



MIGNEX Handbook Chapter 12

Documentation of policy review

Marie Godin
University of Oxford

Carlos Vargas-Silva
University of Oxford

Suggested citation

Godin, M., Vargas-Silva, C. (2022) *Documentation of policy review*, MIGNEX Handbook Chapter 12 (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/d052.

MIGNEX

MIGNEX (Aligning Migration Management and the Migration-Development Nexus) is a five-year research project (2018–2023) with the core ambition of creating new knowledge on migration, development and policy. It is carried out by a consortium of eight partners in Europe, Africa and Asia: the Peace Research Institute Oslo (coordinator), Danube University Krems, the University of Ghana, Koç University, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Maastricht University, the Overseas Development Institute, and the University of Oxford. In addition, Samuel Hall is a core subcontractor.

See www.mignex.org.



MIGNEX has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 770453.

The MIGNEX Handbook

The MIGNEX Handbook grows chapter by chapter over the lifetime of the project. It is primarily as a tool for internal information-sharing and quality assurance. The text refers to 'we' as the team members and 'you' as an individual team member reader. The handbook is public in order to ensure transparency and facilitate knowledge exchange also on issues such as project management, methodology and communication.

Acknowledgements

This document was reviewed by Leander Kandilige (Centre for Migration Studies – University of Accra) as part of MIGNEX quality assurance and review procedures. The content of the document, including opinions expressed and any remaining errors, is the responsibility of the authors.

Publication information

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons CC BY NC 4.0 License. You are free to share and adapt the material if you include proper attribution (see suggested citation), indicate if changes were made, and do not use or adapt the material in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Peace Research Institute Oslo, Oslo, Norway

November 2022 (Version 1)

ISBN (print):
978-82-7288-343-0417-0

ISBN (online):
978-82-7288-343-0418-7

The views presented are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the institutions with which they are affiliated. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information herein.

History of changes

Version	Date	Changes
1	30 November 2022	Version submitted as official deliverable to the EC.

Contents

12.1	Introduction	1
12.2	Methodology	2
12.2.1	Methodological notes	2
	<i>Afghanistan</i>	2
	<i>Cabo Verde</i>	3
	<i>Ethiopia</i>	5
	<i>Ghana</i>	6
	<i>Guinea</i>	7
	<i>Nigeria</i>	9
	<i>Pakistan</i>	10
	<i>Somalia</i>	12
	<i>Tunisia</i>	14
	<i>Turkey</i>	15
12.2.2	Summaries of expert interviews for the 10 MIGNEX countries	16
12.3	Policy database	23
12.3.1	Methods	23
12.3.2	Database	23
12.4	The reviewing process	27
12.5	Three main take-aways/country	29
	References	31

Tables

Table 1	Afghanistan	16
Table 2	Cabo Verde	17
Table 3	Ghana	18
Table 4	Ethiopia	19
Table 5	Guinea	19
Table 6	Nigeria	19
Table 7	Pakistan	21
Table 8	Tunisia	22
Table 9	Turkey	22
Table 10	Database responses for migration questions	24
Table 11	Database responses other questions	26
Table 12	Reviewing process	27

12. Documentation of policy review

This MIGNEX Handbook Chapter documents the policy data collection, including experiences in the field that should inform interpretation of the data. It describes the policy database and present the underlying metadata, such as number and characteristics of interviewees. It then provides information about the reviewing process and provides the key findings for the ten countries.

Based on the policy review, the MIGNEX team prepared ten Background Papers, reviewing key migration policies in each country and their interaction with development and development policies.

The Background Papers contain a methodological note on how the information was systematically collected in each country, informing the interpretation of the data.

The policy database serves as input for the analysis in other MIGNEX Work Packages.

12.1 Introduction

MIGNEX developed 10 background papers that review key migration policies in each country and its interaction with development and development policies. The term ‘policy’ can refer to many different phenomena. MIGNEX adopts a broad perspective and regards policy to include the existence and effectiveness of particular laws, common practices, development initiatives, policy interventions and the broader policy environment or framework. This inclusive definition encompasses the needs of the project’s overall research. Much of the analysis in the reviews involved policies that relate directly to migration and its link to development. The concept of ‘migration-related policies’ includes both the migration policy environment and interventions that seek to affect the development impacts of migration. It also includes policy and projects that might have large effects on migration dynamics, even if not presented under a migration heading.

This MIGNEX handbook chapter documents the policy data collection, including experiences in the field that should inform interpretation of the data. It describes the policy database and presents the underlying metadata, such as number and characteristics of interviewees. It then provides information about the reviewing process and provides the key findings for the 10 MIGNEX countries.

12.2 Methodology

Researchers were asked to prepare a methodological note of between 700 to 900 words on how the information was systematically collected. This note had to explain any obstacles experienced in conducting the policy review and highlight the strategies put in place to overcome them. Authors were invited to discuss their own positionality during data collection and analysis. In some countries, researchers had the opportunity to work with local experts. In such a case, authors were encouraged to provide a reflexive account of their collaborative experience. For instance, in some of the pilots the policy review was conducted in partnership with local researchers and this facilitated access to key experts and documentation.

In some countries, the desk review was limited given the language skills of the different research teams. If this was the case, researchers had to indicate it in the methodological note and explain how this obstacle was overcome. For instance, in one of the pilots the researcher opted to work effectively with a translator and use online translation software in order to overcome the language barrier. The methodological note documents the policy data collection, including experiences in the field in order to inform interpretation of the data. The outline suggested for the methodological note to all researchers was the following:

1. Review of the literature and policy review database
2. Fieldwork description
3. Writing up the background paper and completing the policy review database (based on additional information collected during the fieldwork)
4. Key limitations of the analysis
5. Any other relevant points.

The methodological notes for the ten MIGNEX countries can be found in the sub-sections below.

12.2.1 Methodological notes

Afghanistan

A systematic desk-based review was undertaken between February and December 2020 to identify experts for interview as well as to provide up-to-date accounts of a dynamic policy context on migration and development in Afghanistan. Overall, 14 semi-structured interviews were conducted. Of these, 11 interviews were conducted in person in Kabul and 3 were conducted remotely. Samuel Hall's Nassim Majidi, Zabihullah Barakzai and Jawid Hassanzai conducted the key informant interviews for this policy review. The interviews were conducted in English and in Dari. The Samuel Hall Team in Afghanistan facilitated access to interviewees due to their established network.

Literature review

The literature review for this MIGNEX country profile was conducted in 2020-2021. The main references were from the grey literature or public literature, drawing from the investments in supporting Afghanistan's governance. The literature can be categorised in three parts:

1. Academic papers and reports dating from 2002 – 2020, as well as blogs and papers by scholars.
2. UN, NGO and INGO reports with an emphasis on human rights and migration/displacement specialised agencies.
3. Donor funded / Afghan government reports – with a strong emphasis on EU and GoIRA documentation.

The Samuel Hall team relied on its own research in Afghanistan across the years – including a previous migration profile conducted with Maastricht University in 2012, and updates provided through other projects conducted on migration and displacement.

Fieldwork description

Samuel Hall's Nassim Majidi, Zabihullah Barakzai and Jawid Hassanzai conducted the key informant interviews for this policy review. The interviews were conducted in English and in Dari with members of the GoIRA, donors, UN agencies, international organisations and non-governmental organisations to collect additional information for the policy brief and to cross check information available from project documentation and public websites.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

The policy brief was written by Nassim Majidi with inputs from Zabihullah Barakzai, Jawid Hassanzai, and Camille Kasavan.

Limitations

This analysis (PBP) was limited by the fall of Kabul's government in August 2021. The PBP is only relevant up to that point. Before the fall of Kabul, several policies had been left in draft form and never fully operationalised (such as the Comprehensive Migration Policy) and remain at a point where they could be "picked up again" but never came into fruition.

Cabo Verde

Cabo Verde was part of three pilots of the MIGNEX policy review methodological approach outlined in MIGNEX Handbook Chapter 9, alongside Ghana and Afghanistan (Godin and Vargas-Silva, 2020). The fieldwork took place in Praia (Cabo Verde) between 24th February-6th March 2020. One month prior to the start of fieldwork with experts in Praia, a systematic desk-based review of migration-related and development policies was undertaken by a MIGNEX researcher at ODI. From this review, it became clear that 12 years should be the period of analysis: in 2008 Cabo Verde transitioned from 'Least-Developed Country' to 'Middle-Income Country' status, and in the same year signed a Joint Declaration for a Mobility Partnership with the EU, which was a trigger for migration policy change in Cabo Verde.

