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Policymaking on integration is commonly regarded as primarily a matter of concern for the receiving state, with general disregard for the role of the sending state. However, migrants belong to two places: their origin and their destination. While integration takes place in the latter, migrants maintain a variety of links with the former. New means of communication facilitating contact between migrants and their homes, globalisation bringing greater cultural diversity to host countries, and nation-building in source countries that see expatriate nationals as a strategic resource have all transformed the way migrants interact with their home country.

The INTERACT project looks at how governments and nongovernmental institutions in origin countries, including the media, make transnational bonds a reality, and have developed tools that operate economically (to boost financial transfers and investments); culturally (to maintain or revive cultural heritage); politically (to expand the constituency); and legally (to support their rights).

The INTERACT project explores several important questions:

To what extent do the immigrant integration policies of EU Member States and the expatriate-focused policies of governments and nonstate actors in origin countries complement or contradict each other? How do policies in origin and destination countries affect the successful integration of migrants, and what obstacles do they raise?

Researchers in the European Union have produced a considerable body of high-quality information and analysis on the integration of migrants. Building on existing research to investigate the impact of origin countries on the integration of migrants in the host country remains to be done.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National governments in migrant-origin countries can be an important voice in promoting the integration of their nationals at destination; far less attention has been paid to the important role that subnational authorities in countries of origin can play. Relevant policies and programmes may be direct or indirect; that is, they may deliberately seek to further immigrant integration or have spillover effects that contribute to it. This report represents the first attempt to investigate how the activities of origin countries’ regional and local institutions may improve the lives of emigrants to Member States of the European Union (EU), and assesses the potential benefits of greater involvement.

In federal or otherwise decentralised states, subnational authorities may function at the region, state/province, or city (municipality) level. In decentralised and federal states, subnational (regional/devolved) authorities are often involved in diaspora engagement for development. A closer look reveals that activities meant to engage diasporas for development may also have relevance to issues surrounding integration. Moreover, they are also active in promoting employment, and often take up responsibility for informing, preparing, and protecting migrants who move to find a job abroad.

Migrant-sending cities, meanwhile, can only contribute to the integration of migrants at destination by cooperating with their institutional counterparts abroad. Most often such cooperation takes place through city-to-city partnerships. Municipal practices relevant to immigrant integration are more varied than those observed at the regional level. Besides interventions on employment, political participation, and health care, local authorities may contribute positively to integration at destination through diplomatic visits, community celebrations and other cultural initiatives, and educational exchange programmes—all of which help to increase trust and mutual understanding between immigrants and their host societies.

This report represents the first attempt to investigate how the activities of origin countries’ regional and local institutions may improve the lives of emigrants to Member States of the European Union (EU).

While the examples of good practice discussed in this report provide much hope for the future, a wide range of challenges hamper sending countries’ subnational authorities from doing more to promote the integration of emigrants at destination. Key challenges include inadequately devolved competences and—even where such competences are in place—financial constraints (affecting cities in particular) that make it difficult to address competing policy priorities and take opportunities to cooperate with host countries. Political discourse about migrants and the predominant role of national authorities in diaspora engagement may also discourage subnational authorities from doing more to further integration.

Enhancing the involvement of subnational authorities in integration efforts first requires greater recognition of these authorities’ potential impact. The subnational authorities of migrant-sending countries would do well to participate in EU-level city and regional networks and support immigrant integration in Europe through knowledge sharing, the exchange of best practices, and consultation on innovative cooperation mechanisms. It is important to include stakeholders from the private sector, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), and integration councils—as well as immigrants themselves—in the development and implementation of initiatives. Integration policies and programmes, be they initiated by destination or origin countries, are more successful and sustainable when key members of immigrant communities are involved as initiators, translators, and facilitators. Moreover, clearly defined goals and subtargets improve communication and trust among the stakeholders and communities involved. Expanding city partnerships between origin and destination localities is one promising avenue of action.
I. INTRODUCTION

Today, throughout EU Member States, the responsibility for the design and implementation of integration policies involves an array of institutions across national, regional, and local levels. Immigrant integration is a cross-cutting policy issue whose governance is shared (1) horizontally, across different government portfolios (regardless of the existence of a centralised integration authority at the ministerial level) and (2) vertically, by subnational and local authorities. EU-level governance also contribute to the governance of immigrant integration in Member States, notably by leveraging significant funding. International organisations, noninstitutional actors (e.g., from the private sector), and nongovernmental actors (including migrant organisations) play a key role. Within this framework, the INTERACT project is the first comprehensive attempt to explore the role of origin countries in the integration of migrants in destination countries. The project focuses on major migrant-sending countries to Europe and looks at the governance of immigrant integration using a holistic approach that encompasses the dimensions of employment, social welfare, education, health, political participation, culture, and social and residential inclusion.

Other INTERACT project deliverables have demonstrated that countries of origin can help further emigrants’ integration in host societies through diaspora engagement policies, which are mainly the domain of national authorities. This report aims to shed light on how the involvement of subnational actors in the design and implementation of policy measures can have a positive impact on the integration trajectories of migrants. In this report the term ‘subnational authorities’ is used in contrast with national-level authorities, and includes regional political entities, devolved authorities and federated states in decentralised countries, as well as cities (municipalities).

This report contributes to the debate on how the subnational authorities of origin countries can support the integration of migrants abroad, and discusses relevant obstacles as well as opportunities.

While much is known about how the subnational authorities of receiving countries help govern immigrant integration, little is known about the role of corresponding authorities in sending countries.

In the European Union it is largely recognised that subnational authorities play a central role in the governance of immigrant integration in Member States. Across the European Union regional and local authorities have competence over the implementation and delivery of a broad range of measures and services relevant to integration. The local level, in particular, is key: it is here that day-to-day integration takes place, policies are implemented, and practical solutions for long-term processes are found.

While much is known about how the subnational authorities of receiving countries help govern immigrant integration, little is known about the role of corresponding authorities in sending countries.

The activities of subnational authorities in immigrants’ countries of origin deserve greater attention. As of now, they are overshadowed by the substantial diaspora engagement policies seen most often at the national level. These policies, it might be noted, are relevant to integration even though they do not directly target it. A number of major migrant-sending countries (including Morocco, Turkey, and Mexico) have started to promote the successful integration of their immigrants abroad, with the expectation that successfully integrated immigrants have more to offer to their countries of origin.

3 INTERACT priority countries of origin are: Algeria, Belarus, Brazil, China, Ecuador, India, Lebanon, Moldova, Morocco, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and Ukraine.
4 Desiderio and Weinar, Supporting Immigrant Integration in Europe?
5 Ibid.
7 Rinus Penninx, Dutch Integration Policies after the Van Gogh Murder (Ottawa: House of the Commons, 2005).
11 Özge Bilgili and Melissa Siegel, ‘From Economic to Political Engagement: Analysing the Changing Role of the Turkish Diaspora’, in Emigration Nations,
The subnational authorities of origin countries have a particular role to play in diaspora engagement and integration, provided they are given adequate competences and resources.

