Co-development: ‘win-win’ solution for all or burden-shifting opportunity for the developed world?

International migration constitutes an ideal means of promoting co-development, that is, the coordinated or concerted improvement of economic conditions in both areas of origin and areas of destination based on the complementarities between them.

[…] Countries can cooperate to create triple wins, for migrants, for their countries of origin and for the societies that receive them.

[The] potential benefits [of international migration] are larger than the potential gains from freer international trade¹.


The European Union needs a comprehensive approach to migration addressing political, human rights and development issues in countries and regions of origin and transit. This requires combating poverty, improving living conditions and job opportunities, preventing conflicts and consolidating democratic states and ensuring respect for human rights, in particular rights of minorities, women and children. To that end, the Union as well as Member States are invited to contribute, within their respective competence under the Treaties, to a greater coherence of internal and external policies of the Union. Partnership with third countries concerned will also be a key element for the success of such a policy, with a view to promoting co-development.

European Council Conclusions, Tampere, October 1999

There is no direct link between poverty, economic development, population growth, social and political change on the one hand and international migration on the other. Poverty reduction is not in itself a migration-reducing strategy.

Danish Center for Development Research²

---

¹ The World Bank estimates that if migration flows increase 8% in the period from 2000 to 2025, the gain in income due to migration for native households in developed countries will be 0.4%. Developing countries as a whole will see their income rise by 1.8%. The losers will be migrants to the developed world who arrived earlier, who are predicted to see a 6% decline in their consumption levels.

1. Introduction

'Co-development' appears to be the international community’s new buzzword, featuring prominently on the UN’s agenda as part of former Secretary General Kofi Annan’s efforts to set up a new United Nations body dealing with migration, and triumphantly paraded by the EU as the solution both to rising tensions within Europe over migration and the developing world’s problems. Though interpretations of the term are often conflicting, there seems to be broad consensus over the fact that ‘co-development’ defines attempts to involve migrants in the development of their countries of origin. Some bodies, such as the European Commission, avoid using the word altogether, referring instead to the 'link', or 'nexus' between migration and development.

While the United Nations appear to view co-development in terms of individual, or community, efforts to promote development in sending countries (aided by state intervention to ease the process), the French government, very much a precursor to the debate, prefers to focus on the relationship between states - countries of origin on the one hand and destination countries on the other.

Surrounded by the flurry of debate on the topic, a number of Solidar member organisations are actually implementing co-development projects, linking migrants in Europe with the communities they left behind in North and West Africa, Eastern Europe and Latin America, ensuring young failed asylum seekers do not return to face destitution and a lack of prospects and upholding migrant workers’ rights in sending and destination countries.

Solidar members’ hands-on experience of co-development allows us, as a network, to support the notion that migration and development are inextricably linked and that, as the Belgian government forcefully put it at the UN's High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in September 2006, there are four partners in the co-development dialogue: sending countries, receiving countries, transit countries and migrants and diasporas. Our concern is that all four partners are able to take part in the dialogue as equals and on a voluntary basis. We also believe that the benefits of migration for both countries of origin and of destination must not be used instrumentally to uphold stricter border control policies and to phase out official development aid in favour of remittance flows.

This publication aims to present an overview of current debates about co-development as well as outlining Solidar’s position on the topic. Examples of Solidar members’ projects in the field will highlight how co-development can work in practice.

2. Background

The French government's approach to co-development stems from the first attempts to develop a conceptual framework for the term. First cited in a 1985 international conference organised by Belgium’s Louvain University, ‘Les assises du codéveloppement’, ‘co-development’ was essentially defined as development cooperation between the West and Third World countries which involved full participation of the latter in defining strategies and implementation.

---

In 1975, two years before UNDP launched their highly successful TOKTEN (Transfer Of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals) programme, the French were the first to set up a programme addressing what many see as one of the key issues in co-development, brain drain, providing training to Algerian citizens living in France in exchange for the promise to return to Algeria. This, say critics of the French government's approach, proves that the concept of co-development essentially arose out of the debate on return migration.

It was not until the 1990s that co-development as we know it today began to surface in French government documents and in the debate among civil society organisations as well as within the UN, whose 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo focused on 'international migration and development' as one of its key themes. The PDLM (Programme Développement Local et Migration) was set up by the French government in 1995 to help migrants from Mali, Mauritania and Senegal to return and set up businesses. 1997 saw Sami Nair, who coined what is arguably the first definition of co-development⁴, nominated as a special advisor to the French government on Integration and Co-development. A 'cellule codéveloppement' was launched by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 2005 and the first edition of the 'Lettre du codéveloppement' circulated, though no other editions appear to have been subsequently published.

The mid-1990s also saw the rise of OSIM, or Organisations de Solidarité Issues des Migrations, NGOs set up by migrants in France focusing on development projects in their respective countries of origin. FORIM, or Forum des Organisations de Solidarité Issues des Migrations, was set up in France in 2002, bringing together 52 OSIM federations and over 600 organisations representing 21 countries of origin. Critics argue that French NGOs have accepted what they see as a limited concept of co-development, which involves providing migrants with the means to help their countries of origin rather than campaigning for wide-ranging reforms which would have a far greater impact.

Other countries have slowly followed France's lead. Spain's 2001 immigration bill, the so-called 'Plan GRECO' (Programa Global de Regulación y Coordinación de la Extranjería y la Inmigración en España), mentions co-development as key to involving migrants and spurring development, as do the new 2007 'Strategic Plan on citizenship and integration' (Plan Estratégico de ciudadanía e integración) and the Spanish Development Cooperation Framework Plan for 2005-2008 (Plan Director de Cooperación Española 2005-2008). Spain's Ministry for Foreign Affairs has set up a Council for Development Cooperation whose mandate also covers co-development. Headed by the junior minister for development, the Council includes her counterpart in charge of the immigration and emigration portfolio.

