

Summary

KNOMAD's Public Seminar

Migrant Re-integration and Homeland Development: Policy Prospects and Potential

Ottawa, March 4, 2014

Background

The Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD) was launched by the World Bank in the late spring of 2013 with funding support from the governments of Switzerland, Germany, and Sweden. KNOMAD is sub-divided into twelve thematic working groups and a set of four cross-cutting themes¹.

KNOMAD's Thematic Working Group "Integration Issues in Host Communities" (Chaired by Howard Duncan, Metropolis Project at Carleton University, Ottawa, and Co-Chaired by Gervais Appave, International Organization for Migration) has proposed a five-year long project to KNOMAD's Secretariat to look at the means by which immigrant integration can and does enhance homeland development and to draw out of these explorations some ideas including best practices that governments and other agencies can consider. As part of this undertaking, an Experts Advisory Committee, composed of global experts in immigrant integration and in development, was formed to support the development of knowledge products and related activities over the proposed five-year period.

To take this process forward, a one-day KNOMAD public seminar took place in Ottawa on the relation between migration and development. The purpose of this seminar was to bring together a wide range of stakeholders including government, civil society, academia, embassies, and media to discuss the development potential offered by the continuum of migrant integration, return, and re-integration into the homeland. (See Appendix for list of participants). The seminar was also meant to allow the Expert Advisory Committee to share their experiences and results of their on-going research in the areas of migrant integration, re-integration and development impacts with a public audience (See Appendix for Agenda).

¹ Full details can be found on the website: <http://www.knomad.org/>

The following is a brief account of the presentations made at the seminar and the subsequent discussions.

Keynote Speech

Dilip Ratha, KNOMAD, World Bank

There were 232 million international migrants in 2010 and over 700 million internal migrants. Economic migrants account for 93% of international migrant stock and this form of migration is expected to grow. A growing pattern has been south-south migration which has now become greater than south-north migration. This is a significant development, particularly given that many southern countries have no policies on immigration. The KNOMAD project hopes to address the challenges of migration and integration in light of the lack of such immigration and integration policies and programs. KNOMAD will also consider that the barriers to internal migration may be larger and more restrictive than those on international migration. A key KNOMAD interest is remittances to developing countries, which are estimated to be \$410 billion in 2013 – 7 times the size of all official development aid. In times of the 2008 economic crisis, remittances fell only by 9%, whereas capital flows fell from between 80 and 90%. The UN Population Division predicts that between 2005-2050, 1.5 billion people will join the workforce in Asia and Africa, compared with only 500 million in Europe. As a result, migratory flows will increase in all dimensions: south-north, south-south, internal, and north-south (though to a lesser degree). This increased migration will challenge national border control regimes, the efforts to integrate migrants in their host countries, and efforts to preserve historic national identities. Border control is intimately associated with the very concept of ‘the nation state’ and national identity. Large scale international migration will force us to look carefully at the concept of nationality.

Discussion:

The keynote address raised several issues, the most notable being the idea of whether “making markets work better” was an adequate the solution to improving access to markets for the poor, particularly in the context of south-south migration. For instance, in the Canadian context, the ability of mining companies in developing countries procuring locally, or providing information about markets to people or getting recruitment agencies out of their monopoly position in that way helps lower recruitment costs. However, while increasing competition would help create better access to both markets and increase productivity, particularly for migrants, the consensus was that this alone was not enough. The recruitment market for instance, is less commoditized and standardized than the remittance market. With a mushrooming of recruitment agencies (over 1,900), for migrant labour, there is an important need for the regulation and monitoring of these recruitment agencies and legisla-

tion relating to labour and migration. Employers in many cases are not aware of how many recruitment agencies operate. Embassies/consulates in destination countries and in origin countries can play a major role in the monitoring of recruitment agencies and education of migrants about job opportunities and their rights. There has not much been written about this thus far.