Literature review

Due to the lack of Portuguese language skills of the MIGNEX researcher, during the desk-based review a combination of strategies were employed to review policy documents in Portuguese.

One strategy was to learn key words in Portuguese and use Ctrl+F to search in documents to check for relevant sections. Another was to search for key words in Portuguese on Google and Google Scholar to find relevant literature. Using the Google Chrome browser, which has a built in Translate plug in to instantly translate websites proved very useful. When translating policy documents, Google Translate was first used, with the translation saved into a word document. For important policy documents which require precise translation, a Portuguese-speaking colleague at ODI then verified the translation. For hard copies of documents, the Google Translate app, which has the ability to scan the text from a document, was used to translate documents.

Fieldwork description

Based on the initial desk-based review and assistance from PD Consult – the Cabo Verdean survey firm contracted to implement the MIGNEX survey in Cabo Verde, with whom ODI researchers already had a good working relationship – a list of migration and non-migration experts were identified. Interviews were arranged by Andira Lopes of PD Consult, utilising the firm’s established connections to policymakers, academics and civil society. A total of 25 interviews were completed with 34 experts between 24th February and 6th March 2020. The majority of interviews were conducted face-to-face, with interpretation provided by Eileen Barbosa. Two interviews were conducted online via Skype.

Despite initial concerns that conducting interviews with an interpreter could have a detrimental impact on interview quality, in reality, this was not as much of an issue as anticipated. The interpreter was highly skilled and concurrently translated, which saved precious interview time for questions and answers. It was clear that many experts were unphased by the presence of an interpreter, likely having used them before. The interpreter was a former advisor to the previous Prime Minister, so the researcher capitalised on this insider knowledge by discussing interviews with her. In the majority of interviews, participants were open and receptive to participating in the project and in answering questions, with several stating that MIGNEX is important. Two key informants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Communities were suspicious about the project being EU-funded, which could be interpreted as connected to the context of the renegotiations of the visa agreement between Cabo Verde and the EU at that time. With these two experts, informed consent was discussed for around 15 minutes and they were less open in offering answers. Several experts identified additional policy documents or programmes to investigate, in some cases giving the researcher hard-copies of some documents or offered to send additional documents via email.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

Following fieldwork, the Background Paper and Excel file policy database were completed by the MIGNEX researcher at ODI, utilising policy documents, grey and academic literature, and key informant interview summaries.

Limitations

A few interviews with key experts were unable to be arranged, or were cancelled, including the Boston Consulate, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment, the Municipal Government of Praia, the Directorate General for Employment, Vocational Training and Professional Traineeships, and the National Commission for Human Rights and Citizenship. As the Covid-19 pandemic occurred shortly after the end of fieldwork, it was understandably difficult for a couple of key informants to send promised follow-up information, which was a setback in some cases. Employing various strategies to overcome the language barrier of the

MIGNEX researcher was workable, but time-consuming. Several days beyond the allocated and budgeted time was spent on the policy review as a result.

Ethiopia

Literature review

Some preparatory work for the literature review started in the second half of 2020, with a review of relevant academic and grey literature. A first list of potential experts to contact for interviews was also created. The main part of the systematic literature review was then conducted in March-May 2021, immediately prior to the start of the fieldwork. A follow-up scan of the literature was made in the autumn of 2021, to make sure to include relevant papers published in 2021 and to complement some of the gaps remaining after analysing the interviews. No translation assistance was needed in the literature review as key reports and documents, including legal documents published by the government, are widely available in English.

Fieldwork description

Based on the literature review and the researcher's network, an initial number of experts were identified (both migration and non-migration experts) to complement the literature review. The list of initial experts consisted of about 10 experts, and this list was then expanded through snowballing as interviews proceeded. In total, 15 semi-structured interviews were conducted in English (with 7 International Organisations; 6 Government Agencies; 2 academia), all of them online through either Skype or Zoom. The interviews took place between May 3 and June 14 (in total 9 men and 6 women).

A challenge encountered in the sampling was to reach experts beyond international organisations and government institutions. An important limiting factor in the recruitment was the fact that fieldwork had to be done remotely through online interviews, which made it more difficult to reach certain types of respondents such as migrant association and regional government representatives. The expert interviewed from IOM provided a list of representatives of migrant associations but attempts to contact potential respondents via email did not result in any replies. Several emails sent to local researchers and members of diaspora associations also failed to result in any interviews. The final list of experts interviewed is therefore not as diverse as would have been ideal.

All interviews lasted for around one hour. The interviews were tailored to the expertise of the respondent. The respondents generally had good knowledge of their topic or specific projects and programmes within their field, but they sometimes lacked a more general overview of the migration management landscape and challenges related to migration management beyond their specific field. This was however not true for all experts, and particularly not for representatives of international organisations who generally had experience and knowledge of several of the themes addressed in the review.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

Overall, the write up of the Background Paper was relatively straightforward once the interviews were conducted. The sections on existing policies and trends were overall well covered in both the secondary literature and in the interviews with experts. Impacts of policies and coherence issues were less covered in both literature and interviews. There have for example been few rigorous evaluations of the impact of policies implemented, so the

understanding of their impact is often built on stakeholders' views or impressions of the impacts, rather than documented policy evaluations.

EU-policy was also more challenging to gather information about through expert interviews, beyond interviews with staff of international organisations. Most government stakeholders seemed to have limited knowledge of the policies and migration governance outside their own scope of work, potentially because several of them work more operationally than strategically. Some useful papers on EU-policy were pointed out by reviewers and incorporated in the second version of the draft. In between the first round of literature review and the external and internal review of the draft paper, several useful papers were published. These were taken into account in the revised version of the policy review.

The policy review database was initiated at the end of 2020, and finalised at the end of 2021, together with the finalisation of the background paper to ensure consistency and that all relevant information from the background paper was taken into account in the policy database. The most difficult questions to address in the database were policy effectiveness, as few evaluations of the relevant policies exist.

Limitations

It should be noted that the policy review was drafted during a period of rapidly changing political landscape due to the civil war that broke out in November 2020. The situation in the country has rapidly changed, and it is continuing to change, with direct and indirect effects on migration patterns and management. The most notable impact is the increasing number of internally and internationally displaced, particularly from the northern Tigray region where the conflict started. The conflict is partly addressed in the paper by citing more recent numbers of displacement, but due to the evolving situation it is difficult to see the full impact of the conflict for future migration and governance.

Ghana

Ghana alongside Cape Verde and Afghanistan is part of the three pilot studies to implement the methodological approach developed in the MIGNEX Handbook Chapter 9 (Godin and Carlos Vargas-Silva 2020). Across the ten countries, a similar methodology needs to be applied in order for the data collection to be comparative and to allow researchers to test the set of hypotheses developed for the MIGNEX project on the causes and consequences of migration.

Literature review

One month before the start of the fieldwork (2nd March 2020), a systematic desk-based review was collaboratively undertaken between MIGNEX researchers at both institutions: the University of Ghana and the University of Oxford. Based on this work, the team was able to identify experts - both migration and non-migration ones - to be interviewed in order to get a more nuanced picture of specific migration-related policies. Overall, 13 semi-structured interviews were conducted. In total, 11 of them were conducted face-to-face in the city of Accra between March 2nd and March 10th 2020 and two were conducted over the phone.

Fieldwork description

Dr. Carlos Vargas-Silva, Dr. Joseph Kofi Teye and Dr. Leander Kandilige conducted the face-to-face interviews in Accra. The research team decided to alternate the dynamic about who was carrying out the interview and who was taking notes in order to have a balance in between the "Northern researcher" and "Southern researcher". Dr. Vargas-Silva led the asking of questions

while Dr. Kandilige and Dr. Teye probed further based on responses provided by interviewees and their local knowledge of the migration policy context. All the interviews were conducted in English. Dr. Joseph Kofi Teye and Dr. Leander Kandilige facilitated access to interviewees due to their established network among migration and development experts. The direct participation of the Centre for Migration Studies (CMS) at the University of Ghana to develop Ghana's national migration policy (2016) can explain such appreciation at the local level. As a result, building trustful relationships with local experts was relatively easy. A series of policy documentation (not necessarily publicly available) was also made accessible to the team. As a result, the team did not encounter any obstacles in the completion of the Excel file for the MIGNEX policy database. Lastly, the expertise of Dr. Joseph Kofi Teye and Dr. Leander Kandilige have facilitated the understanding of substantial contradictions and incoherence across migration-related policies as both have an in-depth knowledge of migration and development policies in Ghana and how these two have developed and entangled over the last 10 years. One additional interview was conducted online by Dr. Marie Godin with a representative of a diaspora organisation based in France.

