




CENTER  
FOR  
GLOBAL  
DEVELOPMENT

# CGD and the Development of Global Skill Partnerships

**HANNAH POSTEL**

Hannah Postel is a postdoctoral research fellow at Stanford University and worked as an independent consultant to CGD while authoring this case study. Postel was a member of the CGD migration team from 2015 to 2017.

A decorative horizontal line with five teal-colored circles spaced evenly along it, positioned above the acknowledgments text.

The author thanks Alexander Berger, Nancy Birdsall, Michael Clemens, Helen Dempster, Katelyn Gough, Stephen Howes, Manjula Luthria, and Sarah Rosengaertner for sharing their expertise; Benjamin Soskis for his guidance over the course of the project; and Brin Datema for her support.

# About this Case Study

This case study is one of five that were produced as part of an external assessment undertaken between 2020-2022 to examine how the Center for Global Development contributed to influence and impact in some of its areas of work. The case studies detail five notable initiatives from the organization's first 20 years. On a broad level, the case studies also illustrate the complex ways in which policy change happens and is understood retrospectively, the variability of success, and the interdependency of a range of contextual factors in enabling (or hindering) progress.

This external assessment was led by Benjamin Soskis of the Urban Institute's Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy and overseen by Amanda Glassman with coordination and support from Brin Datema in consultation with CGD's president Masood Ahmed. Each of the case studies were researched and authored by independent consultants to CGD. The full collection of case studies is available at [www.cgdev.org/case-studies](http://www.cgdev.org/case-studies).

CGD is grateful for contributions from Open Philanthropy in support of this work.

## **CENTER FOR GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT**

2055 L Street, NW Fifth Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
[www.cgdev.org](http://www.cgdev.org)

1 Abbey Gardens  
Great College Street  
London, SW1P 3SE

Center for Global Development. 2022.

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0

# Contents

**OVERVIEW .....4**

**GENESIS OF THE GSP IDEA (2005–2012) .....4**

**PUBLIC OUTREACH, HONING OF THE IDEA, AND INCUBATION PERIOD (2012–2016) .....6**

**HEAVY OUTREACH AND IDEAS SOCIALIZATION (2016–2018) .....7**

**PILOTS (2019–PRESENT) .....9**

**SUCCESS MEASUREMENT AND TAKEAWAYS .....12**

---

## OVERVIEW

Since its founding in 2001, the Center for Global Development (CGD) has worked to “reduce global poverty and improve lives through innovative economic research that drives better policy and practice by the world’s top decision makers.”<sup>1</sup> This mission entails focusing on all aspects of development-related policy, not just foreign aid. One important—and often overlooked—such topic is international migration. Unlike trade and foreign direct investment, migration is little discussed in development spaces. When it is, more often than not it is treated as the antithesis to development; migration happens when development fails. In this paradigm, migration also hinders development through so-called brain drain, or taking skilled people away from poor origin countries.

CGD is one of the few development organizations that has tried to better understand and focus on migration as *part and parcel* of the development process. That is, it has promoted the idea that migration can be a tool for development. CGD researchers have shown that the potential welfare gains from increased migration far exceed those from trade, foreign aid, or foreign direct investment.<sup>2</sup> As former senior fellow Lant Pritchett and former senior policy analyst Farah Hani have argued, “The gains to human well-being from more and better flows of workers between countries are an order of magnitude larger than feasible ‘interventions’ to people in situ.”<sup>3</sup>

CGD has also long prioritized the mission of “ideas to action.” As a so-called “think and do tank,” CGD encourages its staff to create both solid empirical research and policy innovations. In the migration field, this has entailed looking for ways to tangibly capture some of the welfare gains mentioned above. One such policy proposal, the Global Skill Partnership (GSP), is the brainchild of Michael Clemens, senior fellow and director of migration, displacement, and humanitarian policy. The model was designed to maximize benefits from migration for all involved (origin countries, destination countries, employers, and the migrants themselves) while minimizing potential negative effects. It is one tool in a broader range of CGD proposals aiming to bring together the migration and development fields for mutual benefit. Almost 10 years since its genesis, the Global Skill Partnership model has gained significant policy

attention and is now being piloted in multiple contexts. Establishing the GSP as an effective tool for mutual benefit is an important first step toward further integrating migration and development policy.

What follows is not a formal program evaluation, but rather an effort to contextualize CGD’s promotion of the GSP concept with particular focus on its impact to date. The report is largely based on interviews with CGD staff and external stakeholders, including funders, project implementers, and strategic partners. A former member of the CGD migration team, the author draws on both her knowledge of the broader migration and development space and specific past experiences with the GSP idea.

---

## GENESIS OF THE GSP IDEA (2005–2012)

According to founding president Nancy Birdsall, CGD’s focus from the start was on “telling the rich world what they could do to encourage development,” specifically beyond foreign aid.<sup>4</sup> Migration caught her attention as potentially impactful, not least because remittances were starting to gain more attention from major development players like the World Bank. However, she found the sole focus on remittances frustrating, especially considering migration’s role as a poverty-reduction strategy. Remittances were a “safe harbor” for the rich world, requiring minimal action on their part. Yet these same rich countries were resistant to the idea that more migration could be good for the world. Birdsall therefore saw both a topical and a strategic gap for CGD to fill.<sup>5</sup>

At this time, migration and development were largely considered separately in both the academic and policy spheres. In 2007, sociologist Hein de Haas noted a “lack of any credible coherence between aid and migration policies.”<sup>6</sup> The two areas were addressed by different government agencies and different international organizations and had different geographic focuses. While migration policymakers in wealthy destination countries focused mainly on domestic concerns (such as integration and border control), development practitioners worked mostly on mobilizing remittances and diasporas to

benefit origin countries.<sup>7</sup> It was not until 2006 that migration and development were addressed as linked on the global stage, with the formation of the UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.<sup>8</sup>

At the time, attempts to look beyond remittances to study how rich countries could encourage migration in support of development were rare.<sup>9</sup> The World Bank launched its Research Program on International Migration and Development in 2003 to strengthen the migration-development knowledge base, but the program focused almost exclusively on remittances. A 2009 conference announcement highlighted a new push to “go beyond remittances.”<sup>10</sup> On the migration side, the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) was founded in 2001 to “improve immigration and integration policies through authoritative research and analysis” but employed a more US- and Europe-focused approach. Of 90 research publications issued in MPI’s first five years, only two centered on the link between migration and development. Both focused on remittances.<sup>11</sup> It is therefore unlikely that another organization would have filled this gap if CGD had not done so.