Although it is still too early in the life of KNOMAD to think about the idea of incorporating new kinds of nations and multiple identities into the KNOMAD project, there is a need to take the questions associated with the notions of identity seriously and ask people in a very systematic way how they perceive their identity. As one begins to know people through the workplace and daily interactions, the individual's concept of his or her identity also changes. In the case of migration, this creates a tension where people may not want to share resources with newcomers. So the question arises; where do you bring them (migrants) in and draw the line? There is a need to break this process down and systematically begin analyzing the various comfort levels in receiving societies what sort of resources they have, etc. An example of Lebanon was provided which has a population of 4 million people but currently houses 1 million Syrian refugees.

*The discussion in the keynote session identified needs for further research which included looking at the issue of **identity** and the impact of policy on **identity relations** in societies. Likewise, **multiculturalism** is related to this concept of identity. Canada's policy on multiculturalism has made a significant difference but this is interpreted differently in other parts of the world. It is hoped that KNOMAD will engage on this and other related issues over the next few years.*

Session 1: Migrant Integration in Host Societies

Chair: Howard Duncan, Metropolis

Daniel Hiebert, University of British Columbia

This presentation focused on three main aspects of integration in the Canadian context: the institutional context within which municipalities integrate new migrants, innovative programming and policy ideas for integration, and the importance of public dialogue. Professor Hiebert focused on the role that municipal administrations can play in coordinating various institutions such as those of civil society, the private sector, and regional and provincial governments to ensure that they collectively work effectively for better integration outcomes. Vancouver, for instance, has created the Mayor's Working Group on Immigration which has developed several pilot initiatives over the years to welcome migrants and provide better integration services. Europe has several examples of good integration practices for new migrants such as in Rotterdam, Copenhagen and Barcelona. These include special

immigration assistance offices, “expat desks” in city hall, and diversity charters. In the Canadian context, there is a need for greater humility and dialogue across sectors to understand ‘what’s missing’ and how can we better understand what cities should be doing to integrate newcomers. Canada needs to be more aware of some of the integration challenges that it still faces.

Eva Millona, Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition

This paper focused on the reintegration of specific refugee groups in post-conflict Croatia and Kosovo. Reintegration, especially in a post-war or post-crisis situation, is a complex and difficult matter. The transition from providing short-term emergency relief to long-term development requires a look at refugees’ contributions to society in order to rebuild a war-ravaged economy. The paper argued that refugees ought to be seen as valuable human capital that can benefit the development of countries post-crisis. The administrative challenges of the return of the minority Serbian refugees to Croatia were particularly focused on housing. During the war, many of those who fled had their homes reoccupied by others and upon their return found that establishing proper ownership, finding housing, and improving housing conditions were major challenges. Discrimination by Croatians against the Serbian minority was a significant problem that continues to challenge the government. In Kosovo, on the other hand, administrative structures were put in place by the Kosovar government with good results, despite the fact that the action has been taking place only since 2007/2008. Kosovo declared independence in 2008, but Serbia does not recognize its independent status; this has created uncertainty that has hurt Kosovo’s development, further fuelled ethnic tensions, and made reintegration difficult.

Agnieszka Weinar, European University Institute, Florence

This presentation centered on the European Union and what member state governments can do for their foreign nationals, regarding this as an important aspect of their migration policies. In the EU, there is no legally binding agreement among member states on immigrant integration. Member states adhere to a set of common basic principles by their own will, and models differ across countries and regions based on language, ethnicity etc. The EU has adopted the following definition of integration: “*Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States*”. There are several platforms and resources related to integration in the EU, such as the European Integration Fund, the European Integration Forum, and a European Website on Integration for shared learning. In 2011, the EU introduced another possible element of the integration policy, that of the country of origin. Thus, the currently explored definition of integration has become that of a three-way process, involving 1) the migrant, 2) the institutions and communities of the country of destination, and 3) the institutions and the communities of country of origin. The INTERACT project undertaken by the European University Institute, looks at this third angle and asks how can the country of origin (its institutions and commu-

nities) influence integration outcomes? Is there (or can there be) cooperation between countries of origin and countries of destination on integration management?