In most of the migrant-sending countries analysed in this report, local authorities have traditionally lacked competence over any policy design, let alone that relevant to migrant integration. But as a significant number of these countries undergo decentralisation reforms and put forward efforts to strengthen local governance, exploring the role of subnational authorities in supporting migrants becomes less trivial. Against this background, this report investigates whether and how subnational authorities in origin countries are able to support the social cohesion and integration of migrants at destination. In many cases, such authorities hold valuable knowledge on migrants’ background, education and health records, skills, potential for employment in the destination country, and so on. Considering their specialised knowledge, how can the capacity of these authorities be strengthened to coordinate, fund, and effectively support immigrant integration in the long run?

Ultimately, gathering information on these processes and actively engaging with authorities at all levels of government in both sending and receiving countries may aid the design and implementation of new policy approaches to immigrant integration—particularly where relevant policy is being mainstreamed. It should be noted here that the role of origin countries’ subnational authorities cannot be understood independent of the migrant-receiving country context and of relations with counterparts at destination.

From the perspective of origin countries, the governance of immigrant integration is a matter of international relations. Subnational and local institutions in origin countries can only contribute to immigrant integration in cooperation with the subnational authorities in destination countries. Various forms of international cooperation can be observed at the subnational level; specifically at the local level, the most relevant is city-to-city partnerships (also referred to as town twinning). Enhancing cooperation between subnational authorities at origin and destination has the potential to effect cost-efficient integration management tailored to ‘the diverse diversities’ that make up the mosaic of the immigrant population in each EU Member State.

This report investigates the role of subnational authorities using two methods. The first is an extensive review of the literature on authorities in the origin countries addressed by INTERACT and any activities that may be relevant to immigrant integration. The second is primary research: interviews with government officials, policymakers, and practitioners from both origin and destination countries were conducted to gain detailed information on how subnational authorities cooperate and contribute to immigrant integration, and to evaluate the obstacles to more successful and sustainable interventions.

---

Enhancing cooperation between subnational authorities at origin and destination has the potential to effect cost-efficient integration management.

This report focuses on well-established migration corridors in Europe, with the assumption that the existence of historical links such as linguistic ties, chain migration, or geographical proximity makes cooperation easier.

After a general discussion of subnational actors in states where diaspora engagement has been decentralised, the report examines the linkages between Turkey and Germany, Turkey and the Netherlands, and Morocco and the Netherlands. The Morocco-Spain migration corridor is also explored. In all cases, the report distinguishes between direct and indirect involvement: that is, those policies and programmes that clearly aim to support migrant integration at the subnational level; specifically at the local level, the most relevant is city-to-city partnerships (also referred to as town twinning).

---


13 City partnerships are defined as the ‘construction and practice, by various groups and to various ends, of relatively formal relationships between two towns or cities usually located in different nation-states’. See Nick Clarke, ‘In What Sense “Spaces of Neoliberalism”? The New Localism, the New Politics of Scale and Town Twinning’, Political Geography 28 (2009): 496.
destination, and those that have a symbolic or ancillary role in doing so. Current challenges are discussed, as are the potential benefits of strengthening the role of subnational authorities in immigrant integration. In the conclusion, suggestions are offered on how to enhance this role.

II. SUBNATIONAL AUTHORITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT

In most of the major source countries for migrants to EU Member States, emigration and diaspora policy design remains highly centralised; the responsibility of local authorities is generally limited to implementation. In some cases, however, particularly in federal states, subnational authorities play a role in diaspora engagement. China, the Philippines, and India illustrate various ways that diaspora engagement is executed at the subnational level.

Establishing territorial branches of central diaspora institutions at the subnational level is one way to decentralise the governance of diaspora engagement. In China, the central Overseas Chinese Affairs Office (OCAO) has branches in 30 provinces and a number of cities across the country, making it one of the largest networks of local diaspora offices in the world.

The local offices of OCAO are mainly responsible for implementing the principles, policies, laws, and regulations of the central government concerning the affairs of Chinese citizens overseas. Their activities are bound strictly by national policy. Among various responsibilities, these offices research and draft detailed guidelines for implementation and supporting policies, and formulate development plans for engaging emigrants from their municipality.

For example, local offices are in charge of studying the conditions of overseas Chinese and suggesting cultural exchange programmes. In cooperation with the State Council and other relevant authorities, the local branches contact cultural organisations and the schools of Chinese nationals residing overseas to provide support for the work of these nationals. The OCAO office in Henan province, for instance, actively searches for Chinese professors to teach back home. Other local authorities in China, including in cities such as Shanghai and Macao, are also responsible for implementing nationally designed policies to engage the Chinese diaspora. The principles of these policies are to encourage immigrant Chinese to respect the culture of the host country, integrate with their host society, promote Chinese heritage and culture in the host country, and promote cohesion among Chinese communities abroad. Of note, integration is explicitly included in these objectives. The importance of this explicit reference should not be underestimated amid the diaspora policy’s overarching focus on development. In particular, the Chinese example illustrates the potential of decentralising diaspora engagement to strengthen cultural and linguistic ties.

Similarly, in the Philippines, the government has decentralised diaspora engagement at the subnational level through three special offices under the Department of Labor and Employment, and the Department of Foreign Affairs. In 2010 the Philippine Republic Act on Migrant Workers mandated local government units to establish overseas Filipino worker (OFW) desks, also known as migrant desks. These desks are an extended arm of the central

14 The Overseas Chinese Affairs Office (OCAO) is also involved in the formulation of relevant policies on the entry and exit of overseas Chinese. While this is not directly linked to the support of Chinese migrants’ integration in destination countries, it nevertheless influences it.
government agency—the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA), which operates at the local level under the Public Employment Service Office (PESO). In contrast to China, the migrant desks are not established in all local government units in the country, but only where PESO branches exist, which largely excludes rural areas. The establishment of the migrant desks has been a challenging and highly complex process involving many authorities at different levels. Namely, to set up a migrant desk, the regional director of the Department of Labour and Employment, the central government’s Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), and POEA sign a memorandum of understanding with a mayor to provide appropriate services for overseas Filipinos through the desk.

The Philippine example not only illustrates the complexity of decentralising diaspora engagement, but also indicates the main policy focus of the country’s diaspora engagement strategy: emigrants’ employment. The migrant desks contribute significantly to Filipino emigrants’ labour market integration abroad, and are thus involved in both diaspora engagement and integration.

In contrast to the two preceding examples, India is one of the few countries where the subnational level has direct responsibility not only for the implementation but also for the design of diaspora engagement policy, particularly in those states with large migrant communities abroad. Several states contributed to the development of the national schemes ‘Know India’ and ‘Study India’ (launched in 2004 and 2012, respectively), which aim to encourage young diaspora members to visit India. Furthermore, autonomous diaspora authorities have been established in several states with many emigrants abroad. In Kerala the Non-Resident Keralites’ Affairs Department was established in 1996 and holds responsibility for both policy direction and implementation. The department designs and implements a vast array of services for Keralite emigrants and stands out as an example of a subnational authority that is active in assisting migrant integration. The Non Resident Indian Department of Andhra Pradesh is another relevant example, notable for its services in assisting emigrants. Both departments develop programmes to raise awareness of illegal recruitment practices, assist in the authentication of educational certificates for those seeking a job abroad, provide predeparture training (e.g., to upgrade skills), provide medical assistance to emigrants abroad, provide legal assistance in cases of marriage or death abroad, and trace missing emigrants.