In 2005, Birdsall requested that the newly hired research fellow Michael Clemens look into migration issues. Senior fellow Lant Pritchett was also pursuing the angle of labor mobility as a highly impactful development strategy. In 2006 Pritchett published his book *Let Their People Come* through CGD, in which he argued that “the gains to people in poor countries from labor mobility are enormous compared to everything else on the development agenda.”<sup>12</sup> Birdsall acknowledged that this idea was “bound to be controversial,”<sup>13</sup> and a *New York Times* article described Pritchett’s proposed temporary guestworker program as “equally offensive to the left and the right.”<sup>14</sup> Despite the fact that the same *Times* profile noted that the book was published “to little acclaim—none at all, in fact,”<sup>15</sup> it was foundational to CGD’s emerging work on migration. More broadly, *Let Their People Come*, one of CGD’s first books, demonstrated an enthusiasm for innovation and going against the grain. It also set the stage for early collaborations between Pritchett and Clemens and kicked off a growing focus on development for *people* versus for *places*.<sup>16</sup>

In 2008, the World Bank asked Pritchett to contribute a background paper to the forthcoming *World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography*.<sup>17</sup> The paper, coauthored with Clemens and Claudio Montenegro from the bank’s Development Research Group, was entitled “The Place Premium.”<sup>18</sup> It highlighted the massive arbitrage opportunity inherent to international labor migration, quantifying the enormous wage gap across borders. The paper found that “the wages of a Peruvian worker willing to work in the United States are about 2.6 times as much as the same person would make in Peru.”<sup>19</sup> This background paper ended up framing the entire *World Development Report*; the opening sentence states that “place is the most important correlate of a person’s welfare.”<sup>20</sup>

Socializing the “place premium” concept in the broader development space both (1) directly led to further CGD research on the topic and (2) laid the groundwork for CGD policy innovations capitalizing on the potential welfare gains described. The *Journal of Economic Perspectives* approached Pritchett to write a paper expanding on *Let Their People Come* and “The Place Premium.” Pritchett asked if his CGD colleague Clemens might be interested instead. Clemens wrote what was to become his most-cited paper on migration, entitled *Economics and Emigration: Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk?*<sup>21</sup> As summarized in a CGD blog post from Clemens, the 2011 paper argues that “a modest increase in emigration out of low-income countries—just 5% of the people now living there—would expand the world economy by several trillion dollars every year... . Minor reductions in the barriers to labor mobility would add more value than the *total, global elimination* of all remaining policy barriers to goods trade and all barriers to capital flows, combined. This creates the greatest single opportunity for global economic prosperity in our age.”<sup>22</sup>

This work established Clemens and Pritchett as two of the leading economists advocating for expanded immigration. In an academic setting, the work might have stopped there, once the idea itself had been articulated. However, given CGD’s focus on “ideas to action,” the next step became exploring how it might be possible to realize these huge gains to international labor mobility. In 2012, Birdsall requested that Clemens

prepare three policy proposals for the CGD board meeting, highlighting tangible ways policymakers could use migration as a development strategy. One of these proposals was what would become the GSP.

Clemens had been noticing a “fundamental incompatibility” prevalent in migration policy conversations: origin countries oppose skilled emigration given brain drain concerns, but destination countries want only skilled immigration. He thought that “rather than taking it off the table, full stop, we should develop policies to help adjudicate” the issue.<sup>23</sup> An earlier paper of his studied the emigration of African health-care workers, finding that increased access to overseas jobs actually encouraged more young people to enter the domestic healthcare field.<sup>24</sup> Combining these two concepts, Clemens hypothesized that fears of brain drain were driven more by financial concerns than emigration per se: origin countries were upset that money dedicated to training their citizens “disappeared” overseas. So, Clemens thought, what about taking a part of the enormous gain from migration and using it to finance part or all of the training? Rich countries could thereby pay for the education of more skilled workers in poorer countries, directly addressing brain drain concerns.

CGD’s network of researchers helped develop and incubate the original GSP proposal. Upon hearing the idea, Pritchett suggested adding another “track” to the proposal: that is, training workers both to migrate and to stay home. This could further help ameliorate brain drain concerns and create a multiplier effect by increasing human capital in local labor markets. This “home track” is one of the main elements making a GSP distinct from other labor mobility programs.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, Birdsall highlighted the importance of working with CGD policy outreach and communications staff to refine how to pitch the GSP concept more broadly.<sup>26</sup> A 2012 panel at the Global Economic Symposium was the first public discussion of the GSP model.<sup>27</sup>

## BOX 1. WHAT IS A GLOBAL SKILL PARTNERSHIP?

A Global Skill Partnership is a bilateral agreement between equal partners. The country of destination agrees to provide technology and finance to train potential migrants with targeted skills in their country of origin, prior to migration, and receives migrants with precisely the skills they need to integrate and contribute best upon arrival. The country of origin agrees to provide that training and receives support for the training of nonmigrants too—increasing rather than draining human capital.

## PUBLIC OUTREACH, HONING OF THE IDEA, AND INCUBATION PERIOD (2012–2016)

This initial outreach set the stage for further institutionalization of the GSP concept, in particular the first written description of its tenets and goals. In 2011, World Bank labor mobility expert Manjula Luthria invited Clemens to speak at the launch of the International Labour Mobility program at the World Bank’s Center for Mediterranean Integration in Marseilles, which she oversaw. Luthria thought the focus on employment and economic growth in North Africa could facilitate conversations about labor mobility with Europe, though countries were still reticent due to fears of brain drain. Luthria therefore commissioned a study investigating the potential of the GSP approach for an EU-funded program training North Africans at home. She hoped this might help shift the narrative and show countries that “it’s not brain drain or no migration.”<sup>28</sup> This paper from Clemens was the first written output on GSPs and was eventually revised into the foundational statement of the GSP model’s promise and principles: *Global Skill Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World*.<sup>29</sup>

Though the EU–North Africa program mentioned above did not come to pass,<sup>30</sup> Luthria helped facilitate an opportunity for Clemens to travel to Australia to study the Australia–Pacific

Technical College (APTC), an initiative that possessed some GSP-like characteristics (more on the APTC below). Clemens had read about the APTC online and was using it as an example of a GSP-like arrangement in public presentations. He came across a blog post by Stephen Howes (former chief economist of AusAid) noting that the APTC had not succeeded as a labor mobility arrangement.<sup>31</sup> Curious, Clemens emailed Howes to learn more and to see if Howes had any interest in coauthoring an article investigating APTC's attempts to facilitate labor mobility.<sup>32</sup> Clemens traveled to Australia in January 2013, where he met Howes and began interviewing sources for their coauthored paper. Though the final product did not explicitly recommend a GSP, Clemens and Howes proposed some key GSP elements to improve APTC labor mobility outcomes (more details below).<sup>33</sup> This was the first connection of the theoretical GSP principles to the tangible details of an extant skills-training-cum-labor-mobility program.

