

Att. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Department for Migration, Peace and Stabilisation



24 June 2024

Response provided by the Danish Red Cross (DRC) to the Public Consultation by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the planned ‘Whole-of-Route Migration Programme’, 2024-2029.

DRC appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the draft programme document in this public consultation. We take note of the overall alignment with and reference to DRC’s route-based migration approaches, programming and experiences and findings from research cooperation with DIIS.

DRC would like to share the following considerations for the further development of the Whole-of-Route programmed.

Overall strategic framework

- DRC welcomes Denmark’s engagement to reduce risks and vulnerabilities of people on the move. It is positive to read that Denmark will seek to “ensure more coherent and impactful approaches to migration through a “whole of route” approach, using a route-based approach of assistance and protection available to vulnerable migrants at all stages throughout their journeys, reducing the risks and vulnerabilities facing people on the move” and thereby contributing to “more safe and orderly migration along the routes, through access to information, direct assistance and services”.
- While it is considered that the objective of contributing to “more safe and orderly migration” fulfills the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) objectives as a relevant main focus, it is suggested to have a more direct alignment between the justification of the main objective of the PD, the “prevention of irregular migration”, and the GCM objective, thereby reinforcing Denmark’s commitment to the GCM, and in particular Objective 7: Address and reduce vulnerabilities in migration, Objective 15: Provide access to services for migrants, and Objective 17: Eliminate all forms of discrimination and promote evidence-based public discourse to shape perceptions of migration
- We are glad to see a strong focus on learnings from past interventions, including the AMiRA, led by British Red Cross with Danish Red Cross as partner, and the 3M programmes, and relevant research. It is fundamental for the pertinence of quality humanitarian interventions that we continue to improve and learn from good practices and research, which includes insight from persons most concerned, in this case migrants along the routes.
- DRC appreciates the comprehensive approach to addressing the needs of vulnerable people along key migration routes providing a broad range of services, including a consortium approach to ensure flexibility and robust monitoring, analysis, research, and learning. We are concerned to what extent the overall budget available can efficiently and fully support the ambitions of the call – to provide comprehensive services in whole-of-route support spanning multiple regions and including potentially costly interventions such as shelter and livelihoods, within the holistic and robust approach suggested. Clarity on priority and number of countries would prove useful for ensuring effectiveness and coherence in the programme, while still ensuring a route-based approach. Further, reference under Outcome 2 – Direct assistance / basic needs” (p. 17), to direct assistance to be provided in “transit locations in the four countries of implementation, seems restrictive and does not seem to align with the whole-of-route approach.

Objectives, outcomes and indicators:

- Outcome 1: While we welcome the approach to information provision as protection, with awareness of risks and of service providers, we do recommend, for information provision to be reliable and contributing to informed decision-making, a more holistic approach in the outcome formulation, where information is never a stand-alone service and that it is clear in the outcome that information should be additive to humanitarian services provided at e.g. HSPs. Likewise, the suggestion of maps, key phone numbers, QR codes, etc. as "quick hits" should be additive to programming that fills other urgent needs, and that it should be framed as providing accurate and timely information to migrants within services points.

Furthermore, while the PD outcome suggests "value-based campaigns, using a mix of persuasion and emotion", research undertaken by the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) "Does information save lives"¹, and quoted in the PD, notes how overt influence and dissuasion can lead migrants to trust service providers less and can therefore limit access of humanitarian actors to migrants in need. Similarly, the report from MMC "Protection risks and assistance needs of migrants in the Central Sahel" from March 2024 highlights the challenges faced by humanitarian actors in fostering and maintaining trust amongst migrants, impacting access to these groups. DRC would therefore suggest limiting actions which may foster distrust or negative perceptions by migrants, such as the collection of personal identifying data, including countries of origin.

- The reference to livelihood is unclear in the unfolding of Outcome 2, where no livelihoods-related output is described. With reference to our comment above on the cost and complexity of livelihoods in a route-based programmed, we suggest considering this included in this outcome, also with reference to the livelihood component included in the Danish Migration Management and Return, Readmission and Reintegration Programme.
- To support the GCM whole-of-society approach, we recommend that outcome 3 include mobilising civil society leaders to promote migration policies that respect human rights, and with this that the PD is explicit about a sustainability strategy.
- We welcome the Outcome 4 approach to a more conducive environment for migrants, due to better information and more balanced debate and the objective to changing the migration narrative to avoid further marginalisation of migrants and refugees highlighting also the positive contributions of migration to development and contributing to better inclusion. To avoid confusion in the overall Outcome descriptions in Outcome 1 we recommend changing the wording of the Outcome from "dis-information relating to migration" align with the GCM objective of "promotion of inclusion and social cohesion".
- In line with past learnings of route-based programming, as also highlighted in the PD to avoid country-based siloed interventions, we further suggest an additional outcome focused on localized cross-border communication and cooperation with capacities to take a route-based approach to providing assistance and protection, communication and cooperation along the main routes, between points of service, and across borders. This would, in addition to the suggestion under Outcome 3, allow for pertinent engagement of local leadership, thereby reinforcing Denmark's commitments to the Grand Bargain on localization.

Finally, DRC would like to note that certain outcome indicators might not be measurable:

- Outcome 2, "# of strengthened national referral mechanisms and strengthened / established and support centers": strengthened national referral mechanisms appears to overlap with outcome 3, we propose to remove this indicator keeping outcome 2 focused on services towards individuals and outcome 3 focused on local duty bearer and system capacity.
- Outcome 2, "# of migrants successfully reintegrated": reintegration is a complex and personal process, measures of success may be different from person to person and may take many years. We propose to change this to "# of individuals receiving reintegration support".
- Outcome 3, "# of empowered municipalities and civil society organizations": as stated this indicator is quite broad and difficult to measure, propose to change to "# of referral partners who report improved capacity to support migrants in need of service.

¹ [DIIS Report 2021: 01](#)