In sum, the cases of China, the Philippines, and India demonstrate the diversity of approaches to the institutionalisation, prevalence, and capacity of subnational authorities in the area of diaspora engagement. Moreover, while the most prominent activities of subnational authorities in the area of diaspora engagement aim to attract the contribution of diaspora members to local development (in accord with national government policies), others facilitate the economic integration and well-being of migrants at destination.

### III. SUBNATIONAL AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS’ INVOLVEMENT IN INTEGRATION ABROAD

Building upon the preceding section’s analysis of subnational authorities responsible for diaspora engagement, this section focuses in on cities (municipalities) to shed more light on the various subnational policy areas and efforts relevant to immigrant integration.

As has been stated, subnational and local institutions in origin countries may be involved in the various dimensions of integration either directly or indirectly, depending on the primary aim of the policies and projects that affect the integration trajectories of emigrants abroad. *Direct involvement*, while rare in origin countries, seeks to directly improve the structural integration of migrants in the receiving society, including—among others—a focus on their employment, health care, and political participation. *Indirect involvement* involves a policy action that does not name integration as

---

21 The Public Employment Service Offices (PESOs) are linked to the regional offices of the Department of Labor and Employment.
24 According to the India Centre for Migration the three major Indian states of migrant origin are Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, and Punjab.
an objective but yet has symbolic value or an ancillary role in promoting the integration of migrants in their countries of residence. This type of involvement contributes to social and cultural interaction and fosters a sense of belonging, loyalty, and identity. Table 1 summarises the similarities and differences between direct and indirect involvement with respect to areas of focus, the participation of immigrants and officials, goals, and impact.

Table 1. The role of subnational authorities in emigrant integration abroad: direct and indirect involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of focus</th>
<th>Direct involvement</th>
<th>Indirect involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural integration</td>
<td>Sociocultural integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic integration</td>
<td>• Cultural belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Political participation</td>
<td>• Identity formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health care</td>
<td>• Language training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of immigrants</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants personally participate in and benefit from programmes</td>
<td>• Pretraining courses</td>
<td>• Celebration of special days and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job fairs</td>
<td>• Cultural exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Voting in elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of officials</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects and activities jointly organised by authorities of migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries</td>
<td>• Knowledge sharing among health professionals</td>
<td>• Diplomatic visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of goals</th>
<th>Integration clearly stated</th>
<th>Integration not clearly stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration is initially identified as an expected outcome of projects and activities</td>
<td>• Integration might be an unintended consequence of projects and activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Measurable goals</th>
<th>Goals more difficult to measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Since integration is identified as a goal, the impact of efforts can be assessed if planned properly</td>
<td>• The impact of indirect involvement is more difficult to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantitative outcomes (e.g., participation in job training)</td>
<td>• Qualitative and subjective outcomes (e.g., mutual understanding, trust)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Examples of direct involvement

In some cases, subnational authorities directly aim to improve the integration and socioeconomic status of migrants abroad. Direct involvement is more likely to occur along certain policy dimensions than others. For instance, there are no examples of subnational interventions in migrants’ residential choices and segregation. INTERACT reports have also mentioned the lack of interventions in the fields of social welfare and religion. The most prominent examples of direct involvement, meanwhile, target emigrants’ labour market integration, political participation, and health care.


1. Employment

Institutions in origin countries often concentrate their activities on labour market integration as a way of managing emigration flows as well as preventing the illegal recruitment of their nationals. Furthermore, labour migration is a potential source of remittances to the origin country; as such, managing labour migration and protecting labour migrants may be part of a strategy to tap diaspora contributions. Diaspora investments in communities of origin are recognised for their potential to stimulate economic growth through job creation and increased local production.\(^{28}\) In this respect, the incentive for origin countries to support labour market integration abroad is clear—and is reflected in its priority among the relevant activities of subnational authorities.

In the case of the Philippines, the focus of subnational institutions’ engagement in immigrant integration is employment. OFW, or migrant, desks are primarily responsible for the dissemination of information on the various aspects of overseas employment; they also seek to support migrants who run into trouble in workplaces abroad.\(^{29}\) These desks provide updated lists of job opportunities and organise job fairs.\(^{30}\) The guidelines for conducting job fairs are set by the Department of Labor and Employment, whereas POEA is in charge of issuing licenses to overseas recruitment agencies seeking to participate.\(^{31}\) The migrant desks, which operate within the PESO branches established at the provincial and municipal level, facilitate the job fairs.\(^{32}\) By hosting and managing job fairs they contribute to the employment of potential overseas workers.\(^{33}\)

In India, similarly, state-level initiatives focus on predeparture training. For example, the Non-Resident Keralites’ Affairs Department designs and implements a vast array of services to further the labour market integration of Kerala emigrants, including predeparture training and orientation, legal assistance to overseas workers, and insurance schemes for domestic workers and unskilled labourers abroad. The objective of predeparture training is to provide information about the host society and potential jobs to help migrants navigate the destination country’s labour market.\(^{34}\) Moreover, the department protects migrant workers by addressing complaints of abuse and maltreatment from employers and recruiters. The department also works to raise awareness of illegal recruitment.\(^{35}\)

Other migration-related initiatives at the subnational level are carried out in partnership with international donors. The Skill Development Initiative for Potential Migrants is a pilot project implemented by eight northeast Indian states in partnership with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM).\(^{36}\) The objective of the project is to ready potential emigrants for the international labour market, with a focus on high-demand sectors such as hospitality and health care.

One example of cooperation between local-level institutions in origin and destination countries is a programme that invited citizens of Antalya, Turkey, to intern in geriatric care in Nuremberg, Germany. With the help of Turkish universities, the German municipality sought Turkish nursing staff to deliver services to the elderly within the Turkish immigrant community.\(^{37}\) In 2011 the European Commission hosted the first international conference on German-
Turkish city partnerships, where the Antalya-Nuremberg programme was highlighted. According to the mayor of Nuremberg, the programme not only enhances the quality of geriatric care in the community but also strengthens ties to Turkish culture.

Box 1. Partners across borders: City twinning along the Germany-Turkey corridor

On the German side, the most common reasons for selecting a particular Turkish municipality as a partner involve already existing contacts at the private or political level. Civil society on both sides also plays a role, most often through existing connections. The German town of Karlsruhe, for example, established collaborations with four different Turkish municipalities.

