperation with the private sector and ethical and humane recruitment and working conditions (Angenendt, 2009; McKenzie and Yang, 2014; UN, 2018). Such measures allow immigrants to participate in the local economy and strengthen certain economic sectors. Policies improving the exploitation of local potential, e.g. by allowing family members and temporary migrants to work, can help to maximise the benefits of economic integration (Angenendt, 2009; Martin, 2004). Regulated access to financial services such as bank accounts and savings schemes and financial education can enhance ownership over immigrants' money and provide incentives for productive investments both in destination and origin countries (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007; McKenzie and Yang, 2014).

The ability to participate legally in destination countries' labour markets can provide immigrants with access not only to their own income, but also to knowledge. Through policies, which ensure that know-how can be obtained and shared with immigrants' origin countries to create innovative solutions and possibilities for investments, this form of capacity building could help to offset the development costs of 'brain drain'. There are two major preconditions to make this work.

Firstly, immigrants need to maintain a connection with their countries of origin. Policies promoting the engagement of and closer cooperation with the diaspora could align migrants' skills and experience with corresponding needs in their origin countries (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007; Angenendt and Koch, 2017). Encouraging and supporting associations for diaspora engagement and collective action in cooperation with local institutions can support migrants in channelling expertise, investments and foreign exchange to their home countries (McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Newland, 2003). This can further contribute to strengthened political and economic ties between involved countries for the benefit of development cooperation (Newland, 2003). Policies that enable and manage return migration and reintegration, such as assisted support programmes and official recognition of obtained skills, can facilitate returning migrants' contributions to poverty reduction, both in terms of financial and social transfers to their countries of origin.

Secondly, immigrants do not just need legal access to education and the labour market, but also the abilities and opportunities to make use of them. This requires successful integration (Angenendt and Koch, 2017; Newland, 2003). Providing access to language courses, educa-

tion, labour markets and the economy, housing and political participation can ensure that immigrants have equal opportunities to take part in social life, to earn a living and to accumulate knowledge (Angenendt, 2009; Martin, 2004b; McKenzie and Yang, 2014). A study in Finland found migrant introduction programmes to positively impact specifically on unemployed individuals, while Swedish researchers, however, highlight the high costs of such measures (Sarvimäki and Hämäläinen, 2012; Andersson and Nekby, 2012). Destination country governments need to manage and control integration policies right from the beginning, while origin countries should provide adequate political, institutional and mental preparation, education and training. Policies managing family reunions can also support integration (Newland, 2003).

The UN seek to improve recruitment and work conditions, investments in migrants' skills development and recognition of competences and qualifications. They also highlight the importance of creating necessary conditions for the diaspora to contribute directly to sustainable development (UN, 2018). Moreover, they call for empowerment of migrants and societies to realise full inclusion by promoting mutual respect and establishing comprehensive migration support programmes and inclusive labour markets and school environments in order to enhance options for migrant participation and skills development.

### **Remittances**

If relationships with origin countries are maintained while migrants earn a living in their countries of destination, they will send about 15 per cent of their incomes to their families (UN, 2017). International policies that reduce transaction costs, encourage competition in financial services and promote transparency of fees and exchange rates can encourage remittance flows (McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Newland, 2003; Adams and Page, 2005). To provide reliable and low-cost options for saving and transferring money, policies may provide flexible investment schemes, exemption from tax, incentives for productive transfers and linkages of savings accounts with financial services in immigrants' origin countries (ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa, 2007; Newland, 2003). This could simplify not only the transfer of money, but also pension transferability, which might encourage return migration along with the potential 'brain gain' benefits (McKenzie and Yang, 2014; Newland, 2003). Moreover, origin country governments need to provide education, training, financing and investment schemes that allow remittance receiving families to convert money into sustainable and productive capacity and to reduce the risk to create dependence (Newland, 2003).

In order for remittance flows not to exacerbate social inequalities in origin country communities, collaborative policy-making that increases access to legal migration information and



opportunities as well as remittance management could be beneficial. The Global Compact (2018) includes commitments for promoting cheaper, faster and safer transfers of remittances and financial inclusion of migrants as well as for enabling the portability of earned benefits and social security entitlements. In destination countries, issues of xenophobia and criminality call for adequate government interventions, especially through integration (Angenendt, 2009).