Tony Fang, University of Toronto, Monash University, Melbourne

This presentation looked at immigrant integration and economic development in the Canadian context. It examined the potential benefits of immigrant integration by using macro-economic models to demonstrate whether integration benefits the national economy. It began with an early understanding of international migration which carried negative connotations and to some critics, paralleled with colonialism, as rich countries took the best talent from the less developed nations at low costs. In a report of 55 developing countries, 1/3 of the countries lost 15% of their university graduates to richer countries, Turkey lost 40% and Caribbean countries lost 50% of such human capital to migration. This lays the foundation for the notion that the migration of skilled migrants has intensified. In Canada, the use of immigration for economic development and nation building is a unique one. Canada is a migration country by definition. The country consists of all immigrants or the children of the immigrants, with the exception of the aboriginal community. From the perspective of long-term benefits of immigration, innovation and creativity are a major driver of the knowledge economy, which immigrants contribute to, particularly in the information technology sector. For instance, 50% of new start-ups in Silicon Valley are funded by immigrants who are also 50% more likely to start businesses, as they are more risk taking by definition since they have given up meaningful employment, their social networks, etc. to migrate. This presentation also demonstrated the economic contribution of Canadian immigration by using a macro-economic model developed at the University of Toronto. The model shows that if Canada were to bring in 100,000 more immigrants than it already does (250,000 p/a), over a 10 year period, and if the labour market is incorporated into other markets such as housing, financial etc. to measure the overall economic impact of an additional 100,000 immigrants, while looking at variables such as labour force participation, unemployment rates, remittances and wages, overall economic growth would increase by 2.3% as measured by real GDP, and unemployment would actually decline over a 10-year simulation period (2012-2021). Yet, there is a public misconception that immigrants take jobs away from Canadians. In reality, immigrants are major drivers of consumption and investment (e.g. housing market), GDP growth, and employment creation.

Discussion:

This session raised questions among the audience about looking at various models of civil society partnering with municipal institutions, in an attempt to foster more one-on-one relationships and city-wide engagement with newcomers. For instance, the “Welcoming America” has been the model for the “Welcoming Ottawa Week”. This requires a conceptual context asking, “who feels responsible for newcomer integration?” Daniel Hiebert described this as a continuum, where on one end, societies want a department at the national level to

be responsible for newcomers. Further along the continuum lies a coordinated “whole of government” approach, where all departments and layers of government are working in coordination for integration, and at the end of the continuum is a “whole of society” approach with partnership between government and society. The United States is moving toward this latter end of the spectrum where it is the responsibility of civil society, government and the private sector to integrate immigrants.

Another issue raised during the discussion was the dichotomy between national and municipal government policies. In the Canadian example, the federal government has recently been issuing statements on how they are going to scale back immigration and refugee services. Policies over recent years have dramatically changed in terms of access to services for asylum seekers, the numbers of whom are now lower than in the recent past. The Canadian federal government has increasingly framed immigration policy to maximize economic benefit and minimize social cost. Municipal governments have been widely complacent in this regard and have taken on a very passive role. Other countries would not accept this so easily and would question whether these policies are ethically correct and whether they represent the desires of the residents of these municipalities.