In recent years formal ties between German and Turkish cities and municipalities have been strengthened. In 2011 the German section of the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (RGRE) hosted the first federal-level network conference on German-Turkish municipal partnerships, bringing together representatives from cities across Germany. There are 80 formal partnerships between municipalities in Germany and Turkey, many of them set up during the 1990s. The beginnings of these partnerships vary. Many started as city council initiatives, often set in motion by mayors from the German or Turkish side. Others were established by unions, politically active individuals, or integration commissioners (as in the case of the Eschweiler-Dalaman partnership). Most partnerships were initiated on the German side; notable exceptions include the Düsseldorf-Izmir and Eschweiler-Dalaman partnerships. In the case of Dortmund and Istanbul-Beyoglu, city representatives met as joint participants in the European Culture Capital project in 2010. In the case of Schönbeck and Söke, the Turkish Ministry of Internal Affairs recommended the partnership after a Turkish businessman in Germany addressed the Turkish embassy.

An interesting example of a public-private partnership is to be found in Moldova, where cooperation with the private sector alleviates the burden of local authorities providing services to labour migrants (including potential ones) from various municipalities. In Moldova, the subnational and municipal authorities are not involved in the design or implementation of policies related to migration. The novel inclusion of the private sector is being pursued by NEXUS, a project funded by the European Union and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC). The initiative brings together local authorities, national governments, and the private sector (mainly banks). It facilitates cooperation among these actors and supports the development of strategies to service long-term labour migrants, potential migrants, as well as returning migrants. The project began in December 2012 and operates in four pilot areas (the rayon and municipalities of Cahul, Edinet, Ungheni, and Chisinau). Through the project, private institutions offer services such as savings, insurance, and transferable pension plans to current migrants. Services offered to potential migrants include the provision of information on visa regimes and employment conditions in popular countries of destination, recruitment services, housing, predeparture language and cross-cultural training, résumé preparation, personal financial planning, financial literacy and training, savings, insurance, pensions, and social networking services.

It is important to note that the Moldovan government initiated decentralisation and public administration reforms only recently, in 2012. As a result, local authorities will receive more competences, and thus must strengthen their capacities to offer more services. Against this backdrop, the national government has pursued projects such as NEXUS to develop new strategies for offering services to migrants at the local level. According to the project representative of NEXUS, ‘the real pain gain of migration does not fall on the national level, but at the local level’.

Sources: E-mail correspondence with Albert Stolz, co-author of RGRE Report for Heinrich Boll Stiftung, 26 September 2014; Rat der Gemeinden und Regionen Europas (RGRE), Deutsch-türkische Städtepartnerschaften: Bestandsaufnahme und Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten, Tagung des Rates der Gemeinden und Regionen Europas—Deutsche Sektion und der Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung in Nürnberg (Berlin: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, 2011).

---

30 Interview with Nicolaas de Zwager, project coordinator of NEXUS Moldova, 7 October 2014.
41 Interview with de Zwager.
local authorities do more to support labour migrants than do national bodies, they also expect to reap the most benefits.

As can be observed from the case of Moldova, nonstate partners (such as the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation for the NEXUS project) are filling the missing gap at the local level in cases where local authorities are limited by legal mandate and inadequate capacity.

The examples considered here clarify that subnational and local authorities cannot intervene in immigrant integration independent of national, external, or nonstate authorities. That being said, their inclusion in a variety of policies and practices in the field of economic integration is critical: local-level connections allow more efficient implementation and better targeting of individuals who may need support.

2. Political Participation

The Platform for Municipal Cooperation between the Netherlands and Morocco (Platform Gemeentelijke Samenwerking Nederland-Marokko), implemented with the Dutch Embassy in Rabat and the Dutch National Committee for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development (NCDO), offers an interesting example of how subnational authorities can encourage emigrants’ political participation at destination. Before Dutch local elections in 2006, the platform organised the exchange of 15 mayors, aldermen, and councillors from Morocco and eight Dutch cities with large Moroccan communities. The exchange aimed to demonstrate how local elections are organised in the Netherlands, as well as how citizens of migrant origin can participate.46 The Moroccan delegation participated as observers and encouraged individuals of Moroccan origin to vote in local Dutch elections.47

Box 2. Partners across borders: City twinning along the Netherlands–Turkey and Netherlands–Morocco corridors

The Netherlands is among the few countries to set up support programmes for municipal international cooperation. The main motivation for Dutch municipalities to link up with local governments in Turkey is directly related to the composition of their populations. Contacts were established with cities in Turkey, Morocco, Ghana, Surinam, Indonesia, and Cape Verde, where many long-term migrants come from. The Netherlands has also allocated a relatively large budget (compared with other countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]) to support these objectives. For example, up to 70,000 euros were granted to a municipal partnership per project period by the LOGO programme, financed by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. While relevant support programmes (implemented through multilateral and bilateral channels, and by nongovernmental organisations) have focused on governance processes, as well as on democratisation in Morocco and Turkey, key objectives have included cultural exchange and increased contact between authorities. The overarching aim is to communicate with migrant communities in the Netherlands and address their needs more accurately and efficiently.


There is a dual value in such initiatives. Not only are Moroccan subnational authorities uniquely placed to support emigrants from their specific localities, but their cooperation with partners overseas is important in the bigger picture. Since a shift in diaspora policy in the mid-1990s, the national government of Morocco supports the long-term integration of Moroccan citizens abroad. Local authorities may now participate in interventions in line with this policy perspective. As the permanence of diaspora communities overseas becomes accepted at both national and subnational levels (as it has in Morocco), cooperation between the subnational authorities of origin and destination countries is key.


3. Health-care services

Local-level cooperation between origin and destination actors may also help facilitate diaspora members’ access to mainstream health services.48 Informing emigrants about the health-care services in their country of residence is not enough, however. Considering that integration is a two-way process in which the host society must also adapt to the specific characteristics of newcomers, immigrants’ access to health services can be improved through the education of health professionals in multicultural issues. In fact, a former alderman of Labour, Higher Education, Innovation, and Participation of the municipality of Rotterdam states that the ‘key is to train everybody involved to do their job in a culturally sensitive manner—be aware of and able to adapt to cultural differences’.49

One important example of such an effort seeks to improve the day-to-day work practices of Dutch professionals providing services to migrants from Morocco. Diabetes is a relatively common health problem among Moroccans in the Netherlands. As a result of city-to-city partnerships, professionals working in the health departments of the municipalities of Amsterdam and Meppel received concrete advice on how to reach out to Moroccan immigrants with diabetes.50 For instance, one Dutch counterpart was advised to use Berber instead of Arabic when necessary, as most individuals in these communities—particularly at risk for diabetes—have a Berber background. Such examples illustrate how local actors specialising in similar fields can exchange knowledge to better support immigrants at destination.

B. Examples of indirect involvement

Subnational and local institutions demonstrate an interest and willingness to assist the integration of migrant communities by involving host countries’ local institutions in cultural and diplomatic exchanges. Such cooperation is believed to bolster mutual trust and thus social cohesion.51 Related activities include the visits of mayors and other officials from origin cities to migrant-receiving countries, media coverage of city partnerships, and the transfer of knowledge about cultural values and other issues relevant to migrants.

1. City partnerships

City partnerships involve a wide range of cultural exchange projects such as art exhibitions, school exchanges, and youth and sports activities.