### **Forced migration**

Forced migration is a sign of crisis, in which many affected countries lack capacity to deal with underlying conflicts and displacements. It is difficult to be managed, because it is often unforeseen. Development cooperation, however, can ensure that countries in crisis are supported with humanitarian aid and political dialogue to promote stabilisation and reduce cases of forced migration (Angenendt, 2014; Angenendt and Harild, 2017; Angenendt and Koch, 2017). Such measures could help, among others, to increase employment opportunities, to strengthen civil society for reduced conflict potential, to support return migration and to enhance cooperation with origin, transit and destination countries to build 'global migration governance' (Angenendt, 2014; Angenendt and Koch, 2017). The example of Nigeria has shown, specifically, that such development cooperation measures cannot only contribute to reducing forced migration, but also provide the basis for a country that suffers from poverty to benefit more strongly from voluntary migration.

When people are forced to migrate, nonetheless, safe migration pathways and support upon arrival can ensure people's safety and reduce vulnerabilities to poverty. Collaborating countries can one another in establishing support systems and providing humanitarian aid, if necessary (Angenendt, 2009). As soon as refugees are entitled to stay, the policy options outlined above can help them as much as voluntary migrants to find employment and contribute themselves to poverty reduction efforts.

Summarising the policy options identified above, they can be grouped into four major categories:

1. **Facilitating legal cross-border migration** (to create employment opportunities, protect migrants' rights and enable financial and social transfers)
  - a) Preparation and information programmes
  - b) Safe and orderly migration opportunities
  - c) Protecting labour rights
  - d) Combating human trafficking

2. **Facilitating integration** (to create employment opportunities and allow for financial and social transfers)
  - a) Targeted preparation
  - b) Assisted arrival
  - c) Integration programmes, including language and professional skills
  - d) Integration into labour markets
  
3. **Facilitating migrants' engagement** (to enable financial and social transfers and promote empowerment)
  - a) Diaspora engagement
    - i. 1 and 2 as prerequisites
    - ii. Supporting diaspora organisations to contribute to development programmes
    - iii. Supporting cross-border cooperation with diaspora organisations
    - iv. Financial transfers: Banking and remittance systems and schemes for saving, spending and investing money both for migrants and remittance receiving families
    - v. Social transfers: Supporting cooperation between migrants' employers and origin countries
  - b) Return migration
    - i. 1 and 2 as prerequisites
    - ii. Financial transfers (see 3.a.iv above)
    - iii. Social transfers (see 3.a.v above)
    - iv. Support entrepreneurship opportunities in origin countries, including investment schemes
    - v. Pension transfer schemes
  
4. **Supporting countries in crisis** (to reduce cases of forced migration)
  - a) Aid and support for countries in crisis
  - b) Support programmes for refugees

The Global Compact addresses all of the policy options discussed above and acknowledges the necessity for international cooperation and a comprehensive approach in order to optimise migration benefits and adequately address the challenges for all parties involved. However, each member state's actual approaches to implementing such commitments are likely to vary. Whether they will be able to put into practice the identified need for sharing respon-

sibilities remains to be seen. In order to facilitate an assessment of changes achieved through such policies, this research proposes a set of indicators.

### 5.3 Indicators for Collaborative International Migration Management Towards Poverty Reduction

There is a range of measures for assessing changes in poverty, including income-based poverty lines and the MPI. To measure progress in turning cross-border migration into a driver for poverty reduction, a similarly multidimensional framework reflecting the underlying complexities could be a useful tool.

Combining the cross-border migration-related impacting factors on poverty reduction targets summarised in Table 1 (see section 4.2) with the policy options identified above, this research proposes a set of indicators for assessing the impacts of international migration policy on the first SDG (see Table 2 below).

For the purpose of this framework, the policy-options for legal migration and integration were applied to the poverty dimension of income only. This is because income is perceived here as a precondition for migrants' engagement as the main driver for other poverty dimensions. Because scope and impact of forced migration on poverty reduction targets are highly difficult to measure in this context, it has been left out of the framework. One could, however, separate indicators for voluntary and forced migration to assess the different impacts of these groups.