Overall, the collaboration among researchers has been a continuous one, taking place prior to the fieldwork, at the time of the desk-based research, during the fieldwork and after at the time of writing-up. In the future, several topics were identified as worth exploring further in a collaborative way. In that respect, the team submitted a panel for the IASFM (International Association for the Study of Forced Migration) 2020 entitled "Ghanaian Diaspora organisations and the "migration and development nexus" which aimed to discuss the involvement of the Ghanaian diaspora organizations in both shaping as well as contesting national and European policy-making in regard to Ghana, in relation to both 'migration management' and 'the migration-development nexus'.

Guinea

Literature review

The literature review was done by Nermin Abbassi, under the supervision of Gemma Hennessey. Nermin searched for relevant literature in English and French, supplemented with studies recommended by Gemma and Jessica and any documents suggested by key informants. Nermin then summarised the key findings of the most relevant documents. Nermin also searched for relevant legislations and policy documents, again supplemented with documents shared by key informants. She then translated key sections and summarised them. These documents formed the basis of the policy review.

Fieldwork description

Gemma Hennessey was hoping to go to Conakry for in-person data collection in July 2021, with a contact at the EU delegation providing inputs on how best to go about this. However, in the end our EU contact suggested to cancel the trip as his intel suggested all visas for British nationals were being denied after weeks of waiting due to high Covid numbers in the UK. Therefore, we had to switch to a combination of working with a local researcher and online interviews.

We then looked for a Guinea based researcher working on migration, who also speaks English to enable easy communication with Gemma. This proved to be impossible. In the end a friend of Mira Ivanova recommended the operations manager – Karim Balde – of an NGO called AquaFarms Africa. Karim was not a migration expert or researcher, but fluent in English and a fast learner. Critically, he was also well connected in Ministries and had a good understanding

of how to best reach respondents. Karim quickly found relevant respondents and approached them for interviews.

Gemma trained Karim on zoom. She also prepared all interview guides for him and discussed them with him prior to each interview. Karim then wrote detailed interview notes after each interview, rather than just summarising them to make sure that we were able to take the most relevant points from each interview.

Gemma also conducted further interviews online, particularly with officials working for international organisations. Some of these were contacts made during the preparation of the Guinea survey instrument.

Data collection took place in August and September 2021. It should be noted that during the data collection period, on the 5th of September 2021, there was a military coup in Guinea, which ousted recently re-elected President Alpha Conde and dissolved his cabinet. In the aftermath, leaders of the coup sought to set up a transitional government, which involved an audit of all government departments. This had an effect on data collection, with many planned interviews no longer able to go ahead. However, surprisingly, some respondents were willing to meet and take part in interviews days after the coup. We do not know how the coup affected the nature of responses.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

The write-up was done by Caterina, Jessica and Moizza, about six months after data collection.

The data collection team left detailed interview summaries, summaries of legislation and literature, other notes and relevant literature. This proved to be an excellent starting point for the analysis. Caterina updated the evidence base with new literature published since August 2021. She then reviewed all summaries, notes and relevant legislation, adding relevant inputs to each section in the background paper. We then divided up the sections in the paper, drafting them on the basis of Caterina's notes and pulling in additional evidence. This worked well.

For Jessica this was the second MIGNEX policy review, so drafting was straight forward. Caterina and Moizza were fairly new to MIGNEX. Caterina found Nermin, Karim, and Gemma's work an excellent starting point, although she had to become acquainted with their personal note-taking and summarising system.

Caterina completed the policy database on the basis of the information included in the sources selected by Gemma and Nermin and on extra online searches she conducted. These searches concerned social protection programs, access to credit, agriculture, and public health.

Limitations

The biggest limitation is that the drafting of the background paper was conducted by researchers who were not part of the data collection team. We have thus not had the experience of talking to any of the key informants and missed out on any subtext or informal discussions, instead fully relying on the notes left for us by the data collection team. This was somewhat alleviated by the fact that Jessica supervised Gemma's and Karim's data collection, receiving regular feedback on the interviews as they were taking place.

Jessica had some prior knowledge of Guinea as the MIGNEX country coordinator, survey lead and researcher for the qualitative data collection. This prior knowledge was useful in terms of checking and making meaning of the contextual issues discussed by key informants. Caterina and Moizza had not worked in Guinea before, which was another limitation. Moreover, none

of us was fluent in French, so to check the finer points of some documents we had to rely on Google translate/Deepl.com.

It should also be noted that the key person conducting key informant interviews in Guinea was not a researcher, nor a migration expert. This meant that he had to rely strictly on the interview guides prepared by ODI, without being able to steer the conversation into other areas that might be relevant.

Nigeria

The data collection was a joint effort between Tobeckwu Nneli, a researcher associated with ODI and based in Abuja, and Jessica Hagen-Zanker and Gemma Hennessey, based in London. Jessica and Gemma were both familiar with the policy review data collection and drafting process, particularly Gemma as she conducted the Cape Verde policy review. Tobe was familiar with the Nigeria context and able to draw on his personal and professional networks and knowledge of Nigerian governance at the federal level. The different researchers thus complemented one another well.

The team met on a weekly basis for a period of about two months, discussing progress, issues that came up and topics to discuss in upcoming interviews. This was an effective way to ensure momentum. The researchers also reviewed each other's interview summaries and sections and provided feedback and asked further questions.

Literature review

Tobe conducted a review of relevant policy and literature documents and drafted a historical and organisational overview, which was a useful background knowledge to prepare us for the interviews. All three authors already had or were aware of relevant literature, which we saved in a shared folder. We conducted further literature searches during the write up, to address specific gaps in the paper. At that stage we found some of the most relevant literature.

Fieldwork description

With Tobe based in Abuja, he was able to call, chase, drop off letters and visit respondents, all of which was necessary to secure face-face interviews. He also conducted the face-face interviews, and he collected hard-copy documents. Jessica and Gemma conducted the interviews that could be done online e.g. with donors and academics. With three researchers involved we were able to conduct a high number of interviews.

The online interviews were often affected with the usual internet connection issues, so they were not all equally useful. In general, it was also challenging to get the right person to be interviewed. Some respondents lacked a comprehensive overview on migration issues in Nigeria and a few were fairly new to their roles because of high turnover in the Nigerian government administration, so also lacking in-depth knowledge. Hence, the interviews tended to be mainly useful to get a general overview of relevant policies and programming, but less so in terms of shedding light on the effectiveness of policy functions on the stage where migration architecture is in Nigeria. Because there was not any serious architecture in the past, most respondents saw the establishment of a working group and the policies as a win and did not focus on how effective the policies are. Unfortunately, lack of constant review of government policies is not peculiar to migration issues but a common feature across different Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). Reviews usually happen when the Chief Executive is significantly interested in them.

We used semi-structured joint interview guides to interview different respondents. With hindsight we realised that some of the questions we asked were a bit too general, and that often there was not enough time to ask the specific questions we needed to cover in line with all sub-sections in the policy review. Hence, we had to do quite a lot of follow-ups after interviews to request additional information, which only some respondents were willing to do.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

We divided up the work, each being responsible for a number of different sections, providing extensive feedback to each other. We ended up moving some of the text around to ensure better flow. As mentioned above, when it came to the writing up, we realised that we had key gaps based on initial analysis and interviews, and we had to seek out further sources as well as conduct additional interviews.

The biggest limitation during the write-up was that Gemma left ODI before she was able to fully draft her sections. While she had drafted some paragraphs and left notes and references, the other two researchers then had to make sense of the notes and familiarise themselves with the areas she was responsible for, which took additional time.

We started on the policy database relatively late during the data collection process. That meant we missed some opportunities to ask respondents specific questions. However, we were able to complete the database fairly easily once we had drafted the relevant sections.