In the cases of Morocco and Turkey many city-run activities are in the fields of education, culture, and language acquisition. Many collaborations involve youth, as in the case of a hospital garden in Berkane created by youth from Zeist in the Netherlands and Berkane in Morocco.52 This project furthered interaction between the youth of the two cities, and gave youth of Moroccan origin in the Netherlands a chance to learn more about Moroccan culture. Many nongovernmental actors, meanwhile, favour exchanges between students in both primary and secondary schools. Successful examples include exchanges between primary schools in Haarlem (the Netherlands) and Emirdag (Turkey), and secondary schools in Meppel (the Netherlands) and Al Hoceima (Morocco).53

In Germany, too, youth both with and without a migration background are encouraged to participate in cultural exchanges to gain a better understanding of migrants’ culture of origin. Youth with a migrant background who have never visited their origin country benefit from such experiences as they learn more about their heritage. German representatives from city partnerships cited participants’ positive feedback on exchange activities.54

49 INTERACT Project workshop, Barcelona, Spain, 23-24 October 2014.
50 Van Ewijk, ‘Window on the Netherlands’.
51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
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54 Interview with Walter Kluth, head of the association for the Cologne-Istanbul city partnership, 17 September 2014; interview with Daniel Nevaril, coordinator for the Nuremberg-Antalya partnership, 30 September 2014; interview with Brigitta Strunk, manager of City Partnerships at Berlin Senate Chancellery, 2 October 2014.
Of the many exchanges among local institutes, some are funded through EU instruments. For example, under the Comenius Programme, Turkish teachers were invited to participate and receive training in Moers, Germany. A participant teacher indicated that her presence helped Turkish-origin students improve their Turkish language skills, while students from all backgrounds learned more about Turkish culture.

Box 3. Mexican educational exchanges

Mexico offers a significant example of cultural and educational exchanges between migrants’ origin and destination countries. The Institute for Mexicans Abroad (Instituto de los Mexicanos en el Exterior, IME), created in 2003, offers programmes for Mexicans living abroad. Binational Teacher Exchange Programme agreements, which seek to meet teaching needs in U.S. schools, are signed with the federal Mexican Secretariat of Public Education and the U.S. Department of Education or local school districts. Another significant programme, Plaza Comunitarias, offers adult courses in Spanish literacy and writing, elementary and middle school education, computer literacy, and English as a second language. These courses enhance Mexican migrants’ opportunities to interact with American society. Considering that these programmes take place in the United States, and involve teachers from various backgrounds, they are exemplary in terms of providing an opportunity for social integration as well as cultural exchange.

An important component of the Advisory Council (Consejo Consultivo), which governs IME, is the 156 counsellors (consejeros) who represent the Mexican community. These counsellors work to share information on Mexican programmes, seminars, and training opportunities and to provide feedback to Mexican authorities to enhance their understanding of the needs of Mexican communities abroad.


By participating in exchanges between origin and destination cities, host-society members learn more about the culture of immigrant communities and gain a more positive outlook on diversity.

According to the local officials involved in the German side of exchange programmes, integration is consistently a goal, even if not explicitly addressed. One official stressed the importance of information sharing among the native-born German population: ‘Germans know Turkish people as their neighbours and they can be indifferent to them. However, once they participate in a cultural event hosted in the city or return from an exchange visit they are suddenly more interested in their culture’. The main objective of the Gladbeck-Alanya partnership, for example, is intercultural understanding, which can in turn aid integration processes.

In particular, the partnerships raised awareness among Germans, allowing them to understand the origins of new members of the society in a different light. They came to realise that individuals residing in the origin country are often likely to be more modernised than those who have migrated abroad. In a phenomenon seen in immigrant communities the world over, migrant workers from rural areas are often more conservative than large portions of their origin country’s population. The participation of contemporary residents of Turkey in exchange programs thus sheds new light on Turkish culture for all participants on the German side. Local authorities in receiving countries, meanwhile, learn more about how to address diversity-related issues. Consider the ‘Arm-in-Arm’ project, a one-year partnership between the city of Denizli in Turkey and Almelo in the Netherlands that took place in 2006. Three pilot schools participated in the project, meant to encourage parents to get more involved in their children’s education. As stated by Otto Snel, the head of the committee representing the city of Almelo, participating in this programme and visiting Turkish schools helped Dutch participants compare the education systems of Turkey and Holland, and gain a
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55 The Comenius Programme is part of the EU Lifelong Learning Programme. The programme seeks to develop knowledge and understanding among young people and educational staff on the diversity of European cultures, languages, and values. It helps young people acquire the basic life skills and competences necessary for their personal development, for future employment, and for active citizenship. See European Commission, ‘Comenius Programme’, updated 5 September 2014, http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/comenius/comenius_en.php.
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new vision for better aligning the education systems of these two countries. They also learned ways to better address the needs of youth from various cultural backgrounds.

In another city-to-city education exchange, as a result of cooperation with the Turkish city of Gaziantep, participants from the Dutch municipality of Deventer identified cultural differences in communication styles that helped them improve outreach to the immigrant parents of primary school pupils. The Turkish partners pointed to the Dutch delegation’s approach to announcing school meetings as too lenient, and suggested that they emphasise the compulsory aspect of parental involvement in education in the Netherlands. They warned that if this was not communicated clearly to migrant parents, such parents might misperceive the significance of these meetings and not attend unless their children faced significant problems in school. This is a clear example of how knowledge exchange among relevant local authorities can help the host society adjust to the diverse needs of specific migrant groups.

In a final example from a city partnership, a police officer from the Dutch municipality of Meppel noted that through his visits to Al Hoceima, he learned more about Moroccan people’s attitudes and behaviour. He discovered how active women are in civic life in Morocco; this observation encouraged him to do more to support the civic participation of Moroccan women of migrant origin in Meppel. It is important to mention here that Moroccans are under-represented in the Dutch police force. As a consequence, police officers may not gain organic exposure to Moroccan culture, a gap that may be filled by international partnerships at the local level.

In sum, the transfer of knowledge about cultural norms that occurs through official partnerships may go far toward enhancing immigrants’ participation in the host society and communication with city officials. Even where programmes do not state integration as a goal, cooperation at the local level may help those delivering mainstream public services in the host country (health-care providers, police, etc.) better understand and serve immigrant communities.

The transfer of knowledge about cultural norms that occurs through official partnerships may go far toward enhancing immigrants’ participation in the host society.

