ADMiGOV

Advancing Alternative Migration Governance

Measuring 'Good' Migration Governance in Turbulent Times,

a Critical State of the Art (Deliverable 7.1)

Author: Francesco Pasetti, CIDOB

2019

Publication information

Acknowledgments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction: new challenges call for new solutions, which need new tools for diagnosis

The scope, intensity and fast-changing nature of contemporary international mobility is putting strain on systems of migration governance, drawing attention to their limits and contradictions. A series of emergencies over the last few years have led the international community to critically assess the governance of international migration in its entirety. This assessment has called into question both the driving principles and operational strategies of international migration governance. The 2016 New York Declaration (NYD), the later 2018 Global Compacts on Migration and Refugees, but also the wider 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), have mirrored such reasoning. These international agreements share key-goals to be pursued in relation to migration governance, including: upholding the fundamental rights and freedoms of refugees and migrants; enhancing humanitarian efforts to save lives and offer adequate short, medium and long-term protection; strengthening the connection between different levels of government and support and improving the cooperation between actors involved in the global governance of migration; and tackling the "root causes" of human mobility in their political, social and economic dimensions. The SDGs, the NYD and the Global Compacts call for new solutions and alternative approaches to migration governance, able to realize such goals.

If new challenges call for new solutions, such solutions will inevitably need new tools. The AMIDGOV project aims at providing the latter, developing indicators of good migration governance from bottom-up empirically grounded research across a number of sites and scales. The idea is to provide a comprehensive set of synthetic measures assessing to what extent current systems of governance comply with principles and live up to contemporary challenges. ADMIGOV indicators of good migration governance will help measure monitor policymaking while holding policymakers accountable for their actions.

The research design for building ADMIGOV indicators combines deductive and indicative approaches. First, indicators that comply with the ADMIGOV aims will be selected among those available in the literature. The selection process will be theoretically driven: ADMIGOV definition of "migration governance" will be employed as benchmark to select among existing

indicators of migration governance. The output of this first stage will be a (sub-) dataset that gathers together existing synthetic measures of migration governance consistent with ADMIGOV aims. At the same time, the literature review carried out in this first stage will guide the empirical work to be done in the empirical work-packages, particularly towards those elements of migration governance most overlooked by the literature, namely those dimensions that still lack synthetic measures of assessment. The second stage will be empirically-driven as the empirical findings gathered in other project work-packages will inspire the creation of *ex-novo* indicators. Finally, ex-novo indicators will be combined with the former selection of existing indicators in a comprehensive set, which will become the ADMIGOV dataset of indicators of migration governance.

The present document places itself at the outset of such a process and aims to provide a critical review of the literature on good migration governance. The first section gives clear and unambiguous definitions of "migration governance" and "good migration governance" that comply with ADMIGOV aims, namely that take seriously the principles set by international institutions to face current migratory challenges[1]. This is done firstly by approaching the broad question of "governance", then narrowing into migration governance and, finally, specifying what we understand for good migration governance. Here the core elements are identified in which migration governance and good migration can be analytically broken down. In the following section, such conceptualizations are employed as benchmark for evaluating current measures available in this field of study in order to establish to what extent they allow a reliable assessment of migration governance (and good migration governance) and –at a later stage – selecting only those that comply with such definitions. The concluding section reflects upon the main findings emerged from the literature review: first, it identifies the main datasets on which it will be relied upon for building the selection of existing indicators that comply with ADMIGOV aims; second, by detecting the main gaps in the literature, it suggests the elements and dimensions of migration governance and good migration governance on which the ADMIGOV empirical inquiry will focus on in view of developing new indicators in the last stage of the project.

---

[1] See Munck, G.L., and J. Verkuilen (2002) "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." Comparative Political Studies 35(1):5–34, in which the authors developed an analytical framework for comparing measures of democracy.

2. Conceptualizing migration governance and good migration governance

To conceptualize "migration governance" and "good migration governance" we must first address the wider and underlying notion of "governance", which is not an easy task. The conceptual boundaries of "governance" have increasingly diversified with its diffusion in academic and policymaking lexicons (Robichau 2011) Despite having become one of the key concepts in Political Science, it is extremely hard to find a clear consensus on governance's meaning. According to Pierre and Peters (2000, 7) "the concept of governance is notoriously slippery; it is frequently used among both social scientists and practitioners without a definition which all agree on".

In defining governance, some scholars turn to the dictionary. Hughes (2010, 88), for instance, uses the Latin root (gubernare) and, combining this with dictionary meanings, elaborates a working definition where governance is "about running organizations, about steering as in the original derivation, how to organize, and how to set procedures for an organization to be run". However, there are more itemized conceptualizations of governance, such as that put forward by Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill (2001, 7), who conceive governance as "regimes, laws, rules, judicial decisions, and administrative practices that constrain, prescribe, and enable the provision of publicly supported goals and services". Drawing upon Krasner (1983), March and Olsen (1997) and Keohane (2002), Frederickson (2005) defines governance as the "sets of principles, norms, roles, and decision-making procedures around which actors […] converge in a given public policy arena".

The variety of perspectives and definitions found in the academic sphere is mirrored in the institutional arena where practitioners seem unable to find a common definition. The World Bank, for instance, defined governance as the "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development" (1992) In contrast the United Nations (2009, 1), referred to it as: "the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented) " It is worth noting the specific meaning that governance assumes in each of these two meanings: narrower and related to the capacity to ensure development in the former, broader and related to the capacity to formulate and bring about decisions in the latter.

2.1 *Governance's shared meaning*

Despite important differences, scholars seem to share an understanding about governance as "how things get done". Osborne (2010, 7) says that governance captures the "realities of public policy implementation and public service delivery within complexities of the state in the twenty-first century". Such an understanding of governance has been developed in Public Administration studies and has spread to other fields and disciplines overcoming the notion of "government" which dominated inquiry (and jargon) until the second half of the 20th century. The emerging consensus on what governance is builds on a prior agreement about what governance is not, namely government. Pierre and Peters (2000: 29) spell it out clearly: despite having the same derivation governance and government "need not, and indeed, should not, be taken to mean the same thing". Governance captures something broader than government (Jordan, 2008, Kjær, 2004), based on the transformation (some) states experienced between the 20th and the 21st centuries when state sovereignty and government power was broadened, dispersed and reconstituted across new sites of action (Jessop 2004; Kennett 2008) In the new context of "unstructured complexity" (Jessop 2004) and "differentiated polity" (Rhodes 1997), the relationships between state and society, governments and citizens, and state and not-state institutions have taken new forms, which have been captured by the concept of governance (Daly 2003; Newman 2005; Kjaer 2004;) In this sense, we can say that governance regards modes of governing in the globalized world of today, where multiple interdependent actors and process are involved.

