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Introduction

This briefing paper addresses the question: In what ways are diasporas/migrants already involved in activities that influence development outcomes in their regions of origin? How can capacity building help them to add value to what they already do and explore new areas, and who can/should provide this support?1

The question’s framing is deliberate. It starts from the premise that diasporas and migrants are engaged in a range of activities with developmental impact and potential and that the most productive starting point is to build upon what already exists rather than starting from a deficit model that focuses upon what is allegedly missing or inadequate. However, it not to take an uncritical view of diaspora/migrant development-related activities and efforts.

This document will provide an overview of the major issues that inform current development awareness i.e. definitions, approaches and successes.

The next section deals with definitions and the question of power dynamics. The following section considers ways in which diasporas/migrants are involved in development. The section following then highlights approaches and viewpoints and illustrates with a few concrete examples. Following this, the paper assesses some success factors and then some challenges. The paper concludes with some recommendations and key questions.

1 The author gratefully acknowledges the comments on the first draft made by reviewers, which have greatly enriched this subsequent draft. All errors and omissions, however, remain the author’s sole responsibility.
Overview of the issue

Definitions help us to frame this discussion. We must first address definitions because we cannot assume a shared understanding of terms such as capacity building, diaspora/migrant, or development. Definitions, meanings, uses, and interpretations of capacity building abound.

● Development
We borrow from Amartya Sen who sees “development as freedom”\(^2\). These freedoms include economic, political, and social ones, as well as freedoms in how people interact with one another in open and transparent ways, and protections from abject poverty. Expansion of these freedoms is both the primary ends of development and the means to development. According to Sen, development is the process of removing the various forms of unfreedom and expanding the capabilities of people “to lead the kinds of lives they value.”

● Capacity Building
Capacity building is considered here to be both a means to achieving specific desirable development-related outcomes and an end in itself in enabling individuals (and peoples) to realize their full potential. Capacity building typically operates at the individual, organizational, or institutional levels (this last level is also sometimes called the enabling environment) and all are relevant for our discussion here. Several commentators point to the ad hoc nature of capacity building efforts and the dearth of evaluations of what actually produces useful outcomes\(^3\).

● Diaspora
For the purpose of this paper, we use the term diaspora to refer to « Individuals originating from one country, living outside this country, irrespective of their citizenship or nationality, who, individually or collectively, are or could be willing to contribute to the development of this country. Descendants of these individuals are also included in this definition.”\(^4\) Migrants are non-citizens who were not born in the host country, to which they have moved often, but exclusively, for work, in which they may or may not intend to settle permanently.

Diasporas and migrants come at development very differently from other actors, such as bilateral or multilateral agencies, NGOs, etc.

Although it is vital to bear in mind the heterogeneity among diaspora/migrant groups vis-à-vis their approaches to development, for many, probably the majority, their “development” initiatives are more akin in their minds to self-help – a mix of obligation, self-interest, and public-spirited concern. It is in this sense that we agree with Orozco when he asserts, “migrant associations are not development-

\(^3\) Eg “Evaluation of capacity building is absolutely critical to achieving quality, although… the practice is not very widespread.” http://www.allianceonline.org/publications/evaluation_of_capacity.page.
\(^4\) This definition is only intended to serve as a common working definition for this session and session 2.4 of the governmental meetings. As the GFMD is an informal non binding process, this definition does not involve any commitment from the governments and agencies participating in their session, nor does it substitute for the usual terminology they may use in their regular practice. Also, along with the focus of the first meeting of the GFMD, this definition should be perceived as global and included in the migration and development context.
oriented by nature, in terms of pursuing formal development agendas. What matters is less their orientation (or indeed motivations) and more the outcomes of their activities. Nonetheless, evidence exists as to the common ground between development practitioners and diaspora/migrants around achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Rather than imagining that development entails a fixed set of practices and beliefs to which diaspora/migrant actors must be brought and about which they must be taught, this paper argues that we start by agreeing on some desirable outcomes and assess the extent to which diasporas’/migrants’ actually existing practices have an impact.