The rest of Europe appears to be reluctant to promote co-development as a core part of their external action or as a means to achieve greater coordination between foreign and domestic policy. This may also explain why calls for greater 'coordination' or 'harmonisation' between the EU's external dimension and home and security concerns have not led to significant results so far. Member states are keen to retain
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⁴ '[Co-development links] migration and development so that both sending and destination countries can benefit from migration flows. In other words, it is a consensual relationship between two countries which ensures that migrants’ contribution to the destination country does not entail a loss for the sending country.' Sami Nair (2007), Technical Advisor to the French government on Integration and Co-development, Rapport de bilan et d’orientation sur la politique de codéveloppement liée aux flux migratoires, 1997, p.t.
absolutely control over migration policy, despite pleas for help by some countries facing what they view as massive inflows of irregular migrants.

Migration and development have been high on the United Nation’s agenda over the last two years as part of Kofi Annan’s drive to set up a migration body within the UN system. The Global Commission on International Migration, an inter-governmental group of high-level experts sponsored by the UN Secretary General, published its final report in October 2005. A UN High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development, the first UN-sponsored global event focusing on migration, was held in New York in September 2006. Fears about the event being boycotted by the developed nations were allayed as the attendance list soared to 127 countries. The Belgian government has volunteered to host the first meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development in July 2007, which will see over 120 countries converging on Brussels. The Global Forum will be an intergovernmental, rather than official, UN event. The informal, consultative setting lacks decision-making powers and discussions will operate under Chatham House rules5, though the Belgian government has stressed that there will be ‘concrete outcomes’. The then Secretary General’s Special Representative on International Migration, Peter Sutherland, underscored how any attempt to set up a formal UN body on migration would have been shot down by the developed states6.

Discussions on 10-11 July 2007 will revolve around three macro-themes (‘human capital development and labour mobility’, ‘remittances and other diaspora resources’ and ‘enhancing institutional and policy coherence’) which will also be picked up at the ‘civil society’ event on 9 July, where non-state actors will gather to draw up a common document.

3. The EU’s approach to co-development: critical points

3.1 ‘Co-development’ for the EU: shorthand for migration management?

Co-development was first mentioned in an official EU document in the 1999 Tampere Council Conclusions, widely regarded as the basis for the development of a common European asylum and immigration policy and which officially established the EU as a common Area of Freedom, Security and Justice. As southern member states struggled to cope with the increasing numbers of migrants arriving to seek work or flee persecution, border management and the fight against irregular migration became the main facets of the fledgling common policy. In EU parlance ‘solidarity’ in the context of migratory flows began to be cited, meaning the sharing of the financial and logistical burden of arrivals rather than any attempts to empathise with the migrants. The conflation between migration and security concerns appears to have informed EU policy in the field over the last years to a large extent, dwarfing attempts to focus on integration. Marie-Arlette Carlotti, a member of the European Parliament and rapporteur on migration and development, estimates that the European Commission has spent a pitiful €15 million on integration so far, or 50 eurocents per legally resident migrant7.

5 The official website for the GFMD is: www.gfmd-fmmd.org, whereas the civil society event website is: http://www.gfmd-civil-society.org
6 Peter Sutherland (October 2006), p.c.
EU co-development initiatives on the topic since 1999 may be summed up as follows:

- 2002: European Commission Communication on 'Integrating migration issues in the EU's relations with third countries'
- 2003: Council Conclusions on migration and development
- 2004: Hague programme on a common asylum and immigration policy
- 2005: European Commission Communication on migration and development
- 2006: European Parliament Report on development and migration
- 2006: EU-ACP Facility on migration (has been announced but not launched)
- 2006: EU Position ahead of the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development

EC funding for co-development projects has so far been limited to the following:

- 2001-2004: Preparatory Actions for cooperation with third countries in the area of migration and asylum. A number of projects financed through this temporary budget line had a co-development perspective (return of highly skilled migrants, facilitating remittance flows, etc.).
- 2004-2006: Aeneas Programme, providing technical and financial assistance to third countries in the areas of migration and asylum. The focus on co-development is provided by the emphasis on projects tackling remittances for productive investments, micro-credit, etc.

New opportunities will be available as from the autumn of 2007:

- 2007-2010: The Thematic Programme on Migration and Asylum (part of the Development Cooperation Instrument), which should have a budget of around €205 million for 2007-2010, will support ‘third countries in ensuring better management of migration flows in all their dimensions’. The global ‘Migration and Development’ initiative, which will have a budget of €10 million (or €2.5 million a year), will be co-managed by the EC and an international organisation and will support projects run by migrant associations in partnership with associations and local authorities in sending countries.

Specific actions addressing return migration are as follows:

- 2002: Return Action Programme approved by Council
- 2006: European Return Fund set up

Specific actions addressing the brain drain:

- 2002: European Commission proposes EU code of conduct to discipline recruitment where it would have negative repercussions on developing countries. Member states veto the proposal
- 2005: European Commission Communication on 'Shortages in human resources in health sectors of developing countries'

---

8 adopted at the General Affairs and External Relations Council on 17 July 2006
The emphasis has also been on mainstreaming migration in development policy, most notably through what the European Commission labels a 'dialogue' with countries bordering the EU and by integrating migration into ACP\(^9\) countries' Country Strategy Papers and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. The European Commission has also started to include migration management in the list of factors to be taken into account when assessing a developing country's record on governance prior to disbursement of development aid\(^10\). Italy's Interior Minister, Giuliano Amato, recently made the link between the allocation of aid and developing countries' ability to control migration flows explicit, saying that EU states should only disburse development funds if developing countries signed readmission agreements\(^11\).

The July 2006 Rabat conference co-organised by the French, Spanish and Moroccan governments and sponsored by the European Commission brought together the EU's 25 member states, accession countries Bulgaria and Romania, Switzerland and 26 northern, western and central African states and was purportedly dedicated to 'Migration and Development'. Though the Rabat Declaration and Action Plan highlighted development issues (the alleged 'root causes of migration') and often seemed to be a word for word copy of the EU's 2005 Strategy for Africa, the real emphasis in talks and in the actual outcomes of the conference was on readmission agreements and 'technical and logistical support' to halt flows of migrants and identify the latter in view of repatriation. The final declaration explicitly stresses 'effective, rapid and tangible solidarity', focusing both on 'sustainable development' and on 'security', as the answer to the 'management of migratory flows'.