2.2 Governance's dispersed, diverse and contested character

Governance takes shape in the process by which the act of governing distances itself from traditional areas of state action. The new form of governing is dispersed, diverse and contested. Governance is "dispersed" because governments are gradually yielding control over policy processes, often to the private sector (e.g. through contractual relationships, partnership, collaboration and outsourcing) (Bevir, 2010; Robichau 2011) Governance is "diverse" because the policy arena involves an increasing heterogeneity of actors across different political layers: local, national, regional and supra-national (Daly 2003) Governance is "contested" because such actors often hold different interests, values, cognitive orientations and power

resources (Koenig-Archibugi 2003) The case of NGOs is paradigmatic in this regard. Their relevance in politics and policymaking is gaining growing attention in scholarship (see, for instance, Lipschutz 1992 and Woods 2003) Still, the spectrum of private actors involved in contemporary governance goes far beyond non-governmental organizations and includes national and multi-national companies, transnational societies, and international institutions (Rosenau 1990) As the policy arena has become more crowded and contested (Kettl 2010), old state-centred and hierarchical modes of governing are leaving room for new modes of governing marked by different spatial scales and new types of relationships. As Newman (2005, 4) says "the image of a hierarchical relationship between state and citizenry... is displaced by the idea of multiple parallel spaces in which power is encountered and negotiated". Networks – the way in which scholars usually describe these new kinds of relationships and interactions (Bevir 2009, Klijn 2008) – are far from substituting old hierarchical structures. Hierarchies and networks have to be understood as essential, coexisting features of the dispersed, diverse and contested character of governance in the 21st century (Lynn 2011, Robichau, 2011)

2.3 Governance's two-fold quality

Scholarship also shows a certain consensus about the way(s) of evaluating governance, namely about the criteria employed to assess its "goodness". Without delving into the specific criteria that each scholar uses for evaluating "good governance" – which depend on the specific field of application and the object of study – it is possible to distinguish two main evaluative modes or approaches: an instrumental approach and a normative approach. The instrumental approach comes from the formative works of Woodrow Wilson (1887) and Max Weber (1946) and focuses on the notions of efficiency and effectiveness. As described by Francis Fukuyama (2013), the instrumental approach assesses governance in relation to policymakers' capacity "to make and enforce rules and to deliver services". In this case the evaluation regards the capacity of the governance system to both reach the expected goals (effectiveness) with the least resources (efficiency)[2]. In contrast other scholars approach governance using explicit normative standards. This is the normative approach that determines good governance by assessing the system of governance vis-à-vis the ultimate

---

[2] In this regard see also Rothstein (2011)

ends it is meant to serve. Contributions offered by the United Nation are illuminating in this regard. The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2009), for instance, employs several value-laden criteria to assess good governance, including participation, transparency, accountability, consent, fairness and equity.

The relationship between instrumental and normative approaches needs further reflection. Two main considerations seem particularly worth of attention: the first points to the importance of keeping governance's qualities apart, the latter to the necessity of making them transparent. The importance of maintaining separated normative and instrumental approaches derives from the fact that they represent two different conceptual and empirical entities. Think, for example, about the ability of a government to effectively provide health services to its population. Such capacity can be evaluated notwithstanding the democratic quality of the state. Democratic quality and health system' effectiveness represent two separate matters. It is no secret that authoritarian countries can have more efficient health systems than democratic ones. For the purpose of the ADMIGOV indicators the need to distinguish instrumental and normative considerations is relevant as it involves the need to keep the evaluation of "migration governance" and the evaluation of "good migration governance" apart. In a few lines we will get back to such two-fold quality of governance.

The second remark concerns the necessity to make explicit the epistemological standpoints that lie beyond instrumental and normative criteria employed in the analysis. The necessity to make them clear derives from the impossibility to make them ultimately value-free. By definition, an indicator evaluates the extent to which a given empirical entity matches with pre-established standards. The standard chosen, which inevitably abides by a concrete theoretical and value-laden standpoint, determines the outcome of the evaluation. Brought to the field of ADMIGOV inquiry, this becomes evident in relation to the specific understanding of good migration governance undertaken. The ways in which the principles of protection and sustainable development will be operationalized through indicators - and, particularly, the way in which the scale of "goodness" will be graded – will determine the result of the assessment.[3] Without delving into in the details of such operationalization, at

---

[3] It is worth noting that the impossibility of a value-free evaluation, do not only regards normative approach, it also concerns the instrumental approach and the criteria employed for assessing "efficiency" and "effectiveness".

this stage it is worth pointing out the necessity of making the criteria explicit that will inspire the assessment of migration governance. These will be duly accounted for in the following stages of the WP7 research.

2.4 Governance's context-dependent nature

Any reflection about governance cannot ignore its context-dependent nature. Historically, this is linked to the proliferation of the concept within and beyond the field of Social Sciences. As described by Robichau (2011), the notion of governance has spread out from Public Administration studies to other fields and across disciplines, from e.g. political science, public policy and administration, as well as management studies, to those (apparently) more distant, such as anthropology (e.g. Higgins and Lawrence, 2005) and geography (e.g., Seldadyo, Elhorst, and De Haan, 2010) This has meant the concept assumes a specific meaning depending on the area of inquiry. As pointed out by Bovaird and Löffler (2003), any definition of governance is context-specific in the sense that its meaning ultimately rests on the specific domain of application and object of inquiry. It is not by chance that in most of the literature the term "governance" tends to come along with an adjective specifying the boundaries of its meaning, such as "global governance" (Rosenau and Czempiel 1992), "democratic governance" (Bevir, 2010) and "migration governance" (Kunz, Lavenex and Panizzon 2011) Holding to the common reference of governance as "how things get done" that lies beyond the various uses and acceptations of governance, the specific significance that governance as a concept takes in empirical investigations is linked to the domain of study and the specific object of research. For the aim of ADMIGOV's research, this requires us to make an additional step: to define governance (and good governance) in the field of migration studies.

3. Defining migration governance and good migration governance

Having set out what "governance" is about in broad terms, in order to define "migration governance" we need to clarify what we mean when we speak of "migration". First of all it, it is worth specifying that, here, the term does not refer to domestic migration[4]; it refers only to international migration, namely to "the movement of a person or a group of persons across an international border, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length,

---

[4] "Domestic/internal migration" refers to the movement of people within state' boundaries

composition and causes" (IOM, 2011) Accordingly, migration governance's target population is made by any person who - regardless of her status, motives, causes and the length of stay - is moving or has moved across state boundaries.

This understanding of migration is in line with the branch of the literature recognizing the "mixed" nature of human mobility (e.g. Richmond 1994, UNGA 2003, UNHCR 2007, Van Hear 1998) This analytical frame acknowledges the heterogeneity of motives that lies beyond the decision to migrate (Horwood, Forin and Frouws 2018) and the fact that people often shift between traditional policy-categories of economic migrants, family-related migrants, asylum seekers, beneficiaries of international protection and migrants travelling through irregular means. A migrant can indeed enter a country as student, but then work, overstay and, possibly ask for asylum, if conditions in his or her country of origin allow for it (Van Hear 2011) Moreover, the decision to migrate often blends the search for safety with the need to find better economic conditions and re-join the family. Fixed categories not only clash with changing social contexts, they also fail to recognize the complexity of person's agency. The distinction between "forced" and "voluntary", just to make a well-known example, underestimates person's agency in the first case and overestimate it in the latter. Moving from such a basis, rather than artificially distinguishing different categories of persons within migrant flows, ADMIGOV frames migration governance as targeting the phenomenon of international migration as a whole.

The character of migration governance mirrors the character of governance illustrated in the previous section. To capture the complexity of actors, layers and relationships involved in the governance of migration, scholars in this field of study usually employ the concept of multi-level governance (MLG) According to Hooghe and Marks (2001, 3), MLG can be understood as the "dispersion of authority away from central government - upwards to the supranational level, downwards to subnational jurisdictions, and sideways to public/private networks". On the same line and following recent contributions on the topic (see, Garcés-Mascareñas and Penninx 2016, Panizzon and Riemsdijk 2018, Zincone and Caponio 2006), which delve into its multidimensionality, migration governance can be thought of embracing various phases, sites, stages, areas, scale and actors.