Key limitations

The biggest limitation was that data and detailed evidence was not readily available, particularly in terms of impact of policies. This was mainly because this data is not collected and not even from IOM which is meant to have a solid institutional memory as it has been a long-term player in the sector. Regardless of several efforts to speak with Nigerian Immigration Service (NIS), we could not get them to grant interviews. NIS is a crucial stakeholder that could have supplied us with migration data that would have helped the analysis. Hence, we had to heavily draw on assessments by commentators and academics, or make assumptions/ assessments based on the limited evidence available and to a lesser extent key informant interviews. The analysis would have been stronger if data had been available.

A related issue is that because the topics covered by the review are quite politically sensitive and directly linked to funding by the EU, the respondents in many cases gave us quite bland, 'official' or over-positive responses. As a result, we had to triangulate some interview data with assessments of commentators and/or academics.

On the whole, the policy review took significantly more time than that allocated in the project budget.

Pakistan

Literature review

The fieldwork for the Pakistan Policy Review was preceded by an extensive review of existing literature, data, and official policy discourse related to migration. Following the template for the Country Policy Review, the research team studied and analysed the available secondary sources to gather information on the nine themes identified in the template, and their sub-sections (Emigration, Diaspora, Transit Migration, Return Migration, Immigration, Internal Migration, Externalisation of EU Migration Policies, Main Development Policies, and COVID-19

related information). This exercise was helpful to identify gaps in literature that needed to be substituted by expert interviews through fieldwork.

Fieldwork description

Preparation for the fieldwork was done systematically. Firstly, the gaps highlighted in the literature review and the prompts given in the MIGNEX excel file formed the basis of questions to be posed to the experts. Secondly, the literature review was also used to conduct an institutional mapping for migration in Pakistan, enabling the research team to identify key institutions and people to approach for the interviews. A total of 15 interviews were conducted with a fieldwork in Islamabad, Pakistan that took place between October 13, 2020 and February 14, 2021. Among them, 8 interviews were conducted with government officials, 2 with academia, 3 with policy researchers at leading national-level think tanks, and 2 with representatives of international organisations.

The research team constituted Ayesha Qaisrani, Dr. Ahmad Yunas Samad, and Samar Rashid. Ayesha Qaisrani arranged the interviews based on her local network and knowledge of the relevant institutions in the field of migration. Snowball sampling technique was used to contact the relevant experts. Initially the research team's existing network was contacted, which led to suggestions about other relevant experts by those interviewed. Experts in some relevant organisations were also identified through official websites.

Ayesha Qaisrani led the asking of the questions in all the interviews, while Dr. Ahmad Yunas Samad probed further based on responses by the interviewees which helped to contextualise the nuances in the responses. Samar Rashid took notes for all the interviews. For each of the experts, a separate semi-structured questionnaire was developed based on their expertise and their institutional affiliation. At least 8-10 questions were made for each of the experts prior to the interview, and based on their responses, probing questions were asked during the interviews.

All interviews were conducted remotely, following COVID-19 protocols. Two of the interviews were conducted one-to-one over the phone by Ayesha Qaisrani, while the remaining thirteen interviews were held on Zoom attended by Dr. Ahmad Yunas Samad, and Samar Rashid. Two of the experts did not provide consent for recording the interview, so shorthand notes were taken by Samar Rashid during the interview. The remaining thirteen experts provided their informed consent for the recording of the interview for documentation purposes. Most interviews were held in English, however, based on the comfort level of the expert, some interviews were conducted bilingually (English and Urdu). As the research team was fully proficient in both English and Urdu, this was not challenging. Samar Rashid transcribed, and where necessary translated, all the recorded interviews verbatim and drafted summaries for all fifteen interviews.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

Prior to the fieldwork, the excel sheet was filled out with available data, and a rough draft of the policy paper was drafted based on the initial literature review. Sections where more information was needed and gaps were highlighted were duly marked. Ayesha Qaisrani led the writing process of the paper, and Samar Rashid contributed by gathering relevant data. Both the excel sheet and the Policy Review draft were revised after the completion of the fieldwork, and any incoherence in information collected through desk-review and that revealed by experts were critically interpreted. The first draft was then reviewed by Dr. Ahmad Yunas Samad, and his feedback was incorporated before submission to the MIGNEX WP5 team.

Any other relevant points

The MIGNEX Country Policy Review initiative received appreciation by the experts. Some experts, particularly some government officials, re-contacted Ayesha Qaisrani for their migration related queries based on the scope of the project. In multi-year research programmes such as MIGNEX, such two-way interactions between the researchers and policymakers create a viable ground for uptake of evidence-based policy recommendations.

Somalia

The fieldwork for this paper was conducted during February and March 2022 in Somalia as well as remotely through videoconferencing. A total number of 17 experts, ranging from government officials and international non-governmental organization (INGO) to academics were interviewed during the fieldwork, following (and in some cases, simultaneous to) a comprehensive desk review that analysed over 80 documents, including relevant policy frameworks and guidelines. This policy review focused on the period 2012-2022, which is when IGAD countries—of which Somalia is a part— established the Regional Migration Policy Framework. This also corresponds to the emergence of the Federal Republic of Somalia and the swearing-in of the first formal parliament in nearly two decades, following years of civil war. Soon after, international aid and recognition would begin flowing into Somalia anew. This crucial time period of federal development and institutional strengthening also roughly corresponds with a decade of study, making it an ideal time period for this MIGNEX country profile.

Literature review

The literature review for this MIGNEX country profile was conducted between January and March 2022. Surprisingly, peer-reviewed academic literature on migration and development topics in Somalia was typically a few years old or otherwise out of date. This may be partially a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting lockdowns and border closures, but it did make reliable information on new policy developments difficult to confirm in some cases. This led to challenges confirming some claims made by key informants, as indicated in the PBP.

While the literature review included some academic research, it primarily relied on EU funding and donor reports, grey literature from INGOs, consulting firms, and United Nations agencies, and the Somalian policy documents and draft documents themselves. The Draft Social Protection Policy (2019) was especially helpful, as it laid out a list of relevant past development and social protection-adjacent policies in the last decade, which allowed the author to confirm her review had indeed been exhaustive. It also allowed her to ensure she was diving deeper into the policies that were the most recent and relevant, especially insofar as migration policies interacted with standout development policies such as NDP-9 and the NDSS. Grey literature and INGO monitoring reports helped to ensure the report author had correctly interpreted the key points and implications of each draft policy.

However, objective information on implementation of these policies was not forthcoming in the literature, and serious gaps in the literature— namely in immigration policies (especially labor migration), emigration, and EU externalization— required additional probing in key informant interviews. The author was able to successfully work with a team of interviewers at Samuel Hall to find ways to pose questions aiming to fill these gaps and bolster (as well as validate) existing desk review results.

Fieldwork description

This fieldwork interviewed four researchers, three government ministries, five international organization representatives, and five INGO representatives. This included 17 phone or video call interviews, conducted by Fatuma Ahmed, Camille Kasavan, Hafsa Ali, and Carly Seedall-Vasic, all of Samuel Hall.

The research was conducted in both 2021 and 2022 due to delays resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Camille Kasavan conducted four interviews in 2021, while Fatuma Ahmed, Hafsa Ali, and Carly Seedall-Vasic led the interviews in 2022. Since the interviews were conducted over a more than one-year period, the research team could observe the development of policy, changes in the political atmosphere, and the effects of the COVID-19 on migration policy-making. All interviews were conducted in English and via video call. Several interviewees had prior connections to Samuel Hall or had previously participated in Samuel Hall studies. This facilitated the dialogue. In addition, these interviewees referred the research team to others in their network, allowing the research team to gain access to a wide range of perspectives, including government actors at both the local and national levels. All research team members had in-depth knowledge of migration and displacement dynamics in Somalia – this allowed the team to ask nuanced follow-up questions.

Background Paper writing and policy review database

One challenge to writing the background paper was that our team wrote the background paper simultaneously with the interview process. While the KIIs confirmed and validated (as well as filled gaps in) the literature review, better understanding of interview results prior to beginning the literature review may have helped to more narrowly focus the final paper. Partly for this reason, the initial draft PBP was overly long, and required trimming. A personnel change in the middle of the interview process also required additional coordination— though ultimately resulted in a fruitful partnership of three researchers communicating closely about gaps, needs, and priorities.