In order to evaluate progress over time, countries can use poverty and deprivation cut-offs, following the MPI method (see Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative, 2018). Moreover, countries can apply different dimensions and indicators that best fit their specific contexts and reflect the unique circumstances of every cooperation.

<b>Poverty Dimension</b>	<b>Migration Policy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>Income</b>	<b>Legal migration</b>	
	Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment rate among immigrants</li> <li>• Per capita income among immigrants</li> </ul>

Poverty Dimension	Migration Policy	Indicator
	Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of preparatory initiatives translating in employment in destination country</li> </ul>
	<b>Integration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of years in foreign employment</li> <li>• Annual income generated in foreign employment</li> </ul>
	<b>Migrants' engagement</b>	
	Investment schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of remittance-related investments</li> </ul>
	Saving schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of remittance-related savings</li> </ul>
	Pension portability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension volume transferred</li> </ul>
	Return migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of jobs created in origin country</li> </ul>
<b>Education</b>	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of returning teachers in employment</li> <li>• Proportion of education investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of education investments</li> </ul>
<b>Health</b>	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of returning health professionals</li> <li>• Proportion of health investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of health investments</li> </ul>

<b>Poverty Dimension</b>	<b>Migration Policy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>Living standard</b>	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of living standard investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of living standard investments</li> </ul>
<b>Social protection and basic services</b>	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of investments in social protection and basic services</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of investments in social protection and basic services</li> </ul>
<b>Disaster risk</b>	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of disaster prevention and coping investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of disaster prevention and coping investments</li> </ul>
<b>Poverty reduction programmes</b>	<b>Development funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of development funds directed towards reducing forced migration</li> <li>• Proportion of development funds directed towards developing collaborative policies</li> </ul>
	<b>Return migration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of related investments</li> </ul>
	<b>Diaspora engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of related investments</li> </ul>

Table 2: Overview of policy options and their impacts on the first SDG

## 6. Conclusion

German and Nigerian perspectives towards cross-border migration and poverty reduction confirm the potential benefits of improved international migration management. However, this

research also highlights that current approaches to development cooperation and migration management are neither integrated in terms of the different policy areas, nor in terms of cooperation, and thus fail to promote identified benefits of cross-border migration for achieving the first SDG.

While Germany continues to rely on development cooperation for reducing migration, Nigeria increasingly seeks to promote migration as a contributor to development. Because of continuing power imbalances, immigration limitations promoted by the German government strongly limit Nigeria's potential to tap into the benefits for reducing poverty. In order for Nigeria and other countries to benefit from cross-border migration, collaborative policy-making that enables safe and orderly migration and integration is required.

The necessity for collaboration is evident in a number of ways. Firstly, joint data collection and analysis are a prerequisite for progress evaluation and policy improvements. Secondly, preparation programmes in origin countries and integration into labour markets in destination countries ideally complement each other to enhance migrants' prospects to find employment and contribute to their origin countries' poverty reduction efforts. And thirdly, unity in supporting diaspora engagement and return migration specifically towards poverty reduction targets in origin countries, including structures for transferring, saving and investing skills and money, can maximise the potential of cross-border migration for achieving the first SDG.

Considering the diverse impacts of cross-border movements on the first SDG, collaborative approaches to facilitating legal migration, integration and migrants' engagement as well as development cooperation for combating forced migration have been identified as a possible motor for turning cross-border movements into a poverty reduction tool.

The main contribution of this research is the development of a framework for assessing and evaluating policy impacts on the connections between cross-border migration and poverty reduction. Legal migration and integration were identified as major policy measures directly affecting the poverty dimension of income, which serves as a precondition for migrants' engagement to influence other poverty dimensions articulated in the first SDG. The framework can be adopted to each country's specific circumstances and allows policy-makers to make evidence-based decisions.