Migration governance is multi-phase in the sense that it covers the key phases of the migratory process trajectory, which go from the moment in which the person leaves the origin

country to the moment in which he or she reaches another country, passing through different dynamics and patterns of circularity[5]. In this regard, the literature distinguishes 2+1 phases that make up the migratory process, the phase of entry, the phase of exit and the phase of circularity (covering temporary movements between home and host countries) (Bjerre et al. 2014, Peters 2013)

Migration governance is multi-sited. If international migration takes place across countries, then the system governing such phenomenon is dispersed across different sites. The streams of research on the externalization of migration control (Triandafyllidou, 2014; Reslow and Vink 2015; Wunderlich 2012) and the migration-development nexus (Lavenex and Kunz 2008; Nyberg–Sørensen, Van Hear and Engberg–Pedersen 2002; Faist and Fauser 2011) provide illuminating insights in this regard. For the aim of this inquiry it is sufficient to bear in mind that migration governance takes place across different sites, situated in country of origins, transit countries and destination countries.

Migration governance is also multi-stage in that it encompasses different stages of the policy-cycle, from policy formulation to policy evaluation, passing thorough executive and implementation steps. In this regard, the scholarship emphasises three main stages: (i) the stage of normative framework setting, (ii) the stage of policy implementation and (iii) the stage of evaluation. The first stage concerns the development of legal apparatuses and, analytically, it points to policy-outputs[6] (Knill and Tosun 2014) or to the "rules of the games", to say with Knoepfel et al. (2007) Policy implementation regards the stage in which policy-outputs are put into practice. As pointed out by Ambrosini and Van der Leun (2015), the way in which bureaucrats and administrators implement the normative framework highly affects migratory experience. Finally, migration governance also includes the stage of evaluation in

---

[5] Migration governance does not include the phase of "integration". The choice is justified on the basis that this phase refers to the settlement of the person in the receiving country without involving cross-border movement. This said, the lines of demarcation between migration phases and the phase of integration are often less clear then they seem at first sight (Bjerre et al. 2014); think for instance of labour and social rights associated to entry permits. The partial overlap between migration phases and the integration phase will be duly considered in the development of ADMIGOV indicators.

[6] Knill and Tosun (2014, 336) conceive policy-outputs as "government statements of what it intends to do or not to do" including laws, regulations, decisions and orders.

which control mechanisms and assessment tools are employed to evaluate the effectiveness and the efficacy of the system.

Migration governance is multi-area inasmuch as it encompasses different domains of policymaking. These include classical policy-areas, such as that of citizenship (e.g. Freeman 2006) and employment (e.g. Robertson, 2014), and areas that have only recently aroused the interest of literature, such as the area of health (see Zimmerman, Kiss and Hossain 2011) To this regard, it is worth pointing out the agreement among scholars to identify the area of development as a proper and specific domain of policymaking within the governance of migration (see, for instance, Lavenex and Kunz 2008; Faist and Fauser 2011)

Finally, migration governance is multi-scalar and multi-actor. Garcés-Mascareñas and Penninx (2016) organize them over two orthogonal axes along which the governance system can be structured. The vertical axis captures the multitude of actors distributed over the different geopolitical scale, including municipal actors and civil society placed at the local level, actors working at the level of the central state, supranational actors such as European Institutions. The horizontal axis captures instead the scope of actors involved, classifying them on the basis on their institutional nature, distinguishing between state (e.g. administrative entities and bodies concerned with immigrant integration) and non-state actors (e.g. NGOs and immigrant associations) In this line, Scholten and Penninx (2016) have gone a step further and have identified 4 ideal-types of multilevel governance configurations: centralist, localist, multilevel and decoupled. The centralist configuration is characterized by a top-down hierarchy among governance levels and a strong and formalized institutional structure. The localist type involves a more bottom-up and horizontal perspective in which the role of municipal actors goes beyond policy implementation and includes policy formulation based on locally grounded agendas. The multilevel type refers to a specific mode of interaction and coordination in which there is no clear dominance of one level over another and usually takes the shape of forums or networks horizontally and vertically articulated. In the decoupled

ideal-type different levels of governance pursue and bring about contrasting actions, possibly ending up in tensions and conflicts between actors placed at different governance scales[7].

Looking at the variety of phases, sites, stages, areas, scale and actors helps to bring into focus the constitutive elements of migration governance, namely the building blocks in which the concept can be theoretically decomposed and empirically investigated. In other words, building blocks represent the necessary elements for developing a definition of migration governance that is as complete, clear and unambiguous as possible. Migration governance building blocks include:

• Actors: set of single/collective, state/non-state and public/private actors involved in the regulation of international migration, distributed over the various levels of governance.

• Relations: formal and informal links and relationships among actors involved in migration governance. Formal connections get back to the procedural architecture described by King et al (2012) while informal relations concern the organization and coordination among actors as they occur in putting measures into practice.

• Resources: in-cash and in-kind means and assets dedicated to the regulation of international migration.

• Policy: policy-outputs meaning "policymaker's statements of what it intends to do or not do in regard to regulation of international migration", paraphrasing Knill and Tosun (2014, 336)

• Practices: measures and processes through which policymakers' goals and policy-outputs are brought into practice given the different actors, relations and resources.

On such ground, it is possible to provide an "essential" definition of migration governance, conceived as the "***the multi-phase, multi-site, multi-stage, multi-area, and multi-scale system of actors, relations, resources, policies and practices regulating international migrations***". The idea beyond such an "essential definition" is to have a working conceptual construct for evaluating available measures of migration governance and to select those that allow a reliable assessment of such a concept or of some of its features.

---

[7] Recent contributions about the governance of 2015 European refugees' "crisis", have emphasized the "turn to the local" and the crucial role played by municipalities NGOs and migrants associations in contrast with central governments' position (see Panizzon and Riemsdijk 2018; Peters and Pierre 2016)

Moving from this, good migration governance could be simply understood as "the multi-phase, multi-site, multi-stage, multi-area, and multi-scale system of actors, relations, resources, policies and practices that well regulates international migrations." This general definition can be better specified by making it consistent with ADMIGOV's aims, according to which migration governance is "good" as long as it is both effective and respectful towards the principles set by the New York Declaration (NYD), the following Global Compacts on Migration and Refugees, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Accordingly, good migration governance can be conceived as "***the multi-phase, multi-site, multi-stage, multi-area, and multi-scale system of actors, relations, resources, policies and practices that effectively regulates international migrations while respecting the principles of protection and sustainable development***". It is worth noting that this definition embraces the two main modes for evaluating the governance's "goodness" identified in the literature while keeping them apart. On the one hand the instrumental approach is followed to the extent that effectiveness is assessed, namely considering how effectively the system of governance regulates international migration. On the other hand, normative considerations also come into play as long as the quality of the governance system is assessed in relation to compliance with protection principles and sustainable development. The idea, again, is to have a conceptual benchmark for reviewing existing indicators of good migration governance, analysing whether and how such datasets assess governance system's effectiveness and capacity to ensure migrants' protection and sustainable development.