November 2006 saw over 50 African countries and the EU's 25 member states attending another summit on migration and development in Tripoli, Libya. Leaders in Tripoli agreed to address what they identified as the 'root causes' of migration, ranging from poverty to conflict and poor governance. Significantly, other possible causes of migratory flows mentioned in the Tripoli Declaration, such as the 'unequal terms of global trade' and 'environmental factors', were left out of the EU Finnish Presidency statement released after the summit\(^12\). Ministers also agreed to meet again, 'within three years', for a new EU-Africa Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development.

France’s new immigration bill, which will take effect in early 2007, exemplifies how ‘co-development’ may be used to, for example, limit migrants’ stay in Europe. Eligible candidates applying for the ‘skills and talents’ visa will be required to prove that they contribute to the ‘economic’, ‘intellectual’ or ‘cultural’ development of both France and their country of origin and are only offered to those who agree to return to their country of origin within six years. Potential migrants will also only be able to

---

\(^9\) The 79 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries which are parties to the Cotonou Agreement

\(^10\) Paragraph 2.1, European Commission Communication on 'Governance in the European Consensus on Development: towards a harmonized approach within the European Union', 30 August 2006

\(^11\) *Immigrazione, Amato annuncia: "A ottobre modifica della legge", 'La Repubblica', 27/09/06


obtain visas under the scheme if the sending country has signed a 'co-development’ agreement with the French government\textsuperscript{13}.

Though the emphasis seems to be on border management, irregular migrants are also significantly overlooked by the EU in its official documents on co-development. Yet undocumented migrants are those probably experiencing the greatest difficulties in sending remittances home and gaining recognition of their qualifications.

### 3.2 A simplistic view of why people migrate and the notion that less poverty will automatically lead to less migration

The EU position on the nexus between migration and development appears to be clear-cut: people migrate because of poverty or, in far lesser numbers, to flee persecution. If the 'root causes' of migration are addressed and internal and external EU policies harmonised, the benefits of migration can be 'maximised' and the negative impacts 'minimised\textsuperscript{14}.

This simplistic, one-dimensional view excludes the wealth of personal motives prompting individuals to risk life and limb to seek a new life elsewhere. The literature on the subject and well-documented studies by authoritative bodies such as the World Bank have amply proven that the vast majority of the migrants who reach the developed world are usually those whom the community has chosen to invest in and are often educated individuals seeking better opportunities elsewhere.

The argument also fails to overlook what countless UN resolutions and, indeed, EU documents, have stressed, namely that development is not simply economic growth.

The EU's implicit argument is also, naturally, that less poverty in the developing world will automatically entail a decrease in migration flows. This is highly controversial, to say the least. A number of studies have shown how economic growth and an increase in oft-cited democratic freedoms may actually encourage the young and willing to leave their country in greater numbers. This appears to have occurred in Ethiopia, for example, after Meles Zenawi swept to power in 2000 in the country's first multi-party elections\textsuperscript{15}.

### 3.3 Migration as exclusively South-North

The EU also only appears to view migration as flows of people moving from the developing world to Europe. Out of the 191 million migrants in the world, roughly one third come from a developing country and have moved to another developing country, and one third originated in a developing country and now live in a developed one\textsuperscript{16}. 'South-south' movements are thus approximately the same as 'south-north' migratory flows.

Despite the rhetoric to the contrary, and despite UN agencies' work in the field to provide assistance to migrants, refugees and IDPs across the developing world, this Western bias also seems to be present to a large extent in Kofi Annan's 2006 report on migration and development.

### 3.4 Circular migration – for the highly skilled alone

\textsuperscript{13} Murphy, K. (2006) \textit{France’s new law: control immigration flows, court the highly skilled} in ‘Migration Information Source’, Migration Policy Institute

\textsuperscript{14} cf. EU Position ahead of the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development, July 2006

\textsuperscript{15} Prof. Abye Tasse, University of Addis Ababa (July 2006), p.c.

\textsuperscript{16} United Nations International Migration and Development Factsheet, 2006
Circular migration, whereby migrants are allowed, or actively encouraged, to return to their country of origin for more or less extended periods of time, is viewed by many as one of the most promising means of reversing brain drain in the developing world and enabling skilled professionals to allow their countries to benefit from the know-how they have acquired abroad.

The EU Position, adopted ahead of the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development (14-15 September 2006), is exemplary, stressing the importance of circular migration without outlining tangible measures to achieve speedy readmission of migrants who return to their country of origin. 'Training programmes' and temporary 'internships' in Europe are thus put forward, whilst setting up innovative visa schemes and reworking legal entry channels are never discussed. As in the Communication on migration and development, the only categories for whom circular migration is deemed to be beneficial appear to be researchers, entrepreneurs and highly skilled professionals, whilst it would be of the most use for the far larger numbers of low-skilled workers.

Research has also demonstrated how strict border controls impeding circular migration increase long-term residence and family reunifications\(^\d\) in the host country, thus driving up the overall number of migrants. In the early 1980s 50% of Mexican immigrants returned home within the year; by 2000, with massive border enforcement programmes in place, returnees were down to 25%\(^\d\).

### 3.5 Temporary migration – a solution for Europe’s retirement problem?

A recent EC Communication on 'The demographic future of Europe – from challenge to opportunity' (12/10/06) appears to view temporary migration not as a way of helping migrants reap the benefits of migration without foregoing links with their country of origin, but as a means of offsetting the EU’s retirement crisis. By 2050 current EU member states will see an overall decline in population of almost 10 million, but the EU will witness a 48 million decrease in the number of working age individuals.

Migration will not compensate the decrease in population, precisely because – though the EC does not state this explicitly - migration flows to the EU are limited. Long-term migrants will eventually retire as well, so temporary migration is seen as a possible solution to the crisis, the argument apparently being that short-term migrants will contribute to European pension systems before returning to their countries of origin.

### 4. Co-development in practice: remittances, remittances, remittances?

The theoretical debate around co-development, with the partial exception of the Francophone world, seems to hover around the issue and ultimately appears to boil down to a set of practical measures to allow migrants to contribute to their countries' development. Remittances loom largely in discussions, surfacing whenever co-development is mentioned, but other examples of co-development in practice, some of which are listed below, are analysed in the literature as well as in EU documents, in Kofi Annan’s 2006 report and in the Global Commission on International Migration's 2005 final report.