The terms of the discourse around diaspora/migrant engagement in development activities are at present mainly defined by mainstream development practitioners. There is however a disconnect between the development industry’s expectations and assumptions, and the existing capacities and motivations of diaspora/migrant. The formal development actors will typically recognize diasporas’/migrants’ potential contributions to development, if at all, primarily based on resources, in terms of the volume of remittances. These actors tend to underestimate the skills and knowledge and existing organization potential of diasporas.

This lack of recognition might cause diaspora/migrant groups to view mainstream development practitioners with a mixture of scepticism and distrust. Many such groups have had experiences of co-option and imposed agendas or of being spoken at and for. For their part, apart from doubting their bona fide development credentials, mainstream practitioners are also wary of diasporas’/migrants’ political allegiances and agendas; their lack of sensitivity to gender issues; their apparent proclivity for fuelling conflicts in their regions of origin; and sometimes their elite orientations and motivations for status in home-country.

The advent of the Global Forum for Migration and Development presents all actors – state and non-state – with a unique opportunity and framework to engage in meaningful dialogue around how and under what conditions they can collaborate to unleash their respective capabilities to achieve lasting positive change in the developing and developed worlds. What is essential, though, is respect for diversity, a degree of humility all round, and self-awareness on the part of those with power to define the terms of this development discourse, combined with a commitment to genuine dialogue.

To summarize, then, we are considering ways in which diasporas and migrants can support themselves and be supported by others in multifaceted ways to be the best that they can be in realizing their aspirations to make a difference to the lives of people in their regions or origin or

---


interest. Capacity building, both a means to that end and an end in its own right, may impact upon individuals, organizations (and networks), and institutions.

**Diasporas’/migrants’ development relevant activities**

Diaspora/migrant organizations are characterized by considerable diversity in their form and focus. The box below illustrates this point (roles are not necessarily mutually exclusive and in many cases, they overlap).

**Box 2: Typology of diaspora actors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Welfare/refugee group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hometown/county association</td>
<td>Umbrella body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic association</td>
<td>Supplementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni association</td>
<td>Virtual organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious association</td>
<td>Research/think tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association</td>
<td>Arts/cultural group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development NGO</td>
<td>Women’s group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment group/business</td>
<td>Development education centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political group</td>
<td>Service provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National development group</td>
<td>Youth group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographer Giles Mohan⁹ argues that we need to consider three inter-related aspects of diasporas’ engagement with the world. The first is *development in the diaspora*, i.e. the circumstances under which diaspora communities operate in the host country – jobs, housing, welfare, etc. Second is *development through diaspora* – the ways that globally dispersed diaspora networks support each other, engage in trade, etc. Third is *development by diaspora* – the support that diaspora communities provide to sending/ancestral home communities through remittances, lobbying, etc.

These three dimensions combine to form an integrated whole that reflects how migrant/diaspora communities actually approach development.

The table below highlights some of the capacity building opportunities of diaspora/migrant activities.

### Table 1: Capacity building possibilities for diaspora/migrant activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development activities</th>
<th>In the diaspora</th>
<th>Through the diaspora</th>
<th>By the diaspora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Family remittances     | Banking the unbanked  
                        | Validating qualifications and providing access to job opportunities commensurate with skills and experience  
                        | Financial literacy training  
                        | Encouraging competition to reduce transfer fees  
                        | Pay special attention to gender issues and realities that women diaspora/migrants often feel more pressured to remit, even though their finances may be more precarious  
                        | Institution of temporary migration schemes to facilitate circular migration | Financial intermediation  
                        | Micro-finance institutions | Minimal regulatory burden to enable diaspora-owned MTOs, (eg Thamel.com) to operate on level playing field and play to their competitive strengths  
                        | Banking the unbanked | Policy initiatives to enable multiplier effects of remittances  
                        | Pay special attention to gender issues and realities that women diaspora/migrants often feel more pressured to remit, even though their finances may be more precarious | Access to business support for remittance receiving entrepreneurs – ensure women receive targeted support |
| Consumption of goods and services | Supporting migrant-/diaspora-owned businesses supplying home-country goods  
                        | Regulatory regimes that do not impose unnecessarily burdensome restrictions on importation of foodstuffs  
                        | Freedom of movement  
                        | Promotion of events, such as PANAFEST in Ghana to promote diaspora tourism  
                        | Use of procurement policies to support local, minority-owned small and medium-sized enterprises | Supply of home country commodities | Small business development – support for accessing export markets |
| Investment of capital   | Banking and credit services – access to transferable credit and joined-up banking | Encouragement and support for global | Respect for property rights (including with gender dimension) |