4. Available indicators for assessing migration governance and good migration governance

This literature review considers sets of indicators developed either for assessing migration governance and good migration governance or appraising some of their dimensions. The key question the review points to answer is: what is the capacity of each dataset to assess migration governance and good migration governance as defined in ADMIGOV terms? Different criteria make up such an evaluative effort, including: concepts and definitions employed (1); the target population covered (2); governance dimensions, in terms of phases (3a), sites (3b), scale (3c), stages (3d) and areas (3e); constitutive elements (i.e. actors,

relations, resources, policy, practices) (4)   Specific remarks will reflect on the way the literature sizes "good governance" (5)

The following table summarizes the core dimensions employed in the literature review. The first part illustrates only the main methodological features of the datasets analysed whereas in the second part each index is set against the characterizing features of migration governance[8]. The pool of texts examined includes both comprehensive and sectorial measures, namely datasets that cover more than one dimension of migration governance at the same time (e.g. MGI) or focus on a single dimension, whether this is a concrete stage of policymaking (e.g. DEMIG focuses on policy formulation), a specific area (e.g. CERNA focuses on labour) or a specific scale of governance (e.g. MIPEX focuses on national level) The section proceeds, firstly, by sifting through indexes and indicators provided by migration studies to then zoom in on datasets accessible in a disaggregated form, as only accessible items can be gathered for building ADMIGOV indicators.

---

[8] Some indexes (i.e. the CDI and the WPP) go beyond the scope of migration and embrace other fields of research. In these cases, the literature review has focused only on the specific subset of items related to integration.

Table 1 – Assessing migration governance: a state of the art of available indexes and indicators

GENERAL FEATURES

Dataset name/acronym	Reference	Aim and Object of Analysis	Nº items/indicators	Temporal coverage	Spatial coverage (N)	Coding rules and Disaggregated data
ASYLUM POLICY INDEX	Hatton 2009	Assessing asylum policy change in terms of restrictiveness (deterrence effect)	15	1996-2006	19	Not available
CDI (migration area)	Roodman 2013, Robinson et al. 2018	*As regard the indicators dedicated to migration area* : Assessing (migration) policy effectiveness in contributing at helping poorer countries to develop and grow.	>100	2003-2018	27	Available
CERNA	Cerna 2014, 2016	Assessing high-skilled migration policy in terms of restrictiveness	6	2007; 2012	20	Not available
DEMIG	de Haas, Natter and Vezzoli 2016	Assessing migration policies change in terms of restrictiveness and magnitude	not specified	1945-2013	45	Available
DETERRENCE INDEX	Thielemann 2004	Assessing deterrence dimensions of countries' asylum policy	not specified	1985-1999	17	Not available
Emigrant Policies Index (EMIX)	Pedrosa and Palop 2017, Pedroza, Palop and Hoffmann 2016	Assessing emigration policies' effectiveness in engaging with emigrants	102	2014-2016	22	Available
GLOBAL MIGRATION BAROMETER (GMB)	EIU 2008	Assessing migration policies in terms of accessibility and attractiveness	32	2007	61	Not available
IMPALA	Beine at al. 2016; Geist et al. 2014	Assessing countries' migration policies in terms of regulatory complexity and restrictiveness	472	1999-2008	9	Not available
IMPIC	Helbling et al. 2015	Assessing admission in terms of functioning (modus and locus operandi) and restrictiveness	63	1980-2010	33	Available
Immigrants' Climate Index (ICI)	Pham and Hoang Van 2014	Assessing migration and integration policy environment in terms of restrictiveness	not specified	2005-2009	50	Not available
Inventory of migration policies	Fondazione Rodolfo Debenedetti 2009	Assessing migration policies in terms of restrictiveness	6	1995-2005	12	Not available
Klugman and Pereira Index	Klugman and Pereira 2009	Assessing migration policies in terms of restrictiveness	84	2009	28	Not available
NIEM	Tzancos 2016	Evaluating the integration system of beneficiaries of international vis-a-vis integration and asylum standards	178	2018-2020	14	Available
MIPEX	Huddleston et al. 2015	Assessing integration policies vis-a-vis integration standards	167	2004,2007-2014	38	Available
MGI	EIU 2016	Assessing migration governance effectiveness vis-a-vis SDG 10.7	73	2015/2016	15	Not available
ORTEGA & PERI	Ortega and Peri 2009	Assessing migration policy change in terms of restrictiveness	not specified	1980-2005	14	Not available
PICMD	Hong and Knoll 2016	Assessing policy and institutional coherence for migration and development	63 (COD) / 48 /CO)	2015	15	Available
World Population Policies (WPP)	UN 2016	*As regard the indicators dedicated to migration area* : Assessing migration, integration and emigration policies in terms of effectiveness and restrictiveness	39 (for migration domain)	1976, 1986, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015	196	Available

MIGRATION GOVERNANCE FEATURES

Dataset name/acronym	Reference	Conceptualization Key definitions	Target population	Phases (Entry / Exit / Circular)	Sites Origin / Destin	Scale Supra / Nat / Reg / Local	Stages Legal / Implementation / Evaluation	Areas (specified)	Constitutive elements
ASYLUM POLICY INDEX	Hatton 2009	Deterrence effect of asylum policy	Asylum seekers and BIPs	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	3access / processing / welfare	Policy (Outcomes)
CDI (migration area)	Roodman 2013, Robinson et al. 2018	Commitment to development	Asylum seekers and legally residing immigrants	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	*Migration-related areas*: international convention / integration policies / receptiveness to asylum seekers / share of refugee / numbers of foreign students / openness to migrants	Policy (Outcomes)
CERNA	Cerna 2014, 2016	high-skilled-related migration policy openness	High-skilled economic migrant	Entry / Circular	Destination	National	Legal	high-skill labour	Policy
DEMIG	de Haas, Natter and Vezzoli 2016	Migration policy change Policy efficacy Policy restrictiveness	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry / Exit (Integration)	Origin / Destination	National	Legal	border and land control / legal entry and stay / integration / exit	Policy
DETERRENCE INDEX	Thielemann 2004	Deterrence effect	Asylum seekers and BIPs	Entry (Integration)	Destination	Supra (EU) / National	Legal	*regarding asylum*: access control policy / determination procedures / integration	Policy
Emigrant Policies Index (EMIX)	Pedrosa and Palop 2017, Pedroza, Palop and Hoffmann 2016	Emigrant policies' effectiveness	Emigrants	Exit (Integration abroad)	Origin	National	Legal / Implementation	Policy / Administration settings	Policy / Relations
GLOBAL MIGRATION BAROMETER (GMB)	EIU 2008	"Attractiveness" to migrants "Accessibility" for migrants	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	not specified	Policy (Outcomes)
IMPALA	Beine at al. 2016; Geist et al. 2014	Regulatory complexity and regulatory stringency of admission policies	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry	Destination	National	Legal	Admission	Policy
IMPIC	Helbling et al. 2015	Immigration policy modus operandi Immigration policy locus operandi Immigration policy level of openness / restrictiveness	4 distinct policy-categories	Entry	Destination	National	Legal	4 areas corresponding to the different categories of migrants targeted	Policy
Immigrants' Climate Index (ICI)	Pham and Hoang Van 2014	Immigration climate's level of restrictiveness	Legally residing immigrants	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National / Regional / Local	Legal	benefits / access to employment benefits / law enforcement / housing / voting / legal services	Policy
Inventory of migration policies	Fondazione Rodolfo Debenedetti 2009	Strictness of migration policy	Legally residing immigrants	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	6 main policy-areas	Policy
Klugman and Pereira Index	Klugman and Pereira 2009	not specified	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal / Implementation	Admission criteria / Treatment / enforcement	Policy (Outcomes)
NIEM	Tzancos 2016	Mechanism for fostering integration as set by European and International standards	BIPs	NONE (Reception / Integration)	Destination	National	Legal / Implementation / Evaluation	13 main policy-areas	Actors / Relations / Resources / Policy / Practices (Outcomes)
MIPEX	Huddleston et al. 2015	Integration policies capacity to foster integration as set by European and International standards	TCN in regular situation	Entry (via family reunion) (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	8 main policy-areas	(actors) / Policy / Outcomes
MGI	EIU 2016	Migration governance's effectiveness	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry / Exit / Circular	Origin / Destination	National	Legal	5 main policy-areas	Actors / Relations (formal) / Policy
ORTEGA & PERI	Ortega and Peri 2009	Tightness of immigration reforms over time	All migrants, distinguished between asylum seekers and non-asylum immigrants	Entry (Integration)	Destination	National	Legal	Entry / Stay	Policy
PICMD	Hong and Knoll 2016	Policy and institutional coherence	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry / Exit / Circular	Origin / Destination	National	Legal / Implementation / Evaluation	6 main policy-areas	Actors / Relations (formal) / Resources / Policy
World Population Policies (WPP)	UN 2016	Immigration, integration and emigration policies' effectiveness and openness	All migrants, distinguished according to traditional policy-categories	Entry / Exit / Circular / (Integration)	Origin / Destination	National	Legal	Several areas	Actors / Policy Outcomes