Apart from this collaboration, the GSP concept did not originally attract widespread support. According to Clemens, funders were largely skeptical, saying the proposal sounded "like something the private sector should be doing."<sup>34</sup> During this period, Clemens and his team had many discussions with employers and officials in origin countries and destination countries, but early interest did not pan out.<sup>35</sup> Clemens noted that there was a sense that "somebody needs to first prove this can work," given the large up-front time and financial investments necessary.<sup>36</sup>

The idea was particularly hard to sell in destination countries because it was being pitched at a time of very politically fraught migration policies. As Clemens explains, "the very whiff of brain drain" scared off development agencies because they saw their role as preventing the need for migration.<sup>37</sup> Meanwhile, destination country politicians couldn't touch the issue of expanding migration pathways, particularly with migrant arrivals rising through 2015. Clemens noted that "it was hard to find anybody in any room who could envision such a project."<sup>38</sup> The amount of work entailed in partnering with local training institutions, training trainers, and building long-term partnerships was not palatable to policymakers, especially in the context of a migrant "crisis."

Origin country governments and the private sector were also unconvinced. The former felt they needed a lot of up-front investment to make a GSP worthwhile, as many lacked the necessary institutional capacity.<sup>39</sup> For example, Nigeria's labor ministry was excited by the idea but ran out of money before it could complete its health migration strategy, much less implement a GSP.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, in many countries there was a reasonable skepticism about such projects, given thousands of years of extractive migration channels.<sup>41</sup>

On the private-sector side, there are very few immediate incentives for a company to invest in a GSP. This is particularly true for smaller businesses, as the long timeline and intensive start-up costs can be risky.<sup>42</sup> The prevailing sense during this period was that GSPs were an interesting idea but that no one felt comfortable investing until there was solid proof that the proposal could work.

At CGD in early 2016, there was no sense that a GSP would become a reality in the near future. Though Clemens and other members of the migration team continued to promote the GSP concept at conferences and other public events, most of their time and attention shifted to other projects. Birdsall recalls that "for three or four years I don't think there was any [outside] interest there at all, [but] the most amazing thing was how Michael kept plugging away at it."<sup>43</sup>

---

## HEAVY OUTREACH AND IDEAS SOCIALIZATION (2016–2018)

Focus on migration as a political issue sharpened considerably after the 2015 spike in migrant arrivals to Europe. Across the Atlantic, the weaponization of immigration in the 2016 US presidential election campaign also raised the salience of the topic. These global developments shaped how both CGD and the international community pressed forward. It became clear that global migration governance was severely lacking, a gap the United Nations attempted to fill with a nonbinding agreement called the Global Compact for Safe, Regular, and Orderly Migration (GCM). CGD's pitch to the GCM revolved around GSPs, and policy outreach efforts increased accordingly through the GCM's adoption in December 2018. As the

first-ever international agreement on migration, the GCM was seen as a “once-in-a-generation chance to shape migration cooperatively, for mutual benefit.”<sup>44</sup>

The UN General Assembly meeting in 2016 kicked off the GCM process. Peter Sutherland, the former UN special representative on migration, was working to put together a report to inform the meeting. CGD made an effort to be involved in this process through conversations with Sutherland’s advisers and facilitated Clemens’ GSP proposal being cited (albeit in a footnote) under the recommendation “strengthen the architecture to govern labour mobility.”<sup>45</sup> Clemens and former research associate Hannah Postel were also cited elsewhere for their work on facilitating temporary labor migration from Haiti and acknowledged in the report’s list of experts consulted. One of Sutherland’s advisers noted that there was “significant carryover” from the researchers involved with the Sutherland report to those consulted when the full text of the GCM was being decided. This adviser also highlighted that the GCM drafters were particularly interested in soliciting fresh ideas and concrete proposals, and they knew that Clemens’s work was similarly solutions-oriented.<sup>46</sup>

CGD pitched GSPs at every major migration policy gathering. For example, the Global Forum on Migration and Development had existed for years but took on a more prominent role as the sounding board for GCM ideas and proposals following the 2016 UN General Assembly. CGD was able to secure a roundtable discussion fully dedicated to the GSP concept at the 2017 Global Forum on Migration and Development in Berlin. Clemens participated in the sixth thematic consultation for the GCM, in a session on “irregular migration and regular pathways, including decent work, labor mobility, recognition of skills and qualifications and other relevant measures.” The migration team also built on existing relationships to socialize the idea even further: for example, the Canadian government officially recommended building pilot GSPs into the GCM framework.<sup>47</sup>

Momentum for the GSP concept had built further by December 2017, when UN secretary-general António Guterres included the “promising idea” in his contribution to the first

draft of the GCM.<sup>48</sup> This recommendation built on a Clemens paper commissioned by the UN, entitled *Migration Is a Form of Development: The Need for Innovation to Regulate Migration for Mutual Benefit*. The paper was commissioned as an intended contribution to the GCM and built on months of CGD interchanges with the compact drafting team. Until the GCM was signed in December 2018, CGD policy outreach on migration focused almost completely on GSPs. Clemens and former research associate Katelyn Gough attended nearly every GCM preparatory meeting and further spread the word at high-level international meetings like Wilton Park. These efforts involved many cold emails, seeking out individuals at events, and encouraging GCM drafters to be as specific and action-oriented as possible.<sup>49</sup> A member of the Sutherland advisory team noted that CGD was highly effective at developing innovative ideas and educating people on their merits. She perceived CGD as taking a less active advocacy approach than other organizations—for example, in terms of trying to build alliances among UN member states. But she noted that this approach “worked well in an ecosystem,” as a complement to other actors.<sup>50</sup>

This effort paid off when GSPs became—according to Clemens—the only concrete policy proposal included in the GCM.<sup>51</sup> Objective 18e calls for states to “build global skills partnerships among countries that strengthen training capacities of national authorities and relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and trade unions, and foster skills development of workers in countries of origin and migrants in countries of destination with a view to preparing trainees for employability in the labour markets of all participating countries.”<sup>52</sup> The specificity and detail of the GSP proposal is notable compared to the other recommendations for Objective 18 (e.g., “engage in bilateral partnerships and programs”). The former Sutherland adviser notes a few other concrete recommendations in the GCM (mainly in terms of protecting migrants in transit). But she agrees that there are very few specific policy proposals in the final text, and that there is a “a very recognizable link” to Clemens’s work.<sup>53</sup>