---

\(^\d\) It must be underscored that the right to family reunion is a basic human right. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights reads as follows: ‘Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life’.

4.1 Remittances: replacing ODA?
Money sent home by migrants in 2005 totalled an estimated $232 billion, with the share of global remittances going to developing countries increasing from 57% in 1995 to 72% ($167 billion) in 2005. Remittances are considerably greater than ODA (Official Development Aid) and the second-largest source of income for developing countries after FDI (Foreign Direct Investment). In 2006 Latin American migrants sent $62 billion back to their families, more than ODA and FDI flows to the region combined. Remittances are also expected to be substantially higher than the official figures as a large proportion is sent through informal channels. The Inter-American Development Bank estimates that migrants from South American will transfer $100 billion a year back to their countries by 2010, though it warns that burgeoning remittance flows mean that people are unable to seek viable livelihoods at home and are being forced to move abroad.

According to the World Bank, remittances have contributed to declines in poverty in many developing countries, ranging from a 6% drop in Bangladesh to an 11% decrease in Uganda. In 1998, after Hurricane Mitch wrecked damage across Central America, the Salvadoran government called on the US administration to extend Salvadoran migrants’ permits rather than send aid, in the hope that the migrants would transfer funds to relatives affected by the storm.

Remittances can in no way substitute ODA, as 1) remittances tend to be used by households for domestic consumption and, to a lesser extent, for education and healthcare and for micro-entrepreneurial activities. Though this may buoy consumption and local commodity markets, infrastructure projects and large-scale investment require development aid and local or foreign investors; 2) remittance flows tend to be the lowest in the poorest developing countries.

Opinions on whether remittances can boost economies in developing countries are mixed, whereas it is clear, though often not acknowledged, that migrants contribute greatly to destination countries’ economies (migrants remit 13% of their income on average, which means that 87% is spent in host countries, making migrants’ contribution to the latter total a staggering $1 trillion). On a macro-economic scale, whilst remittance flows improve the creditworthiness of receiving countries, lower borrowing costs and provide reliable financing in times of instability (remittances are usually counter-cyclical, providing much-needed cash after natural catastrophes or conflict, when most investors flee), it is also true that they may reduce export and domestic competitiveness by artificially boosting the domestic currency’s value. Reliance on remittance flows also exposes countries to sudden economic downturns in the nations their migrants are living in, as was evident during the 1998 East Asian crisis, when Indonesian labourers were expelled from Malaysia and Thailand.

---

19 UNFPA, State of World Population Report 2006, A passage to hope: women and international migration
20 Inter-American Development Bank, Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean to top $100 billion a year by 2010, Press release, 18/03/07
21 ibidem
24 Demaret, L. and Taran, P. (2006) Dispelling the migrant myth, ‘World of Work’ no. 57, International Labour Organisation. The authors also point out that migrants added $4 billion to the UK’s budget in 1999-2000; that they now contribute 10% of the country’s GDP (up from 8.8% in 1999-2000) and that in Spain in 2006 25% of construction revenues will come from housing built for migrants.
On a local level, remittances may engender tension by driving up the cost of life and fueling conflict over scarce resources such as land, which households receiving money from abroad tend to invest in. A GRPG study found that over the long term Zimbabwean households which lacked a migrant abroad fared considerably worse than those receiving remittances as a consequence of price adjustments in local markets. According to the World Bank, remittances initially increase income inequality in local communities as migrants tend to come from the richer households, but as poorer migrants leave remittances have a levelling effect, reducing inequality. Findings from both studies thus point to remittances as one of the driving forces behind greater emigration.

Another factor which needs to be taken into account is the fact that 'migrant elites', i.e. researchers, lecturers and highly skilled professionals, whose salaries are considerably higher than their low-skilled counterparts, tend to remit less or not at all, with payments to a sending country declining as the percentage of its migrants with tertiary education increases. The World Bank highlights to this effect how it is precisely the migration of low-skilled workers which is the most likely to reduce poverty in developing countries. Low-skilled workers, however, are precisely those against whom legal barriers to entry in the developed world are the highest.

Governments in developed countries are also wary of encouraging remittance flows through money transfer companies as the latter may be used to launder money and fund criminal and terrorist organisations. A recent police operation in Italy, the world’s second-largest money transfer market, worth €1.4 billion a year, uncovered 400 illegal agencies. The Italian authorities estimate that up to 30% of money transfer agencies operating in the country are illegal and believe that crime syndicates are using them extensively.

How can remittances be put to the best use to spur development and how can remittance costs (now currently running at up to 20% of total remittance flows) be slashed?

Recommendations: how to enhance the positive role of remittances in development

- Increasing access to banking among migrants and among local communities in developing countries, what the UK House of Commons' International Development Committee refers to as 'banking the unbanked'. Banks can lower the cost of remittances by: a) promoting the use of debit/cash cards in ATMs in developing countries to receive the money (the problem in this case is that European banks usually – though not always – require an account to do this); b) acting as transfer agents through agreements with their counterparts in the country of origin; c)

---


29 Sequestrate 400 agenzie Money Transfer : le usavano trafficanti e presunti terroristi, ‘La Repubblica’, 05/03/07

30 ibidem

traditional wire transfer; d) alliances between banks and money transfer operations.

- One of the many difficulties migrants face in sending remittances through cheaper, more effective channels is that many are undocumented. The US and Mexico are experimenting solutions to this problem, one of which involves Mexican consulates issuing consular ID cards with which irregular migrants can open bank accounts.

- Matching funds. Mexico is pioneering efforts in this field as well: the federal government and local and regional authorities have pledged to match every dollar remitted by migrants in the US to the region with a dollar each. The ‘Tres por uno’ programme, pioneered by the regional government of Zacatecas in 1993 as a ‘Dos por uno’ initiative, was officially launched in 1999 in a number of Mexican states. Funds collected under the scheme are invested to improve education facilities, healthcare and infrastructure. In 2005 alone, Mexican HTAs (Hometown Associations) raised about $20 million for projects across Mexico, whilst the government and local authorities contributed $60 million. Caution has, however, been expressed about these programmes, with sceptics highlighting how the sustainability of the projects, which depend on a constant flow of remittances, is not guaranteed, and how HTAs often lack the expertise to implement development projects and may not work with local community stakeholders.