*This session urged us to take a long-term view of the **societal benefits** of immigration. There is a need to analyze more innovatively such data as income data to extrapolate the broader social and economic impacts of migration. The analysis of the provocative scenario of increasing the number of immigrants to Canada by 100,000 per year illustrates what can be achieved through more innovative approaches to data analysis. Cases such as this will help to stimulate further discussion about the **economic benefits** of immigration.*

Session 2: Migrant Re-integration in the Homeland

Chair: Themrise Khan, Metropolis

Karin Mayr, University of Vienna

This presentation examined the effects of international labour mobility on aggregate human capital in source countries. Traditionally it has been understood that the effects are principally negative, that emigration represents principally a brain drain from sending countries that is detrimental to their economic well-being. However, it is now more accepted that emigration prospects can provide incentives for individuals to invest in education and lead to a positive effect, a brain gain in the source country owing to the fact that not all who enhance their human capital will emigrate, and many who do leave will come back later in life, bringing back even higher human capital and potentially extra skills or greater labour market experience acquired abroad. The motivation for the study arose from the fact that emigra-

tion rates are much greater among high skilled than low skilled and that return migration is believed to be sizable. Between 30 and 60% of emigrants from Eastern Europe from 1990 to 2000 returned to their home country within that same decade. The study considered the decisions of individuals regarding the level of education they acquire, whether to opt for emigration, and whether to return. The study found that the share of emigrants as well as return migrants will be greater among the high-skilled than the low-skilled if the value of education is greater at home than abroad as well as if migrants receive a wage premium upon return. This can result in potentially sizeable increases in average human capital in source countries. As people perceive greater opportunities to emigrate, they will invest in the education they need to be marketable overseas. This can enhance source country development because many who acquire greater human capital will not in fact leave, and many who leave will return.

Imelda Nicolas, Commission on Filipinos Overseas

Filipinos have been migrating for decades and can now be found in over 200 countries worldwide in different socioeconomic statuses and across several generations. However, for permanent or long-term migrants (as differentiated from temporary migrants, more commonly known as Overseas Filipino Workers) reintegration into the homeland was not traditionally considered part of the migration experience. However, we are seeing that strong ties to the homeland prevail, increasingly facilitated by technology which increases returns through both increased familial connectedness and through social remittances (knowledge, skills and opportunities that can be shared). There is little data on the return migration of Filipinos, but plans are in progress for generating, gathering and analyzing such data, especially for evidence-based policy-making. The newly-created subcommittee of migration and development within the national government's planning and policy coordinating body (National Economic Development Authority/NEDA) is also giving priority to put in its agenda the return (not necessarily "physical" return) of permanent, temporary and irregular migrants and their various respective modes of reintegration. The main challenge is to provide mechanisms and policies that allow migrants to contribute to the development of the homeland. An example of this is the Diaspora to Development initiative of the Commission on Filipinos Overseas under the Office of the President of the Philippines – a comprehensive program to encourage overseas Filipinos to contribute to nation-building.

Peggy Levitt, Wellesley College and Harvard University

This presentation encouraged us to rethink the connection between migration and development by using the concept of transnationalism and by starting from the assumption that, for many people, mobility and connection are the norm, rather than remaining within a static, bounded nation-state. The presentation further called attention to the important role of social as well as economic remittances. In many cases, migrants and non-migrants, while

separated by physical distance, continue to occupy the same social, economic, and political space which is created by the constant circulation of money, people, goods, and social remittances—ideas, skills, know-how, social capital, and identities which influence migrants and non-migrants alike. Therefore, migrants may vote, pray, and invest in their homelands at the same time that they buy homes, run for office, and join the PTA in the places where they settle. That means that poverty in a sending community and in an immigrant community of settlement are two sides of the same coin. You cannot alleviate one without dealing with the other. It does not make sense to talk about integration, return, and re-integration in absolute terms because that implies a dichotomized exit and entrance that does not match what the contemporary migrant experience.

A transnational lens calls into question static concepts of integration and return because it sees migrants and non-migrants as living within a transnational social field that includes both the sending and receiving country. Migrants do not return in the traditional sense because they never fully left this seamless imagined geography. Nor do non-migrants have to move to be influenced by the values and norms that circulate within it. Migration is not a linear, progressive journey from membership in a home country to belonging in a host country. Rather, more and more, people participate simultaneously in multiple communities, crafting livelihood strategies involving their home and host countries. At various stages of their lives, in response to economic downturns, life cycle events, elections, or natural disasters, they may shift their orientation to particular sites within this transnational space but they will never choose one or the other, be categorically in or out. In fact, research shows that people who are more integrated in one place are better able to participate in another.