---

The table above highlights a number of salient points:

- Host and sending country governments both have vital roles to play in creating the enabling environment for diasporas/migrants to maximize the developmental impact of their activities. This transnational age demands more “joined-up” policy initiatives – eg the performance of minority-owned businesses typically located in inner-city areas with high immigrant populations is a matter equally for the trade and industry ministry as it is for the ministry (and local authority) responsible for integration as it is for overseas development ministry keen to see poverty eradication through, among other things, increased trade and exports.

- The private sector has vital roles to play in various aspects of facilitating diaspora/migrant activity.

- Sending country governments need to re-evaluate their development policy frameworks (eg Poverty Reduction Strategies) to take full account of the opportunities thrown up by diaspora/migrant activities\(^{11}\).

---

\(^{11}\) The government of Ghana has targeted non-resident Ghanaians (NRGs) as a potential source of funds for the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) and other poverty-related programmes. The financing strategy of the current GPRS identifies innovative financing mechanisms such as contributions from NRGs through a NRG Fund for Poverty Reduction. (Source, personal communication Michael Boampong, Young People We Care, Ghana)
Some concrete examples

The following are examples of deployment of resources, skills and knowledge, organization, politics and power, and incentives for the purposes of capacity building:

- Netherlands-based IntEnt has over the last ten years supported nearly 2,000 diaspora/migrant entrepreneurs from Surinam, Ghana, Morocco, Netherlands Antilles, and Turkey, to mobilize €12.5m to establish 200 businesses employing 840 people in their countries of origin. IntEnt is now seeking additional financing to replicate the program in other European countries.

- In 2005, the UK-based volunteering organization, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) established the Diaspora Volunteering Initiative. To date, VSO has provided technical and financial assistance to five diaspora organizations to establish or beef up volunteering programs and send over 100 volunteers to four countries in Africa and Asia. Some 50 diaspora organizations have approached VSO for support. VSO has also lobbied the UK government to make financial provisions for diaspora volunteering.

- Kacoke Madit (KM) is a UK-based diaspora organization formed in 1997 and made up of people from northern Uganda concerned about the conflict in their home region (at a time when some northern Ugandans in the diaspora were suspected of supporting the conflict from afar). In 1999, KM formed a partnership with international NGO, Conciliation Resources. According to KM, this collaboration “allows for a constructive relationship, which has helped KM to build its own capacities and enhance its role in supporting intermediaries and its partners.”

- In 2003, the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) negotiated with diaspora groups and individuals to establish an umbrella body, Connections for Development (CID), bringing together a diverse range of diaspora, migrant, black, and minority ethnic groups, communities, and individuals around their shared interest in international development from across the UK. CID signed a three-year Strategic Grant Agreement with DFID with the primary aim of facilitating better and more informed interaction between DFID and CID members. In June 2007, DFID commissioned independent external evaluators to assess CID’s progress and to ascertain whether to continue the funding relationship. To date, CID has a membership of 400. The organization has engaged members and relevant stakeholders in response to current international policy debates. Examples include: a) the UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development (2006); b) preparation for the civil society day at the Global Forum on Migration and Development (2007); c) Intercultural Dialogue on Migration and the role of migrants, organized by the Council of Europe (2007); d) Research to inform migration and development in collaboration with Institute Panos (2006-08); and e) DFID consultations of Ethiopian and Pakistani Country Action Plans (2007).