This approach highlights the complexities and wide range of possible actions to be taken by governments. The specific examples of Germany and Nigeria can hardly be representative of all possible collaborations between countries receiving and providing development assistance. Which policy options work best to reduce poverty will be subject to context-specific questions regarding migration patterns, structural capacities to deal with them, individual

development targets and possible areas of cooperation. Moreover, a country's financial means will also determine which policy options a country may take. Furthermore, the applicability of the proposed framework for measuring progress is subject to available data on different indicators.

The proposed framework requires major rethinking of existing power imbalances in international cooperation. The particular importance of migrants themselves for contributing to poverty reduction highlights the potential of cross-border migration to enhance empowerment and thus fundamentally change the ways in which countries work together. While the value of such international collaboration is also highlighted in the Global Compact (2018a), different countries have various degrees of interest both in managing migration and achieving the first SDG. As both the SDGs and the Global Compact are not legally binding, a country's commitment to international migration management in favour of poverty eradication may thus also vary.

One of the major shortcomings of this research is the fact that it largely reflects the author's perspective shaped by her origins in Germany. Moreover, due to the limited scope of this paper, the framework excludes a range of relevant factors, including the different profiles (e.g. gender) and routes of migrants as well as internal migration. Further research can help to reassess such shortcomings and further expand the framework. This could include an assessment of concrete tools for implementing suggested policies, as well as analysis of different management tools for optimising migration management.

In summary, to which extent the suggested policies are able to turn cross-border migration into a driver for poverty reduction is subject to more investigation. As McKenzie (2014) found: "There is [...] a strong need for research to provide better evidence on [...] migration policies in order to ensure that they really can enhance the development impacts of international migration." (p.38)

## References

- ACBF and IOM for West and Central Africa (2007) 'Migration, Development and Poverty Reduction. Report on the Workshop in Dakar on Migration, Development and Poverty Reduction, Dakar, 8-10 August 2006' (IOM)
- Adepoju, A. (2004) 'Changing Configurations of Migration in Africa. Migration Information Source' <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/changing-configurations-migration-africa>, date accessed 9 May 2021.
- Adepoju, A., T. van Naerssen and A. Zoomers (ed.) (2008) 'International Migration and National Development in sub-Saharan Africa. Viewpoints and Policy Initiatives in the Countries of Origin' (Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden)
- Akanle, O. and J. O. Adesina (2017) 'Remittances and Household Welfare in Nigeria.' *African Population Studies*, 31(1)
- Andersson, J. P. and L. Nekby (2012) 'Intensive Coaching of New Immigrants: An Evaluation Based on Random Program Assignment' *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 114(2): 575-600
- Angenendt, S. (2009) 'Grundlagendossier Migration' (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung) <http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/dossier-migration/>, date accessed 18 May 2018.
- Angenendt, S. (2012) 'Migration, Mobilität und Entwicklung. EU-Mobilitätspartnerschaften als Instrument' (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Deutsches Institut für Internationale Politik und Sicherheit, Berlin)
- der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit.
- Angenendt, S. (2014) 'Flucht- und Migrationsursachen. Entwicklungspolitische Herausforderungen und Handlungsmöglichkeiten' (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Deutsches Institut für Internationale Politik und Sicherheit, Berlin)
- Angenendt, S. and N. Harild (2017) 'Tapping into the Economic Potential of Refugees. Fostering Development through Transitional Social and Economic Integration' (Stiftung