Session 3: Development Benefits of Re-integration to Host and Homeland Societies

Chair: Hanspeter Wyss; KNOMAD

James Busumtwi-Sam, Simon Fraser University

When talking about the development benefits of integration and reintegration, we operate around the built-in assumption that integration is always positive. In fact, we need to adopt a more dynamic model of integration and reintegration. For instance, in some cases, societies may be inherently unjust – what does it mean to integrate into such societies? It is important to question the linear diffusionist model of migrating, integrating, returning and reintegrating in a one-way transfer of skills and knowledge. What works in the host may not necessarily work in the homeland – we cannot assume that transplanting knowledge and skills across different contexts is always effective. Ethical and policy concerns also arise regarding the ecological and social sustainability of migration for long-term development.

These concerns are currently not at the forefront of the migration/development discussion. Migration is inherently political – at its core is the distribution of membership in a political community, raising fundamental questions of distributive justice in an increasingly transnational society. Integration however, occurs at different scales – we need to question the national social imaginary, i.e., the policymaker’s, researcher’s, or expert’s fixation on the migrant in terms of his or her identification to a nation-state, as opposed to a region, town, ethnic group, etc.). The key contributions that migrants and diasporas can make are two-fold:

- 1) innovation in thinking, doing business, meeting social problems; to the extent that success in the host country strongly requires a high degree of adaptability, this same adaptability makes them well-suited to re-integrate.
- 2) cultural and social capital – how migrants and diaspora can serve as informal ambassadors; the way that migrants return to “homelands” and speak about their host countries has an effect on the “promotion” of host countries.

However, the challenges in implementing policy to manage migration to benefit development are also many. These include, the character of state-society relations and the character of the state, a sensitivity to broader social relations, the role of traditional authority, the assumption that remittances always have positive outcomes – even where economic growth occurs, this may not produce redistributive outcomes to address poverty – remittances can actually increase inequality, and fuel conflict. Finally, tensions within migrant communities themselves may occur.

David Phillips, Director, GBRW consulting, formerly World Bank

This presentation focused on Mr. Phillip’s research comparing the contribution of development aid to the potential contribution of the world’s diasporas (and migrants). Briefly, development aid in nominal terms has fluctuated over the years on an upward trend. During the 1960s, aid was static for almost 15 years and then climbed steadily until 1992, declining largely because of the end of the Cold War when western aid donors no longer felt compelled to provide competitive assistance to countries. The decline continued to 1998. Subsequently, aid increased with the greatest spike in 2005 after the conference on aid effectiveness in Paris, with later conferences in Ghana and Busan, reaching \$130 billion dollars per annum. But despite the rise of nominal aid and the effort at renewal, there has been a long term decline in aid “effort” (as a percentage of gross national income) and a growing fragmentation of aid between multiple donors while many African countries are dysfunctionally aid dependent. During the same period diaspora remittances have grown enormously and have been relatively stable compared to foreign direct investment (FDI) and other private flows. FDI in Sub Saharan Africa is running, with wide fluctuations, at only 6% of world foreign direct investment. But even though the rise of remittances has been rapid,

the recorded amount only captures a fraction of total remittances to Sub Sahara Africa, which probably amount to well over \$50 billion a year, the greatest single item, above FDI, foreign aid, and net debt flows. The IMF has developed a new payment classification system to record remittances more accurately, but the vast underestimation makes statistics challenging to work with.