Limitations of the analysis

This analysis (PBP) is limited by the difficulties in accessing key informants in the various government ministries and agencies in Somalia. Key informants were not, at first, responsive to requests for interviews, and information on best contact points in each agency was difficult to find. As a result, this review does not include expert opinion or key information from state officials in Jubaland and Puntaland, as well as in the Benadir Regional Administration (BRA), though it did ultimately secure interviews from some officials. This may be problematic, as policies in each of these areas differ, and in some cases inform or out-perform, policies within the FGoS. One explanation for this may be research fatigue amongst key informants based in Somalia. The fact that these interviews took place remotely through video conferencing also had the impact of somewhat limiting access to grassroots organizations in Somalia. Interview participants were primarily contacted through existing Samuel Hall networks and the “snowball effect” of recommendations and referrals, especially through Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS). Additional interview participants were found through LinkedIn’s search and messaging service, though it is likely that this search excluded relevant stakeholders who are not present on LinkedIn or otherwise connected to existing Samuel Hall contact networks. Given the emphasis on localization and community ownership of policies highlighted in this report, the lack of grassroots or municipal government participation in interviews represents a key limitation of this analysis. The exception to this is one KII who is the current mayor of Baidoa, and offered a nuanced local perspective.

Tunisia

Review of the literature and policy review database

Three months before interviews took place, a systematic desk review was undertaken by the Koc University research team. Based on this work, the team was able to identify a small number of experts to be interviewed, contacts for whom were shared with the Samuel Hall research team. Given challenges in receiving responses and in the willingness of identified experts to participate in interviews, research teams used a snowball approach to identify further relevant experts, asking participants for recommendations of further KIIs. These targeted in particular areas where the policy database was unable to be fully filled out based on the literature review.

Overall, 14 interviews were conducted, most of which were conducted over the phone or via videoconferencing software given concerns related to Covid-19 in Tunisia at the time of fieldwork between May and October 2021.

Fieldwork description

Interviewers: Camille Kasavan (Samuel Hall), Naeem Meer (Samuel Hall)

Camille Kasavan conducted a first round of seven remote interviews in Tunis between May and August 2021. Interviews were conducted in either French or English (with 4 INGOs, 2 regional governmental institution, 6 national governmental institutions from various countries and 2 independent researchers), and questions were targeted to the specific interviewee based on remaining gaps in the policy brief database and draft. Interviewees were initially selected based on a small list of five contacts provided by Koc University and emerging from the literature review. Given the fact that several potential respondents refused to participate in interviews, a snowball approach was then implemented, asking key experts to recommend further contacts at the end of each interview.

Obtaining participation of key experts (6 Men and 8 Women) proved a challenge, particularly for government stakeholders and other national stakeholders. This may be attributed to a variety of factors, including the very difficult Covid-19 situation in Tunisia, ongoing political turmoil in the country during the summer of 2021, and other priorities for government actors. Some academic actors also proved reluctant to participate, with at least two citing time constraints and a lack of desire to get involved with this type of research. Even stakeholders who did eventually agree to participate required a long process, often with two to three weeks, and sometimes longer, occurring between the initial interview request and the interview actually taking place.

To complete this and close the gap, a second round of expert interviews was conducted between September and October 2021 by Naeem Meer. New relevant contacts were scoped and contacted for participation in the interview. Those who accepted the invitation to be interviewed were interviewed over the phone (In total, 9 interviews were conducted remotely due to Covid-19 situation and 5 face-to-face interviews).

Background Paper writing and policy review database

The Koç University research team has been the lead on the initial drafting of the background paper based on the desktop research, with the Samuel Hall research team revising and adding in inputs based on interviews. Koç team identified the existing gaps in the literature based on the desktop research and suggested specific questions to be directed at the experts to fill in the

gaps and contribute to the background paper. The same process applied for the policy review database as well.

Turkey

Review of the literature and policy review database

A systematic desk-based review was undertaken by the Koç team during November 2020-April 2021. Based on this work, the team was able to identify experts – both migration and non-migration ones – to be interviewed. Overall, fifteen semi-structured interviews were conducted in Turkey, between November 24, 2020 and October 7, 2021. All the interviews were conducted online using Zoom given concerns related to COVID-19 in Turkey at the time of the fieldwork.

Fieldwork description

Ayşen Üstübcü conducted a first round of five interviews between November 2020 and May 2021 based on her policy expertise and knowledge of the gaps in the literature. In other interviews, one or more of the interviewers were present.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İçduygu and Dr. Ayşen Üstübcü facilitated access to interviewees due to their established network among relevant policymakers and experts and the central role of the Migration Research Center at Koç University (MiReKoc) in migration research and fostering academic collaboration and dialogue between researchers, policymakers, international organizations, and civil society actors. Building trustful relationships with local experts was relatively easy thanks to the good reputation and established network of the MiReKoc. Hence, it was not challenging to obtain participation of key experts. Moreover, experts were glad to have contributed to a work undertaken by the MiReKoc team.

The research team also used a snowball approach to identify further relevant experts, asking participants for recommendation of further key experts. The selection of key experts was based on the gaps identified in the literature or need to get expert comments on the realized or expected impact of certain policies as well as interaction between different certain migration and development policies (in total: 2 Civil Society Organisations; 1 think tank; 3 Ministries; 6 academics; 3 governmental bodies)

All the interviews were conducted in Turkish (with 8 men and 7 women) and all conducted online over Zoom due to COVID-19 situation. The fact that interviewers were native Turkish speakers and did not have to use translator, it was easy to build rapport with interviewees and conduct interviews in a very efficient way. Separate sets of questions were prepared for each expert and circulated among the Koç team and finalized before the interview based on the gaps in the literature and the relevant expertise of the interviewee. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed, which both helped researchers on probing further during the interview instead of taking extensive notes and preparing the summaries of the interviews.

Writing up the background paper and completing the policy review database

In the writing stage, Ayşen Üstübcü and Pınar Ensari wrote the first draft. Then document was revised and updated with the input from expert interviews as well as the additional policy and empirical research documents shared by some of the experts. Nilay Kavur took an active role in revising the document and integrating the expert interviews. The policy review database was completed by Pınar Ensari by drawing on findings of desktop research and expert interviews.

Any other relevant points

The time unit of analysis for the paper is 10 years from 2011-2021. This period is selected because 2011 was a significant year for migration and development policy. Following the eruption of civil war in Syria in 2011, Turkey experienced large influx of Syrian nationals which transformed Turkey into the country with the largest number of refugees in the world as well as a net transit and immigration country. This situation shaped Turkey's migration policymaking and cooperation with the EU in terms of facilitating movement of persons, managing transit migration, and controlling unauthorized migration flows.

12.2.2 Summaries of expert interviews for the 10 MIGNEX countries

In terms of interviews with policymakers, a summary of 300 to 500 words was drafted for each interview. This summary was on the role of the individual and their policy expertise, main policies discussed, impacts of these policies on migration and/or development, and any key sources of policy incoherence identified in the relationship between migration policies, development policies, and other sectoral policies at the national level. Different degrees of coherence between the policies of a national government and those of sub-national authorities, supranational entities, the multilateral system, partner countries, and non-governmental stakeholders had to be highlighted if discussed between the researcher and the expert.

These summaries are internal documents for the use of MIGNEX researchers while conducting analysis related to the project and are not to be shared outside the MIGNEX research team. In addition to the summaries, experts had to provide a table summarising the number of interviews conducted with both migration and non-migration experts, the type of organisation, the interview date, the language used and the need (or not) for an interpreter, and, finally, if the interview took place face-to-face or online.