As regards criteria 1, the tendency among scholars is to centre the conceptual apparatus on policy. With the exceptions of the MGI, none of the contributions' conceptualizations embrace the whole system of migration governance: most of the concepts underlying existing databases exclusively point to the domain of policy. This is to say that most of the definitions available in this branch of the literature fail to account for the multidimensionality of migration governance (and good migration governance) On the other hand, it is worth noting that not all the sets of indicators developed are clearly defined in relations to the concept being measured, sometimes definitions are not even provided (e.g. Ortega and Peri 2009), in others they are only briefly sketched (e.g. Economist Intelligence Unit 2008)

As regards the target population (criteria 2), none of the datasets recognize the mixed nature of migratory flows. Most of the them consider different categories of migrants, but they do so following the traditional distinction in policy-categories. DEMIG, for instance, offers one of the finest breakdowns, differentiating between 14 kinds of migrant groups[9], but it fails to acknowledge the complex nature of human mobility. Consolidating indicators according to fixed policy-categories implies assigning a specific sub-set of items to each migrant category. However, the fact that some indicators apply to certain categories of migrants but not to others clashes with the fundamental assumption about the mixed nature of migration (Richmond 1994, UNGA 2003, UNHCR 2007, Van Hear 1998) This matter becomes even more challenging when a weighting scheme is applied so that different weights are attributed to different sub-sets of indicators depending on the category of migrants they target, possibly jeopardizing indicators as evaluative tools of analysis.

All the datasets examined systematize their indicators according to policy-areas (3e) However, criteria employed to identify such areas varies highly among scholars, who tend either to follow classical distinctions of thematic policy-categories (e.g. labour, education; etc. see MIPEX and NIEM) or develop ad-hoc policy-domains according to concrete research rationales. The Deterrence Index developed by Thielemann (2004), for instance, distinguishes three sub-domains of the asylum-area: i) access control policy, related to rules and

---

[9] Including: low-skilled workers; high-skilled workers; family members; family members of high-skilled workers, investors; family members of migrants travelling through irregular means; refugees, asylum seekers, and other vulnerable people; international students; entrepreneurs, and business people; migrants travelling through irregular means; members of the diaspora.

procedures governing the admission of foreign nationals; ii) determination procedures, which regard each country's refugee recognition system, appeal rights, and rules concerning subsidiary protection; and iii) integration policy, referring to rights and benefits given to asylum seekers (e.g. work and housing conditions, welfare provisions, etc.) In principle, the criteria employed to organize indicators in policy-areas should not affect the quality of assessment inasmuch as the set of indicators embraces all the governance's constitutive elements. As it is better spelled out below, the problem is that policy-areas covered by available datasets mean scarce coverage of governance's constitutive elements. For the aim of this study, it is worth noting that only the MGI and the PICMD recognize the area of development as a proper and distinct area of policymaking, offering synthetic measures for its assessment. Therefore these are the only sources relevant for ADMIGOV purposes as regard this specific policy-area.

As regard the phases of the migratory process (criteria 3a), there are only two sets of indicators that cover the 3 phases conceptualized in this study (i.e. the MGI and the PICMD) The great majority of contributions either focus on entry or combine this with the phase of integration, which is outside the scope of migratory governance as defined in ADMIGOV. The phase of exit and that of circular migration receive far less attention by scholars: apart from the MGI and the PICMD, exit is covered only by the DEMIG, the EMIX and the World Population Policies database, whereas indicators referring to circular schemes are included only by the CERNA Index and the World Population Policies database. Moreover, indicators targeting exit and circular schemes are usually less developed, both in quantity and quality, than indicators addressing entry.

The literature's stance is also limited regarding the sites where governance takes place (criteria 3b): synthetic measures capturing governance dimensions in destination countries exceed by far measures targeting countries of origin. The main interest of scholars remains on policies and measures regulating in-flows. Exceptions in this regard are represented by the MGI, the PICMD, and the World Population Policies database – which considers both arrangements regulating inflows and outflows – and the EMIX database, which is a specific set of indicators developed for assessing countries' effectiveness in linking with emigrants and diaspora (Pedrosa and Palop-García 2016)

With the exceptions of the Deterrence Index, the Immigrants' Climate Index and the IMPALA, the rest of datasets are centred on the national level, focusing on actors, measures and actions brought about by the central government. To date, governance dynamics that happen at other layers of governance have remained almost out of scope of analysis (criteria 3c) This gap is especially critical, if we consider the key role played by local actors, whose actions often challenge and contrast the role of governments (Panizzon and Riemsdijk 2018; Peters and Pierre 2016) A remarkable exception in this regard is represented by the Immigrants' Climate Index (ICI) The set of indicators developed by Pham and Hoang Van (2014) includes items targeting governance measures carried out at local and regional levels. The main limitation of this index is to be circumscribed to governance's legal framework.

This limitation mirrors a wider tendency in the literature, which tends to focus on the legal stage (criteria 3d) So far, the phase of implementation and the phase of evaluation remain outside the literature's lens of analysis so that governance has remained mainly confined on what is "put onto paper."[10] The only sets of indicators that contain some measures pointing at the implementation and evaluation stages are the Emigrant Policies Index (EMIX), the NIEM dataset, the PICMD and the Klugman and Pereira Index. As regard those stages of the policy-cycle, these datasets represent relevant sources of inspiration for the ADMIGOV project. Yet, other significant constraints should be taken into account when it comes to the assessment of migration governance: the EMIX only assesses emigration policies; NIEM, rather than migration governance, evaluates the governance of integration and it merely focuses on the system addressing beneficiaries of integration protection; the PICMD indicators are mainly centred on the area of development; the Klugman and Pereira Index, among all constituents elements of the migration governance systems, merely investigates policy.