Private funds are also being deployed in these schemes. In 2005 Western Union unveiled its ‘Cuatro por uno’ programme, which adds additional funds to donations made by Mexican HTAs in the US up to a maximum of $1.25 million. Critics of the programme point out, however, that migrants are contributing to financing infrastructure projects in Mexico to a far greater extent than affluent Mexicans. In Mexican towns with a population of less than 3,000, HTA donations are typically 50% of municipal public works budgets.

A group of Latin American HTAs in Italy has also launched a ‘4+1’ programme in 2007, with the proceeds of each €1 raffle ticket sold to migrants being matched by €3 donated by Italian and South American banks. The funds will be used to finance a number of projects implemented by the HTAs in the Andes region.

- Tax incentives on remittances. France and the Netherlands are considering offering incentives to individual migrants who remit, whilst African communities in the UK have called for a pooling of tax rebates into a fund controlled by migrants and geared at financing development projects in countries of origin. Other proposals include setting up a scheme whereby governments in the developed world transfer taxes reaped on remittances to migrants’ countries of origin.

- Transferring funds through mobile funds. Telecommunications giant Vodafone and the Citigroup bank are pioneering efforts in this field. A pilot scheme whereby
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33 New Economics Foundation (2006) *Migration and the remittance euphoria: development or dependency?* 
35 New Economics Foundation (2006) *Migration and the remittance euphoria: development or dependency?* 
37 Investi un euro, in patria ne arrivano S, ‘Metropoli: Il giornale dell’Italia multietnica’, 04/03/07
39 New Economics Foundation (2006), *Migration and the remittance euphoria: development or dependency?*
money will be transferred from the UK to Kenya will be launched soon, with Vodafone customers paying for the money transfer at company branches or online and recipients receiving a text message with a secure PIN number on their mobile phones. The cash can then be collected at Safaricom offices and Postbank branches throughout Kenya. Neither of the people involved in the transaction will need a bank account, and Vodafone claim that transfer costs will be roughly half what companies such as Western Union currently charge.

- IFAD, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, has set up a $10 million initiative, the Financing Facility for Remittances, to finance projects which cut the costs of money transfers to the developing world. Grants of up to €200,000 will be awarded to projects that increase access to remittances in rural areas.

4.2 Return/circular/temporary migration

A number of successful examples of migrants returning to their countries of origin to boost economic growth are increasingly being used to uphold temporary migration schemes. Korean workers and engineers employed in construction projects in the Middle East in the 1970s are widely believed to be behind Korea’s massive industrialisation in the following decades, while Mexican seasonal migrants to Canada have set up small-scale entrepreneurial activities at home and Moldavian migrants working under a temporary migration scheme in Slovenia in the 1990s appear to have used their savings to invest in their country of origin.

There is, however, plenty of evidence in the literature of returning migrants being unable to harness their newly-acquired skills – when and if they have indeed developed new skills – in the countries they left behind. Germany’s famous Gastarbeiter, or ‘guestworker’, programme, for example, was shown to have provided Turkish workers with little or no additional training. Returnees who are deported from destination countries may also destabilise the countries they left behind. Estimates suggest that were Serbia to sign the readmission agreement with the EU which is in the pipeline, up to 100,000 Serbian citizens could be repatriated, with catastrophic consequences for a country already struggling with high unemployment rates.

Contrary to expectations, return migrants’ unemployment rate is usually higher than local inhabitants. Those who do succeed in, for example, setting up businesses upon return, though they may encourage others to do so by lowering reputational barriers to investment and trade, need to return to a country whose economy is not stagnant. Return migration alone is not enough to produce economic growth, which is, instead, a prerequisite to successful return.

Return migration, trumpeted as the solution to the massive losses experienced by developing countries, fails to address brain drain or to act as a catalyst for development when, as is mostly the case, return is not voluntary. Studies have
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40 Need to send cash abroad? Just reach for your mobile, ‘The Guardian’, 17/02/07
41 Inter-American Development Bank, Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean to top $100 billion a year by 2010, Press release, 18/03/07 and www.ifad.org
42 www.ifad.org
44 ibidem
demonstrated that the most successful returns are those which occur voluntarily. Very few programmes in developed countries focus on those migrants who will be forcibly repatriated, many after spending considerable time in the host country, and who badly need the training and funding available (to a limited extent) for the highly-skilled who have chosen to return.

A number of schemes to encourage return have been put forward, ranging from ensuring temporary migrants or their employers purchase financial security bonds, which could be redeemed when the migrants leave, to setting up mandatory savings accounts for migrants. The latter solution, as Agunias (2007) notes, would allow policymakers to assuage the public’s fears about temporary migration programmes. Some economists, such as the World Bank’s Maurice Schieff, have put forward more controversial ideas, such as selling temporary migrants’ bonds to a private insurance company, which would then be charged with tracking down the migrants should they overstay their visas.

The OECD has, on the other hand, highlighted how temporary migration programmes could easily be more beneficial for development if visa and working arrangements were more flexible. Multiannual visas for seasonal work, allowing temporary migrants to re-enter the countries they have worked in and pioneered by Switzerland, which has seen most migrants under this scheme return to their country of origin, are amongst the proposals put forward in a 2003 OECD policy brief, alongside free agency (ensuring migrants are not tied to a single employer) and longer and more flexible contracts. A number of experts have, in fact, demonstrated that 12-month contracts and residence permits, typically issued by EU countries, do not allow migrants to generate enough savings to make leaving their country of origin worthwhile.

Temporary migration, through, for example, seasonal work permits, would also seem to run counter to integration policies.

Recommendations: ensuring successful return/circular/temporary migration

- As mentioned above, successful circular migration is not possible unless entry and readmission requirements and processes in the developed world are significantly revised and temporary migrants are granted longer and more flexible contracts and re-entry options.
- Temporary migrants should not be tied to specific employers, as this increases their chances of suffering blackmail and exploitation. The UK’s Highly Skilled Migrant Programme (HSMP), for example, allows foreign professionals who meet certain requirements to work as free agents (though recent changes to the UK’s

immigration legislation mean that migrant domestic workers, who have been able to switch employers since 1998, may no longer do so53.