Table 1 Afghanistan

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date (2020)	Language	Mode
AFG1	Government official	24-Nov	English/Dari	Face-to-Face (F2F) or phone
AFG2	INGO Representative	1-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG3	Civil society leader	1-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG4	INGO Representative	25-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG5	Donor	25-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG6	UN representative	23-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG7	UN representative	23-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG8	IO representative	12-Dec	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG9	IO representative	12-Dec	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG10	NGO representative	25-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG11	INGO representative	25-Nov	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG12	INGO representative	25-Jan	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG13	UN representative	23-Jan	English/Dari	F2F or phone
AFG14	IO representatives	22-Jan	English/Dari	F2F or phone

Table 2 Cabo Verde

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date (2020)	Interpreter	Language	Mode
CVPR1	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Communities	24-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR2	Directorate-General of Communities, Consular Affairs and Migration	24-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR3	Directorate-General of Communities, Consular Affairs and Migration	24-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR4	PD Consult	24-Feb	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR5	IOM Praia	25-Feb	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR6	IOM Praia	25-Feb	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR7	National Institute of Statistics	27-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR8	National Institute of Statistics	27-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR9	University of Cape Verde	27-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR10	Business and Governance school	27-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR11	EU Delegation Cabo Verde	28-Feb	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR12	General Directorate of Immigration within the Ministry of Family and Social Inclusion	28-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR13	Platform of African Communities Resident in Cape Verde	28-Feb	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR14	West African Institute	02-Mar	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR15	Organisation for Women in Cabo Verde	03-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR16	National Centre for Social Pensions	03-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR17	Cape Verdean Institute of Children and Adolescents (autonomous)	04-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR18	Senegalese Embassy	04-Mar	Yes	FRE	F2F
CVPR19	Spanish Embassy	04-Mar	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR20	CIGEF at UNICV	04-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR21	World Bank	05-Mar	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR22	World Bank	05-Mar	No	ENG	F2F
CVPR23	Chamber of Commerce	05-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR24	Chamber of Commerce	05-Mar	No	PRT	F2F
CVPR25	Portuguese Embassy	05-Mar	Yes	ENG/PRT	F2F
CVPR26	Directorate of Foreign Borders	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR27	Hospital board	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR28	Hospital board	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR29	Hospital board	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR30	UNTC	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F
CVPR31	UNTC	06-Mar	Yes	PRT	F2F

CVPR32	Bentley University	06-Mar	No	ENG	Skype
CVPR33	ICMPD	02-Apr	No	ENG	Skype
CVPR34	ICMPD	02-Apr	No	ENG	Skype
CVPR35	National Commission on Human Rights and Citizenship	EMAIL	No	ENG	Email exchange
CVPR36	General Directorate Labour	EMAIL	No	ENG	Email exchange

Table 3 Ghana

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date	Language	Mode
GHA1	Civil Society Organisation	06/03/2020	English	Via phone
GHA2	Human Trafficking Secretariat, The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection – MoGCSP	04/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA3	Ghana Refugee Board (GRB) - Ministry of the Interior	02/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA4	Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations	06/03/2020	English	Via Phone
GHA5	IOM – Ghana	02/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA6	Civil Society Organisation	05/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA7	Civil Society Organisation	04/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA8	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration	02/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA9	Migration consultant	06/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA10	The National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)	05/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA11	Ghana Immigration Service - Migration Management Bureau	03/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA12	Academic (Geography)	05/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA13	Academic (Population Studies)	05/03/2020	English	F2F
GHA14	CSO - Diaspora organisation in France	12/05/2021	English	Online

Table 4 Ethiopia

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date	Language	Mode
ETH1	International Organisation for Migration (IO)	02/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH2	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IO)	03/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH3	World Bank (IO)	04/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH4	International Labour Organisation (IO)	27/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH5	OECD Development Centre, (IO)	21/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH6	Agency for Refugees and Returnees Affairs (GA)	14/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH7	Agency for Refugees and Returnees Affairs (GA)	09/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH8	Agency for Refugees and Returnees Affairs (GA)	10/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH9	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (GA)	15/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH10	Jobs creation commission (GA)	09/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH11	Maastricht Graduate School of Governance (academia)	21/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH12	Policy studies institute (academia/think-tank)	03/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH13	Urban Job creation and food security agency (GA)	14/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH14	International Organisation for Migration (IO)	17/05/2021	English	Online (Zoom)
ETH15	International Organisation for Migration (IO)	10/06/2021	English	Online (Zoom)

Table 5 Guinea

PID	Organisation	Date (2021)	Language	Mode
GINP01	IOM	05-Aug	English	Zoom
GINP02	Sabou Guinea	17-Aug	French	In person
GINP03	IOM	23-Aug	English	Zoom
GINP04	EU	25-Aug	English	Zoom
GINP05	IOM	25-Aug	English	Zoom
GINP06	UNICEF	27-Aug	French	In person
GINP07	OPJ	28-Aug	French	In person
GINP08	CNLTPPA	03-Sep	French	In person
GINP09	Ministry of Social Action	08-Sep	French	In person

GINP10 and GINP11	OPROGEM	15-Sep	French	In person
GINP12	National Direction of Youth Employment in the Ministry of Youth and Employment	23-Sep	French	In person
GINP13	Deputy Director General of Guineans abroad.	5-Oct	French	In person
GINP14	Responsible for the Office of Reception, Orientation and Follow-up of Guineans Abroad (BAOS)	5-Oct	French	In person
GINP15	Acting Head of Section for Migration and Reintegration.	5-Oct	French	In person
GINP16	Guinean Organization for the Fight against Irregular Migration (OGLMI)		French	In person
GINP17	Civil Registration & Justice support expert at ENABEL	11-Oct	English	Zoom

Table 6 Nigeria

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date	Language	Mode
NGA1	Academic	07/06/2021	English	Online
NGA2	Academic	11/06/2021	English	Online
NGA3	Academic	22/06/2021	English	Online
NGA4	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	26/06/21	English	Online
NGA5	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	07/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA6	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	09/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA7	National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons (NAPTIP)	09/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA8	Nigerians in Diaspora Commission (NiDCOM)	12/07/2021	English	Online
NGA9	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	22/07/2021	English	Online
NGA10	National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI)	22/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA11	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment	22/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA12	Civil Society Network on Migration and Development (CSOnetMADE)	28/07/2021	English	Online
NGA13	National Bureau of Statistics	29/07/2021	English	Physical
NGA14	Policy Management and Consulting Centre (PMCC)	30/07/2021	English	Online

NGA15	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	03/08/2021	English	Online
NGA16	National Population Commission (NPopC)	03/08/2021	English	Online/Physical
NGA17	Federal Ministry of Justice	04/08/2021	English	Online
NGA18	Centre for Migration Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka	08/08/2021	English	Online
NGA19	OSGF – Nigerian National Volunteer Service	09/08/2021	English	Online
NGA20	International Labour Organisation (ILO Nigeria)	16/08/2021	English	Online
NGA21	NIDO Europe	04/09/21	English	Online
NGA22	PhD student, University of Nigeria	13/10/21	English	Online
NGA23	EU delegation	13/10/21	English	Online
NGA24	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	15/10/21	English	Online

Table 7 Pakistan

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date	Language	Mode
PAK1	Bureau of Emigration and Overseas Employment (BEOE)	20/11/2020	English	Zoom
PAK2	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	26/11/2020	English	Zoom
PAK3	International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)	27/11/2020	English	Zoom
PAK4	Federal Investigation Agency (FIA)	30/11/2020	English and Urdu	Zoom
PAK5	International Organization for Migration (IOM)	11/12/2020	English	Zoom
PAK6	Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE)	11/12/2020	English and Urdu	Zoom
PAK7	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	22/12/2020	English and Urdu	Zoom
PAK8	Punjab Higher Education Commission	29/12/2020	English and Urdu	Telephone
PAK9	Lahore School of Economics	08/01/2021	English	Zoom
PAK10	Collective for Social Science Research	13/01/2021	English	Zoom
PAK11	Overseas Pakistanis Foundation	14/01/2021	English	Zoom
PAK12	National Vocational and Technical Training Commission	27/01/2021	English and Urdu	Zoom
PAK13	Environmental Protection Agency	10/02/2021	English	Zoom
PAK14	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	12/02/2021	English and Urdu	Zoom
PAK15	Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development	14/02/2021	English and Urdu	Telephone

Table 8 Tunisia

PID	Organisation	Date	Language	Mode	Expertise
TUN01	OFII	06/07/2021	French	Online	Migration
TUN02	GIZ	19/07/2021	French	Online	Migration
TUN03	OFII	02/06/2021	French	Online	Migration
TUN04	AFD	23/07/2021	French	Online	Non-Migration
TUN05	EEAS	02/06/2021	French	Online	Non-Migration
TUN06	IOM Tunisia	01/06/2021	English	Online	Migration
TUN07	[Independent]	17/05/2021	English	Online	Migration
TUN08	[Independent]	04/10/2021	French	In person	Migration
TUN09	Dutch Embassy in Tunisia	04/10/2021	English	In person	Migration
TUN10	ICMPD	05/10/2021	English	In person	Migration
TUN11	ICRC	21/10/2021	French	Online	Non-migration
TUN12	UNODC	25/10/2021	French	Online	Non-Migration
TUN13	Swiss Embassy in Tunisia	01/10/2021	French	In person	Migration
TUN14	French Office for Immigration and Integration (OFII) and French Embassy in Tunisia	05/10/2021	French	In person	Migration