A number of changes in the policy landscape also helped facilitate successful socialization of the GSP concept. Clemens



hypothesizes that immediately following the 2015 migrant “crisis,” no one wanted to discuss opening more legal channels for migration in fear that “more people show up.”<sup>54</sup> However, as time passed and the crisis did not recur, countries realized they needed to put new structures in place to regulate future migration flows. Concurrent with the development of the GCM, policymakers began thinking about the medium to long term again. States now recognized that the post-2015 emergency measures were only a Band-Aid but were dissatisfied with the existing policy options.<sup>55</sup> The desire for innovative, longer-term policies created fertile ground for CGD’s policy outreach. Perhaps more surprisingly, the rise of global populism and the belief that foreign aid needs to benefit the national interest also helped socialize the GSP concept. As a program that not only educates workers in origin countries but also fills destination country labor needs, a GSP can be compelling to individuals across the ideological spectrum.<sup>56</sup>

Even more broadly, global demographic shifts have caused destination countries to recognize the need to diversify beyond traditional migration channels. Migration from long-standing countries of origin (e.g., India, the Philippines, and Mexico) has slowed as their populations age and become wealthier. Destination countries started to “compete” against each other to attract skilled workers; for example, the EU’s 2020 New Pact on Migration and Asylum acknowledges that the region is “currently losing the global race for talent.”<sup>57</sup>

In addition, the international community was looking for ways to bridge the GCM with the Sustainable Development Goals (Agenda 2030).<sup>58</sup> GSPs fit this mandate well by providing both skills training and likely poverty alleviation in developing countries with a “safe, regular, and orderly” migration channel.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, after 18 months of intense migration policy debate, few other concrete policy options had emerged.<sup>60</sup>

CGD’s outreach surrounding the GCM (and the ensuing mention in the GCM text) was likely effective in several ways. First, CGD’s involvement in the drafting process—as an organization offering expertise and policy specificity—opened doors for further discussions of potential GSP implementation. Gough met with members of the GCM drafting team on

multiple occasions, including to discuss the practicalities of implementing a GSP and how the GCM language could best capture these considerations.<sup>61</sup> Second, inclusion in the GCM removed some of the “chicken or egg” discourse around needing to show proof of the GSP’s efficacy before anyone would be willing to pilot it. According to Gough, this also gave some GCM signatory governments political ammunition for legitimacy and government sponsorship of a future GSP.<sup>62</sup> CGD policy fellow and assistant director for migration, displacement, and humanitarian policy Helen Dempster disagrees, suggesting that interest in GSPs has occurred despite rather than because of GCM inclusion, particularly for governments skeptical of the compact.<sup>63</sup>

The extended GCM outreach campaign also enabled CGD to work behind the scenes on ways to pitch the GSP concept and develop possible adaptations. This effort stemmed directly from many conversations about what it would take for states to implement a GSP pilot. Gough was consistently in touch with both the GCM drafting team and interested government representatives via phone and email, and in person when possible. Hearing these parties’ questions and concerns, CGD adapted accordingly. The team homed in on (1) detailing the GSP esque aspects of successful private-sector initiatives; (2) highlighting how tailorable the idea is to different contexts; (3) reassuring policymakers that a GSP can, in many cases, be implemented without a change to migration statute; and (4) proposing the “aid in the national interest” approach to bring both liberals and conservatives to the table. These strategies have all proven useful in different country contexts.<sup>64</sup>

---

## PILOTS (2019–PRESENT)

When asked what she attributes recent interest in GSPs to, Dempster notes that “sustained hammering is effective!”<sup>65</sup> In early 2019, Dempster joined CGD as the first full-time migration team staff member focused solely on policy outreach. A senior-level hire who had previously worked in migration policy and thus knew all the major actors and understood the landscape, Dempster has been able to jump-start the implementation of multiple GSP pilots. In part this is simply because no one from the migration team (typically comprised

of Clemens, a research assistant, and a program coordinator) had ever had the time and/or mandate to spend so much time on policy outreach. By contrast, Dempster estimates that half her time has been spent “catalyzing the GSP idea” through in-person contact with policymakers, including near-weekly trips to Brussels.<sup>66</sup> By many accounts, Dempster is also well known and respected in the field.<sup>67</sup> For example, upon reaching out to a Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation staffer she knew from a previous job, Dempster was promptly invited to speak in an agency strategy session on the topic. Dempster’s position in the CGD Europe office has likely helped these efforts, as Europe has been a more receptive policy landscape than the United States.

We can broadly categorize existing GSP pilot programs into two types: preexisting programs that were adapted to more fully embrace the GSP model, and programs that were created from scratch with the explicit aim of implementing GSP principles.

## Preexisting programs

**GIZ-Kosovo.** Germany has implemented youth training and employment programming in Kosovo since 2017, with the aim of reducing Kosovar youth unemployment (currently over 50 percent).<sup>68</sup> The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) recently began to trial elements of a GSP in the construction sector, building on an existing private healthcare training partnership. While the GSP-like dimensions of the Youth, Employment and Skills in Kosovo (YES) project were not implemented, a new project building on the networks created and lessons learned is already under development.

The GSP model was introduced to the project by a GIZ staff member who had previously conducted a study about applying the model in the Philippines. He noted that while the on-the-ground Kosovo construction work was “quite grassroots,” it reminded him of the GSP model with its focus on training Kosovar workers to find work both at home and abroad. When he began working on the project, it didn’t yet have a skill partnership model incorporated, but he wanted to explicitly engage with the GSP idea and evolve the project accordingly.

This suggests that the GSP model is sufficiently fleshed out that it may no longer require active intervention from CGD to implement.<sup>69</sup> As the project evolved, GIZ staff aimed to keep the GSP principles in mind and incorporate lessons learned from previous private-sector skill partnerships. Despite the limited reach of the Kosovo pilot, project staff noted that skill partnerships could be a “big story” for development agencies since they combine many elements of interest.<sup>70</sup>

**APTC.** The Australia Pacific Training Coalition (APTC, previously known as the Australia-Pacific Technical College) was established in 2007 to foster skills creation and labor mobility across the Pacific. Since the program was announced in 2005 at the 36th Pacific Islands Forum leaders meeting, five training schools on different Pacific Island nations have taught almost 17,000 students.

The APTC’s original focus was to train Pacific Islanders for employment in high-demand sectors both at home and abroad. Its two major goals since its inception have been to “build up human capital on the islands, and to provide skilled workers for shortage occupations in Australia.”<sup>71</sup> Migration from Pacific Island nations has traditionally been seasonal and lower-skill,<sup>72</sup> a trend the APTC aims to diversify. The training institutes provide Australian-recognized credentials across a range of qualifications (certificates, diplomas) and industry sectors (automotive, manufacturing, construction, electrical, tourism and hospitality, and healthcare).

Though labor mobility has always been a part of the APTC model, only 2.9 percent of graduates had migrated overseas by 2014 (1.2 percent to Australia). CGD’s 2014 evaluation of the APTC called for the inclusion of a more formal “away track” in response to the low numbers of graduates working internationally.<sup>73</sup> An internal Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) evaluation of the second APTC stage built on these recommendations, which eventually became a major part of the third stage redesign. Beginning in 2018—following CGD’s 2014 recommendations—the APTC’s third stage has included this “away track.” CGD’s collaboration with Stephen Howes, professor of economics at the Australian National University and the former chief economist at AusAid (DFAT’s

precursor) was an important element of what current APTC leaders see as “quite a strategic partnership” between CGD and the university.<sup>74</sup> Howes noted that GSPs are a “very radical idea,” and radical ideas typically “take a long time to socialize and create uptake,” especially when sponsored by national governments.<sup>75</sup>

## GSP creation from scratch

**PALIM.** The original impetus for the Pilot Project Addressing Labour Shortages through Innovative Labour Migration Models (PALIM) program came from the Flanders region of Belgium, which since 2017 had been facing a shortage of information and communications technology workers. The Flemish leadership was interested in finding qualified foreign workers to fill these gaps and jump-start business growth and productivity. This desire dovetailed quite nicely with the European Commission’s 2018 communication on fostering legal migration pathways, which highlighted the desire to “make legal pathways a compelling part of our partnership approach with third countries.”<sup>76</sup> The European Commission also set up the Mobility Partnership Facility to fund member state pilot programs on legal migration. The Belgian Ministry of Development Coordination tasked its development agency, Enabel, with assembling a proposal for a pilot project.

PALIM was designed as a “by the book” GSP, following GSP principles as closely as possible while adapting to the “complex reality” of Belgium, Morocco, and the system of partnerships that developed. When Enabel was tasked with developing a pilot program on legal migration pathways, such a project “could have been anything” given the broad mandate from the ministry. Raffaella Greco Tonegutti, Enabel’s labor mobility specialist, had heard about the GSP model in a previous position and thought it might be a match for Enabel’s focus on piloting and testing development innovations. She contacted CGD to propose that Enabel become the first EU actor to fully implement the GSP model in practice.<sup>77</sup>

The program trained 120 workers beginning in late 2019; more than half found jobs in Morocco and the rest continued with

more specialized training courses or are currently seeking employment in both Belgium and Morocco. The job-matching aspect of the project—especially for the Belgian companies recruiting abroad—was unfortunately complicated due to COVID-19 border closures. PALIM concluded on April 30, 2021, but support to the participants will continue through the new EU-funded project Towards a Holistic Approach to Labour Migration Governance and Labour Mobility in North Africa (THAMM).<sup>78</sup> Notably, THAMM is a scaled version of the GSP that includes three origin and three destination countries.

## The importance of sustained CGD outreach

As detailed in the previous section, the “away track” innovation in APTC’s curriculum derived from Clemens’s 2014 paper with Stephen Howes. Howes continued to push the idea during an evaluation of the APTC to which he served as an adviser, and he achieved the labor mobility track’s inclusion in 2018. This success speaks to the importance of CGD’s strategic partnerships. CGD had been actively building bridges with the Australian government since 2006—through a funding partnership and Australia’s participation in the Commitment to Development Index—which laid the groundwork for Clemens to connect with Howes.<sup>79</sup> Publishing the 2014 paper in partnership with Howes at the Australian National University was also key to the adoption of the “away track.” CGD was relatively unknown in Australia, so the work wouldn’t have had the same impact without this collaboration.<sup>80</sup> With his colleague Richard Curtain, Howes was able to “take [Clemens’s] ideas and run with them” to encourage government uptake.<sup>81</sup>

In a slightly more haphazard fashion, the other two pilot projects that have been initiated occurred because staff members at other organizations had heard about the GSP concept in previous jobs. Though at the time they were unable to move the concept forward, their new positions further facilitated engagement with and trial of GSPs. The key takeaway here is that patience has been a virtue for CGD and that seeding ideas widely can ultimately bear fruit both directly and indirectly.

## SUCCESS MEASUREMENT AND TAKEAWAYS

How can we measure the success of GSPs? Most fundamentally, success would entail a merging of migration and development policy at the national and/or international level, through recognition that each affects the other and policy should take this into account.<sup>82</sup> An interim step would be that GSPs become a main tool or new model in the migration-development policy toolbox. Country governments are the actors most relevant to this goal, as they control their borders, but some elements of the GSP—such as capacity building and training—can be implemented by nongovernmental and private-sector organizations. The most proximate success metrics are (1) amount of new country uptake and (2) success/scale-up of ongoing pilot projects.

Progress on the first is promising. CGD has begun to follow up on pre-COVID connections and is responding to an increased demand for healthcare partnerships. Dempster notes that the idea was “taking off” by late 2019, and she held workshops for policymakers in seven European countries. By late 2020, there had been an “explosion of interest in healthcare partnerships.” Though most countries had healthcare worker shortages pre-COVID, now there is both (1) an increased need and (2) a renewed understanding of the role migrants play within the healthcare system. For example, the UK is proposing a number of upcoming healthcare partnerships, of which at least two will be GSPs. The EU’s agenda on fostering legal migration pathways (described above in the context of PALIM) is a concomitant impetus. Since this agenda also includes a funding mechanism to kick-start such pathways, this lowers member states’ risk burdens and is likely another factor driving increased interest.

There is also interest in expanding the core GSP remit. The UK government is starting to think about how it could apply the GSP concept to refugee populations. CGD has also been involved in discussions about targeting climate-vulnerable countries, with a focus on how policymakers could use GSPs to build skills for low-carbon transitions. As discussed above, often a “brain circulation” component drives these

conversations, for example, “having the right people in the right places” with previous relevant experience and knowledge of the GSP concept. Finally, though most of the interest to date has been on Europe-Africa partnerships, CGD is beginning to explore the possibility of a United States GSP with the Northern Triangle.

Dempster notes a concurrent narrative change, with countries slowly recognizing the need to shape migration for mutual benefit.<sup>83</sup> Similarly, the focus on legal pathways for labor migrants has grown and in some cases (e.g., the EU’s Talent Partnerships) mirrors the CGD approach.<sup>84</sup> Dempster has also noticed a shift away from arguments that development will stop migration, noting that “connecting migration to development has arguably been the biggest impact of CGD outreach in this space.”<sup>85</sup>

Despite all these successes, a number of challenges remain:

1. **Timeline.** GSP projects are hugely time-intensive and produce results that are far from immediate. The co-CEO of one of the CGD migration team’s longest-running funders is concerned about the use of pilot projects “as a mode,” as they are highly capital- and labor-intensive.<sup>86</sup>
2. **Scale.** These programs start small. For example, in CGD’s work facilitating temporary labor migration from Haiti, just 62 workers moved over three years.<sup>87</sup> The small scale is, of course, a valid concern for funders and implementers. However, given the long timeline discussed above, it makes sense that participation would remain low at the start. And the benefits to those who do travel are enormous.<sup>88</sup> Dempster notes that some policymakers are open to the idea of a GSP only if CGD can prove such a program will reduce irregular migration. This is impossible with the model’s current scale and results timeline.
3. **Complexity.** GSPs require a relatively large network of committed players. Starting such a network from scratch is difficult—for example, if a country is interested in principle, how does it begin? There is no single body set up to facilitate increased labor migration (including to conduct up-front planning and support countries during implementation). Creating and maintaining

partnerships is both crucial to the program's success and extremely difficult. And while the benefits of bundling a labor mobility program with skills training are clear, the fact that both elements are necessary for a GSP to succeed makes its implementation more complex and opens more potential for it to not work.

4. **Funding and sustainability.** Costs are extremely high per worker, especially during the pilot phase. For example, the PALIM project cost €1.5 million and required full-time staffing to develop, for 40 people who ended up moving. Currently, all these projects are funded primarily by official development assistance. This is not sustainable in the long run; a successful GSP must eventually transition to a more sustainable financing model. Dempster explained the current sense that development assistance can be used to bring companies on board and provide free (to them) workers in the beginning, but once the partnership is established the private-sector partners can begin picking up more of the costs.<sup>89</sup> This is currently being attempted by the APTC, but with minimal success thus far.<sup>90</sup>
5. **Political constraints.** Despite CGD's work to develop a political narrative that can be palatable across the aisle, the fact remains that countries have sole sovereignty over their borders. If a government does not wish to admit migrants, it has no obligation to do so. Clemens hopes that the success of programs like the GSP can help people change how they think about migration, but others—including one of the CGD migration team's main funders—are not as convinced. Open Philanthropy's co-CEO Alexander Berger believes that the "constraints [to program growth] are fundamentally political rather than economic."<sup>91</sup> While Clemens and Dempster believe that the GSP can help build a broader political constituency for labor migration, Berger sees this (currently limited) constituency as necessary for bringing such projects to scale.

More broadly, it is unclear what role CGD will continue to play as GSPs become more widespread. Dempster believes the migration team may continue to actively promote the model

for the next few years. External take-up has increased; in fact, sometimes CGD does not even hear about a specific proposal that's been floated. In one way, this is a definite sign of success. However, Dempster also suggests that an "unintended consequence of [the GSP idea] getting bigger is that CGD has lost ownership over it." If CGD does step back from active GSP outreach, there will be no central organization to help interested partners get up and running.<sup>92</sup> Additionally, if CGD takes less active ownership over the GSP name and concept, this may confuse implementers and potentially hinder future uptake. For example, an initiative spearheaded by the International Organization for Migration and the International Labor Organization (with other international organization partners) also has a program entitled "Global Skills Partnerships." Though the two programs are practically distinct, the shared terminology—and separate ownership of the concept—has already confused potential implementers.<sup>93</sup>

Relatedly, Clemens has driven much of the idea's generation and outreach. According to Birdsall, "A lot of this success comes down to Michael as an individual. He has worked hard to make [GSPs] matter—to come up with policy solutions and to push to make sure they happen." Berger agrees, noting that Clemens epitomizes the CGD model of "bridging big ideas with practice." However, having programs that are managed and driven forward by a single individual can also raise concerns, as the work portfolio becomes highly dependent on one person's personality, professional exigencies, and personal connections. Channeling impact through a single individual creates many complexities.

Overall, though, this case study finds that the development of the GSP model in practice has embraced the CGD approach to great success. Dempster suggests that "perhaps similar migration pathway expansions would have occurred without CGD as developed countries acknowledge aging demographics, labor force shortages, and the need for development partnerships."<sup>94</sup> But CGD has raised the profile of the idea, demonstrated its importance, provided a concrete option to test, and directly supported governments in these efforts. Perhaps CGD's biggest impact has been to make expanded labor mobility pathways more development-friendly. Without

CGD's focus on the development aspects of nondevelopment policies, countries might have chosen direct labor recruitment schemes with minimal development benefits. And beyond the

tangible elements of a GSP, CGD has demonstrated that innovation in this very thorny policy space is possible.