This paves the way for wider consideration regarding the appropriateness of the literature vis-à-vis the building blocks of migration governance (criteria 4) To date, scholars' work on indicators has been mostly directed at measuring and evaluating policy elements. Still, the broader system of governance as it pertains to actors, resources, relations and practices

---

[10] Data accessibility considerations come into play for explaining such tendency. While desk research and policy analysis suffice for filling in legal items, collecting data for indicators targeting implementation and evaluation stages usually involves more complex techniques of inquiry (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and less accessible data.

remains substantially overlooked. Only few contributions are equipped with measures that go beyond policies. As regards ties and relationship among actors, for instance, the most interesting contributions are those provided by Tzancos (2016), the IOM (2016), Pedrosa and Palop-García (2016) and Hong and Knoll (2016) Their limitation is that they only refer to formal relations, leaving informal links – as they occur in the day-to-day administrative routines – out of the analysis. If we look at practices, the array of measures offered by the literature is even more limited. The only dataset including specific indicators addressing this element of migration governance is the NIEM dataset. In sum, synthetic measures developed so far by scholars allow us to measure and assess policies, but they do not allow us to say much about the rest of the elements that make up the system of migration governance.

Analogous considerations can be drawn regarding the concept of good migration governance. If, on the one hand, scholars in the field have made use of both instrumental and normative assessments, these have mainly concerned the domain of policies. Migration policies have been evaluated on the basis of their magnitude and complexity (i.e. instrumental approach) or, most of the time, according to the degree of openness (i.e. normative approach) Scholars' collective effort has left questions pertaining to the quality of whole governance system aside. Moreover, normative assessments underlying current datasets leave ADMIGOV's core principles of development and protection unaddressed.

The IOMs' Migration Governance Index (MGI) represents a remarkable exception in this regard. The MGI represents, indeed, the only analytical framework aimed at assessing the whole system of migration governance. Its methodological rationale, which follows a multidimensional understanding of migration governance, appears fully compatible with ADMIGOV goals. Its 73 indicators assess migration governance across five domains: i) institutional capacity, ii) migrant rights, iii) safe and orderly migration, iv) labour migration management, and v) regional and international cooperation and other partnerships. Despite an analytical focus centred on labour-oriented migration, the advantages of MGI indicators are evident: while policy-oriented indexes tend to narrowly focus on (one or a few domains of) policy, the MGI covers different elements and features of the governance system. Clear examples of this include the role of the private sector in labour migration management and the involvement of multiple actors in diaspora networks. Unfortunately, the possibility to

employ MGI as a basis for ADMIGOV indicators seems precluded by the inaccessibility of data. This gets back to a crucial and more general problem related to indicators, as only very few studies make their data fully accessible in a disaggregated form. If the complete list of indicators is unavailable, a careful assessment of their appropriateness - and thus usefulness - for ADMIGOV purposes is precluded.

To sum up: i) within the variety of contributions reviewed, it's hard to find a one-and-only dataset that complies with ADMIGOV rationale; ii) each set of indicators provides interesting insights and valuable tools for the assessment of migration governance, but at the same time presents significant flaws; iii) the impossibility to access data and questionnaires in a disaggregated form make things even more complicated. In light of these shortcomings the most fruitful strategy seems that of "cherry-picking", selecting among accessible datasets only items that can contribute to the building of ADMIGOV indicators. This is captured by the following table, which places open/accessible contributions in the literature according to the way in which they cover dimensions (lines) and constitutive elements (columns) of migration governance.

Table 2 – Assessing migration governance: a state of the art of accessible indexes and indicators

	ACTORS	RELATIONS	RESOURCES	POLICY	PRACTICES
PHASES					
Entry	WPP; PICMD	PICMD	PICMD	DEMIG; IMPIC; CDI; WPP; PICMD	
Exit	WPP; PICMD	EMIX; PICMD		DEMIG; EMIX; WPP; PICMD	
Circular	WPP; PICMD	PICMD		WPP; PICMD	
SITES					
Origin	WPP; PICMD	EMIX; PICMD	PICMD	EMIX; WPP; PICMD	
Destination	NIEM*; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	DEMIG; NIEM*; IMPIC; CDI; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*
SCALE					

Supranational					
National	NIEM*; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*; EMIX; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	DEMIG; NIEM*; IMPIC; CDI; EMIX; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*
Regional					
Local					
STAGES					
Legal	NIEM*; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*; EMIX; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	DEMIG; NIEM*; MIPEX*; CDI; EMIX; WPP; PICMD	NIEM*
Implementation	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*
Evaluation	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*; PICMD	NIEM*

This literature review allows us to raise some concluding remarks.

Table 2 organizes available indicators according to their capacity to offer insights for assessing specific features of migration governance. In this sense, two studies appear particularly relevant for the construction of ADMIGOV indicators: the study by Hong and Knoll (2016) developing PICMD indicators and the paper by Tzancos (2016) introducing NIEM dataset. PICMD indicators cover many of the key elements of the governance system and they do so along the entire policy framework, offering specific items to measure the stages of implementation and evaluation. Furthermore, the dataset elaborated by Hong and Knoll (2016) provides a sub-set of measures targeting migration and development. NIEM has an even wider scope: it covers indeed all the elements of the governance system identified in the present research. Although these items address the process of integration of asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection, they nonetheless offer a questionnaire structure that - if appropriately adapted to the migration context and extended to embrace the whole migrant population - can represent a fundamental analytical basis for developing migration governance indicators. In this sense, Table 2 is meant to serve as analytical basis

upon which alternative migration governance indicators will be developed in the last stage of the project.

Besides, Table 2 empty cells identify the features and dimensions of migration governance where ex-novo indicators are needed. In this regard, two main dimensions deserve special attention: i) the supra and sub-national layers of governance; and ii) the domain of practices. The first one points to the need of developing indicators assessing governance dynamics that take place above and below national policymakers. The second one points to the necessity of complementing the top-down approach – which dominates the literature –with on-the-ground and bottom-up indicators able to grasp governance as it takes place in day-to-day administrative practice. More generally, taking into consideration available knowledge regarding the "building blocks" of migration governance, the future stages of the ADMIGOV project will be organized as follows:

• Actors. Beyond state-actors already covered by the literature, indicators should include non-state and public/private actors involved in the regulation of international migration, paying special attention to those placed above and below the national level of governance.

• Relations: Apart from formally established relations, whether within central administration or internationally determined via inter-states agreements, indicators should capture informal ties as they occur in governance practices', such as among public officials and civil society actors.

• Resources. Given the scarcity of available indicators referring to resources, a specific set of items should be developed for assessing monetary and non-monetary means, including staff capacity, financial contribution, training materials as well as ITC systems and devices.

• Policy: As regard policy indicators, accessible items coming from the literature will be revised and opportunely adjusted according to ADMIGOV purpose, paying special attention to the development of items for the stages of policy implementation and policy evaluation.

• Practices. This element of the migration governance system represents the most overlooked dimension by the literature so far. In this regard bottom-up, empirically driven indicators will be developed, paying special attention to the way in which governance practice

takes place on the ground, such as asylum request formalizations carried out at borders by state officials.

5. Conclusions: Setting the stage for developing new indicators of good migration governance

The ADMIGOV project proposes an alternative way of evaluating the current system of migration governance. For this, it aims at developing new indicators of good migrations governance. This is done by relying on existing knowledge to select those indicators that comply with ADMIGOV rationale and principles (#1) and then developing new indicators complementing those selected from the literature (#2) In other words ADMIGOV indicators of migration governance and good migration governance will represent a compound set including, on the one hand, measures that will be gathered drawing on existing knowledge and, on the other hand, measures that will be developed relying upon empirical insights coming from the empirical part of the project.