Table 9 Turkey

PID	Organisation (ENG)	Interview date	Language	Mode	Expertise
TUR01	University (anonymous)	24.11.2020	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR02	Civil society organisation (anonymous)	30.12.2020	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR03	Civil society organisation (anonymous)	17.01.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR04	University (anonymous)	06.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR05	Think tank (anonymous)	10.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration

TUR06	Koç University	18.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR07	TÜBİTAK- Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey,	20.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Non-migration
TUR08	İstinye University	25.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR09	Hacettepe University	27.05.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR10	Ministry of Labour and Social Security	07.06.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Non-migration
TUR11	Ministry of Family and Social Services	11.06.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Non-migration
TUR12	Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities	11.06.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR13	Ministry of Industry and Technology	14.06.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Non-migration
TUR14	Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities	14.06.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Migration
TUR15	Koç University	07.10.2021	Turkish	Zoom	Non-migration

12.3 Policy database

12.3.1 Methods

The policy database is an input for the analysis in other MIGNEX work packages. The methodological approach for the policy database involves using different data sources to obtain information that is necessary to explore some of the hypotheses developed for the MIGNEX project. Some of the information required researchers to code some responses on a one to four scale. The relevant tables provide instructions of the considerations to use during the coding.

Completing the policy database involved the following steps:

- Completing a desk-based review.
- The information in an Excel sheet was completed as much as possible based on the desk-based research.
- Conducting fieldwork.
- Upon completion of the fieldwork, researchers checked whether there was a need to review the scoring based on the additional information they collected.
- The researchers checked the scores one last time, after completing the background paper.

12.3.2 Database

Table 10 provides a summary of the information on the database which relates to migration. This is just a summary as the actual database covered additional information. In particular, the database collected nuances in the responses that have been removed from the summary.

For the most part, countries do not impose restrictions on the emigration of nationals abroad, nor encourage the emigration of their nationals. However, bilateral labour agreements are very common. Most countries also have policies to encourage diaspora investments, but policies directly related to remittances tend to be ineffective or non-existent.

Table 10 Database responses for migration questions

Question	Afghanistan	Cabo Verde	Ethiopia	Ghana	Guinea	Nigeria	Pakistan	Tunisia	Turkey	Somalia
Is there a current policy that restricts the emigration of nationals abroad?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>In what year was the current policy established?</i>	N/A	N/A	2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA
<i>Is the current policy more restrictive than the previous one?</i>	N/A	N/A	Less	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA
<i>Who is the main target of this policy?</i>	N/A	N/A	Low-skilled	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA
Is there a current policy to encourage the emigration of nationals abroad?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
<i>In what year was the current policy established?</i>	2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2017	Unknown	N/A	N/A
<i>Who is the main target of this policy?</i>	All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Low-skilled	All	Skilled, high-skilled	N/A	N/A
Are there bilateral labour agreements to facilitate the recruitment of nationals abroad?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Who is the main target of this policy?</i>	All	High-skilled	Low-skilled	All	All	All	All	Skilled, high-skilled	Low-skilled	All
Are there multilateral labour agreements to facilitate the recruitment of nationals abroad?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
<i>Who is the main target of this policy?</i>	All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	High-skilled	N/A	N/A	All	N/A
<i>Are any of these agreements with EU countries?</i>	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Can nationals who reside abroad vote in national elections?	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
What is the impact of policies to increase the effect of remittances on receiving households' incomes? 1 = there are no policies 2 = modest impact. 3 = have an impact, but smaller than intended by policies. 4 = have major impact.	1	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1
What is the impact of policies to increase the effect of remittances on national poverty? 1 = there are no policies 2 = modest impact. 3 = have an impact, but smaller than intended by policies. 4 = have major impact.	1	1	2	3	1	3	2	1	1	1
Are there any policies that facilitate diaspora investments?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Is there a policy to cooperate with home-town associations abroad?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Do irregular migrants have access to publicly funded education?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear
Is there a policy to deport irregular migrants?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
What is the level of enforcement of such policy? 1 = no deportations at all. 2 = deportation is the exception rather than the norm. 3 = deportation very common, but not systematic 4 = deportation rules are strictly enforced at most times.	N/A	1	2	3	N/A	2	2	3	3	N/A
Is there a policy to encourage the return of nationals from abroad?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Is there an integration policy for nationals returning from abroad?	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Are there any programmes of collaboration for the readmission of nationals to the country?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Are any of these programmes with the EU?	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the country impose restrictions on transit migrants?										
1 = labour market 2 = housing 3 = labour market and housing 4 = others (specify) 5 = No	5	5	3	5	5	1	4	1	3	5
Does the country receive any EU funding for border enforcement?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 11 provides a summary of other information collected in the database. Microcredit initiatives and agricultural subsidies are very common across countries. Regional trade agreements are also very common, but trade agreements that involve the EU are the exception.

Table 11 Database responses other questions

Question	Afghanistan	Cabo Verde	Ethiopia	Ghana	Guinea	Nigeria	Pakistan	Tunisia	Turkey	Somalia
What is the level of coverage of social protection programmes related to employment aspects? (i.e. nationwide) 1 = there are no such programmes. 2 = programmes exist but have almost no impact on employment aspects. 3 = programmes exist and have an impact on employment aspects for some groups (e.g. particular regions). 4 = programmes exist and have a strong impact on employment aspects across most of the population.	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	1
Are there large microcredit initiatives on the part of the government or other organisations (e.g. cover over 10% of the population)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Does the country have any large agricultural subsidy programmes (e.g. cover over 10% of the rural population)?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
What is the level of access to publicly funded health services? (i.e. nationwide) 1 = less than 20% has access. 2 = 21% to 40% has access. 3 = 41% to 60% has access. 4 = 61% and above has access.	4	4	2	4	N/A	1	2	4	4	1-2

Does the country have a regional trade agreement (i.e. within Africa, Asia, etc.)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the country have a trade agreement with the EU?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

12.4 The reviewing process

After the completion of the data collection, the author(s) uploaded or sent via e-mail, the following documents: the full policy database Excel file; an early version of the policy background paper, including at least four sections (e.g. Emigration, Diaspora, Transit and Return); the methodological note (MN); and expert summaries (SUM). Feedback was then be provided to the author(s) by Marie Godin and Carlos Vargas-Silva as part of MIGNEX quality assurance and review procedure. The full background paper, including necessary revisions to the first four sections, was then sent back to the Oxford MIGNEX team. For all the PBPs, one or two external reviewers were invited to conduct a friendly review in order to solicit additional constructive comments on the full background paper. Nevertheless, the content of the document, including opinions expressed and any remaining errors, are the responsibility of the author(s). In the following table, the list of external reviewers per country is provided as well as the names of people who assisted the main researcher(s) to collect the data.

Table 12 Reviewing process

	MIGNEX country	Author(s)	External Reviewer(s)	Special thanks to
1	Afghanistan	Samuel Hall research team	Reza Hussaini from the City University of London	/
2	Cabo verde	Gemma Hennessey - Research Officer in the Politics and Governance programme, working on ODI's migration research.	João Resende Santos - Associate Professor, Global Studies Invited International Researcher, University of Lusofona Interdisciplinary Center for Research on Education and Development Affiliated Faculty, Institute of Cape Verdean Studies Ph.D. Harvard University	Aaron Bailey-Athias and Eileen Barbosa for interpretation support, as well as Andira Lopes, Paulino Dias and team from PD Consult for fieldwork assistance
3	Ethiopia	Lise Andersson - Economist, OECD Development Centre (Previously researcher at the University of Maastricht)	Kerilyn Schewel - Lecturing Fellow in the Duke Center for International Development, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University	Alexe Ceulemans for very useful research assistance.

