

**STATE-DIASPORA
PARTNERSHIPS AND
BILATERAL
AGREEMENTS: HOW
CAN THEY HELP TO
MANAGE MIGRATION?**

By Miryam Hazán, Marion Panizzon, Sandra Lavenex, and Sonia Plaza September 14, 2011

Outline



- Main research questions
- State-diaspora partnerships
 - ▣ sending countries (bilateral agreements, co-development, mobility partnerships, etc)
 - ▣ receiving countries (Mexico 3*1)
- Achievements and Limitations
- Lessons Learned
- Policy Recommendations

Main questions



- What types of state-diaspora partnerships can we identify and what are their characteristics?
- What are their successes and limitations?
- What are the lessons we can learn from partnerships in host countries (France and Spain) and source countries (Senegal and Mexico) and how can the initiatives be linked together?

Host Countries: Examples of partnerships

	France	Spain
Name	Solidarity for Development	Co-development
Approach	Top down (some initiatives are diaspora-led)	Bottom-up segmented approach

Host Countries: Examples of partnerships

	France	Spain
Types of initiatives	Co-funding matching schemes, priority solidarity funds, tax-free saving accounts, access to micro-credit facilities	Technical and financial assistance to diasporas/ NGOs led initiatives
Development focus	Sustainable development (infrastructure, circular migration, entrepreneurial)	Different definitions depending on local/ regional priorities

Host Countries: Examples of partnerships

	France	Spain
Sources of funding	National government, with participation of migrants and private sector	Local and regional governments with some support from financial institutions
Role for other actors	Universities, research centers, financial institutions private sector, NGOs	Universities, NGOs, financial institutions

Home Countries: Examples of partnerships

	Mexico	Senegal
Name	3x1 Program (now 4x1) <i>Compatriot invest in your Land, Invest in Mexico</i>	Replication of the French program
Approach	Diaspora led	Government led

Home Countries: Examples of partnerships

	Mexico	Senegal
Types of initiatives	Matching funds (federal, state and municipal level) some new private sector support	Investment by diaspora, exchanges of professionals, mechanisms for remittances' transfers
Development focus	Urbanization, small infrastructure, micro-investments to create employment (still very new)	micro-investments Infrastructure, transfer of resources

Home Countries: Examples of partnerships

Cases	Mexico	Senegal
Sources of funding	Three levels of government in Mexico, collective remittances, new private sector participation, IDB	National government
Role for other actors apart from states and diasporas	Private sector International organizations	NGOs private sector, small financial institutions,

Achievements and limitations: France



- Migrants became actors
- first attempt to link multiple stakeholders, including financial, research institutions and industry associations in home country
- broad perspective on development with multiple initiatives

But

- no clear role to diaspora
- no feasibility assessment
- difficulty to separate development initiatives from return migration/immigration control
- difficulty of implementing diaspora-led model when migrants are not well inserted in the labor market

Achievements and limitations: Spain

- Co-development never linked to immigration control
- allows for capacity building (transfer of knowledge from NGOs, local and regional governments) and increases the social capital of diasporas
- allows for experimentation due to the decentralized nature of the model

But

- No proper impact evaluation and no participation of counterpart institutions in sending country → undermines institutionalization of initiatives

Achievements and limitations: Mexico



Helps create good governance by introducing a civil society actor (diaspora)

Has attracted investments in places where state institutions did not provide

Has supported the diaspora and increased its social capital

But ...

No proper impact evaluation, limited vision of what is development, and lack of accountability mechanisms until recently

Achievements and limitations: Senegal



Demonstrates that sending countries could replicate co-development initiatives initiated by the counterpart

But

Lack of trust of migrants in their home country institutions and policies leads to limited diaspora investments in source country government-led projects

Not every migrant is an entrepreneur

General lessons learned:



- Need to find a balance between development and immigrant integration
- Programs should not have as goals immigration control or return migration
- Support for entrepreneurial activities is good. But difficult to create entrepreneurs
- Diaspora contributions will depend on their labor market participation
- Programs provide a space for unskilled diasporas to contribute
- Need to find effective coordination among stakeholders

Policy Recommendations



- Align host country initiatives with the development goals in home countries
- Improve negotiation of Bilateral Migration Agreements to consider:
 - Home countries' labor surplus
 - All skills levels
- Conduct impact evaluation of programs