The diaspora contribution is, however, much more than just remittances; it includes return of capital, skills and entrepreneurial expertise (‘social remittances’) from individuals and groups with special connections to and interests in their home country; that is what makes it particularly significant in terms of poor country capacity building. This is supported by the fact that the average educational attainments of more recent migrant workers is often higher than the average educational level of the home population. There are of course some caveats: firstly, diasporas are not homogeneous and have diverse incentives; secondly the diasporas may not provide public goods; and there are questions about how far they fund investment rather than consumption. However, there are also responses. One is that the rising skill and income levels of several African diasporas have allowed investment rates out of income remitted to rise and this increases their importance as providers of public goods, and their potential to replace development aid in many areas.

Gordon Betcherman, University of Ottawa

In tracing the development benefits of reintegration, it is important to highlight the difference between individual returns and social returns – how might we use these concepts to think about development benefits of integration and reintegration. The reason people migrate is because incomes increase with migration. In low HDI countries, there are enormous increases in incomes – these are known as private/individual returns. The returns or benefits to a society are more than the sum of these individual returns. For instance, consider this example of a negative spillover effect of migration: health personnel from Caribbean countries experience income increases by migrating to the US, but this loss of workers can cause a deterioration of the health service system in the Caribbean itself. If the sum of individual contributions is greater than social contributions, policy needs to intervene. The policy question then is, “how can sending and receiving countries contribute to greater social returns?”. This distinction between social and individual returns applies to both sending and receiving countries. The new “story” about the social returns of migration has now moved beyond brain drain which is predicated on the notion on permanent migration. Today, it is accepted that migrants return or move on to other countries. Even if migrants don’t return (permanently or at all), social remittances can be conveyed through temporary returns, increased trade, foreign investment, and virtual communications.

Discussion

One of the questions raised during this session was whether developed countries consider the impacts of remittances (as well as development) on those countries that receive them. Likewise, have we ever considered the state of development when considering the granting of ODA funding to poor countries? There has been an increasing poverty focus to channeling aid to the poorest and an attempt to rationalize foreign aid in general. The concern raised about foreign aid by some of the speakers was that there are several systemic issues involved in foreign aid, especially when affecting capacity building and developing democratic systems. These affect more low-income countries, because middle-income countries are more or less effectively able to take advantage of this.

One of the issues raised by the audience was the need to focus on the impacts of the social integration of immigrants. Many immigrants attempt to integrate and remain underemployed, underpaid, overworked, with little remittances to send. Most remittances are sent because of the effects of poverty in the migrants' countries of origin, not because migrants have achieved a level of social or economic status or security. The psychological impacts of this are for many immigrants, who in many cases are unable to return to their countries if they are unsuccessful in the host country. This raises questions such as what could be the policies and frameworks that maximize the diaspora's social returns to sending countries. Furthermore, it is not just about what happens to those who go back, but what happens at the level of labour market outcomes in the host country. What kind of innovative credential recognition schemes exist that can be portable and allow the effective integration of migrants who come from different social and professional backgrounds? In the EU for example, a specialized agency, the European Training Foundation, works with non-EU countries of origin and EU countries of destination to establish a framework for the mutual recognition of professional skills for both new migrants and returnees. In Moldova, working alongside Italy, Sweden and Romania, a framework of recognition has been established across a range of sectors. A similar system of skills recognition exists between the Province of Quebec in Canada and France. There is a need for such frameworks to be replicated in other countries. Note, too, that in the EU, 28 Member States worked out a common approach to skills recognition as an indispensable part of the EU Common Market.

*This session raised the very important issue of the **recognition of credentials**, particularly in regulated versus unregulated professions. Understanding this area is very important for controlling integration failures. It also opened up the **sensitive nature** of migration and integration where many migrants are reluctant to return to their homelands if they have been unsuccessful in their host countries.*

Conclusion

Howard Duncan, Metropolis

The Seminar concluded with the proposition to study best practices in integration and reintegration of migrants in both developing and developed countries. Metropolis has been encouraging and pursuing this line of study by managing and organizing training development courses for officials around the world. This project will now give KNOMAD the opportunity to take this forward. Through the collection of the research presented at this seminar by all the speakers, the intention is to be able to test several of the hypothesis presented and also, answer the questions and issues raised. One of the ways, KNOMAD attempts to do this is by conducting a comparative case study of migrant reintegration in Croatia and Kosovo. It is hoped that this will lay the foundation of conducting further research into the issues raised at this forum.

Appendix: Seminar Agenda

8.30-9.00am	<i>Arrival and Registration</i>
9.00-9.15am	<i>Welcoming remarks</i> Howard Duncan , Metropolis Project
9.15-9.45am	<i>Keynote Speech</i> Dilip Ratha , KNOMAD Secretariat, World Bank
9.45-11.15am	<i>Migrant Integration in Host Societies</i> Chair: Howard Duncan , Metropolis Daniel Hiebert , University of British Columbia Eva Millona , Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition Agnieszka Weinar , European University Institute, Florence Tony Fang , University of Toronto, Monash University, Melbourne
11.15-11.30am	Tea/Coffee Break
11.30-1.00pm	<i>Migrant Re-integration in the Homeland</i> Chair: Themrise Khan , Metropolis Karin Mayr , University of Vienna Imelda Nicolas , Commission on Filipinos Overseas Peggy Levitt , Wellesley College and Harvard University
1.00-1.45pm	Lunch
1.45-3.15pm	<i>Development Benefits of Re-integration to Host and Homeland Societies</i>

Chair: **Hanspeter Wyss**, KNOMAD Secretariat, World Bank

Gordon Betcherman, University of Ottawa

David A. Phillips, Director GBRW consulting, formerly World Bank

James Busumtwi-sam, Simon Fraser University

3.15-3.30pm

Next steps and thanks

Howard Duncan, Metropolis Project

Appendix: List of Participants

Name	Organization
Saheed Ajasa	Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, Ontario
Alisha Arnold	University of Ottawa
Charmaine B. Bene	DFATD
Ray D. Bollman	Brandon University/ University of Saskatchewan
Solomon Belay Faris	Association for Higher Education and Development (AHEAD)
Hugo Genest	CIC
Gonzalo Gonzalez	Embassy of Ecuador
Nicola Graviano	IOM
Cindy Hanks	Employment and Social Development Canada
Robin Higham	University of Ottawa
Jaimie Hildebrand	McMaster University
Lara Hill	Metropolis
Aakelah Jamal	HRSDC
Nyamulola Kambanji	
Sarah Kambites	United Nations Association in Canada
Andrey Kholin	Embassy of the Russian Federation
José-Antonio Torres-Lacasa	Delegation of the European Union to Canada
Ho Hon Leung	State University of New York College
Les Linklater	CIC

Chrystal Liverpool	Carleton University
Nopakhun Luichant	Embassy of Thailand
Lordana Marcetti	IDRC
Umardin Mutalib	Malaysian High Commission
Boniface Mweu	Kenyan Community in the National Capital Region
Jane Mweu	Canada East Africa Chamber of Commerce
Jennifer Pedersen	NDP
José Antonio Miguel Polo	Embassy of Spain
Wendy Quarry	Independent Consultant
Rudi Robinson	
Christa Ross	Conference Board of Canada
Hallvard Hodne Sandven	Embassy of Norway
Ali Saidi	Embassy of Algeria
Alexander Schahbasi	Austrian Ministry of Interior
Robert Sauder	DFATD
Ian Smillie	Independent Development Professional
Dr. Denise L. Spitzer	University of Ottawa
Olivia Tan	
Louisa Taylor	New Canadian Media
Rolando Vera	Embassy of Ecuador
Yongjie Wang	IDRC
Matilda Warfman	Embassy of Sweden



Barbara Waruszynski

Defense Research & Development Canada

Ann Weston

IDRC

Kate White

United Nations Association in Canada