13 CID also undertook consultations on the 2007 DFID diaspora volunteering consultation and is planning another consultation on Caribbean issues. CID engaged African diaspora/migrant groups in preparing a response to the Joint EU-Africa Strategy on 29 May 2007. See www.cfdntwork.co.uk for more examples.
• In 2001, the London-based African Foundation for Development (AFFORD) partnered with Birkbeck College, University of London to establish the UK’s first development studies course taking a head-on look at the role of the African diaspora in contributing to Africa’s development. AFFORD also partnered with Oxford-based Fahamu to offer an innovative flexible learning course in fundraising and resource mobilization for diaspora/migrant organizations. AFFORD has now developed a model of delivering enterprise development support in African countries, tapping into diaspora resources, that it is able to franchise for the benefit of smaller hometown and other such associations.

• Formed in 2005 in the United States, The African Federation, Inc has embarked upon a series of consultations across the US to establish a framework for providing capacity-building support to African immigrant organizations.

• In 2003, Ghana enacted laws to allow dual citizenship, some 2,400 non-resident Ghanaians have taken advantage of this option. Ghana has also made it possible for people of more distant African descent but with no identifiable direct links (eg African-Americans) to Ghana to apply for Ghanaian citizenship and enjoy rights.

• Oxfam Novib aims to increase the voice of diaspora organizations in decision-making processes relating to development co-operation. To that end, Oxfam Novib stimulates the formation of migrant-driven national, regional, and international alliances between and among diaspora/migrant organizations. To date, Oxfam Novib has helped the formation of the following: Sudan Civil Society Forum (42 Sudanese member organizations); ENNOS (network of 15 Ethiopian organizations), Multicultural Women Peacemakers Network (18 women migrant organizations of various nationalities but mostly coming from conflict and post-conflict regions) involved in peace building activities in the Netherlands and in their countries of origin; Migrant women Initiatives in the Netherlands for Development (MIND), which focuses on gender-mainstreaming and women’s economic justice; and Diaspora Forum for Development (DFD), a network of 26 migrant organisations representing 17 countries.

• Oxfam Novib has also funded projects implemented by two large, well-established Netherlands-based diaspora/migrant development organizations: Stichting DIR Ethiopia/The Netherlands (€300,000 for three years, 2007-2010) and Himilo Relief and Development Aid (HIRDA) – Somalia/The Netherlands (€600,000, 2005-2007). DIR runs an Ethiopian coffee house in Amsterdam, Buna Bet Ethiopian Coffee project, for which it has received broad support from various Dutch funding agencies (Skan Fonds, Stichting Doen, VSB Bonds, as well as Oxfam Novib). It has also received technical assistance from foundations for new entrepreneurs (Start Foundation and GAK), and several others in the private sector (including graphics, accounting, and marketing firms).

• Formed in 1986 in Marseilles, south of France, Migrations & Développement supports a range of informal, semi-formal, and formal organizations of Moroccan migrants/diaspora groups (including young French-born people of Moroccan origin) to mobilize support for their villages of origin in Morocco. To date, more than 1,000 diaspora/migrants have contributed financially to various projects, and 300 of them were directly involved in implementation, benefiting more

---

14 Memo from Leila Rispens-Noel, Program Officer, Oxfam Novib, Linkis/Migration and Development, June 2007.
than 50,000 people in Morocco. One result has been the formation of a network linking France/Europe and Morocco. Some 150 village associations with responsibilities to oversee projects now exist. They are democratic structures that give voice to all the residents, especially women. These associations are sites that combine traditional knowledge, imported techniques and ideas from the diaspora/emigrants, and the dynamism of the youth.\(^\text{15}\)

- Diaspora/migrant actors in the UK have been at the forefront of the RemitAid\(^\text{16}\) campaign for tax relief on collective remittances for the purposes of international development. The RemitAid framework would support diaspora/migrant development initiatives through a common fund built on remittance tax rebates (similar to the gift-aid scheme that applies tax relief for domestic charitable donations).