The present document has represented the first step in such direction. After having defined what ADMIGOV intends for "migration governance" (MG) and "good migration governance" (GMG), these concepts have been employed for revising available sets of indexes and indicators in the field of migration studies. The literature reviewed shows that it's hard to find a one-and-only dataset that complies with ADMIGOV rationale. When it comes to evaluate the complex and multidimensional concepts of MG and GMG, the toolbox currently accessible for ADMIGOV researches is rather restricted, being this mainly geared towards policy-outputs developed at national level by destination countries, for regulating specific categories of migrants' entry (and integration) Available datasets overlook important features and elements of the migration governance system. Moreover, they give scant attention to normative considerations regarding the compliance of the governance systems with the principles of protection and sustainable development. The lack of accessible data and questionnaires makes things even more complicated. Despite limited practicability, each set of indicators anyway provides interesting insights (and valuable items) upon which part of the ADMIGOV indicators may draw upon. At the same time, by recognizing the main analytical gaps in the field, the literature review identifies the elements and dimensions of migration governance where the construction of indicators from the ground up will be mainly centred

on. In this regard, the following stages of the project will pay special attention to the development of items for assessing governance practices as well as supra and sub-national layers of governance. Empirical insights coming from other WPs' fieldworks will be channelled to inspire the next stage of WP7 research. Such results will also inform the way in which the principles of protection and sustainable development will be operationalized into criteria for evaluating the "goodness" of migration governance.

References

Ambrosini, M. and Van der Leun, J. (2015) "Introduction to the Special Issue: Implementing Human Rights: Civil Society and Migration Policies", *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 13(2) 103-115. Doi: 10.1080/15562948.2015.1017632.

Beine, M. , Boucher, A. , Burgoon, B. , Crock, M. , Gest, J. , Hiscox, M. , McGovern, P. , Rapoport, H. , Schaper, J. and Thielemann, E. (2016) "Comparing Immigration Policies: An Overview from the IMPALA Database", *International Migration Review*, 50: 827-863. Doi:10.1111/imre.12169

Bevir, M., (2009) *Key Concepts in Governance.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Bevir, M., (2010) *Democratic Governance.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bjerre, L., Helbling, M., Romer F. and Zobel M. (2014) "Conceptualizing and Measuring Immigration Policies: A Comparative Perspective", *International Migration Review,* 49(3) 555–600.

Bovaird, T. and Löffler, E. (2003) "Evaluating the Quality of Public Governance: Indicators, Models and Methodologies", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *69*(3) 313 328. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852303693002

Cerna, L. (2014) "The EU Blue Card: Preferences, policies, and negotiations between Member States", *Migration Studies*, 2(1) 73–96.

Cerna, L. (2016) "The crisis as an opportunity for change? High-skilled immigration policies across Europe", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(10) 1610–1630.

Daly, M. (2003) "Governance and Social Policy", *Journal of Social Policy*, 32(1) 113–28.

De Haas, H., Natter, K. and Vezzoli, S. (2016) "Growing Restrictiveness or Changing Selection? The Nature and Evolution of Migration Policies", *International Migration Review.* Online First. Available at:
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/imre.12288

Economist Intelligence Unit – EIU (2008) *Global Migration Barometer. Methodology, Results and Findings. Executive Summary.* Available at:
http://www.un.org/esa/population/meetings/seventhcoord2008/GMB_ExecSumEIU.pdf

The Economist Intelligence Unit – EIU (2016) *Measuring well-governed migration: the 2016 Migration Governance Index*, London. Available at:
https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/migration_governance_index_2016.pdf

Faist, T. and Fauser, M. (2011) "The Migration–Development Nexus: Toward a Transnational Perspective." In: *The Migration-Development Nexus. Migration, Diasporas and Citizenship Series*, edited by T. Faist, M. Fauser and P. Kivisto. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knill, C. and Tosun, J. (2014) "Policymaking". In *Comparative Politics*, edited by Daniele Caramani. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 335–48.

Fondazione Rodolfo Debenedetti (2009) *Inventory of migration policies (1990-2005), Reforms and index on strictness of migration policy, online resources.* Available at:

http://www.frdb.org/page/data/categoria/international-data/scheda/inventory-of-migration-policies-1990-2005/doc_pk/11028

Fredrickson, G.H. (2005) "Whatever Happened to Public Administration? Governance, Governance Everywhere." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn, Jr, and C. Pollitt. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 282–304.

Freeman, G.P. (2006) "National models, policy types, and the politics of immigration in liberal democracies", *West European Politics,* 29(2) 227-247. Doi: 10.1080/01402380500512585

Fukuyama, F. (2013) "What is Governance?", *Governance,* 26(3) 347-368. Doi:10.1111/gove.12035.

Garcés-Mascareñas, B., and Penninx, R. (2016) "Integration Processes and Policies in Europe." In *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe. Contexts, Levels and Actors,* IMISCOE Research Series, edited by Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas and Rinus Penninx. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 11–30.

Gest, J., Boucher, A., Challen, S., Burgoon, B., Thielemann, E., Beine, M., McGovern, P., Crock, M., Rapoport, H. and Hiscox, M. (2014) "Measuring and Comparing Immigration, Asylum and Naturalization Policies Across Countries: Challenges and Solutions", *Global Policy*, 5: 261-274. doi:10.1111/1758-5899.12132

Hatton, T.J. (2009) "The rise and fall of asylum: What happened and why?", *Economic Journal,* 229(535) 183– 213

Helbling, M., Bjerre, L., Römer, F., and Zobel, M. (2015*) "*Measuring immigration policies: The IMPIC database", *European Political Science,* 49(3) 79-98.

Higgins, V., and G. Lawrence, eds. (2005) *Agricultural Governance: Globalization and the New Politics of Regulation.* London: Routledge.

Hong, A. and Knoll, A. (2016) *Strengthening the Migration-Development Nexus through Improved Policy and Institutional Coherence*, KNOMAD working paper 15. Available at: https://www.knomad.org/publication/strengthening-migration-development-nexus-through-improved-policy-and-institutional

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001) "Types of Multi-level Governance", *European Integration Online Papers.* Available at: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/pdf/2001-011.pdf

Horwood, C., Forin, R. and Frouws, B. (Eds.) (2018) "*Mixed Migration Review 2018, Highlights, Interviews, Essays, Data*." Geneva: Mixed Migration Centre. Available at: http://www.mixedmigration.org/

Huddleston, T., Bilgili, Ö. and Vankova, Z. (2015) *Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015,* Brussels/Barcelona: Migration Policy Group/CIDOB http://www.mipex.eu/

Hughes, O. (2010) "Does Governance Exist?" In *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, edited by S.P. Osborne. London: Routledge, 87–104.

Jessop, B. (2004) "Multi-Level Governance and Multi-Level Meta-governance", *Multi-Level Governance* 1 (9):49–75.

Jordan, A. (2008) "The Governance of Sustainable Development: Taking Stock and Looking Forwards", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26 (1) 17–33.

Kennett, P. (2008) "Governance, the State and Public Policy in a Global Age". In *Governance, Globalization and Public Policy*, edited by P. Kennett, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Keohane, R. (2002) "International Organizations and Garbage Can Theory", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 12: 155-159.

Kettl, D.F. (2010) "Governance, Contract Management and Public Management." In *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, edited by S. P. Osborne. London: Routledge, 239–54.

Kjær, A.M. (2004) *Governance.* Cambridge: Polity.

Klijn, E. (2008) "Governance and Governance Networks in Europe: An Assessment of Ten Years of Research on the Theme", *Public Management Review,* 10 (4): 505–25.