## Notes

- 1 "Mission and Impact," CGD, [www.cgdev.org/page/mission](http://www.cgdev.org/page/mission).
- 2 Michael Clemens, "Economics and Emigration: Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk?" (Working Paper 264, CGD, Washington, DC, 2011), [www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/1425376\\_file\\_Clemens\\_Economics\\_and\\_Emigration\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/1425376_file_Clemens_Economics_and_Emigration_FINAL.pdf); Michael A. Clemens, Claudio E. Montenegro, and Lant Pritchett, "The Place Premium: Wage Differences for Identical Workers across the US Border" (working paper, World Bank, Washington, DC, 2009), <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/9230>; Michael A. Clemens and Hannah Postel, "Temporary Work Visas as US-Haiti Development Cooperation: A Preliminary Impact Evaluation," *IZA Journal of Labor & Development* 6, no. 4 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40175-016-0070-x>.
- 3 Lant Pritchett and Farah Hani, "The Economics of International Wage Differentials and Migration," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedias* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020), 49.
- 4 Interview with Nancy Birdsall, June 23, 2021.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Hein de Haas, "Turning the Tide? Why Development Will Not Stop Migration," *Development and Change* 38 (2007): 819–841, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2007.00435.x>.
- 7 Ibid.; Kathleen Newland, *Leveraging the Links between Migration and Development: US Government Policy, Practice, and Potential* (Washington, DC: CGD, 2017), [www.cgdev.org/publication/leveraging-links-between-migration-and-development](http://www.cgdev.org/publication/leveraging-links-between-migration-and-development).
- 8 "United Nations High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (HLD)," International Organization for Migration, [www.iom.int/united-nations-high-level-dialogue-international-migration-and-development-hld](http://www.iom.int/united-nations-high-level-dialogue-international-migration-and-development-hld).
- 9 Two syntheses of the papers presented at the Annual Migration and Development Conference (begun in 2008 and run by the World Bank, French Development Agency, and CGD) highlight (1) the preponderance of remittances-related topics in the early years and (2) the ensuing diversification toward other areas of the migration-development relationship. One of these syntheses, written by Clemens with Hillel Rapoport and Çağlar Özden in 2014, is aptly entitled "Migration and Development Research Is Moving Far Beyond Remittances."
- 10 Sonia Plaza, "Diaspora Conference: What a Successful Event!" World Bank *PeopleMove* blog, July 22, 2009, <https://blogs.worldbank.org/peoplemove/diaspora-conference-what-a-successful-event>.
- 11 Author's calculation from research listed on the Migration Policy Institute website (<https://migrationpolicy.org/research>).
- 12 "Migration and Development: Temporary Workers Are Key," CGD, September 18, 2006, [www.cgdev.org/article/migration-and-development-temporary-workers-are-key](http://www.cgdev.org/article/migration-and-development-temporary-workers-are-key).
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Jason DeParle, "Should We Globalize Labor Too?" *New York Times Magazine*, June 10, 2007, [www.nytimes.com/2007/06/10/magazine/10global-t.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/10/magazine/10global-t.html).
- 15 Ibid. The author of the *Times* profile, Jason DeParle, has since published a book on migration's benefits to developing countries, entitled *A Good Provider Is One Who Leaves*.
- 16 From the *Times* article above: "Pritchett assails a basic premise—that development means developing places. He is more concerned about helping Nepalis than he is about helping Nepal. If remittances spur development back home, great, but that is not his central concern. 'Migration is development,' he says."
- 17 The report focused on the roles of "density, distance, and division" in economic geography and argued for more inclusive/integrated development effects across—not just within—a geographic division. Though migration was considered, the report mainly focused on urbanization, territorial development, and regional integration.
- 18 The paper was originally entitled "The Great Discrimination," following the argument that international barriers to movement are the largest source of global wage discrimination. The title was not well received by reviewers—as place of birth was (and still is) not considered a relevant basis for discrimination like gender or race—and revised to "The Place Premium."
- 19 Clemens, Montenegro, and Pritchett, "The Place Premium," emphasis added.
- 20 World Bank, *World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009), 1, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/5991>.
- 21 Michael Clemens, "Economics and Emigration: Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 25, no. 3 (2011): 83–106, [www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.25.3.83](http://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.25.3.83).
- 22 Michael Clemens, "Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk: Why Don't More Economists Study Emigration?" *CGD Blog*, September 6, 2011, [www.cgdev.org/blog/trillion-dollar-bills-sidewalk-why-dont-more-economists-study-emigration](http://www.cgdev.org/blog/trillion-dollar-bills-sidewalk-why-dont-more-economists-study-emigration).
- 23 Interview with Michael Clemens, May 12, 2021.
- 24 Michael Clemens, "Do Visas Kill? Health Effects of African Health Professional Emigration" (Working Paper 114, CGD, Washington, DC, 2007), [www.cgdev.org/publication/do-visas-kill-health-effects-african-health-professional-emigration-working-paper-114](http://www.cgdev.org/publication/do-visas-kill-health-effects-african-health-professional-emigration-working-paper-114).
- 25 Most "direct-recruitment" labor mobility schemes are born from wanting to fill gaps in destination country labor markets and do not explicitly consider the potential development benefits of such programs.
- 26 Interview with Nancy Birdsall, June 23, 2021.
- 27 Interview with Michael Clemens, March 2, 2021.
- 28 Interview with Manjula Luthria, August 3, 2021.
- 29 Michael Clemens, *Global Skill Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World* (Washington, DC: CGD, 2014), [www.cgdev.org/publication/global-skill-partnerships-proposal-technical-training-mobile-world](http://www.cgdev.org/publication/global-skill-partnerships-proposal-technical-training-mobile-world).
- 30 A related project, focused on overseas employment for Moroccan youth, is now underway. See "Accessing Overseas Employment Opportunities for Moroccan Youth," World Bank, <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P150064>.
- 31 Stephen Howes, "Note: Australia-Pacific Technical College," *Devpolicy Blog*, July 23, 2012, <https://devpolicy.org/note-australia-pacific-technical-college20120723>.
- 32 See the section "The Importance of Sustained CGD Outreach" for more on the broader CGD networks that facilitated this contact.