4	Ghana	Leander Kandilige (University of Ghana), Joseph Teye (University of Ghana), Carlos Vargas-Silva (University of Oxford) and Marie Godin (University of Oxford)	Dr Mary Boatemaa Setrana (Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Migration Studies CMS, University of Ghana, Legon) and Thomas Yeboah, PhD (Research Fellow, Bureau of Integrated Rural Development at the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology Kumasi-Ghana)	/
5	Guinea	Mazzilli, C., Binat Sarwar, M. and Hagen-Zanker, J.	Professor Esther Botta Somparé (Université Kofi Annan de Guinée et Université Julius Nyerere de Kankan, Guinea)	Gemma Hennessey and Karim Balde, and Nermin Abbassi for research assistance
6	Nigeria	Tobechukwu Nneli, Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Gemma Hennessey (ODI)	Amanda Bisong (policy officer in ECDPM's migration and mobility and AU-EU relations) and Omolola S. Olarinde (Omolola Smaria Olarinde (PhD. Econ, Ibadan) is University based Researcher working on migration governance, location effects of migration, and returns to migration, in relation to inclusive growth and development)	/
7	Pakistan	Qaisrani A., Rashid S. and Samad Y.	Dr Nasra M. Shah, Professor at the Lahore School of Economics	/
8	Somalia	Madison Chapman Independent Consultant Nassim Majidi Co-founder, Executive Director of Research and Policy & Migration Pillar Lead, Samuel Hall Hervé Nicolle Co-founder, Executive Director of Research and Policy & Social Equity Lead, Samuel Hall	Abdullahi Abdi Hassan (Solutions Manager at Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS)	/
9	Tunisia	Pinar Ensari (Koç University), Camille Kasavan (Samuel Hall), Eleonore Thenot (Samuel Hall)	Katharina Natter, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Political Science at Leiden University	/

10	Turkey	Pinar Ensari Ayşen Üstübcü Nilay Kavur Maryam Ekthiari	Prof.Dr.Ayselin Yildiz at the Yaşar University and UNESCO Chair on International Migration at Dep.of International Relations	Authors also would like to thank Kübra Ergün for her assistance in the preparation of this report. We would also like to thank Ahmet İçduygu and Damla Bayraktar Aksel for their comments and to Eric Larden for copy-editing the report.
----	--------	---	---	---

12.5 Three main take-aways/country

Table 13 Take aways

Nbr	Country	Three take aways
1	Afghanistan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Emigration, return and internal displacement are dynamic facets of the Afghan migration and displacement context, which render policy-making a complex task; 2) While the Afghan government considers migration a vehicle for development, policy growth and implementation have proven slow. Return policies remain at the draft stage and there is a siloed approach to reintegration; 3) Labour migration strategies and bilateral labour agreements exist, but with no progress on implementation and further delays due to political instability, renewed conflict and a global pandemic. This limits the possibility of regular and safe migration pathways.
2	Cabo Verde	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are several initiatives to engage the diaspora, including the Emigrant Investor Statute in 2020; 2) Immigration is a key policy issue since the launch of the National Immigration Strategy in 2012; 3) Cabo Verde cooperates on mobility issues with the EU under the framework of the Mobility Partnership, signed in 2008.
3	Ethiopia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Migration management in Ethiopia is to date mainly characterised by declarations, proclamations and legal documents, but a national migration policy is currently being drafted; 2) Migration management in Ethiopia is to date mainly characterised by declarations, proclamations and legal documents, but a national migration policy is currently being drafted; 3) There is a shift in how labour migration policy is viewed in Ethiopia, away from solely focusing on protection of low-skilled workers in the Middle East to more active promotion of labour migration of middle-skilled and skilled workers to new destinations.
4	Ghana	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Interest in migration policy has increased since the launch of the National Migration Policy in 2016; 2) Free movement in the ECOWAS region and a ban on migration to the Gulf States are two of the main issues; 3) There are key initiatives to engage the African diaspora, including declaring 2019 as the Year of Return and 2020 as Beyond the Return.

5	Guinea	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Guinea has drafted its New Migration Policy, but it has not come into force yet due to the September 2021 coup d'état; 2) Despite being a country of major emigration, policies for regular labour emigration are absent, while donor programming on irregular migration is rife; 3) Its collaboration with the EU is centred around the EU's priorities of return and reintegration and irregular migration
6	Nigeria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Donors have shaped the design of many recent migration policies and pay for much of implementation; 2) There is a mismatch between EU and Nigerian political priorities in the area of migration; 3) Nigeria government policy priorities are in diaspora remittances and investment, and legal emigration channels.
7	Pakistan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Pakistan has a strong policy framework to promote labour emigration, channelling remittances through formal routes and encouraging diaspora engagement for national development; 2) Concerns exist around the diversification of skills and choice of destination country, as well as the reintegration of returnees; 3) Internal migration, specifically from rural to urban areas, is high but unplanned at the national and provincial levels
8	Somalia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Advancement in the assistance of Somali returnees and IDPs, based on the adoption of durable solutions approaches with the adoption of two distinct but interacting policies: the NPRRI and NDP-9; 2) Policy implementation of is negatively impacted by the low coordination between government actors, and the lack of monitoring and coordination mechanisms; 3) Given conflicts over natural resources, the growing role of HLP, tenure security, and anti-eviction laws will continue to be central for the protection, and reintegration, of IDPs and returnees.
9	Tunisia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Jasmine revolution of 2011, the Arab spring, the crisis in neighbouring Libya, and the strategic location of Tunisia (bordering Libya and being at the southern border of Europe) have had a big influence on migration and development policy in Tunisia; 2) There is no official migration policy in Tunisia at present. The National Migration Strategy (SNM) which covers all aspects of migration has not been formally adopted and enacted. Tunisia's security-driven migration policy could not be reformed due to both domestic and international forces; 3) Despite the intention and efforts to enhance development in general and through migration, factors such as the lack of economic opportunities, political instability, corruption, rising youth unemployment, and the COVID-19 pandemic have hindered this.
10	Turkey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Turkey's diaspora engagement policies have become more proactive in the last decade. High skilled emigration has accelerated in recent years and the Turkish government is taking actions to reverse this trend; 2) Turkey has acted as a gatekeeper in managing transit migration into the EU but also uses this role as a foreign policy tool to gain leverage in its relations with the EU; 3) Although one of the largest refugee recipients in the world, Turkey does not give official refugee status to asylum seekers outside of Europe. Since 2016, the country is operating one of the largest cash aid programs to refugees. The cash aid program called ESSN is funded by the EU and covers over 1,5 million refugees. In Turkey, overwhelming majority of them are Syrians.

References

- Afghanistan (AFG): Samuel Hall (2021) Migration-relevant policies in Afghanistan – before the fall of the GoIRA. MIGNEX Background Paper. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/afg Disclaimer: The report was drafted in 2021 and uses the present tense. All information reflects the pre-August 2021 state of affairs. The MIGNEX consortium believes this policy brief still holds value – to record history and to serve as the basis for future policy engagement.
- Cabo Verde (CPV): Hennessey, G. (2021) Migration-relevant policies in Cabo Verde (v2). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/cpv
- Ethiopia (ETH): Andersson, L. (2022) MIGNEX Policy Review: Ethiopia (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/eth. Disclaimer: The report was drafted in 2021.
- Ghana (GHA): Kandilige, L., Teye, J., Vargas-Silva, C. and Godin, M. (2022). Migration-relevant policies in Ghana. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/gha. Disclaimer: The report was drafted in 2021. Ghana was one of the three pilot studies to test the methodological approach developed in the MIGNEX Handbook Chapter 9 (see Godin and Carlos Vargas-Silva 2020).
- Guinea (GUI): Mazzilli, C., Binat Sarwar, M. and Hagen-Zanker, J. (2022). Migration-relevant policies in Guinea (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/gui
- Nigeria (NIG): Nneli, T., Hagen-Zanker, J. and Hennessey, G. (2022). Migration-relevant policies in Nigeria (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/nig
- Pakistan (PAK): Qaisrani A., Rashid S. and Samad Y. (2021) Migration-relevant policies in Pakistan. MIGNEX Background Paper. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at: <https://www.mignex.org/pak>
- Somalia (SOM): Chapman, M., Majidi, N. and Nicolle, H. (2022) MIGNEX Policy Review: Somalia (v2). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/som
- Tunisia (TUN): Ensari P, Kasarani C and Thenot, E (2022) MIGNEX Policy Review: Tunisia (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/tun
- Turkey (TUR): Pınar Ensari, Ayşen Üstübcü, Nilay Kavur and Maryam Ekthiari (2022) MIGNEX Policy Review (v1). Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo. Available at www.mignex.org/tur