- Dual citizenship encourages individuals to move between countries.
- Pension portability and the portability of health benefits (e.g. in France legal migrants who have left the country are allowed to come back for healthcare) are key as the inability to claim payments made to host countries' social security systems many from returning to their country of origin. Ensuring the portability of pensions and of health benefits should not be based on individual countries’ whim. Migrants who have contributed to social security systems in EU countries have the right to reclaim what they have paid out over the years or months they have worked in the host state.
- Easing access to loans and training in host countries.
- Trade and investment links between host and sending countries must be improved.
- Countries of origin may offer potential returnees professional and financial incentives. In the case of China, however, where local and federal authorities compete to lure back entrepreneurs and academics, those who have returned do not appear to have given up particularly successful careers to do so54. About two thirds of Chinese who have studied abroad since the 1980s have not returned to China55.
- Increasing funding for NGOs working on return migration to ensure migrants’ human rights are respected and that returnees are able to succeed once they are back in their country of origin. SAMAH, a branch of Dutch Solidar member organisation Humanitas, are working on an ambitious 3-year project aimed at young returnees, both voluntary and non.

4.3 Transforming brain drain into brain gain

The oft-cited figure whereby there are more Malawian doctors in the United Kingdom than in Malawi highlights the dramatic situation faced by many developing countries as the highly educated flee to more lucrative jobs abroad. Former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, writing in his 2006 Report on migration and development, stated that 'between 50-80% of all highly educated citizens from several small countries in Africa and the Caribbean live abroad'. The World Bank estimates that losses due to emigration are higher than gains if over 20% of the highly educated leave56.

A significant proportion of the migrants etching out a living filling Europe's low-paid jobs are highly educated, leading to the phenomenon of 'brain waste'.

However, some countries, such as the Philippines or India, actively seek to encourage their educated citizens to move abroad. India's software engineers, who previously migrated to the US’ Sylicon Valley in search of employment, are now returning in droves, boosting India's software export empire.

53 Bunting, M. (2007) Incredibly, we are about to modernise legal domestic slavery again in ‘The Guardian’, 26/03/07
55 China’s lost talent overseas, BBC online, 21/02/07
56 World Bank, Global Economic Prospects Report 2006
Brain drain can also have positive effects if those left behind choose similar training to those who have left (though if the highly-qualified end up working in low-skilled jobs, fuelling ‘brain waste’, potential migrants may be discouraged from pursuing higher education), and, finally, brain drain may be a symptom, and not a cause, of underdevelopment, particularly in countries in crisis such as Zimbabwe or Liberia.\(^{57}\)

**Recommendations: reversing brain drain**

- Improving the **portability of qualifications** and **mutual recognition of degrees and certificates**.
- **Compensating sending countries for their losses** through, for example, increasing funding for these states’ education and healthcare sectors.
- Receiving countries could implement **binding codes of conduct** to ensure they are not contributing to the brain drain, especially in the health sector. The UK’s National Health Service, for example, adopted a code of practice in 2001 whereby medical personnel from developing countries could only be recruited, including through private agencies, if bilateral agreements were in place.\(^{58}\) Critics of the scheme have, however, pointed out that the massive influx of health workers from developing countries to the UK continues unabated.
- Setting up **transnational research networks** and **twinning partnerships** between universities in developed and developing countries to encourage academics to stay in sending countries.
- Host countries could **fund training** of, for example, medical personnel in sending countries.

---

5. **Co-development in practice: programmes and projects**

5.1 **International organisations**

5.1.1 **UNDP TOKTEN**
UNDP’s pioneering TOKTEN (Transfer Of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals) programme was launched in Turkey in 1977 to reverse losses caused by the mass exodus of specialists by funding voluntary returns. By the end of the 20\(^{th}\) century over 5,000 TOKTEN volunteers in 49 developing countries had worked in public administration, management, agricultural research and computer technology in developing countries.

5.1.2 **IOM MIDA**
IOM’s MIDA (Migration for Development in Africa) is a capacity-building programme whose aim is to transfer the African diaspora’s skills back to the continent by helping to ‘mobilise competencies acquired by African nationals abroad for the benefits of Africa’s development’. IOM has experience in the field through the Return of Qualified African Nationals (RQAN) programme. MIDA ensures qualified migrants in the programme enjoy freedom of movement, posts vacancies and investment opportunities, compiles job assignments, builds synergies with the private sector and recruits and trains personnel.

---


The programme also involves local authorities and SMEs in host and sending countries to foster circular migration and investments in migrants’ home communities. Migrants’ associations in Italy have, for example, set up a partnership with local authorities and Italian firms to sell tropical fruit produced by their home communities in Ghana.

5.2 NGOs: SOLIDAR members’ projects

5.2.1 BLinN (the Netherlands): ‘Working together on prevention and reintegration’

Partners and background

Solidar member organisation Humanitas and Oxfam Novib have been running a programme focusing on supporting the victims of trafficking, BLinN, or Bonded Labour in the Netherlands, since 1999. BLinN supports the victims of trafficking in the Netherlands through: 1) victim identification, especially, but not only, in detention centres; 2) information services, financial support, ‘buddy support’ programmes, counselling, social skills training, self-defence courses, support for education and help in accessing the job market.

The project also draws on the close cooperation between BLinN and IOM (the International Organisation for Migration), STV (the Foundation against Trafficking in Women), La Strada and SRTV (the Dutch Foundation of the Religious against Trafficking in Women) and on good practices from the GAATW (Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women).

Where?
The Netherlands, Nigeria, Cameroon.

Background

BLinN has shown how Nigerian NGOs can provide Dutch organisations with extremely useful advice on trafficking for sexual exploitation.

Funding

Humanitas and Oxfam Novib provide funding for all BLinN’s activities.

Objectives

- Design and implementation of prevention activities in countries of origin with the active involvement of victims of human trafficking
- Contributing to making voluntary return a feasible and safe option for victims of trafficking
- Contributing to the establishment/strengthening of networks working against trafficking in human beings within and between the Netherlands, countries of origin and other European countries
- Using the results and findings from the project for advocacy at national, European and international level.