- The Philippine Consortium on Migration and Development (Philcomdev) is a recently formed network of migrant and family organizations, NGOs, cooperatives, microfinance organizations, social enterprises, trade unions, networks both in the Philippines and abroad which are involved in the issue of migration and development. The aim is the realization of a strategy to enhance diaspora resources for the benefit of development\(^\text{17}\).

**Some success factors?**

The most successful of these initiatives have responded to demand by diasporas/migrants and played to their strengths and passions rather than co-opted them into pursuing agendas not their own. Skilled diasporas/migrants often undertake informal, ad hoc skills-sharing initiatives when visiting their regions of origin, for instance. What the capacity building support does is to add value, to put some structure on the ad hoc, to connect to wider structures.

Mainstream organizations that have engaged successfully with diaspora/migrant organizations seem to have had a combination of leadership vision and commitment at the top and operational capabilities and an understanding of working with diaspora/migrants groups to deliver results at the managerial middle (often through the agency of diaspora personnel working within the organization).

Another possible success factor has been the focus on clear development outcomes and what the partnership intends to achieve (both in terms of building capacity and in terms of development impact affecting people’s lives).

Such examples appear to agree with the Overseas Development Institute when it suggests that successful capacity building depends upon “long-term support based on strategic partnership, coherence and coordination between the actors offering capacity building and those whose capacity is being enhanced.” Also, “the question of roles and how they are negotiated is centrally important in capacity building.”

\(^{15}\) Personal communication with Jacques Ould Aoudia of Migrations & Développement, June 2007.
\(^{16}\) The (2007) UK Diaspora Civil Society Submission to the Global Forum on Migration and Development; Discusses the RemitAid concept in details. See [www.cfdnetwork.co.uk](http://www.cfdnetwork.co.uk); See also [www.RemitAid.org](http://www.RemitAid.org).
\(^{17}\) From GFMD civil society online discussion forum, [http://www.gfmd-civil-society.org](http://www.gfmd-civil-society.org)
Conclusion and questions

On the basis of the above examples: success factors and challenges can be identified, leading to the observation that capacity building is important to maximize diasporas’ contributions to development, and that it should include (in order of priority):

- Increased networking among diaspora/migrant groups and formation of mutual support structures is likely to happen only if diaspora/migrant organizations take the responsibility for developing the full range of their capabilities based upon where they want to get and how they want to get there. This, fundamentally, is a leadership and management challenge first and foremost. Diasporas and migrants shall not be able to realize their full potential unless they step up to this leadership and management challenge. Questions that arise include: what are the most appropriate forms of leadership development to enable diaspora/migrants to realize their full potential? Which institutions are best suited to facilitate this sort of leadership/management development?

- diaspora/migrant communities will be able to recognize their formidable strengths, if they combine forces to work together with fellow diasporas and migrants on national, regional, and global levels. This, therefore, is the second priority and recommendation for diaspora/migrant groups: to build, from the bottom up, structures that enable them to share ideas, learning, resources, strategies with fellow diasporas and migrants in order that together they can shape the agenda, influence policies, and mobilize the resources they need to make the lasting difference to their lives and the lives of their counterparts in regions of origin. In this respect, cooperation in light of the CSD of Global Forum on Migration and Development and next years’ meeting should be explored further: An immediate question is how can diaspora/migrant groups use the Civil Society Day of the Global Forum for Migration and Development to deliberate this issue and map out a way forward? What is a realistic target for the next year leading up to the next forum in the Philippines?