- Wissenschaft und Politik, Deutsches Institut für Internationale Politik und Sicherheit, Berlin)
- Angenendt, S. and A. Koch (2017) 'Global Migration Governance im Zeitalter gemischter Wanderungen' (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Deutsches Institut für Internationale Politik und Sicherheit, Berlin)
- Anger, B. (2010) 'Poverty eradication, MDGs and sustainable development in Nigeria' *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3(4)
- BAMF (2018) Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge. <http://www.bamf.de>, date accessed 18 May 2018
- Beam, E., D. McKenzie, and D. Yang (2013) 'Unilateral Facilitation Does Not Raise International Labor Migration from the Philippines' *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 6689
- Bendel, P. (2014) 'Coordinating Immigrant Integration in Germany: Mainstreaming at the federal and local levels.' (Migration Policy Institute Europe)
- Bhattacharya, C. and U. Moffitt (2017) 'Migration, Sustainable Development and the Role of Business' (UN iLibrary)
- BMZ (2017) 'Der Zukunftsvertrag für die Welt. Die Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung' (Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)
- Bruns, P. (ed) (2015) 'Die Post-2015 Agenda für nachhaltige Entwicklung' in *Weltwirtschaft und internationale Zusammenarbeit* (Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft)
- Carling, J. (2005) 'Trafficking in Women from Nigeria to Europe' (Migration Policy Institute)
- CDI (2017) 'Commitment to Development Index, <https://www.cgdev.org/commitment-development-index-2017>, date accessed 18 May 2018
- de Frece, A. and E. T. Higgs (2017) 'Gender and Social Inequality' (Centre for Development, Environment and Policy, University of London and SOAS University of London)
- de Haas, H. (2006) 'International migration and national development: Viewpoints and policy initiatives in countries of origin. The case of Nigeria' (International Migration Institute)
- Edoh, T. (2003) 'Poverty and the Survival of Democracy in Nigeria' *Nigerian Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, 1(4)

- Farrant, M., A. MacDonald, and D. Sriskandarajah (2006) 'Migration and development: Opportunities and challenges for policymakers' *IOM Migration Research Series*
- Ferreira, F. H. G., S. Chen, A. Dabalen, Y. Dikhanov, N. Hamadeh, D. Jollie, A. Narayan, E. B. Prydz, A. Revenga, U. S. Prem Sangraula, and N. Yoshida (2015) 'A Global Count of the Extreme Poor in 2012. Data Issues, Methodology and Initial Results.' *Policy Research Working Paper, 7432*
- Focus Migration (2007) 'focus Migration: Country Profile Germany', Hamburgisches Welt-Wirtschaftsinstitut (ed.) <http://www.focus-migration.de>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- Fratzke, S. and B. Salant (2018) 'Moving Beyond "Root Causes": The Complicated Relationship between Development and Migration. Towards a Global Compact for Migration: A Development Perspective' (Migration Policy Institute)
- GCIM (2005) 'Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for Action. Report of the Global Commission on International Migration' (Global Commission on International Migration)
- German Federal Foreign Office (2018) 'Auswärtiges Amt' <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- German Federal Government (2018) 'German Coalition Agreement: Ein neuer Aufbruch für Europa Eine neue Dynamik für Deutschland Ein neuer Zusammenhalt für unser Land'
- German Federal Statistical Office (2018) 'Destatis' <https://www.destatis.de/EN>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- GFMD (2018) 'Global Forum on Migration and Development' <https://www.gfmd.org>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- Handley, G., K. Higgins and B. Sharma (2007) 'Poverty and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria and Tanzania – Country Case Studies' (Overseas Development Institute)
- Heise, M. (2017) 'Population, ageing and immigration: Germany's demographic question' (World Economic Forum)
- Hernandez-Coss, C. E. and M. Josefsson (2006) 'The UK-Nigeria Remittance Corridor' (The World Bank)

- Heymans, C. and C. Pycroft (2005) 'Drivers of change in Nigeria: Towards restructuring the political economy' (Department of International Development, UK)
- IOM (2014) 'Migration in Nigeria: A Country Profile' (International Organization for Migration)
- IOM (2015) 'Nigeria Adopts National Migration Policy' <https://www.iom.int/news/nigeria-adopts-national-migration-policy>, date accessed July 2018
- IOM (2017) 'The Sustainable Development Goals seen through the lens of migration' (International Organization for Migration)
- IOM (2020) 'Migration Data Portal' <https://migrationdataportal.org>, date accessed 10 May 2021
- IOM (2021) 'Global Compact for Migration', <https://www.iom.int/global-compact-migration>, date accessed 10 May 2021
- Kabeer, N. (2015) 'Gender, poverty, and inequality: a brief history of feminist contributions in the field of international development' *Gender & Development*, 23(2):189-205
- Landeszentrale NRW (2011) 'Migration und Integration.' <https://www.politische-bildung.nrw.de/multimedia/migration/gesamtfilm/index.html>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- Luft, S. (2016) 'Flucht nach Europa' (C.H. Beck oHG)
- Martin, P. L. (2004) 'Migration and Sustainable Development: Towards Sustainable Solutions' *Willamette Journal of International Law and Dispute Resolution*, 15(2):182-226
- Maslow, A. H. (1970) 'Motivation and Personality' (Harper & Row)
- McKenzie, D. and D. Yang (2014) 'Evidence on Policies to Increase the Development Impacts of International Migration' *Policy Research Working Paper*, (7057)
- Mutume, G. (2006) 'African migration: from tensions to solutions' (Africa Renewal)
- Newland, K. (2003) 'Migration as a Factor in Development Reduction (Migration Policy Institute)
- van Hear, N., F. Pieke and S. Vertovec (2004) 'The contribution of UK-based diasporas to development and poverty reduction' (ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford)

- Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics (2012) 'Social Statistics in Nigeria. Part III: Health, Employment, Public Safety, Population and Vital Registration'
- Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics (2017) 'Immigration Statistics', <http://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- NNPC (2004) 'Meeting Everyone's Needs: National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy' (Abuja: Nigerian National Planning Commission)
- Nussbaum, M. and A. Sen (1993) 'The Quality of Life' (Oxford University Press)
- Oltmer, J. (2015) 'Zur Zukunft der globalen Beziehungen: Zusammenhänge zwischen Migration und Entwicklung' (terre des hommes Deutschland e.V., Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V.)
- OECD (2016) 'Perspectives on Global Development 2017: International Migration in a Shifting World' (Paris: OECD Publishing)
- OPHI (2015) 'Measuring Multidimensional Poverty: Insights from Around the World' (Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative)
- OPHI (2018) 'Multidimensional Poverty Index' <http://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/>, date accessed 18 April 2018
- Prague Process (2013) 'Germany – migration profile light' (Global Migration Forum on Migration and Development)
- Adams, R.H. Jr. and J. Page (2005) 'Do international migration and remittances reduce poverty in developing countries?' *World Development*, 33(10): 1645-1669
- Sarvimäki, M. and K. Hämäläinen (2012) 'Assimilating immigrants. The impact of an integration program' *Norface Discussion Paper Series 2011015* (Norface Research Programme on Migration, Department of Economics, University College London)
- Sturm, R. and T. Winkelmann (2015) 'Herausforderung Millenniumsziele: die konzeptionelle Antwort des BMZ. Die Post 2015-Agenda für nachhaltige Entwicklung' (Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft)
- Sumner, A. (2007) 'Meaning versus measurement: why do 'economic' indicators of poverty still predominate?' *Development in Practice*, 17(1): 4-13
- UN (2015) 'Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development'

- UN (2017) 'Making migration work for all. Report of the Secretary-General, A/72/643'
- UN (2018a) 'Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration'
- UN (2018b) 'The Sustainable Development Agenda'
- UN DESA (2017) 'International migrant stock: The 2017 revision', <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates17.shtml>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- UNHCR (2018) 'Nigeria emergency', <http://www.unhcr.org/nigeria-emergency.html>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- UN Refugees and Migrants (2018a) 'Global Compact for Migration', <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/migration-compact>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- UN Refugees and Migrants (2018b) 'New York Declaration', <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/declaration>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- UN Refugees and Migrants (2018c) 'Infographics', <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/infographics>, date accessed 18 July 2018
- UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform (2016) 'Executive Summary of the Report of the German Government to the High-Level Political Forum' (German Federal Government)
- UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform (2018) 'Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals', <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1#>, date accessed 18 April 2018
- UN World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) 'Our Common Future' (Oxford University Press)
- Utermoehlen, N. and S. Wirsching (2017) 'Development Funds for Migration Control' (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung)
- World Bank (2016) 'Migration and Remittances – Recent Developments and Outlook' *Migration and Development Brief, 26*
- World Bank (2017) 'Migration and Remittances – Recent Developments and Outlook' *Migration and Development Brief, 28*

Zandonella, B. (2003) 'Zuwanderung nach Deutschland' (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung)