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STRENGTHENING SECTOR POLICIES FOR BETTER FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION RESULTS

This policy guidance note is part of a series that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and partners are producing to support policy makers address the food security and nutrition situation in their country. Each note provides guidance on how to sharpen the focus of sector policies in order to achieve sustainable food security and nutrition outcomes.
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Food security and nutrition and migration are interrelated: food security and nutrition is one of the key drivers of migration, and at the same time migration has impacts on food security and nutrition.

Migration can have positive and negative impacts on food security and nutrition in countries of origin, transit or destination. When supported by effective policies, migration can contribute to inclusive and sustainable development in both countries of origin and destination.

There is often minimal coherence between migration policies on one hand, and agriculture and rural development and food security and nutrition policies, programmes and actions on the other hand. To avoid incoherent approaches and policies, government officials need to communicate and coordinate among themselves and with the private sector and civil society, including migrant and diaspora associations and youth organizations.

More efforts are needed to systematically generate evidence on differentiated migration patterns and impacts and ensure decision-makers utilize it to promote a stronger coherence between migration, agriculture and rural employment and food security and nutrition policies and programmes.

There has been considerable focus on international migration, whereas in many cases internal migration presents critical implications for food security and nutrition.

Discourse and policy-making on migration and food security and nutrition need to move away from a rural-urban dichotomy towards addressing households as mobile and multi-locational units.

Efforts should focus simultaneously on: improving rural livelihoods and reducing pressure to migrate; improving the conditions for migrants along their journey and at arrival to their destination; and addressing the impacts on host communities.

Food security and nutrition policies need to consider the growing challenge of urban food insecurity caused in part by increased migration.

Introduction

The purpose of this guidance note is to support policy officers and other stakeholders in facilitating dialogue for integrating rural migration issues into policy-making on food security and nutrition and conversely to integrate food security and nutrition considerations into migration-related policies. It does this by: (i) exploring the interactions between rural migration and food security and nutrition; (ii) exploring how migration and related policies (e.g. employment, youth, human settlement, natural resources) impact food security and nutrition outcomes and conversely how agriculture and food security and nutrition policies impact migration; and (iii) identifying the policy changes that are needed to ensure greater synergy between the rural migration and food security and nutrition policy agendas.

FAO uses the term migration to refer to the movement of people, either within a country or across international borders. See Annex for Migration Terminology.
There are 247 million international migrants (UNDESA, 2015) and 736 million internal migrants (UNDESA, 2013).

In 2016, worldwide, there were 65.6 million forcibly displaced individuals (refugees, internally displaced persons and asylum seekers) (UNHCR 2016).

About one-third of all international migrants are in the 15-34 age group (UNDESA, 2015).

Women account for 48 percent of all international migrants (UNDESA, 2015).

According to IOM, by 2050 forecasts predict up to 1 billion migrants due to environmental causes.

Remittance flows are estimated to have exceeded USD 600 billion (2015), of which around USD 441 billion was directed to developing countries, representing nearly three times the total amount of official development assistance (World Bank, 2016).

Migration is part of the process of development as economies undergo structural transformation and labour shifts away from agriculture into manufacturing and services (Kuznets, 1966; Hnatkovska and Lahiri, 2014). In 2015 migration contributed an estimated USD 6.7 trillion worldwide, or 9.4 percent of global gross domestic product (GDP) (Woetzel et al., 2016). Migration is a component of rural household strategies for risk mitigation to improve and diversify their sources of income (Groger and Zylberberg, 2015; World Bank, 2008; OECD, 2007). In this regard, migration can play an integral part in achieving food security and nutrition by addressing one or more of the four pillars of food security and nutrition – availability, access, stability, or utilization – for both migrants themselves and their household of origin.

Despite the long history of migration, the scale and complexity of recent migratory flows in recent years is unique. In 2015, there were 244 million international migrants – or 3.2 percent of the world’s population – representing an increase of 65 percent in the global North and 34 percent in the global South since 1990. They included 150 million migrant workers, or those migrating not as refugees or seeking asylum but specifically for employment (ILO, 2015). Internal migration is an even larger phenomenon, with an estimated 736 million internal migrants (UNDESA, 2013). In this vein, migration is contributing to population growth in developed countries with low fertility rates and is one of the leading causes of urbanization in many developing countries. Part of this increase in migration is attributed to an upsurge in those who are forcibly displaced by conflict or crisis. However, although refugees and IDPs may receive the greatest focus in media, they represent under 10 percent of the world’s total migrants. International and internal migration are closely linked, with internal migration often occurring as a first stage, followed by onward international migration. As shown in Figure 1, a significant number of international migrants go to neighbouring or nearby countries. More than 60 percent of global migration still consists of people migrating within their region of origin (Woetzel et al., 2016).

The drivers of migration are diverse and are influenced by a range of factors, including: individual determinants (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, education, employment status and individual preferences and aspirations); household characteristics (household size and composition, cultural and social norms, assets base, age, gender and education of the household’s head); and macro-level socio-economic “root causes” linked to the context, as well as conflicts, violence and extreme weather extreme events (Burrows and Kinney, 2016; FAO, 2016).

---

2 In 2015, this number reached an unprecedented 65.3 million people, including 21 million refugees, 3 million asylum seekers and over 40 million IDPs. Roughly half of the world’s refugees are in the Near East and Northern Africa (UNHCR, 2016).

3 Based on UNHCR definition, which does not capture migrants displaced by natural or environmental disaster, famine or severe food and nutrition insecurity.
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With rising migration, remittances have also increased, reaching USD 601 billion in 2016 (World Bank, 2016). A large share of remittances is directed to rural areas – in 2014 around 40 percent of global remittances were directed to rural areas (IFAD and World Bank Group, 2015). Remittances overall – to both rural and urban households – have become the second largest and most stable source of external finance after foreign direct investment (Ratha and Shaw, 2007; World Bank, 2015). There are many positive spill-over effects of remittances related to poverty reduction and economic development as a result of the increase in disposable income, spending and increasing tax revenues. However, although remittances provide significant benefits,
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the benefits are about 50 percent lower than what migrants in developing countries would have generated if they had not moved, for example, if there were ways that they could remain and productively contribute to their areas/countries of origin (Woetzel et al., 2016).

Historically, policies that have addressed food security and nutrition have largely been split along a rural-urban dichotomy without acknowledging that migrant households are multi-locational and more fluid. Food security and nutrition policies have also failed to consider the diverse challenges faced by origin, transit and destination countries. The trend of increasing urbanization does not automatically imply that rural areas are being abandoned or that those migrating to larger towns and cities are doing so on a permanent basis. Most first-generation migrants retain close links with their household of origin and may even spend portions of the year living in both rural and urban areas (Crush, 2013; Potts, 2010). Therefore, the focus can no longer be on rural or urban food security, as the two become increasingly interlinked, particularly at the household level. Similarly, little attention in policy-making has been given to the process of migration and how it impacts food security and nutrition in areas of origin, transit and destination. Hence, it is also necessary to consider, for instance, policies dealing with remittance flows and the transfer of knowledge, experience and skills, particularly given the circularity of migration, as well as the provision of services and infrastructure when migrants transit or move between different areas. Policies will need to account for the more fluid and dynamic nature of migration – in terms of both circular migration and return migration – in order to mitigate risks and maximize potential returns for food security and nutrition.

**Purpose of this guidance note**

This guidance note aims to assist policy officers specifically, but also public and private sector stakeholders engaged in policy and programmes related to migration and food security and nutrition more broadly, in integrating rural migration issues into policy-making on food security and nutrition, and conversely to integrate food security and nutrition considerations into migration-related policies and programmes.

The purpose of this guidance note is not to recommend policies to prevent or reduce migration, but rather to focus on how to increase policy coherence for mutually beneficial migration and food security and nutrition outcomes, and to address the root causes of migration, to ensure safe, orderly and regular migration and harness its developmental potential for food security and nutrition.

The guidance note outlines key questions to address the interlinkages between rural migration and food security and nutrition and provides examples of positive and negative impacts of various policy interventions to illustrate the importance of key policy shifts. Questions addressed are:

- What are the positive and negative linkages between food security and nutrition and migration and why are they important for development?
- What types of policies can facilitate more positive linkages and mitigate risks associated with rural migration and food security and nutrition?
- How can food security and nutrition and migration policies be more integrated and coherent to better contribute to food security and nutrition of rural and urban households in countries of origin, transit and destination?
- What actors are relevant to address these issues and how can their coordination be improved to deliver more sustained and coherent outcomes?

This guidance note offers a stepwise approach towards enhancing policy coherence among rural migration and food security and nutrition policy agendas. Step 1 provides guidance on how to assess the current migration and food security and nutrition situation. Steps 2 and 3 examine how the migration policy landscape connects with the food security and nutrition policy landscape, identifying policy options for greater harmonization. Step 4 identifies ways in which policy change might be brought about.
Background: migration, food security and nutrition linkages and challenges

Types of migration
Before embarking on a discussion of the specific linkages between migration and food security and nutrition, it is important to define the type of migration that this guidance note is addressing. The note uses the term migration to refer to various kinds of short-, long-term international or internal human movements, and uses the term “migrant” to refer to individuals who participate in or undertake such movements (Hong and Knoll, 2016). Moreover, the note focuses on migration originating from rural areas, and thus uses the term rural migration to refer to such types of human mobility. The focus is on economic migration and as such does not include crisis-related or forced migration (i.e. refugees, IDPs or asylum seekers). However, this guidance note does address migrants who perceive migration as their only viable option for moving out of poverty and food insecurity. As the line between these groups is often blurry, there may be parts of this guidance note that are also useful for addressing issues related to forced migration. Further information on types of migration is provided in Annex 1.

The drivers of migration include economic and demographic factors, environmental considerations, and social and political dynamics. Migrants can move because of socio-economic factors, including poverty, food insecurity, lack of employment and income-generating opportunities, limited access to social protection, natural resource depletion, environmental degradation and the adverse impacts of climate change (FAO, 2016). These drivers of migration are especially strong in developing countries. There are also a range of factors that influence migration, including demand and supply of labour, growth of global communication systems, and the status of human rights (IOM, 2013). It is important to note that drivers differ dramatically by age, gender and economic status or access to assets, as discussed in the section that follows. The influence of these factors is also highly variable across contexts (local, national, regional), and some of these drivers may unfold suddenly (e.g. crisis, natural disaster), while others may do so slowly (e.g. demographic transitions, climate change). More often than not, these drivers of migration interact in complex ways. In particular, many of these factors may determine a food security and nutrition situation which in turn influences a household’s decision about migration (Milan et al., 2015).

1 The guidance note acknowledges that, along the migration continuum, varying degrees of voluntariness mark each individual’s migration experience. It is therefore acknowledged that under certain circumstances, such as violence, severe human rights abuses, other conflict-related risks, or even a sudden natural disaster, the decision to migrate is not an option, but rather a last resort in order to survive. The note therefore focuses more on migration driven by socio-economic factors, mainly food insecurity; when relevant it refers to other types of migrants. It is not within the scope of the document to discuss coherence specifically in relation to the policies that target different types of migrants. Relevant references are provided whenever possible. See also the Annex on Migration Terminology.

Migratory contexts

Differences among migratory contexts are important to consider, as policy interventions will vary greatly depending on the specific context – whether the area being addressed is an area of origin, transit, or destination, or some mix of the three. Today, many countries, and regions within countries, are simultaneously areas of origin, transit and destination of migrants or may progressively change from one to the other. For example, a region of a particular country may have historically been a source of migratory flows, but it may turn into a destination area of migration from neighbouring areas due to increasing labour demand that has arisen from a temporary shortage created by the earlier outflow of migrants. In this regard, policies need to respond to these often fluid dynamics, and countries and regions cannot be put in one box or the other with unilateral policy approaches.

Food security and nutrition as a driver of migration

Migration is part of an overall household coping strategy to ensure food security and nutrition. Both real and perceived food and nutrition insecurity play a significant role in households’ decision to migrate (IOM and WFP, 2015). However, the way that migration is used – and the resulting impact on food security and nutrition – varies dramatically based on the diversity of assets of each household. The extremely poor, landless households, etc. – who are often the most food- and nutrition-insecure – may undertake migration out of extreme need, especially during the “hunger seasons” as they have no other options or means of coping with shocks or stressors (Warner et al., 2012). Given the costs associated with migration, those with fewer resources may be more likely to undertake internal migration, to other rural or urban areas in search of work or food (Abdelali-Martini and Hamza, 2014). In fact, as migration is costly, it is the low-to middle-income quartiles (or higher) that can afford international migration, often of the household members it is youth who migrates, as an option to improve their livelihoods and overall resilience (Thomas – Hope 2011; Lacroix, 2011).

Note: Duration may vary from temporary (seasonal, circular, etc.) to long term.

Source: FAO, 2016a.
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Note: Costs associated with migration may include costs associated with preparing for migration, the journey, finding employment, finding housing and establishing a new home (supplies, furniture, etc.), and costs that are associated with discrimination or lack of rights in the area of destination (GFMD, 2016).
Youth migration

Ninety percent of youth currently live in developing countries where food insecurity and malnutrition are the highest. Roughly 12 percent of international migrants – or one in eight – are youth (15-24 years old). Although age-disaggregated data in developing countries are sparse on the topic, youth are considered to have the highest propensity to migrate. Seventy three million youth between the ages of 15 and 24 were unemployed in 2013, with the highest proportions in North Africa and Western Asia. Over the next decade more than 1 billion young people globally will be entering the workforce, and only 40 percent will be working in jobs that currently exist (World Bank, 2016). These statistics indicate the growing urgency of addressing youth-specific challenges to achieving food security and nutrition (Global Migration Group, 2014). There is also an opportunity to turn the growing youth population into a “demographic dividend” if youth can be absorbed into productive jobs by addressing the current mismatch between skills and labour market needs. Migration drivers for youth are similar to those for other age groups, although youth are more prone to migrate and are more highly influenced by factors such as high unemployment, conflict, desire for access to education and new skills, pressure from the household and/or family to provide income, and a growing lack of interest in agriculture – particularly those who have seen generations before them struggle to support their livelihoods. Youth are also a growing priority on the global agenda, figuring prominently in discourses over forced migration, youth employment and entrepreneurship, and the need to make agriculture more attractive for youth, as underpinned by the Inter-Agency Network on Youth Development, the Global Initiative on Decent Jobs for Youth, and the commitments of the World Humanitarian Summit’s High Level Session on Transforming Humanitarian Action with and for Young People.

TABLE 1. Migration drivers, household profiles and food-insecurity risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of migration</th>
<th>Diversity of and access to assets</th>
<th>Profile of migrants</th>
<th>Risks to food security and nutrition of migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration to improve livelihoods and resilience</td>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>Early 20s with some education</td>
<td>None to Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration to survive</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>Head of household, mid-40s for seasonal or temporary migration</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration as erosive coping strategy</td>
<td>Zero - Low</td>
<td>Head of household, mid-40s, seasonal, temporary or longer-term (internal) migration</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration not an option</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Female-headed households, or elderly household</td>
<td>N/A, trapped in food insecurity and malnutrition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Warner et al., 2012 (p. 11, figure 2).
Box 3  Migration as a coping strategy to address food insecurity and malnutrition

Research conducted in four villages in the poorest region of Ghana indicated that households primarily migrate for livelihood and food security reasons, which are directly linked to climatic and environmental factors as a result of the heavy reliance on rain-fed agriculture in this region. The primary drivers listed included decline in crop production for own consumption, changes in the rainy season, unemployment, longer drought periods followed by unreliable harvest, and an increase in drought frequency. Migration for households in this region provides a means to address gaps in agriculturally based income, with the majority indicating seasonal migration rather than longer term. Due to social and cultural drivers are similar, they affect women and men in rather different ways and extents – particularly with relation to vulnerability to human rights abuses, exploitation, discrimination, and specific health and nutrition risks. There are also contributing factors in terms of age, power within the family, children’s age, and the household’s ability to cope without the migrant in terms of availability of others to take on their activities. Many studies have shown that even though female migrants tend to earn less than men at destination, they also tend to remit more both overall and as a percentage of their incomes due to stronger networks with family at origin and because their decisions on remittances are more tied to altruism (Le Goff, 2016).

Box 2  Changing drivers of women’s migration

More and more women are migrating independently based on the same drivers as men, rather than as family dependents or as part of the family reunification process. Thus, an increasing number of women migrate to access better employment and educational opportunities and to escape restrictive gender roles and social norms (UNFPA and IOM, 2016). Many other factors such as state and community settings, traditions and family circumstances also play a significant role. Although the norms in this area, male migration is more common than female migration, although the latter is increasing in recent years. The typical age of first-time migrants is 23 years old, and it is primarily for income rather than for educational purposes (IOM and WFP, 2015).

Similar evidence has emerged from Vietnam in the context of the landfall of Typhoon Ketsana in 2009, which heavily affected crop production in rural areas. The average household experienced a drop in income of 10-50 percent, primarily caused by a loss of crop income, resulting in many cases in reduced food consumption. Among a range of household coping mechanisms, the primary mechanism employed was internal labour migration to urban areas. Approximately 17 percent of households responded to the shock by sending members away for work, so that the remittances they would send back could assist with income losses (Groger and Zylberberg, 2015).
The impacts of rural migration on food security and nutrition

Migration can both positively and negatively impact food security and nutrition in areas of origin, transit and destination, mainly depending on: (i) expenditure and contributory patterns, investments, and labour allocation of migrant households; and (ii) the extent to which financial resources, knowledge and skills are transferred back home by migrants, returning migrants, migrants’ networks and diaspora groups. Impacts can therefore differ according to the type of migration (e.g. internal versus international migration, temporary/circular versus permanent migration), the profile of the migrant (e.g. age, gender, education and family ties), and the social norms, institutions and traditions of the areas of origin.

Overall, two trends are illustrated widely: (i) households receiving remittances in areas of origin are generally more food-secure than households with no migrants and households with migrants but not receiving remittances; and (ii) at destination, migrant households are generally less food-secure than non-migrant households (Crush, 2013). Despite many of the benefits of migration, migrants are among the most vulnerable members of society and likely to experience human rights violations, loss of employment, lower pay, longer hours, poor working conditions, and other negative conditions (UN, 2015). These conditions also make them more vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition.

For households of origin, the primary changes for food security and nutrition that occur include: (i) the possibility to receive remittances from the migrant, thus influencing consumption and investment patterns; ii) the potential receipt of information, knowledge and skills from the migrant’s new location, influencing their behaviour; and (iii) fewer household members, resulting in lower consumption needs but also lower labour availability (Zezza et al., 2011). These different impacts can be seen along the four dimensions of food security – availability, access, utilization, and stability – and nutrition.

Availability

Availability is impacted by migration mainly as a result of changes in agricultural production and productivity resulting from changes in the labour pool and a potential reduction of pressure on land and water resources. Food availability is first affected in households of origin as a result of fewer mouths to feed, thus increasing the availability of food for the other members of the household, and subsequently affected by changes in the labour force available for agricultural production in the areas of origin, and by the use of remittances (if received). Food availability in households at destination is primarily impacted by two factors: (i) the capacity to participate in own production based on the skills of the migrant and the area of destination (urban or rural) and allocation of space for food production; and (ii) food remittances. Both have received little attention in the literature, with food remittances often described as “invisible” in the sense that they are outside of market channels or documented transfers, but fundamental to the ability of poor urban households to survive (IIED, 2017).

Access

Migration can be an asset for both areas of origin and destination in terms of access to food and nutrition, depending on how migration impacts households’ incomes and employment outcomes. Remittances can reduce liquidity and credit constraints, and constitute a significant share of households’ income in countries of origin. Remittances can be used to improve access to food, and for investment in agriculture, education, health and housing. Increased household income as a result of better employment or as a result of remittances can lead to greater investment in farm and non-farm activities, creating new demand for labour and stimulating other productive activities other productive activities, including services and manufacturing – in both rural and urban areas. The same impact can be achieved when...
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Increased work burden, lower time with kids*

Increased reliance on street foods**

Remittance dependency*

No receipt of remittances + loss of household head*

Greater vulnerability to higher food prices**

Pressure to send remittances**

No access to infrastructure and services**

LOW LIKELIHOOD

Increased demand for fruit and vegetables*

Improved consumption from remittances + income*

Increased work burden, lower time with kids*

Greater vulnerability to higher food prices**

Investment of remittances in agriculture*

Access to better services + infrastructure

Counter-cyclical role of remittances*

Increased demand for fruit and vegetables*

POSITIVE IMPACT

Higher wages from lower competition*

Access to better services + infrastructure

Greater vulnerability to higher food prices**

Increased work burden, lower time with kids*

Increase in non-farm employment*

Investment of remittances in agriculture*

Density of remittances + income*

Counter-cyclical role of remittances*

Improved consumption from remittances + income*

Increase in urban agriculture**

Labour shortage = less land used, less labour intensive production*

Increased demand for fruit and vegetables*

HIGH LIKELIHOOD

NEGATIVE IMPACT

Labour shortage = lower production* Ability

Higher consumption of processed foods

Vulnerability, informal settlement**

Departure of skilled labour*

Increased work burden, lower time with kids*

Increased reliance on street foods**

Remittance dependency*

No receipt of remittances + loss of household head*

Greater vulnerability to higher food prices**

Pressure to send remittances**

No access to infrastructure and services**

LOW LIKELIHOOD

Increased demand for fruit and vegetables*

Improved consumption from remittances + income*

Increased work burden, lower time with kids*

Greater vulnerability to higher food prices**

Investment of remittances in agriculture*

Access to better services + infrastructure

Counter-cyclical role of remittances*

Increased demand for fruit and vegetables*
diaspora groups are mobilized to invest in their countries of origin in favour of employment promotion and enterprise development. This may impact more cyclical or circular migration patterns, where labour migrates temporarily or commutes to access opportunities (Le Goff, 2016).

**Utilization**

Households of origin and migrants are affected differently by migration in terms of food utilization, especially considering energy for refrigeration and cooking, infrastructure for the safe transport of food, and hygiene-related services. On the one hand, rural areas typically have lower provision of services and infrastructure as a result of higher capital costs per person, given the more remote location and economies of scale. On the other hand, in recent years cities and towns have expanded rapidly, in many cases without planning for or understanding the needs created by the influx of migrants. These individuals may also be left out of the poverty analysis, which only addresses income and cost of food, even though the conditions they live in drastically affect their ability to achieve food security and adequate nutrition (UN Habitat, 2012).

As incomes rise – either as a result of remittances in households of origin or due to new employment in destination households – there is also an increased demand for fruit, vegetables and dairy and a decrease in reliance on staple grains, cereals, roots and tubers. Shifting demand away from staples such as grains presents opportunities for smallholders to increase earning potential and improve nutrition by shifting production to fruits and vegetables. The latter can provide a higher return per labour day or hectare compared with grains – sometimes 5-10 times higher (Sohel et al., 2015). Increasing consumption of fruits and vegetables and a more varied diet overall as a result of higher incomes has positive impacts on nutrition in households of origin and destination. Migration affects members of the household in different ways – particularly children. While remittances are often used to invest in healthcare and education for children (Mansuri, 2007; IOM, 2013) – making up the second largest share after food consumption – there are also negative impacts as a result of the loss of a household member (the so-called “care drain”). Changes in labour allocation within the household may lead to increasing time burdens for the household members left behind, which can lead to negative impacts on food utilization and nutrition.

**Stability**

Stability of households in countries of origin and destination is most clearly impacted depending on the diversification of the household’s livelihood basis. For example, migrants in destination countries may have greater access to diverse income-generating opportunities but with lower social protection mechanisms in terms of exposure to food price fluctuations and other related shocks. Similarly, the stability of households in countries of origin is strongly affected by both the level and consistency of remittance flows, but also the other income- and food-generating activities that the household is engaged in. Counter-cyclical remittances play a particular role in food stability for both households of origin and destination. Remittances, while contributing to stability, may also create dependency and put pressure on migrants in destination countries, whose food security and nutrition may suffer as a result (Alvarez – Tinajero, 2013). Many migrants already face challenging conditions for achieving food stability in destination countries, with many low-income and informal settlements – often largely comprised of migrants – located in areas exposed to floods and landslides, and where there may be very little or no provision for sanitation, surface water drainage and waste collection.
In Sri Lanka, labour migration has increased significantly in recent years, leading to a significant number of children “left behind” by migrant workers. An estimated 1.7 million Sri Lankans, or 8.5 percent of the population, are working overseas, with 200,000 additional migrants leaving every year. Remittances are estimated at 8 percent of total GDP. The majority of migrants are male (63.2 percent) and between the ages of 25 and 29. To respond to this increasing trend, the Government of Sri Lanka adopted the National Migration Health Policy in 2014 in order to ensure health, nutrition and social protection for migrant workers and their families. To support the development and implementation of this policy, the Government embarked on an effort to gather and analyse data related to food security, nutrition and health of households of origin. The results of the study showed that households most at risk of malnutrition are the poorest households where the mother is based overseas as a migrant worker. The study also indicates how childcare practices decrease with younger children and when the father is a migrant worker, which may be associated with excessive time burdens for the remaining parent as a result of competing responsibilities for the household (Jayatissa, and Wickramage, 2016).

In Guatemala, migration is one strategy used by many parents to improve the prospects for children overall. Remittances have played a significant part in reducing malnutrition in Guatemala – in particular, Davis and Brazil (2016) find that from 62.1 percent of all Guatemalan children under five stunted in 1989, to 48 percent in 2009. However, recent research has indicated that child nutrition remains poor, and that migration overall amplifies the risk of malnutrition. Remittances (when received) can counterbalance the negative effects of migration on stunting. However when the migrant is the primary breadwinner, there may be a period at the beginning when the cost of migrating eats into any potential remittances and thus food budget for the parent left behind. This can lead to the parent left behind being responsible for both agricultural and household labour, but also reverting to at least temporary employment, which could indirectly harm young children through a reduction in supervision and possible early reduction/cessation of breastfeeding. The negative impacts can be mitigated through the use of social networks that can help facilitate the journey, including finding housing and employment, thus reducing the overall cost of migration and time for the migrant to settle at the destination. Considering that there is often a lengthy period of time for migrants to establish themselves and begin sending remittances, this study has shown that households with young children are unlikely to receive sufficient or timely remittances to cover the critical needs of children at this stage of life. (Davis and Brazil, 2016)
This section addresses a series of questions and issues aimed at enhancing policy coherence among rural migration and food security and nutrition policy agendas. Enhanced policy coherence will enable countries to harness the positive impacts of migration, while mitigating potential negative impacts. Pursuing coherence may not only improve migration and food security and nutrition outcomes, but can also contribute to better systems for multi-stakeholder decision-making overall, in which there is a more holistic understanding of interrelated development challenges (Hong and Knoll, 2016). Considering these questions in four steps can assist stakeholders that contribute to policy-making related to migration and food security and nutrition, to recognize possible adjustments and interventions, to identify trade-offs and synergies, and to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in planning and implementing policies dealing with both migration and food security and nutrition outcomes.

**Stepwise approach**

**Addressing migration and food security and nutrition linkages**

FIGURE 4. Four steps for addressing migration and food security and nutrition linkages

- **Step 1** CONDUCTING A SITUATIONAL AND STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
  Assessing migration and food security and nutrition linkages and mapping relevant stakeholders

- **Step 2** MAPPING AND ANALYSING THE POLICY LANDSCAPE
  Analysing policies and programmes impacting migration and food security and nutrition

- **Step 3** PROMOTING CROSS-SECTORAL POLICY COHERENCE
  Enhancing positive linkages between migration and food security and nutrition across key sectors

- **Step 4** UNDERSTANDING THE POLITICAL ECONOMY
  Influencing the policy agenda to facilitate change

**Step 1** CONDUCTING A SITUATIONAL AND STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
Recognizing the drivers and patterns of migration out of rural areas is crucial to develop targeted policy recommendations. Given the particularity of each case, micro-studies or even village-level studies are often needed to capture the wide range of issues at play in the spectrum of migration linkages with food security and nutrition (Mendola, 2006). Data gathering is a crucial part of assessing the situation.
Key questions

The following set of questions can serve as the basis for beginning an assessment of the availability and quality of information available, and to address past gaps in data collection:

- What type of data are available/are we collecting on migration? Migration-related food security and nutrition? Where are the gaps?
- Do the available data give an adequate picture of where the key food security and nutrition challenges exist among households in areas of origin and those in areas of destination, covering the following areas:
  - Areas of heavy out-migration
  - Areas of heavy in-migration
  - Current rural-urban linkages – where they are strong and where they are weak
  - Areas of food insecurity and malnutrition
  - Household data from these areas on:
    - Household engagement in agriculture
    - Gender and age composition
    - Level and sources of income
    - Employment status
    - Access to social protection (both assistance and contributory)
    - Expenditures
    - Nutrition
    - Migrant vs. non-migrant status
- What are the root causes driving migration in each area and how can the causes be addressed through domestic interventions? How are the causes related to food security and nutrition?
- How well linked are households in countries of origin with migrant members and communities abroad? What are the existing rural investment opportunities for migrants, diaspora associations and community-based organizations?
  - Frequency of origin household interaction with migrant and vice versa
  - Number of people and level of reliance on remittances for livelihoods

In countries of origin, there is the need to collect evidence on the determinants of migration, including internal migration (rural-rural and rural-urban) and circular/seasonal migration by: (i) running ad-hoc migration and remittances surveys and diagnostics; (ii) including specific questions or modules in already planned household surveys; or (iii) exploring alternative data sources, including administrative data (Global Migration Group, 2016).

Global sources which can be useful include data collected by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Population Division, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Bank, and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Food Security Index. However, one of the key challenges with data in most developing countries is the reliability and breadth of information that is available. It is often of poor quality and sparse. Part of this initial step is to identify gaps in data and the resulting implications for policy-making and programmes. Many data collection systems are not adapted to account for the flow of people moving...
Migration- and FSN-related information can be assessed in part through sources such as:

- census data
- visa processing and border registers
- remittance data from national financial institutions
- demographic surveys
- labour force surveys
- migration surveys
- household-level panel data

Tools and sources for collecting information

Ghana is undergoing significant changes in mobility patterns – increasing internal migration, emigration, transit migration and immigration involving regular, irregular, seasonal, temporary and voluntary and forced dimensions of migration. Data gaps were identified as a significant issue in understanding and addressing the variable components of migration and resulting impacts on food security and nutrition. To address this, Ghana first undertook a situation analysis of the existing data sources and current practices among data collection agencies and ministries, resulting in the formulation of the strategy for the National Migration Database for Ghana. Part of the strategy also included coordination among government ministries, with IOM designated as the coordinating authority. Ministries and other stakeholders involved included Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ghana Immigration Service, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Ghana Investment Promotion Centre, and diaspora associations in countries identified with high Ghanaian migration (Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, UK, and USA). Ghana has thus used this information to develop Migration Profiles – or characteristics of various migrants – in order to target policies to address their needs.
Using the Household Income and Expenditure Survey to assess migration and food security in Bangladesh

Bangladesh has one of the highest rates of out-migration of any country in the world, with one in nine households having at least one international migrant as of 2010. Of the country of origin households with a migrant overseas, 92 percent receive remittances. Officially recorded remittances have increased seven times since 2000, and were estimated at USD 15 billion, or 11 percent of the country’s GDP, in 2014. Migration has literally reshaped Bangladesh society. Based on the Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2010/2011, it was possible to analyse the estimated net impact of international migration on six household-level food security indicators. As a result of a lack of complete data, a no-migration counterfactual was used to test findings. This method provided the possibility to understand that migration had a positive impact on all food security dimensions. However, this case also illustrates the limitations of the availability of only partial data. For example, in this case, the dataset did not have sufficient detail to disentangle the effects of household recomposition, remittances and information as channels through which migration affects food security, or to differentiate the effects by type of household and across household members.


Stakeholder mapping

In order to understand the key actors and stakeholders to engage with, it is important to identify stakeholders working on the range of issues related to migration and food security and nutrition, including within government, among the private sector, and civil society organizations, with particular attention to organizations representing migrant interests/rights. In many cases, although they may be relevant to the issues presented by migration and food security and nutrition, many stakeholders may lack the capacity to engage in a meaningful way.

It can be useful to develop a stakeholder mapping matrix to plot stakeholders’ influence and interest/engagement over various aspects of migration and food security and nutrition policy-making. This will assist in identifying whom to reach out to on specific policy interventions and entry points for coherence (discussed in the sections that follow). Some stakeholders may be thought of as traditionally more migration-focused or food security- and nutrition-focused, but part of the purpose of this mapping is to include stakeholders across the spectrum. In addition, noting at what level stakeholders are engaged can be helpful in mapping which stakeholders are most relevant at the national level versus stakeholders that may be more engaged only in specific districts or local areas. An example stakeholder mapping matrix is given in Figure 5.
Key questions

The following set of questions can serve as the basis for stakeholder mapping, to be adapted to the specific country context:

- Who are the main stakeholders engaged in migration, rural development, food security and nutrition? What are their respective roles and authority?
- How are stakeholders engaging with other types of stakeholders (e.g. fora, coordination mechanisms, institutional set-up, rules and procedures)? Who leads these efforts? Are they effective? At what scale are they working/engaged – international, national, local levels?
- To what extent are vulnerable individuals, particularly food-insecure women, men, youth, children and elderly, as well as migrants engaged in policy-making?
- What is the role of diaspora and migrant associations, as well as youth organizations, and what actions can be taken to improve their coordination and representativeness? What are their major constraints in accessing financial services (including remittances)?
- Are there inter-institutional mechanisms or multi-stakeholder platforms in place to relate migration and food security and nutrition, and/or agriculture and rural development in the country? Are agricultural and other rural stakeholders invited to participate in migration working groups at country level and consulted in the development of migration policies, strategies and programmes? Are migration and labour stakeholders invited to participate in food security and nutrition working groups at country level and consulted in the development of food security and nutrition policies, strategies and programmes?
- Where are the pressure points or areas of disagreement? Are there processes/mechanisms in place for reaching consensus? How do these processes engage or interact with international/global processes?
- What are the capacity development gaps of stakeholders in terms of: engaging in BOTH migration and food security and nutrition; establishing contacts with all the other relevant stakeholders; and resolving conflict/finding agreement?
FIGURE 5. Example of a stakeholder mapping matrix for migration and food security and nutrition coherence

Source: own elaboration.

*Household at origin; **Household at destination (no * signifies that it could apply to both household at origin and destination).
Key questions

The following questions can serve as the basis for mapping and analysing policies and programmes:

- What policies are currently in place to address migration? And food security and nutrition? What is the primary focus of the policies – e.g. targeting a specific group like children, youth or women, addressing root causes of migration, facilitating migration, enhancing benefits for migrants, facilitating remittances?

- Are policies inter-sectoral? Is there any coordination among the existing policies or any cross-referencing – e.g. do agriculture policies reference migration and do migration policies reference/address food security and nutrition?

- Do migration policies, strategies and programmes include reference to rural migration? Do measures for the management of labour mobility account for the seasonality of agricultural calendars and the labour needs of agriculture and rural areas? Are there policies addressing the portability of social security benefits? Are there mechanisms or schemes in place to encourage the return of skilled migrants or potential agro-entrepreneurs? Are there programmes providing pre-departure information packages that also cover rural areas to facilitate informed migration decisions?

- Do agricultural and rural development policies and programmes include explicit measures to improve the performance of the agriculture sector to generate more employment and entrepreneurial opportunities that are attractive to rural youth? Do they include measures to facilitate access to youth and women to land, credit and markets?

Step 2 | MAPPING AND ANALYSING THE POLICY LANDSCAPE

Having now identified the key migration and food security and nutrition linkages and the relevant stakeholders, the next step is focused on mapping existing policies and programmes which have an impact on migration and food security and nutrition (jointly and separately). Migration and food security affect many areas of public policy-making, from healthcare to education, agriculture, labour, infrastructure and services provision.

Box 8 | Strengthening the policy environment through multi-disciplinary mixed-method approaches

More and more researchers and policy-makers alike are acknowledging the need for and benefit of conducting multi-disciplinary mixed-method approaches to strengthening the policy environment. The fact that migration cuts across sectors and areas of expertise means that any effective policy will need to be developed by including a wide range of expertise. Similarly, by mixing methods through a combination of structured and semi-structured interviews together with the use of panel data and traditional knowledge, it is possible to contrast and compare various perspectives, and capture both quantitative and qualitative information. A mixed-methods approach was applied in eight countries (Bangladesh, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Peru, Tanzania, Thailand and Vietnam), and the results illustrate the value of having a much richer picture of the interrelated aspects and trigger points for policy interventions. In fact, in those countries, by combining research and household-level data with more participatory methods, households were better integrated into thinking through ways to manage vulnerability, food security and nutrition, and migration (Warner et al., 2012).
Do sectoral policies include assessments and diagnostics of the determinants of rural migration, including internal and seasonal migration? Do they include evidence on the impacts of migration, including remittances on local labour markets, wages, agricultural production, and food security and nutrition outcomes?

Are there explicit efforts to support skills development and local job searches in rural areas (migration-prone areas)? Are there labour market information systems in place that ensure coverage of rural labour markets and job opportunities in agricultural value chains?

Are there any measures to increase access to safe, reliable and affordable remittance services in rural areas? Are there policies and mechanisms to facilitate the investment of remittances (individual and collective) in agriculture and the rural non-farm economy? Are there targeted measures promoting financial literacy and inclusion of migrants and their families? Are there financial services tailored to the needs of rural youth and women?

Are there any differences between national- and local-level policies addressing migration and food security and nutrition?

To what extent are policies implemented and enforced? Are there adequate resources to monitor policy implementation and impact?

Evidence has shown that countries pursuing more holistic policy-making and establishing coordination mechanisms achieve better migration governance overall (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2016). This section provides guidance on the types of policies and programmes which are relevant to include in order to facilitate a comprehensive review of potential areas of impact and leverage points.

Table 2 outlines some of the key policies related to migration and food security and nutrition that may be in place in countries of origin, transit and destination. Not all countries will have policies covering all of these issues, but this list provides a basis.

Each of the types of policies and programmes included in the table can have various impacts on migration and food security and nutrition depending on the specific context, including whether it is an area of origin, transit or destination. For example, agricultural subsidies can contribute to decreasing migration in richer countries, but can increase migration in poorer countries; in some countries agricultural subsidies can decrease migration barriers or costs for beneficiary households, although impacts depend on the agricultural sector performance and type of subsidies (OECD, 2016). Similarly, policies aimed at addressing insurance and risk reduction may reduce the “need” to migrate, while also encouraging more people to migrate. The range of types of insurance-based mechanisms, from government procurement to social protection, also means that the impacts may vary widely. Thus the links between policies are complex and highly context-dependent. When mapping policies and programmes, it is important to understand how policies influence each other and to identify entry points for intervention.
### TABLE 2. Key policy and programme areas related to migration and food security and nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Type of Policy/Program</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>State recruitment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary labour and/or seasonal schemes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing private recruitment agencies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare insurance/social protection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-departure training, information, dissemination and counselling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly skilled migrant requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary migration assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical recruitment codes</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation for skilled migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to financial services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized financial products and tools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compulsory remittance schemes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diaspora engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitating investment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing dual citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge transfer initiatives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return facilitation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making social security benefits and benefit agreements portable</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reintegration/return facilitation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Type of Policy/Program</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural subsidies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural services – government-sponsored</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training programmes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural insurance and risk management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land tenure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water permitting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing and infrastructure provision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour laws and worker protection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster/crisis response mechanisms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to markets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social protection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each policy/programme, the following information should be identified:

- Lead institution
- Other partners involved – government, private sector, civil society organizations, international organizations, etc.
- Date of policy/programme launch
- Objective of the policy/programme
- Related/cross-referenced policies/programmes
- Implementation/impacts to date
- Monitoring framework
Step 3 Promoting Cross-Sectoral Policy Coherence

As discussed in previous sections, migration can have both positive and negative impacts on food security and nutrition. In turn, food insecurity and malnutrition are key drivers of migration. Better policy coherence at the national level of government can help to facilitate better coordination, but will also require a measure of decentralized policy-making. On the other hand, incoherence can reduce the effectiveness of policies and imperil both migration and food security and nutrition objectives. Fostering coherence requires a clear understanding of the linkages between migration- and food security and nutrition-related policies, including (Hong and Knoll, 2016):

- What thematic policy areas are relevant
- How the policy areas interact
- How policies are linked to policies in other countries
- What the causal chains are where certain policies impact migration and food security and nutrition objectives
- How policies can reinforce or strengthen each other to make each policy more effective.

This section outlines key thematic policy areas to explore in both migration- and food security and nutrition-related policies in order to identify ways to enhance coherence and manage trade-offs. It also provides guidance on how various policies interact and how policies can strengthen each other to facilitate policy and programme coherence, and how to adjust migration interventions for improved food security and nutrition. At the policy level, promoting coherence between food security and nutrition and migration can facilitate synergies across sectoral policies while minimizing inconsistencies and conflicting goals. At the programme level, the actual impacts depend on design and implementation features along with the linkages developed among complementary interventions.

Box 9 Zimbabwe’s migration and development unit

In order to address the complexity of the issues of migration, Zimbabwe established a dedicated Migration and Development Unit within the Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment Promotion to act as a focal point for all migration and development issues, including food security and nutrition. The aim was to have a dedicated unit that could map the range of policies and coordinate with all the entities involved without creating competing priorities or responsibilities. The unit intended to: (i) formulate/implement/monitor national migration and development policy, legal and institutional frameworks; (ii) facilitate mainstreaming of migration policy and practice in national and sectoral development plans such as national budgets, youth policies and national censuses and surveys; (iii) identify and commission research on migration and development; (iv) identify and engage with diasporas for investment and development initiatives; (v) formalize and harness the positive impacts of labour migration for national socio-economic development; (vi) ensure enforcement of measures to protect and promote the human rights and well-being of migrants; (vii) identify and initiate skills retention programmes and measures to mitigate brain drain; and (viii) identify and initiate economic and community development for migration programmes to address the root causes of migration out of extreme need or survival and provide livelihood alternatives for potential migrants.

Source: Global Migration Group, 2010.
While aiming to maximize synergies and foster coherence, there will inevitably be trade-offs to manage in prioritizing policy objectives. It is important that policy-makers are fully aware of the potential trade-offs in each specific context and when considering the interests of various stakeholders in origin, transit, and destination areas.

**Identifying the policy areas where migration and food security and nutrition are interlinked**

The following questions can serve as the basis for identifying the specific areas for policy attention. The questions should be adapted and refined considering the specificities of the country context:

1. **What measures are in place to facilitate access to employment and services in rural areas? For urban migrants?**

   The lack of employment and income generating opportunities is one of the main root causes of migration, especially for youth. In many developing countries, the primary driver for migration is a lack of decent and productive work opportunities rather than outright unemployment. Efforts should be devoted to creating more employment opportunities, both farm- and non-farm, in migration-prone areas, as well as ensuring adequate social protection coverage in rural areas. Productive and decent work opportunities can be fostered by building youth’s skills in agriculture through vocational training tailored to rural settings and promoting sustainable socio-economic entrepreneurship. Promoting entrepreneurship and farm “business” skills can lead to the creation of more small and medium agro-enterprises, creating both farm and non-farm employment opportunities. Where job creation occurs in migration-prone areas, livelihood opportunities may increase and households may be less inclined to migrate. Facilitating employment opportunities in rural areas, accompanied by better access to land and credit, may render farming more attractive.

   Promoting more decent employment opportunities is also important. Improving both the quality and/or quantity of services available to households in both rural and urban areas can have an influence on the quality of employment and subsequently on migration. As mentioned earlier, increased household income through better employment or as a result of remittances can contribute to generate more economic and employment opportunities for those who are involved in services and manufacturing in both rural and urban areas. Also, for example, household members who are driven to migrate to

**Box 10  FAO’s Decent Rural Employment Policy Database**

FAO’s policy database on decent employment in rural areas is an online inventory of current national, regional and global policies, programmes and studies that are relevant to the promotion of more and better jobs in the rural areas of developing countries. In 2014, FAO’s Social Policies and Rural Institutions division began to collect regional and country information on employment-related policies, programmes and institutions in order to inform the policy assistance provided to countries under FAO’s programme of work on Decent Rural Employment. In 2015, the information gathered became an intranet policy database available to all of FAO. After a positive internal testing phase, the database content was made available to the public through the launch of the present version in October 2016. The database is designed to provide easy access to relevant information through a flexible searching feature.
seek better education may prefer to stay in their area of origin if educational services are improved. Where healthcare and or workers' benefits are improved and potential migrants are able to address issues that may affect their ability to work in their area or origin (e.g. disability or access to medicine or maternity benefits), they may not need to move to address their food security and nutrition needs.

ii. How is safe, orderly and regular labour migration being facilitated?

Safe, orderly and regular migration from rural areas, including seasonal migration linked to agricultural calendars, can benefit migrants and their communities. If well managed, seasonal employment schemes in agriculture can guarantee decent working conditions for migrants and address the risk of competition with native workers. If implemented in synergy with agriculture and rural development policies and programmes in the areas of origin, seasonal employment policies can overcome seasonal labour shortages in agriculture. Large beneficial migration flows have taken place through circular migration agreements, as such agreements often foresee the cooperation of governments or employers in the destination areas to provide assistance for recruitment, health assessment, pre-consular support services and pre-departure orientation training (Ellis, 2000). Pre-departure information campaigns can be one way to facilitate safer and more orderly labour migration and can include information on: (i) tools for seeking employment and income-generating opportunities; (ii) specific job-related skills and languages required in destination areas; (iii) housing and healthcare; and (iv) migrants’ rights (FAO, 2016).

iii. How are rural-urban linkages being addressed?

There are also opportunities to harness the positive impacts of migration on food security and nutrition through strengthened rural-urban linkages, which are reshaping economic and social relations among households in countries of origin and migrant members and communities abroad. As discussed in previous sections, one example of this is farmers' transition away from staples and cash crops to the production of perishables to sell in urban or peri-urban markets. With the growth of smaller cities, these areas are also becoming hubs of market access for rural agricultural production and centres for a variety of essential services, thus providing more opportunities for non-farm employment for rural households as an alternative to longer-term migration to cities that may be farther away (IIED, 2015). Where investment in infrastructure accompanies the growth in services and markets in these smaller towns and cities, the potential to support vibrant rural and urban livelihoods increases.

iv. How are social protection schemes dealing with/addressing interactions between migration and food security and nutrition?

Given the complexity and variability of migratory flows and patterns, there is increasing recognition of the need for social protection and supportive policies that can respond to the associated vulnerabilities. For most migrants, there is an ongoing tension between the mobility of labour and the lack of portability of social protection benefits (Gasper and Truong, 2013). This is an important issue to address in order to ensure that the human rights of migrants are respected, but also to improve the food security and nutrition of both migrants and households of origin. Migrants also face specific risks, as a result of their more transient nature, which require protection.

Similarly, by improving social protection coverage and quality in rural areas, some households may be less inclined to use migration as
Rural-to-urban migration has been increasing in Vietnam in recent years, from 6.5 percent of the total population in 1999 to 7.7 percent in 2009, and such figures may underestimate the phenomenon as they do not include short-term, temporary or circular movements. Studies have shown that migration is a key strategy for households in economic difficulty and searching for better livelihood opportunities; at the same time, they face considerable risks as a result of a lack of adequate social protection coverage. Current schemes are residence-based, which reduces migrants’ ability to take benefits with them as they move. Vietnam’s policies have also been designed as “band-aids” in critical situations rather than as preventive policies to mitigate the risk of arriving at a critical stage. The policy framework is not very responsive to “spontaneous migration” from rural to urban areas or to the increasing amount of circular and temporary migration. This has resulted in a two-fold problem: (i) vulnerabilities of migrant workers as a result of poor enforcement of labour laws in the formal sector; and (ii) lack of awareness of migrants of their rights or avenues to express concerns or problems. Addressing these issues can help to ensure that rural-to-urban migrants in Vietnam become agents of development and diminish the risks they face in terms of food insecurity and malnutrition.

Source: Duong, et al., 2011.
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Sustainable Development Goals, to leave no one behind and to address these pockets of poverty in both migration and food security and nutrition policy-making. This requires a better understanding of the areas and groups and individuals most affected by food insecurity and malnutrition and the associated drivers and impacts of migration.

In countries of destination, integration of migrants is a key issue to achieving food security and nutrition. Integration is not just economic integration in terms of employment, housing, and access to health, education and financial services, but also social and cultural integration. The faster migrants are integrated into destination societies, the faster they can become productive and contributory economic agents for both their countries of origin and their destination household and region (e.g. through expanding the tax base).

vi. How are remittance flows, diaspora investments and return migration being managed? With what results?

Evidence indicates that a large share of remittances is spent on food, thus underlining the importance of remittances for food security and nutrition. Many countries have acknowledged this and, as a result, are working to facilitate the flow of remittances. For example, India is the top beneficiary of financial remittances in the world (USD 65.5 billion in 2016) and in 2005 created a Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs to implement a multi-faceted diaspora policy. However, in many places there are still not enough financial institutions in rural areas, meaning that rural populations can only receive remittances through informal cash transfers, which limits the overall flow in terms of accessibility and cost.

Box 12  Focusing on integration

The longer it takes for migrants to integrate in destination countries, the worse the outcome for food security and nutrition. Many countries have started to prioritize integration programmes as part of their approach to migration.

**Australia:** Active Refugee and Migrant Integration aims to build on integration programmes that often terminate after five years of entry into the destination country, even if many migrants still require support, such as legal aid, citizenship courses, skills training, social events, housing, parenting support, and health and education.

**Canada:** The Canadian Immigrant Integration Programme starts addressing integration before migration even begins by providing prospective migrants with a resource network to connect with employers and attend live online mentoring sessions.

**Spain:** The XEIX project (Fostering intercultural relations around local businesses) was formed to address xenophobia that arose in response to an influx of Chinese migrants. The project focuses on language barriers and conducts intercultural exchanges and anti-rumour campaigns.

*Source:* Economist Intelligence Unit, 2016.
Reducing the cost of transferring remittances and the role of the Diaspora

Given the vital importance of remittances for households and countries of origin, the G20 has prioritized this as an area for international policy support and in 2011 endorsed the “5x5” initiative to reduce the cost of remittances from a global average of 10 percent to 5 percent. This would result in an additional USD 17 billion for countries of origin. The European Commission and European Union Member States have supported this goal through the introduction of the Payment Services Directive in 2009 and other initiatives, such as the adoption of the General Principles for International Remittance Services. As a result, in most countries in the European Union, and globally, the cost of sending remittances has been reduced. For example, in 15 countries out of 36 where the World Bank has provided technical support, the average costs of sending remittances are below or within one percentage point of the 5x5 objective. However, the global average of sending remittances, even if it has fallen from 9.81 percent to 8.95 percent, remains high (World Bank, 2014a).

The role of diaspora associations in Armenia

The Armenian diaspora is dispersed throughout the world and now significantly exceeds the country’s resident population. The Armenian government has established a Ministry of Diaspora and instituted a policy to engage with its population spread throughout the world. Diaspora movements have played a significant role in Armenia’s development at different stages throughout its history. For example, following independence in 1991, the diaspora was mobilized to launch numerous schools, medical centres, infrastructure projects, as well as to lobby in support of the new democracy. Between 1994 and 2004, an estimated 69 percent of all foreign investors in the Armenian economy were diaspora-connected. By 2006, up to 12 percent of Armenian households relied on support from a migrant abroad. Most recently the inflow of more than 17,000 Syrian-Armenian refugees has contributed to a rise in the country’s hospitality and service sectors, and agricultural projects. The diaspora has played a primary role in funding resettlement for refugees through grassroots campaigning, such as with the Syrian Armenian Relief Fund which raised almost USD 1.2 million. Government policy supports these efforts through the Ministry of Diaspora and initiatives including an online news portal, annual forums and conferences, repatriation programmes, and cultural and sporting activities.

Source: Gevorkyan, 2016.

A reduction in transfer costs can have a positive impact on the amount and frequency of remittances received (FAO, 2016).

Addressing overall policy coherence

Once the key areas for policy attention have been identified, the policies addressing the interlinkages between migration and food security and nutrition should be analysed to address coherence. Specific questions to address coherence include:

i. Have food security and nutrition considerations been included in different policy instruments aimed at addressing migration? In what ways and who is targeted? Is the target benefitting from the policy?

In order to understand whether food security and nutrition considerations have been included in policies and programmes targeting migration, a review of the four dimensions of food security and nutrition should be conducted. An example is provided in Table 3.
Gender deserves a concentrated focus, since women account for almost half of international migrants. There are specific regions where female migration is much higher. For example, 70 percent of all migrants moving from Central and South America to Spain are women. In other regions such as Asia, which saw particularly high female migration figures – 65 percent of those who left the Philippines in 2005 were women, and in 2003, 79 percent of those who migrated from Indonesia for work were women – figures have drastically reduced as a result of policies creating more decent working conditions for women through the passing of a minimum wage for domestic workers and greater access to higher education in their country of origin.

Source: Le Goff, 2016; O’Neil et al., 2016.

**BOX 14  Policy differentiation to address gender**

**TABLE 3. Assessing policy impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Food security and nutrition elements to incorporate/check for:</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary/seasonal migrant schemes</td>
<td>■ Agriculture/key staple crop focus</td>
<td>■ Vulnerable migrants (who may otherwise undertake irregular channels)</td>
<td>■ Secure migration route with improvement in access to and availability of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Portability of benefits (rural-urban)</td>
<td>■ Destination country employers and consumers, as a result of addressing labour market needs and keeping food prices in line</td>
<td>■ Increased remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Labour standards for temporary/seasonal migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Greater access to healthcare and schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive-based remittance schemes</td>
<td>■ Higher skilled migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Increasing corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Low food security and nutrition impact due to already food- and nutrition- secure benefitting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ii. How are policies differentiated to address specific food security and nutrition issues of varying types of migration (e.g. circular, seasonal, international)? And for different types of migrants (e.g. women, youth, refugees, IDPs)?**

Understanding how certain policies are benefitting or aiming to benefit specific target groups and assessing whether this corresponds with the groups that are most food- and nutrition-insecure is a core component of ensuring that policies are achieving both migration and food security and nutrition benefits. In some contexts, women may be more food-insecure, whereas in others youth may require a stronger focus. Similarly, in some contexts it is important to foster circular and seasonal migration to provide greater income security during changing weather patterns.

**iii. What are the existing synergies, if any, between policies/programmes aimed at achieving the right to food and the right to decent work? How can these synergies be strengthened?**
The overall objective is that migration-related policies and food security and nutrition-related policies outlined in Step 2 (Table 2) are mutually reinforcing in their objectives and approaches and are not working against each other. Integrating a rights-based focus is one way to enhance synergies, with the right to work underpinning the right to food and vice versa.

In measuring policy coherence, it is important to identify specific indicators. A number of studies and tools have been developed to provide guidance on this matter, and have differentiated among input, output, outcome, and process indicators, all of which are important (King et al., 2012).

### Step 4 UNDERSTANDING THE POLITICAL ECONOMY

The political economy refers to the ways in which politics, laws and economics are connected. It requires taking a “big picture” view of the political and economic environment in which the policy framework exists, and looking for the best ways to influence the migration and food security and nutrition policy agendas. While policy analysis can yield various options for policy adjustments that are technically viable, these can be politically unfeasible. Therefore, it is important to understand the political economy behind public policy-making and implementation that affects decision-making related to migration and food security and nutrition. Building on the analysis conducted in the previous three steps, this final step aims to bring all of the information together in order to identify the specific entry points for facilitating policy change.

The following guiding questions can be helpful to assess the political economy in relation to migration and food security and nutrition:

1. **Among the stakeholders identified in Step 1, who can influence the debate and the agenda on migration and food security and nutrition? How can they be more involved? How does their engagement need to evolve to facilitate policy change?**

Revisiting the stakeholder mapping conducted in Step 1 with an eye on the key areas for policy intervention identified in Step 3 can provide the means for approaching specific stakeholders on specific issues. Table 5 illustrates how this information can be combined to identify entry points.
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### TABLE 5. Stakeholders and associated policies/programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/programme</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
<th>Role(s)</th>
<th>Gap/entry point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training/extension programme</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Funding and design of the programme</td>
<td>Include migrant workers as target beneficiaries and liaise with migrant organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer organizations</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Include farmer organizations and migrant organizations in design of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include private sector companies that will benefit from more skilled labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ii. Is a decentralized or centralized model, or mix of both most effective?**

In many cases migration and food security and nutrition responsibilities are divided across different ministries and institutions (see Figure 5), and inter-ministerial coordination is key to ensuring effective policy-making and implementation. In some cases, there will be a lead ministry or institution that will be tasked with coordinating among the institutions and can help to streamline processes. Often there is a mix of decentralized and centralized models, which can deliver benefits in terms of more balanced power relations, while ensuring that there is ownership among at least one entity to keep pushing processes forward. An approach that combines centralized and decentralized models is that of mainstreaming migration into food security and nutrition policies on the one hand, and food security and nutrition into migration policies on the other hand, with different lead ministries or institutions involved in each process (Hong and Knoll, 2016).

**iii. What are the main obstacles to policy change when it comes to migration and food security and nutrition? How can they be addressed?**

Often the largest obstacle or barrier to policy change related to migration and food security and nutrition comes down to the way that migration is framed. There is considerable evidence related to the importance of shifting the narrative on migration – away from confronting it as a burden or a problem to solve, and instead focusing on the benefits it can bring in terms of development in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2016). In order to provide a foundation for policies to better address the key challenges, it is important to frame the issue in the context of harnessing the positive potential of migration for poverty reduction, food security and nutrition of all households (at origin and destination) by ensuring that migration is safe, orderly and regular.
It is also important to provide better options to ensure that households do not see migration as the only option for survival. Table 6 presents some of the other obstacles to policy change and potential solutions.

Overall, the greatest obstacle to effective policy change may be countering public perceptions about migration overall. Discrimination may have already limited the positive contributions that migrants can make to food security and nutrition and development, which may then be used in discourse to counter policies aimed at fostering more effective migration and food security and nutrition linkages. Promoting policy coherence may often require a parallel process of social inclusion and the countering of anti-migrant xenophobia as a starting point (Hong and Knoll, 2016; Demireva, 2015; Saggar et al., 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>How to Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing interests among migration and food security and nutrition</td>
<td>Create multi-ministry/inter-sectoral coordination group(s) and incorporate food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities and lack of inter-sectoral coordination</td>
<td>security and nutrition actors in migration policy-making and vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of food security and nutrition issues</td>
<td>Conduct training/workshops on food security and nutrition for migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities</td>
<td>authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of migration, labour, social protection and youth</td>
<td>Conduct training/workshops for agricultural stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues among agricultural stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and programmes not addressing the most vulnerable/those who</td>
<td>Incorporate the most vulnerable into policy dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>require the most assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding for policy and programme implementation</td>
<td>Identify potential resources within the government and externally among partners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as well as explore innovative financing mechanisms (e.g. diaspora support; migrant investments and contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of monitoring and evaluation of policy impact to make the case that</td>
<td>Create a monitoring and evaluation framework, including impact assessments,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change is needed</td>
<td>with dedicated roles and resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding remarks

This guide has highlighted the key linkages between migration and food security and nutrition and how these linkages can be addressed through policies and programmes to achieve more positive outcomes for both migration and food security and nutrition. The recommendations put forward in this guide should be evaluated and used within the specific context in each country.

The positive interlinkages between migration and food security in terms of remittances, improvement in access to income and services, productivity improvements, skills development, and others are not widely understood or acknowledged in policy dialogue. Greater evidence of the positive impacts of migration policies on food security and nutrition and food security and nutrition policies on more positive migration outcomes needs to be more widely distributed to increase awareness and strengthen the development of targeted and action-oriented approaches.
Annex

Terminology

Migration
Movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border, or within a state. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification (IOM, 2013).

International migration
Movement of a person or a group of persons who leave their country of origin, or country of habitual residence, to establish themselves either permanently or temporarily in another country. An international frontier is therefore crossed (IOM, 2011).

Internal migration
Movement of a person or a group of persons from one area of a country to another area of the same country. It includes: (i) rural-to-urban migration; (ii) rural-to-rural migration (e.g. seasonal migration linked to agricultural calendars); (iii) urban-to-rural migration; and (iv) urban-to-urban migration (IOM, 2011).

Circular migration
Fluid movement of a person or a group of persons between countries or areas, including temporary or long-term movement, which may be beneficial to all involved, if occurring voluntarily and linked to the labour needs of areas of origin and destination.

Irregular migration
Movement of people that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving countries. There is no clear or universally accepted definition of irregular migration. From the perspective of destination countries, it is entry, stay or work in a country without the necessary authorization or documents required under immigration regulations. From the perspective of the sending country, the irregularity is, for example, seen in cases in which a person crosses an international boundary without a valid passport or travel document or does not fulfil the administrative requirements for leaving the country. However, there is a tendency to restrict the use of the term "illegal migration" to cases of smuggling of migrants and trafficking in people.

Diaspora
Migrants and their descendants, who live outside the country of their birth or ancestry, either on a temporary or permanent basis, yet still maintain affective and material ties to their countries of origin (IOM and MPI, 2012).

Labour migration
Labour migration is generally defined as a cross-border movement for purposes of employment in a foreign country. However, there is no universally accepted definition of labour migration. The term "economic migrant" is sometimes used as an equivalent to the term labour migrant or migrant worker.
**Distress migration**

When migrating is perceived as the only viable option for moving out of poverty. Migration is distress if it is motivated by extreme economic deprivation, natural and environmental disasters, or forms of gender and social oppression perceived to be intolerable (Mander and Sahgal, 2012).

**Refugee**

According to the 1951 UN Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol, refugees are persons who have fled their country because of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinions. Regional refugee conventions, namely the 1969 Organisation of the African Unity Convention and the 1984 Cartagena Declaration, also regard as refugees groups of people who flee because of external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order.

**Internally displaced persons (IDP)**

Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, UN Doc E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2.). See also de facto refugees, displaced person, externally displaced persons, and uprooted persons.

Source: IOM, FAO.
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