The establishment of a credit union may provide the institutional platform to bring all diaspora/migrant groups associated with one region together and use this to facilitate the strengthening of ties between diaspora communities and their home governments. Home governments, multilateral organisations, and foundations interested in bringing diaspora communities closer to their home government to accelerate development, address poverty and improve standards of living should support such initiatives so that diaspora communities can be moved to commit to nation building efforts to a new level of efficiency and to effectiveness.

- A recommendation to governments and funders is that they earmark significant funds specifically for diasporas/migrants to contribute to development, by living their transnational existences and scaling up the sorts of contributions they are already making. While this is public money and should be managed with all the probity, transparency, and due process to be expected of public funds, it is important that the criteria for accessing the funds work with, not against, the grain of the best that diasporas/migrants are capable of. The fund should not insist (as current funding mechanisms overwhelmingly do) that diaspora/migrant applicants contort themselves to fit the prevailing norms of mainstream professional development practice. It is possible to identify both product and process outcomes that are justifiable in public policy terms that diaspora/migrant groups can compete to satisfy. To the extent that such groups do indeed require more capacity building inputs and support, funders could experiment with voucher systems that enable groups to purchase what they need from
the suppliers best-placed to provide capacity building. **What are the obstacles now standing in the way of funders putting in place such funding mechanisms?** Can funders put in place voucher schemes to enable diaspora/migrant groups to purchase the capacity building they need? Can funders work with more established diaspora/migrant networks and umbrella bodies to manage such funds and programs?

Governments – sending and receiving – must recognize their central roles in creating the enabling environments within which diasporas/migrants can actualize their aspirations that have significant implications for development. Creation of integration programs in receiving countries which help migrants to address challenges such as illiteracy and enable them to become more confident investors in their home countries is one example. Sending/origin countries could mainstream investment promotion programs targeting their respective diasporas/migrants by making more effective use of their diplomatic missions in host countries.

• Although they tend not to present themselves as such, diasporas and migrants are active players in the development of their countries of origin, whether acting individually or collectively. Although now the hot topic of discussion, this phenomenon is neither new nor insignificant. Together, they have found ways of mobilizing and moving billions of dollars around the world each year; of sustaining households, communities, schools, and hospitals through good times and bad, so they certainly do have a lot of capacity.

Yet diasporas and migrants have potential to leverage far more impact from their efforts, but this is likely to happen only if they can work effectively with other actors, such as governments (both host and origin), civil society, and the private sector. Diasporas/migrants and NGOs working in the development field are natural partners,

• There is growing consensus that the vital jobs and vibrant economies needed that are a central part of reducing poverty and achieving development are impossible without the active participation of the businesses that must invest in the developing world, transfer skills, technology, and management know-how. With none of the baggage of the development sector to carry, one possibility to consider is that business and diaspora/migrants might form partnerships that effect development in the latter’s regions of origin. This, then, is a third priority and recommendation for diasporas/migrants – to explore partnerships and collaboration with “unusual suspects”, with whom they might achieve win/win outcomes. **How can diaspora/migrants form new alliances with business and other non-traditional development actors? What is the basis of win/win strategies?**

As part of their strategies to deepen their engagement in developing countries in which they operate, e.g. through supply/value chain initiatives aimed at strengthening local enterprises, corporate social responsibility, etc, businesses could partner with diaspora/migrant organizations from those regions as an integral element of the strategy.

• A recommendation to stakeholders wishing to establish programs with diaspora/migrant organizations is to treat them as co-owners and include them in the planning, identification, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project.
A number of mainstream NGOs have taken the lead in working with diaspora/migrant groups in ways that appear to speak to the best ideals of partnership, mutuality, and capacity building. However, this has happened relatively recently and few of these organizations have evaluated this work and this is an urgent priority and a final recommendation. Important questions include: What types of capacity-building interventions are most effective? Where do mainstream organizations add value to diaspora/migrants and vice versa?

Whatever the constellation of partners, the central question is: what can they achieve together? Only when the answer to that question is clear should we then address questions such as what forms of capacity building do different actors need to achieve these outcomes?
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