- 33 Michael Clemens, Colum Graham, and Stephen Howes, "Skill Development and Regional Mobility: Lessons from the Australia-Pacific Technical College" (Working Paper 370, CGD, Washington, DC, 2014), [www.cgdev.org/publication/skill-development-and-regional-mobility-lessons-australia-pacific-technical-college](http://www.cgdev.org/publication/skill-development-and-regional-mobility-lessons-australia-pacific-technical-college).
- 34 Interview with Michael Clemens, March 2, 2021.
- 35 This happened for a range of reasons, all fairly idiosyncratic to the specific situation. For example, a program working to bring North African nurses to Germany was unable to deliver the planned training due to a legal challenge regarding the program's ability to include "cultural education" for the North African trainees. (Ibid.)
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 African Union, Report of the "Assessment of the Capacity Building Needs of African Union Member States and Regional Economic Communities to Manage Migration" (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: African Union, 2018), [https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/40609-doc-Report-Capacity\\_Building\\_Needs\\_Assessment-9\\_Jan\\_2019.pdf](https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/40609-doc-Report-Capacity_Building_Needs_Assessment-9_Jan_2019.pdf).
- 40 A 2021 joint report by CGD and the World Bank outlines what a potential healthcare partnership between Nigeria and the UK could look like, noting that the Nigerian National Policy on Human Resources for Health Migration is still in draft form. Samik Adhikari, Michael Clemens, Helen Dempster, and Nkechi Linda Ekeator, *Expanding Legal Pathways from Nigeria to Europe: From Brain Drain to Brain Gain* (Washington, DC: World Bank and CGD, 2021), [www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/expanding-legal-migration-pathways-nigeria-europe-brain-drain-brain-gain.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/expanding-legal-migration-pathways-nigeria-europe-brain-drain-brain-gain.pdf).
- 41 Interview with Helen Dempster, March 7, 2021.
- 42 Dempster thinks "a lot of it [comes down to] trust." If firms have never hired from a specific location, it is more difficult to feel certain that any hired workers will match their needs, no matter how desperate the shortage.
- 43 Interview with Nancy Birdsall, June 23, 2021.
- 44 Kate Gough, "The Global Compact on Migration Is Now Being Negotiated. Here Are Three Sticking Points," *CGD Blog*, February 20, 2018, [www.cgdev.org/blog/global-compact-migration-now-being-negotiated-here-are-three-sticking-points-negotiations](http://www.cgdev.org/blog/global-compact-migration-now-being-negotiated-here-are-three-sticking-points-negotiations).
- 45 Peter Sutherland, Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Migration, UN General Assembly, 71st Sess, UN Doc A/71/728 (February 3, 2017), [undocs.org/A/71/728](https://undocs.org/A/71/728).
- 46 Interview with Sarah Rosengaertner, August 11, 2021.
- 47 Government of Canada statement at Thematic Session 2: Addressing Drivers of Migration, New York, May 22-23, 2017. [https://refugeemigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/canada\\_ts2\\_p1.pdf](https://refugeemigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/canada_ts2_p1.pdf).
- 48 António Guterres, "Making Migration Work for All: Report of the Secretary-General" (report presented to the UN General Assembly, New York, December 12, 2017), [https://refugeemigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/sg\\_report\\_en.pdf](https://refugeemigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/sg_report_en.pdf).
- 49 Interview with Kate Gough, May 8, 2021.
- 50 Interview with Sarah Rosengaertner, August 11, 2021.
- 51 Interview with Michael Clemens, March 2, 2021.
- 52 "Objective 18e," *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration* (UN General Assembly resolution, December 19, 2018), 27, <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/sites/g/files/tmzbd416/files/docs/gcm.pdf>.
- 53 Interview with Sarah Rosengaertner, August 11, 2021.
- 54 Interview with Michael Clemens, March 2, 2021.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Interview with Helen Dempster, March 4, 2021; interview with Kate Gough, May 8, 2021.
- 57 European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a New Pact on Migration and Asylum* (Brussels, Belgium: European Commission, 2020), [https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/1\\_en\\_act\\_part1\\_v7\\_1.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/1_en_act_part1_v7_1.pdf).
- 58 "Towards a Global Compact for Migration: A Development Perspective," Migration Policy Institute, [www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/international-program/global-compact-migration](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/international-program/global-compact-migration).
- 59 Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Hannah Postel, and Elisa Mosler Vidal, *Poverty, Migration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (Geneva, Switzerland: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, 2017), <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/11743.pdf>.
- 60 Interview with Michael Clemens, March 2, 2021; interview with Kate Gough, May 8, 2021; interview with Sarah Rosengaertner, August 11, 2021.
- 61 Email from Kate Gough, August 20, 2021.
- 62 Interview with Kate Gough, May 8, 2021.
- 63 Email from Helen Dempster, August 10, 2021.
- 64 Interview with Kate Gough, May 8, 2021; email from Helen Dempster, August 10, 2021.
- 65 Interview with Helen Dempster, March 4, 2021.
- 66 Ibid. (The comment refers to pre-COVID travel.)
- 67 Clemens notes that Dempster's success is due largely to "her own extraordinary talents, which have allowed her to quickly become a global intellectual leader in this policy area." (Email, November 30, 2021.)
- 68 "Creating Employment Perspectives for Youth in Kosovo," GIZ, last updated March 2021, [www.giz.de/en/worldwide/66634.html](http://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/66634.html).
- 69 Put another way, the "design elements" of a GSP are clear and in place for countries or other actors to adopt. The "Start a GSP" section of CGD's new Global Skill Partnership online portal is a particularly strong example.
- 70 Interview with GIZ program staff, March 26, 2021.
- 71 M.A. Clemens, "Global Skill Partnerships: A Proposal for Technical Training in a Mobile World," *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* 4, no. 2 (2015): 12.
- 72 Satish Chand and Helen Dempster, "A Pacific Skills Partnership: Improving the APTC to Meet Skills Needed in the Region," *CGD Blog*, August 2, 2019, [www.cgdev.org/blog/pacific-skills-partnership-improving-aptc-meet-skills-needed-in-region](http://www.cgdev.org/blog/pacific-skills-partnership-improving-aptc-meet-skills-needed-in-region).
- 73 Michael Clemens, Colum Graham, and Stephen Howes, "Skill Development and Regional Mobility."
- 74 Interview with APTC and DFAT staff, April 19, 2021.
- 75 Interview with Stephen Howes, August 16, 2021.
- 76 European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: Enhancing Legal Pathways to Europe: An Indispensable Part of a Balanced and Comprehensive Migration Policy* (Brussels, Belgium: European Commission, 2018).
- 77 Interview with Enabel staff, April 1, 2021.
- 78 The THAMM project includes THAMM-Enabel, a component building on PALIM (€5 million out of the total €30 million in funding). The program comprises several components and provides training in the information and communications technology, hospitality, and tourism sectors. Despite COVID-19-related delays, THAMM has already trained 162 people, with 48 benefiting from job placements and 129 benefiting from legal migration pathways. (Email from Enabel staff, May 26, 2021.)
- 79 Email from Michael Clemens, May 10, 2021.
- 80 Interview with APTC staff, April 19, 2021.
- 81 Interview with Stephen Howes, August 16, 2021.

- 82 Dempster has a slightly different perspective, seeing this as the focus of the overall migration program. For GSPs in particular, she highlights two distinct and more narrow goals: (1) proving that innovation in this space is possible and spurring other ideas, and (2) harmonizing skills qualification and recognition across borders (e.g., enabling a nurse qualified in Ghana to access a wider range of labor markets). (Email, December 8, 2021.)
- 83 Often referred to as the “triple-win,” that is, a win for destination countries, origin countries, and migrants themselves.
- 84 “Talent Partnerships,” European Commission, [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/migration-and-asylum/legal-migration-and-integration/talent-partnerships\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/migration-and-asylum/legal-migration-and-integration/talent-partnerships_en).
- 85 Email from Helen Dempster, December 8, 2021.
- 86 Interview with Alexander Berger, April 14, 2021.
- 87 Clemens and Postel, “Temporary Work Visas.”
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Interview with Helen Dempster, March 2, 2021.
- 90 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, *Australia Pacific Training Coalition Stage 3 (APTC 3) Strategic Review: Executive Summary*, (Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2021), [www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/apct-3-strategic-review-executive-summary.pdf](http://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/apct-3-strategic-review-executive-summary.pdf).
- 91 Interview with Alexander Berger, April 14, 2021.
- 92 Dempster notes that this was never intended to be CGD’s role either. However, the organization “stepped into a void” given the lack of broader infrastructure and took on these responsibilities out of necessity to help the GSP concept become reality.
- 93 Interview with Helen Dempster, March 2, 2021.
- 94 Ibid.





CENTER  
FOR  
GLOBAL  
DEVELOPMENT

---

**Center for Global Development**

2055 L Street NW  
Floor 5  
Washington DC  
20036

1 Abbey Gardens  
Great College Street  
London  
SW1P 3SE

**[WWW.CGDEV.ORG](http://WWW.CGDEV.ORG)**