2. Cultural diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy plays an important role in international cooperation among local authorities. Before closing this discussion of indirect involvement, it is crucial to discuss the significance of cultural diplomacy between local actors. In Turkey, for example, official documents reveal that the country has been in the process of restructuring its foreign policy, including steps to expand the foreign policy instruments at its disposal and acquire new tools in such fields as public and cultural diplomacy. Numerous visits are organised every year between mayors and high-level administrators. These visits may also include community religious leaders. As a result of the partnership between Bursa and Hessen, Germany, for example, the mufti of Bursa and representatives of the Protestant Church of Hessen met during a Turkish-German cultural introduction and education trip. The mayor of Bursa points to such meetings as of extreme importance in bringing together the two cultures and fighting against prejudice. Diplomatic actions also translate into symbolic gestures between cities. For example, as a result of the cooperation between Vienne (France) and Emirdag (Turkey), a street in Vienne is named after its sister city. Such gestures of goodwill are especially important in cities linked by migration. News of them, disseminated in local newspapers and other media, boosts migrants’ trust that local authorities welcome their presence.
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The celebration of cultural heritage days in destination countries offers yet another opportunity to invite local officials and civil society organisations from migrant-origin countries to cities throughout Europe. For example, in 2011, Turkey celebrated its 50th year of migration to many European countries. Such commemorations provide yet another channel to promote cultural understanding among various nationalities and ethnic groups.

IV. CHALLENGES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES’ INVOLVEMENT IN IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION

While numerous examples of both direct and indirect involvement in integration exist at the local level, such activities are limited by various challenges. The involvement of subnational and local authorities seems to be the exception rather than the rule, and their role could be enhanced significantly—with promising results. This section highlights the issues that hamper subnational authorities from playing a larger role in the governance of immigrant integration. It first looks at various challenges faced by local authorities in origin countries, before summarizing those experienced at destination.

A. Constraints in the origin countries

1. Centralisation and constraints on local authority and funding

Centralised decisionmaking is the main culprit for the limited involvement of subnational authorities from origin countries. The competences of subnational institutions, in particular at the local level, remain limited in many migrant-sending countries. In countries where control is more centralised than less, a lack of autonomy at the subnational level magnifies any existing financial constraints. Subnational authorities are hindered from adding migration-related initiatives to an already strained budget.

In Morocco, new provisions of the Municipal Charter of 2002 furthered the nation’s decentralisation process, with a focus on local human development (such as access to basic services). But difficulties remain, such as in transferring responsibilities from the central government to local authorities. Amid fiscal constraints and a general resistance to change, competences are not clearly defined and much overlap remains. These are considerable obstacles to the engagement of local authorities with migrants abroad. Decentralisation processes are generally very complex and involve multiple delays in operationalizing new competences at the local level. A lack of capacity at the local level (e.g., for tax collection, service provision) often serves as a rationale for central authorities to legally devolve authority while resisting actual fiscal decentralisation. In Morocco, for example, research in the city of Berkane indicates that no funds are allocated for international exchange at the municipal level. The budget is centralised at the national level, limiting the decision-making role of the city.

In Turkey, current legislation indicates that the decentralisation process is proceeding apace. The responsibilities and powers of local authorities have expanded, while the central government’s oversight has diminished considerably.
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New laws have transferred new responsibilities and powers to local authorities, especially in the fields of health, education, and natural and cultural heritage. Yet the conclusion of international partnerships is still conditional on the approval of the Turkish Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the financial resources for such activities are also centrally assigned.\(^{72}\) Turkish municipalities, meanwhile, still have rather limited mandates.

Box 4. Decentralisation remains a challenge in various INTERACT priority countries of origin

The case of Lebanon reveals another facet of local governance. Namely, local authorities’ ability to execute their competences is conditional on political context. Amid a formal local democracy and ongoing national debates on decentralisation, in practice problems persist, including a lack of capacity to provide services, and political turmoil. As a result, municipalities remain weak.

In the case of Tunisia, for instance, regional governors and local administrators are appointed by the central government and do not have autonomy in decisionmaking. Although mayors and municipal councils are elected, they remain highly dependent on the central government. Even though local institutions appear to be independent structures, they act only on behalf of the central state and by means of its resources. Meanwhile, even if a wider range of responsibilities is assigned to local authorities on paper, little can be done without adequate resources (in the absence of local taxation and proper capacity to mobilise resources).


In the Philippines, decentralisation is viewed as an important element of democratisation. Since the adoption of the Local Government Code in 1992, significant functions—including basic service provision—have been transferred to lower tiers of government. The administrative structure is fairly complex and encompasses local government units at the level of provinces, independent and component cities, municipalities, and barangay.\(^{74}\) As competences have been devolved, the powers of local units to collect taxes have expanded. Such changes improve the capacity of subnational authorities along with their competence.

In the midst of this positive picture, corruption is a major problem that bedevils both national and local governments and constrains local authorities’ support of integration. Filipino overseas workers have appealed to the Philippines government to audit the work of the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration and Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) and get rid of corrupt officials exploiting overseas workers.\(^{75}\)

In sum, local authorities’ overall lack of competence presents a significant hurdle to their engagement in international cooperation and—ultimately—communication with migrant communities abroad. While decentralisation efforts are under way in several migrant-origin countries, changes have been slow. Local capacity must be enhanced to allow local authorities to actively engage in designing—not just implementing—policies related to migration.

2. Dominance of national institutions in diaspora engagement

Migrant-origin cities do not necessarily prioritise improving relations with migrants abroad, especially where the national level dominates diaspora engagement. This is clear in the cases of Turkey and the Philippines, where local authorities can only implement nationally designed policies on migration.

\(^{72}\) RGRE, Deutsch-türkische Städtepartnerschaften.

\(^{73}\) Independent cities are highly urbanised and are not under the jurisdiction of provinces, whereas component cities are part of a larger province.

\(^{74}\) The barangay is the smallest political unit into which cities and municipalities in the Philippines are divided. It is the basic unit of the Philippine political system; see Philippine Statistics Authority, ‘Concepts and Definitions’, accessed 14 September 2014, www.nscb.gov.ph/activestats/psgc/articles/con_lgu.asp.

Research on diaspora engagement policies at the national level in Turkey and Morocco indicate a change in political attitudes toward emigrants over the years. A focus on emigrants’ return has been supplanted by acceptance of substantial, permanent diaspora communities abroad. Today, both countries prioritise supporting the socioeconomic and cultural well-being of emigrants, and actively encourage links to their countries of origin. Such policies are believed to increase migrants’ willingness and capacity to contribute to the socioeconomic development of the origin country in the long run.

In Turkey, the Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities, founded as a public institution under the Prime Ministry, has the strongest say in developing and maintaining relationships with the diaspora. The predominant role of this national-level institution seems to be bolstered by citizens abroad, who are less likely to approach local-level authorities.

Meanwhile, the national bodies in charge of migration issues often do little to communicate with local authorities. For instance, the Presidency for Turks Abroad and Related Communities focuses on partnering with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Directorate of Religious Affairs, the Turkish International Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TİKA), the Council of Higher Education (YÖK), the Yunus Emre Institute, and the Public Diplomacy Office. Interviews with local officials also reveal a lack of communication between the presidency and foreign affairs departments of cities.

Meanwhile, it is important to note that the success of origin countries’ interventions to support integration, be they national or subnational, depends on the level of trust between origin-country authorities and emigrant communities overseas. For example, experts from the city of Barcelona indicate that members of the Moroccan and Pakistani communities in that city do not always choose to cooperate with authorities in their home country. Emigrants who, at origin, would find themselves in a minority or in opposition to the government party may be unwilling to cooperate with the authorities of their origin countries, even when the objective of such cooperation is to their benefit. If and when subnational authorities seek to collaborate in integration-related matters, they must first build trust and gain acceptance in emigrant communities.