Activities during the project’s first year of activity

- Mapping the existing social networks of the target group
- Identification of partner organisations in West Africa through missions to Nigeria and Cameroon
- Return visit of West African organisations to the Netherlands
Developing ideas for concrete cooperation between the Netherlands and West Africa in the form of pilot projects and individual support and assistance for return and reintegration

- Pilot projects in the area of the prevention of trafficking
- Individual support for return and reintegration
- Coordination and cooperation between relevant organisations in the Netherlands
- Establishment and/or strengthening of counter-trafficking networks in West African countries
- Dissemination of results and awareness-raising / advocacy.

For more information: www.blinn.nl

5.2.2 SAMAH (the Netherlands): 'Beyond borders'

Partners
SAMAH, The voice for Young Asylum Seekers, and the Cordaid Mediation Agency for Return. SAMAH is a foundation set up by Humanitas, a Solidar member organisation.

Where?
The Netherlands, Angola, Sierra Leone, Guinea Conakry.

Background
SAMAH used to only work with minors. As politically-motivated constraints on the right to asylum in the Netherlands have increased over the last couple of years, many young migrants have gone underground to avoid deportation. SAMAH’s target group is now aged 15-25.

Funding
SAMAH’s ‘Beyond borders’ project is financed by the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Development cooperation.

Objectives
- Assisting young failed asylum seekers and young voluntary returnees (including those who only intend to visit their country of origin before travelling back to Europe) in the Netherlands to return to their countries of origin by providing them with the tools to forge a new life for themselves.

Activities
- SAMAH provides training and support in the Netherlands (e.g. through the drafting of a ‘personal action plan’, setting up networks of young asylum seekers, partnerships with companies and contacts with asylum seekers who have already returned)
- Cordaid assists the youngsters when they are back in the country of origin (e.g. by arranging travel documents, finding family members and providing assistance in setting up small businesses).

For more information: www.samah.nl

5.2.3 ISCOD (Spain): 'Union participation in migration flows'

Partners
ISCOD (Instituto Sindical de Cooperación al Desarrollo), Spanish trade union UGT (Unión General de Trabajadores), Colombian union CTC (Confederación de Trabajadores de Colombia), Bulgarian union CITUB (Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria) and the Ecuadorian Labour Ministry.

Where?
Spain, Colombia, Bulgaria, Ecuador.

Objectives
- Involving unions in the formulation of migration policy
- Establishing mechanisms for the effective management of migration flows in sending and destination countries
- Preventing and combating irregular migration
- Promoting integration and migrants' rights.

Activities
- Information Centres in sending countries to provide information on legal migration channels, employment opportunities, workers’ and human rights in Spain
- Training course for Spanish union members on national migration legislation
- Setting up links between Migration Information Centres in Spain and in sending countries
- Information campaigns in sending and destination countries (bulletins, info sheets, etc. as well as a migration guide in Spanish and Bulgarian).

Other projects
1) Encouraging Spanish multinationals working in Latin America (Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia) to commit to social responsibility schemes such as respect for the environment and for local communities. The project works through a website which hosts a forum where unions in the four countries monitor the companies’ behaviour.
2) A new project seeks to address South-South migration. The project will kick off with a seminar on migration flows between Costa Rica and Nicaragua attended by banana sector unions in both countries.

For more information: www.ugt.es/iscod

5.2.4 MPDL (Spain)

MPDL, the Movimiento por la Paz, el Desarme y la Libertad, has been at the forefront of attempts to engage in co-development. MPDL’s projects in the area can be divided into three broad groups:

1) Legal advice in countries of origin and in Spain
Examples:
- Lawyers from Ecuador and the Dominican Republic travel to Spain for training on issues such as legal channels for entry, residence permits and working conditions before holding sessions for potential migrants in the two sending countries.
- Legal assistance offices in Alhucemas (Morocco) and Madrid funded by the Madrid town council. Target groups are Moroccan migrants in Madrid and potential and return migrants in Alhucemas.

2) Assistance for voluntary returnees
When?
The project will run till 2007-2008 in Romania, Morocco, Ecuador and the Dominican Republic (with partners VOMADE, Voluntariado de Madres Dominicanas en España) but is still in the pilot phase in Mali, Niger and Morocco.

How?
MPDL provide information about migration (e.g. on opportunities, risks and legal channels for entry) to people living in marginal areas in sending countries and help migrants who want to return. The overall objectives are ensuring migrants are better off when they return and fighting irregular migration.

3) La Casa del Migrante. The project focuses both on legal counselling and on assisting returnees.

When?
MPDL helped to set up and run the project in 2003-2004 in the Dominican Republic and Ecuador, but has since handed it over to local partners.

Where and for whom?
Target groups are migrants in Madrid and local communities in Ecuador, Dominican Republic, Morocco and Mali/Niger (where potential local partners are still being identified).

Partners
MPDL, the Asociación Hispano Ecuatoriana Rumiñahui in Madrid and the local government of the Quito Metropolitan District; VOMADE in the Dominican Republic; BADES in Morocco.

Objectives
- Help rationalise migration flows
- Provide assistance to migrants in Spain
- Set up small businesses and opportunities for employment in sending countries

Activities
- Capacity-building and labour market counselling in Madrid and Ecuador
- Casa del Migrante in Madrid: 1) legal and labour market advice; 2) psychological support; 3) individual coaching and employment centre; 4) fair trade and micro-credit schemes; 5) strengthening citizens’ involvement and community organisations.

4) Assisting migrant communities in Spain set up projects in countries of origin

Examples:
- Income-generating projects (beekeeping, vegetable gardens, almonds, rural tourism), focusing specifically on ensuring women are able to access the labour market and geared towards increasing productivity in agriculture in the Moroccan region of Alhucemas. The project aims to strengthen local organisations and improve economic conditions, is financed by the local authorities in Madrid and is the result of consultations involving the migrant community from the region in Madrid, local associations and the Moroccan government.
5) Training and assisting potential migrants

Examples:

- Chef and waiter courses, training in IT skills, domestic work, nursing and language courses for young potential migrants in Alhucemas (Morocco) to help them find a job in the services/domestic sectors in Morocco or Spain. Teachers are Spanish and Moroccan. The project is funded by the Madrid town council.
- Potential migrants in Morocco are also able to access legal assistance, advice on employment opportunities and psychological support.
- A new co-development project funded by the Spanish Development Cooperation Agency is currently being kick-started in Mali, Niger and Morocco. The project will foster the development of local associations, offer training for potential migrants with a special focus on women, carry out awareness-raising activities and provide legal assistance in the three countries and in Spain, working with the local population as well as with migrants in Spain.