Klugman, J. and Medalho Pereira, I. (2009) *Assessment of National Migration Policies: An Emerging Picture on Admissions, Treatment and Enforcement in Developing and Developed Countries* (October 1, 2009) United Nations Human Development Research Paper No. 48. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1595435

.Knill, C., and Tosun J. (2014) "Policy-Making." In *Comparative Politics*, edited by Daniele Caramani. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 335–48

Knoepfel, P., Larrue, C., Varone, F. and Hill, M. (2007) *Public policy analysis*. Bristol: The Policy Press, University of Bristol.

Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2003) "Global Governance". In *The Handbook of Globalisation*, edited by J. Mitchie. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Krasner, Stephen D., ed. (1983) *International Regimes.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kunz, R., Lavenex, S. and Panizzon, M. eds (2011) *Multileveled Migration Governance, the Promise of Partnership*, London: Routledge.

Lavenex, S., Kunz, R., (2008) "The Migration–Development Nexus in EU External Relations", *Journal of European Integration*, 30(3) 439-457. Doi: 10.1080/07036330802142152

Lee, R., Käppeli, A., McKee, C., Mitchell, I., Hillebrandt, H. (2018) *The Commitment to Development Index: 2018 Edition, Methodological Overview Paper.* Washington: Center for Global Development. Available at: https://www.cgdev.org/commitment-development-index-2018

Lipschutz, I. (1992) "Reconstructing World Politics: The Emergence of Global Civil Society", *Millennium*, 21 (3): 300–420.

Lynn, L.E.Jr., Henrich, C. and Hill, C. (2001) *Improving Governance: A New Logic For Empirical Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lynn, L.E. Jr., (2011) "The Persistence of Hierarchy." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by M. Bevir. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 318–36.

March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1983) "What Administrative Reorganization Tells Us About Governing", *American Political Science Review* 77(2) 281-96.

Munck, G. L. and Verkuilen, J. (2002) "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices", *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1) 5–34.

Newman, J. (ed.) (2005) *Remaking Governance: Peoples, Politics and the Public Sphere,* Bristol: Policy Press.

Nyberg–Sørensen, N., Hear, N.V. and Engberg–Pedersen, P. (2002) "The Migration–Development Nexus Evidence and Policy Options State–of–the–Art Overview", *International Migration*, 40(5) 3-47. Doi:10.1111/1468-2435.00210

Osborne, S.P. ed. (2010) *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance.* London: Routledge, 1–16.

Pedroza, L., and Palop-Garcia, P. (2017) "Diaspora policies in comparison: An application of the emigrant policies index (EMIX) for the Latin American and Caribbean region", *Political Geography,* 60, 165–178.

Pedroza, L., Palop, P. and Hoffmann, B. (2016) Emigrant Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean. Santiago de Chile: FLACSO-Chile.

Peri, G. and Ortega, F. (2009) *The Causes and Effects of International Labor Mobility: Evidence from OECD Countries 1980–2005,* Human Development Research Paper, New York: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Available at: https://ideas.repec.org/p/pra/mprapa/19183.html

Pham, H. and Van, P. (2014) "Measuring the Climate for Immigrants: A State-by-State Analysis." In *The Role of the States in Immigration Enforcement and Policy,* edited by G.J. Chin and C. Hessick, 21–39. New York: New York University Press.

Panizzon, M. and van Riemsdijk, M. (2018) "Introduction to Special issue: 'Migration governance in an era of large movements: a multi-level approach'", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(8) 1225-1241. Doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1441600

Peters, M. (2013) *Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration in the Era of Globalization*. Working Paper. New Haven: Yale University. Available at: https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/campuspress.yale.edu/dist/8/355/files/2011/10/Open_trade_closed_borders_accepted_web-qoetcq.pdf

Peters, G. and Pierre,J. (2016) *Comparative Governance: Rediscovering the Functional Dimension of Governing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pierre, J. and Peters, G. B. (2000) *Governance, Politics and the State*, London: Macmillan.

Reslow, N. and Vink, M. (2015) "Three-level Games in EU External Migration Policy: Negotiating Mobility Partnerships in West Africa", *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 53(4) 857–874.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997) *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Richmond, A. (1994) *Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism and the New World Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robertson, S. (2014) "Time and Temporary Migration: The Case of Temporary Graduate Workers and Working Holiday Makers in Australia", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 40(12) 1915-1933. Doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.876896

Robichau, R.W. (2011) "The mosaic of governance: Creating a picture with definitions, theories, and debates", *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1) 113–131. Available at https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00389_8.x.

Roodman, D. (2013) *The Commitment to Development Index: 2013 Edition*, Center for Global Development. Available at: https://www.cgdev.org/publication/commitment-development-index-2013

Rosenau, J. (1990) *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenau, J.N. and Czempiel, E.O. (eds) (1992) *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, B. (2011) *The Quality of Government: Corruption, Social Trust, and Inequality in International Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scholten, P., and Penninx, R. (2016) "The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration." In *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe. Contexts, Levels and Actors,* edited by Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas and Rinus Penninx, Amsterdam/ Cham: Springer, 91–108.

Seldadyo, H., Elhorst, J.P. and De Haan, J. (2010) "Geography and Governance: Does Space Matter?", *Papers in Regional Science,* 89 (3) 625–40.

Tanczos, J., (2016) *Lost in transition? The European standards behind refugee integration.* NIEM ANALYSES. Available at: http://www.forintegration.eu/pl/pub

Thielemann, E.R. (2004) "Why asylum policy harmonisation undermines refugee burden-sharing", *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 6, 47–65.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2014) "Multi-levelling and Externalizing Migration and Asylum: Lessons from the Southern European Islands", *Island Studies Journal,* 9 (1): 7–22.

United Nations General Assembly (2013) "Strengthening the Capacity of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to Carry on its Mandate", note by the Secretary-General UNGA. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/excom/unhcrannual/3fb33cbe7/strengthening-capacity-office-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees.html.

UNHCR (2007) *Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration: A Ten-Point Plan of Action, revision 1, January 2007.* Geneva:UNHCR. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/publications/manuals/50ab86d09/refugee-protection-mixed-migration-10-point-plan-action.html

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (2009) *What is Good Governance?* Available at: https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf

Van Hear, N. (2011) *Mixed Migration: Policy Challenges.* Available at: https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/PolicyPrimer-Mixed_Migration.pdf

Van Hear, N. (1998) *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities.* London: Routledge/University College London Press.

Weber, M. (1919) "Politik als Beruf", Gesammelte Politische Schriften (München, 1921), 396-450. This was originally a speech at Munich University in 1918, published and translated in 1919 In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, 77-128.

Wilson, W. (1887) "The Study of Administration", *Political Science Quarterly,* 2(2) 197-222.

Woods, N. (2003) "Global Governance and the Role of Institutions". In *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance,* edited by D. Held and A. McGrew. London: Polity Press.

World Bank (1992) *Governance and Development*, Washington: The World Bank. Available at: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/604951468739447676/Governance-and-development

Wunderlich, D. (2012) "The Limits of External Governance: Implementing EU External Migration Policy", *Journal of European Public Policy,* 19 (9): 1414-1433.

Zimmerman, C., Kiss L., Hossain, M. (2011) "Migration and Health: A Framework for 21st Century Policymaking", *PLOS Medicine* 8(5): e1001034. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001034

Zincone, G. and Caponio, T. (2006) "The multilevel governance of migration", in *The Dynamics of International Migration and Settlement in Europe: A State of the Art,* edited by R. Penninx, M. Berger and K. Kraal. IMISCOE Joint Studies Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.