3. Competing local priorities and challenges to sustainable cooperation

Constrained by limited competence and financial resources, local authorities often find it difficult to balance competing demands for public services. In Turkey, major metropolitan cities have foreign affairs departments involved in projects related to EU membership. Most such departments were established starting in 2005, when negotiations for accession to the European Union gathered speed. Meanwhile, EU funds were provided to help municipalities strengthen relations with European cities. Interestingly, few initiatives have addressed emigrants living in Europe.

Interviewees from origin countries state financial constraints as a key reason why little attention is paid to migrant issues.

Interviewees from origin countries state financial constraints as a key reason why little attention is paid to migrant issues; local authorities must prioritise domestic issues, such as local service provision, over international cooperation. According to an expert in foreign affairs at the Turkish Union of Municipalities, municipalities do not see cooperation with migrant-receiving cities as a priority. And there is little evidence to suggest that such relationships are sustainable. Few active partnerships address migrants living abroad. An official from the municipality of Izmir revealed in an interview that more than targeting Turkish migrants living abroad, the city hoped to promote tourism.
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through various cultural activities.  

Long-term partnerships are also difficult amid shifts in the political landscape. In the case of Antalya, the composition of the municipal department in charge of city partnerships with international partners completely changed after the March 2014 elections. In an interview, the Vice President of the municipality of Emirdag pointed to a need for newly appointed officials to take over their predecessors’ focus on cooperation. The leadership of mayors is important in this respect; city-to-city partnerships may stagnate when a newly appointed mayor is not eager to prioritise a particular initiative.

### B. Constraints posed at destination

#### 1. Multiple, misaligned actors, and financial constraints

Subnational authorities in origin countries cannot succeed in contributing to the integration of emigrants without the participation and partnership of authorities in destination countries. Strong cooperation between authorities at origin and destination is a core element of successful direct involvement. Thus, the potential and challenges of origin countries’ role in integration cannot be completely understood without looking at the context of the destination country.

In Europe integration policies that address the livelihoods of migrants represent a significant development of the past couple decades; the topic of labour market integration is covered by a large number of institutions. In Germany there is a clear division between subnational institutions that are directly involved in immigrant integration and those that indirectly address the issue. On one side are state institutions such as the regional-level Council for Integration (Landesintegrationsrat) or the State Advisory Board for Integration and Migration (Landesbeirat für Integrations-und Migrationsfragen) and integration councils at the city level, also found under the title Advisory Board for Foreigners (Ausländerbeirat). In addition, each city may adopt its own official integration policy. Local foreign policy and city partnerships fall within the portfolio of the local authority’s international relations department and are thus separate from the institutions in charge of integration. The involvement of various authorities in integration presents a hurdle to linking initiatives undertaken by city partnerships with broader local policies on immigrant integration, led by the integration councils. In this respect, it is important to improve coordination among the various relevant authorities to increase the effectiveness of subnational authorities.

Furthermore, recognising the importance of international cooperation on matters of integration requires a link with the foreign affairs portfolio, which is often disconnected from the integration portfolio. In 2014 Austria merged the integration portfolio with a restructured Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration, and Foreign Affairs. The government’s new approach highlights the ‘multi-faceted synergies existing between integration work in Austria itself and the realm of international affairs’. The merged portfolio sets out the goal of providing integration initiatives that involve countries of origin and promote measures—both at origin and destination—to prepare migrants for their lives in Austria.

Compared with migrant-sending countries, decentralisation is more advanced in many migrant-receiving European countries. For instance, local governments in the Netherlands have a significantly broad mandate and financial resources to develop their own policies for engaging with various partners within their locality. However, considering that part of the financial resources allocated to local governments is assigned by the central government, the decision-making power of local governments in how to distribute funds is limited. To cooperate with Turkey, Dutch municipalities could draw on the LOGO East programme, and to cooperate with Morocco several municipalities made use of
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the MATRA programme,90 both funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.91 However, these programmes were discontinued amid the global economic crisis. Subsequent budget cuts made it difficult to sustain the relationships built over the course of years. As noted by an official in the city of Barcelona, ‘hundreds of daily problems’ leave authorities needing to prioritise the most urgent. In this context, it is difficult to focus on international cooperation.

European funds can supplement central funding to local authorities in the areas of migrant integration and international cooperation. The European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals—otherwise known as the Integration Fund—has served as a building block for collaboration between EU Member States and migrant-origin countries, particularly in areas such as predeparture preparation and introduction to the host society.92 For example, the Diversity in the Economy and Local Integration Project, cofunded by the Integration Fund, supports migrant entrepreneurship.93 The newly introduced Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, mandated for the period 2014-20,94 benefits local public bodies. These structures should be utilised by all stakeholders to serve the interests of migrant communities and support their well-being.

2. Political and human-rights context

A multiplicity of actors at the subnational level—and their limited competence and budget for international relations, even in wealthy migrant-receiving countries—is not the only obstacle to cooperation with countries of migrant origin. It is also important to consider the political context and atmosphere. The definition of integration has become increasingly narrow in Europe, and migrants’ continued links with origin countries are often discouraged in this context. Notwithstanding the formal attention paid to predeparture activities in origin countries, which are expected to help integration at destination, some receiving countries are clearly distancing themselves from the model of the multicultural society.95 For example, in the Netherlands integration is increasingly defined by compliance with so-called Dutch values. In such a context, immigrants are expected to detach themselves from their origin, while their integration is addressed within the boundaries of the host nation-state.

Cooperation flounders when not supported by the central agenda—and, in the case of cities, by individual officials. Compared with Cologne and Nuremberg, whose mayors focused on partnerships with Turkey to further the interests of Turkish migrant communities, the political leadership of Berlin has shown less interest in forging similar partnerships.96

Cultural differences between destination and origin countries may influence such decisions. Amid media reports of discrimination against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community in Turkey, the Berlin mayor has distanced himself from an existing link with Istanbul. Human-rights issues thus directly impact international cooperation. The Berlin mayor has not conducted any official visits to Istanbul during the mandate of 2011 and 2014. Interview with Strunk.

3. Cost-benefit analysis and impact assessment

Some officials in destination countries complain that the investment made to cooperate with origin cities—in terms

90 MATRA stands for ‘societal transformation’ (an abbreviation of the Dutch terms Maatschappelijke TrAnsformatie). The program was initiated in 1994 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 2006 the MATRA programme included all countries around the Mediterranean. A special focus of the MATRA programme was youth participation and good governance in Morocco. See Van Ewijk and Baud, ‘Partnerships between Dutch Municipalities and Municipalities’.
91 In addition, support for Dutch-Moroccan partnerships is part of the EU policy on promoting stability in ‘Europe’s new neighbouring countries’.
96 The Berlin mayor has not conducted any official visits to Istanbul during the mandate of 2011 and 2014. Interview with Strunk.
97 Interview with Strunk.
98 Interview with Strunk.
of time, money, and human resources—does not necessarily pay off. An official from Barcelona argued that, amid differences in approach and resources, it is often difficult to work together with migrant-origin cities. This point was also recognised by a representative of the Turkish Union of Municipalities. According to these sources, city partnerships between migrant-sending and migrant-receiving cities are challenged by differences in the policy agenda and in resource levels. Most Turkish emigrants originate from rural areas and small towns then settle in larger migrant-receiving cities. A town with a population of about 40,000 people and a large metropolis such as Berlin function in very different ways, making it difficult to sustain any relations established.

Meanwhile, it remains a challenge to prove the efficacy and impact of subnational authorities’ involvement in immigrant integration. According to the Berlin Integration Council, city partnerships are most often limited to cultural trips and exchange visits and as such do not necessarily improve the lives of migrants. However, it is important to note that these remarks are subjective and not based on evidence. Few evaluations of the impact of subnational and local authorities’ involvement in immigrant integration exist, perhaps because gauging it is highly complex and difficult. It is especially difficult to assess the impact of indirect involvement. Considering the high importance accorded to evidence-based policymaking, more investment can be made in the monitoring of policies and programmes in this area. For example, the effectiveness of Moroccan authorities’ efforts to encourage emigrants to participate in local Dutch elections in 2006 could have been followed more systematically and better assessed.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The subnational authorities of origin countries are relevant to the governance of immigrant integration in host countries. Examples of direct subnational support of emigrants’ employment, health care, and political participation indicate such authorities’ potential to further emigrant integration. Moreover, some level of communication exists between many local authorities at origin and at destination, especially at the city level. In fact, many migrant-sending and receiving cities, especially those linked by chain migration, are in partnerships that provide a useful platform for collaboration and participation in joint activities.

However, significant obstacles hamper the potential contribution of subnational entities. In origin countries the capacity of local government administrations to address international cooperation is most often limited by a lack of legal competence. Local responsibilities in origin countries rarely include foreign policy, putting precise bounds on any possibility for international action. Recent moves to decentralise authority (for example, in Turkey) have focused on building local capacity to deliver services and handle local community issues. Local authorities in origin countries are, by and large, excluded from policy design, and their potential to understand migrants’ interests and reach out to emigrants is overshadowed by national policy priorities.

Examples of direct subnational support of emigrants’ employment, health care, and political participation indicate such authorities’ potential to further emigrant integration.

Subnational actors in origin countries are also constrained by a lack of financial resources. Most city partnerships derive from the local and in-kind contributions from participating members, or are covered by particular donor-supported projects. A lack of political will to address issues of migrant integration abroad is underpinned by the size of local budgets. In countries where subnational institutions remain financially dependent on national budget allocations, it is unlikely that adequate resources will be allocated to international cooperation. Where local authorities are given responsibility to look after the interests of emigrants abroad, their actions are commonly limited to diaspora engagement—most often attempts to attract the investments of labour migrants to help local development at origin.

From the perspective of destination countries, international cooperation with the subnational authorities of origin countries is not necessarily a priority. Local authorities must balance a myriad core tasks under often tight financial
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constraints, without much political and policy support to consolidate international partnerships.

Lack of coordination among organisations from both sending and receiving countries is an additional impediment to effective integration policy. This gap is widened by a lack of communication across governmental levels. For example, activities undertaken by local partners from Turkey and Germany may not have strong links with the work of the integration councils at Germany’s local level. As stated by a local official, ‘in Berlin, we have 130,000 citizen[s] of Turkish origin; it’s a very large community and we could use the Berlin-Istanbul partnership much more to benefit them’.

The role of origin countries’ subnational authorities in supporting the governance of immigrant integration needs to be discussed within the broader debate on integration. It is to be argued that strengthening migrants’ links to their home country aids their integration at destination. Support from subnational authorities can help migrants gain visibility and foster mutual understanding. In addition, subnational authorities can react more quickly to conditions on the ground. Smaller institutions are comparatively more flexible than national ones, and may be able to quickly develop programmes and activities that meet the needs of emigrants—and official partners at destination—as they arise.

Building upon existing city partnerships is pivotal. Despite being limited in their freedom to design new policies, local institutions in origin countries are often allowed to enter international cooperation through formal partnerships. This provides an important channel for reaching migrant communities abroad. Even when activities do not specifically aim to promote integration, it is important to recognise their potential positive impact on the lives of emigrants. Knowledge transfer and mutual understanding are more likely to occur when their value is recognised.

Building upon existing city partnerships is pivotal.

Other actors also have a part to play in promoting integration. Nongovernmental associations both in origin and destination countries can serve as a necessary link. Local authorities in origin cities must utilise such links to reach out to emigrants. Moreover, further coordination between integration councils and the international relations departments in origin cities would help streamline initiatives. The case of the NEXUS project in Moldova illustrates what strong cooperation can achieve. The project brings together authorities from both national and local levels together with actors from civil society and the private sector to develop new mechanisms of communicating with current and potential emigrants. Without the involvement of the private sector, immigrant associations, and other nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), it is very difficult to maintain initiatives in the long term.

For the success of partnerships between subnational authorities at origin and destination, it is extremely important that the two sides be seen as equal partners. When exchange is mutual, both sides become more receptive. This is relevant to the advice given in the city partnerships’ handbook of Turkey: it is best if municipalities cooperate with others of similar capacity and size.

When representatives of origin communities are involved in projects to bolster migrants’ well-being at destination, the projects are more successful. Migrants and migrant organisations are best included in any relevant partnerships, which stand to benefit from these actors’ existing transnational links and networks. Migrants can also facilitate transnational exchanges: they are important sources of knowledge, and can successfully bring together the right partners for cooperation. They also serve as transnational links themselves. A representative of the municipality of Emirdag, for instance, notes that the city has a strong connection with the municipality of Saint-Josse-ten-Noode in Belgium: the current mayor, Emir Kir, is a Turkish immigrant from Emirdag.

The suggestions and examples provided in this report indicate ways that subnational authorities can successfully participate in the governance of immigrant integration. To aid evidence-based policy design, the relevant activities and interventions of authorities need to be systematically monitored and evaluated. A comprehensive evaluation of rele-
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vant activities, both during their implementation and after their completion, will go far toward informing policymakers about the potential role of subnational authorities in fostering migrants’ integration.

Finally, it is of great importance that local authorities at both origin and destination cooperate with EU-level institutions. Building on local authorities’ existing responsibilities for migrant integration in Member States, the European Union could support deeper collaboration between these states and migrant-origin countries. According to city officials in Rotterdam, an effective way for migrant-receiving cities to improve integration measures for migrants is to communicate with—and learn from—other migrant-receiving cities in European countries. This points to the value of EU-level platforms for knowledge sharing and communication—one that can only be increased by the knowledge of subnational authorities in origin countries. Networks of international collaborators may provide a first pathway for exploring the potential contribution of subnational authorities to integration governance.
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