For more information: www.mpdl.org

6. Co-development: 'win-win' solution for all?

Though the principles underlying co-development (involving migrants wishing to contribute to their countries' growth in the development process) may be well-meaning, in practice 'co-development' can be a heavily weighted term, implying the somewhat patronising assumption that migrants should have an interest in the development of their countries of origin. Remittances should thus be 'productive', and not simply sent to individual households for consumption or school fees.

Linked to this view is the implicit argument that migrants, however long they may have been living (and paying taxes) in the developed world, still belong 'over there', in their countries of origin, and that one day they will return home. Many migrants, though they maintain strong links with the countries they left behind, want to settle down in the host country, ensure their children receive a high-level education and enjoy the benefits of their hard-earned pensions.

As the years pass, migrants tend to remit less. Remittances have a curvilinear trend, with small amounts being sent in the first year, more over the next few years, and then a gradual decrease as links with family members 'at home' grow weaker. The so-called second- and third-generations tend not to remit at all and to show little or no interest in their parents' or grandparents' countries.

Efforts to involve migrants in co-development would thus seem to run counter to integration policies as if the latter are effective migrants' interest in the fate of the countries they left behind wanes. On the other hand, it is precisely those migrants who have residence permits, have settled down and are able to access resources and networks in the host country who engage most effectively in co-development. 'Harmonisation' of EU policies should thus require policymakers to explore the links

---

59 Bendixon and Associates (2001) Inter-American Development Bank Study on 'remesas' and related subjects
60 Innovative projects financed by the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs, however, seek to encourage the 'second-' and 'third-generation' to forge links with the countries their relatives left behind.
between co-development and integration as well as optimising coordination between foreign policy and home and security concerns.

Kofi Annan's exhaustive report shares a worrying characteristic with EU documents on co-development and on migration and development, namely the lack of emphasis on rights as the building-block and basis of all migration policies and of any substantial reference to the international normative framework. EU efforts in the field of migration and development should be premised on the signing, ratification and implementation of the relevant international agreements, starting with the UN Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, which no EU state has signed.

Another problematic aspect of co-development is that attempts to involve 'hometown associations' and diasporas in spurring developing countries' growth often overlooks the fact that migrant communities abroad may have overt political motives in getting involved. This may be limited to individual migrants using their new prestige and/or financial standing to run for office upon return, but vocal members of the diaspora may hijack the agenda in the host country, influencing development policy for their own political aims.

Further problems with the concept of co-development are outlined above and may be summed up as follows:

- The lack of a single, coherent theoretical framework (co-development appears to boil down to a series of concrete projects and issues)
- The emphasis on the controversial causal link between poverty and migration
- Co-development cannot, and should not, substitute ODA and FDI
- South-South migration is overlooked in favour of overwhelming attention for South-North movements
- Co-development as shorthand for border management for the EU
- Undocumented migrants are ignored though they face the greatest difficulties in engaging in 'co-development' (e.g. in sending remittances and in returning to their home countries and being able to enter the host country again)
- Circular/temporary/return migration is only tackled as far as elites are concerned. Revising admissions systems is never mentioned in EU documents.

7. Conclusion. Solidar’s position: firm commitments are needed to ensure co-development is a success

Co-development is not the solution to the developing world's problems nor can it provide the magic wand European policymakers yearn for to reap the benefits of migrants' work in Europe without worrying about integration. What it can provide, however, is the means to involve migrants, with their unique knowledge of the places they left behind, in decisions about how to help their countries of origin. At the same time, co-development offers migrants themselves the opportunity to harness their newly acquired skills for the benefit of their countries of origin and the

---

developing world the chance to substantially reduce the negative impact of migration. Finally, co-development offers host societies the opportunity to take a refreshing look at what they can learn from migrant communities and at how migrants are contributing to the countries they have chosen to live in. For this to take place, however, Europe needs to commit to measures allowing co-development initiatives to be successful. If only the highly skilled can engage in circular migration, if undocumented migrants are ignored and if potential returnees are denied pension portability, no amount of rhetoric will deliver for the world's poorest nations and for the millions of migrants living in Europe.

Efforts to involve migrants in the development of their countries of origin remain, at best, piecemeal across Europe. Though governments and the EU institutions may be animated by the best intentions, any initiatives should be underpinned by the Global Commission on International Migration's stressing of the voluntary nature of migrants' involvement.

This is precisely what a number of Solidar members have been doing, providing the expertise and means for specific groups of migrants in Europe (unaccompanied minors seeking asylum in the Netherlands, migrant workers from Latin America and Eastern Europe in Spain and the victims of trafficking) to contribute to the development of the countries and communities they left behind without foregoing, and, indeed, whilst strengthening their rights.

In their unique position as NGOs with both a development perspective and international outlook on the one hand and a focus on social service provision in Europe on the other, Solidar members have the expertise to link the two dimensions for the benefit of migrants and their countries of origin. Whilst co-development may not provide the solution to tackle developing countries' growth and the many issues surrounding migration in Europe, it does provide a fruitful tool for those organisations willing and able to take it up.

The EU's efforts in the field of co-development are currently limited to the disbursement of a part of the Development Cooperation Instrument Thematic Programme on Migration and Asylum for relevant projects. Solidar:

1) Calls on the European institutions to substantiate the rhetoric on the subject by a) implementing effective policies which enable migrants to contribute to the development of their countries of origin and b) providing civil society actors with the means to further co-development.

2) Upholds calls for a greater harmonisation of the EU and member states’ foreign, development and social and home affairs policies.

3) Stresses the importance of human rights as the foundation of all migration-related policies.

Co-development will only be ultimately successful if migrants are willing participants in the process – and if the developed world allows them to do so effectively.

Contact:
Giulia Laganà
Migration Project Officer
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