



Risbo

Research-Training-Consultancy

Erasmus

Shared Concerns, Inadequate Cooperation

Diaspora organisations, the Dutch authorities and migration practices

Marion van San

Colophon

**Shared Concerns, Inadequate Cooperation
Diaspora organisations, the Dutch authorities and migration practices**

**M. van San
Rotterdam: Risbo / Erasmus University Rotterdam**

July 2016

Erasmus University Rotterdam/Risbo
P.O. Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
Tel.: +31 (0)10 4082124
Fax: +31 (0)10 4081141

© Copyright WODC. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced and/or published by means of printing, photocopying, recording or in any other way without the prior permission of the Board of the Institute.

Contents

Summary	5
Chapter 1 Introduction	9
Chapter 2 Presentation of the Findings	21
Chapter 3 Conclusion	37
Consulted Literature, Documents and Websites	41
Appendix 1 Consulted Key Informers	49
Appendix 2 Selected Diaspora Organisations	50
Appendix 3 Characteristics of Diaspora Organisations	51
Appendix 4 Selected Staff Members Government Agencies	55
Appendix 5 Supervisory Committee	56

Summary

The literature shows that several countries still recognise the importance of diaspora organisations in current migration practices. The general consensus is that these organisations are able to build bridges between communities and in addition create transnational communities which are important for both the host community and the countries of origin. Moreover, it is generally recognised that diaspora organisations can make a significant contribution to the development of the countries of origin. In various countries, government organisations assign an important role to diaspora organisations and take steps to facilitate their involvement. Diaspora organisations have also been regarded as important actors in migration practices in the Netherlands for many years.

This report first examines the role which diaspora organisations play in migration practices in the Netherlands (in terms of promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging voluntary repatriation), how they go about this and how this is assessed by Dutch government employees. It then examines the obstacles and opportunities which arise in the cooperation between diaspora organisations and the Dutch authorities¹ in the implementation of migration practices.

Method

The first step was to conduct a literature study on diaspora organisations in general and the role they could play in migration practices in the Netherlands in particular. Ten diaspora organisations were then selected and asked about their role in the implementation of migration practices. The selected organisations were examined as separate cases. For instance, we broadly examined the objectives of the organisations, their areas of work, their relationships with the ministries involved, their attitudes towards repatriation and their ties with the country of origin. The selected organisations were then visited and (group) interviews with several staff members were held. In this way, we obtained a good impression of their way of working. The acquired knowledge was then

¹ Here, "the Dutch authorities" refers specifically to the Ministry of Security and Justice, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment and municipalities.

used to enter into a dialogue with Dutch government employees who deal specifically with migration practices and deal or work with diaspora organisations on a professional basis. Both personal and group interviews were held with eight officials.

Main Findings

Diaspora organisations organise all kinds of activities which are conducive to integration, sometimes with government assistance, sometimes self-financed. The activities they organise are usually in response to the demand of their members. The authorities sometimes ask the organisations to focus on integration and, if requested, make a financial contribution to this. Only a few of the organisations which are the focus of this study are involved in the reduction of irregular immigration. They recognise the problem, but have no idea how to deal with it. However, the organisations do, in general, provide assistance and support to fellow countrymen residing irregularly in the Netherlands. Some organisations have made repatriation their core business. Others are strongly opposed to the repatriation of fellow countrymen to their country of origin.

The assessments of the activities of the diaspora organisations by government employees vary considerably. They believe that some of the organisations do good work, but are much less enthusiastic about other organisations. Incidentally, this study shows that there are not very many contacts between Dutch government agencies and diaspora organisations. Most government employees therefore do not feel called upon to assess the activities of diaspora organisations. A problem which most government employees do signal is that, in their view, diaspora organisations often have good contacts with their fellow countrymen in the countries of origin but have difficulty with the financial management of their organisation. The respondents believe that this is the reason why most diaspora organisations do not exist for very long.

Most of the diaspora organisations are critical of their cooperation with the Dutch authorities. They believe that this cooperation is generally non-existent. They are critical of the fact that, in their view, the authorities are not interested in consulting diaspora organisations but prefer to make all decisions independently. The government employees are considerably more positive about their relationship with the diaspora organisations, although there is some distrust and they admit they would rather not work

with some of the organisations. It also appears that most of the diaspora organisations are not on good terms with the authorities in the countries of origin, and that there is usually a lot of distrust of these authorities. This study found little evidence for the assertion that diaspora organisations could mediate between the Netherlands and the authorities in the countries of origin, something which is often suggested in the literature.

One may also conclude that diaspora organisations which receive government grants have, in any case, greater scope for action in the implementation of migration practices than organisations which depend on their own resources. An oft-heard complaint from organisations is that they would like to initiate all manner of things but lack the financial resources to do so. Moreover, initiatives are easier to take when they are embedded in a cooperation with the Dutch authorities. For the very same reason, organisations which work exclusively with volunteers are considerably less ambitious in what they wish to achieve, and therefore have less influence than organisations which have employees on the payroll and where migration practices form part of their daily operations.

Positive trends can nevertheless be identified. For instance, it seems that organisations which have good contacts and networks in the countries of origin and which, moreover, maintain good contacts with NGOs in the countries of origin have more opportunities to play a role in migration practices in the Netherlands. When such contacts do not exist, their role is usually very limited.

There are also opportunities which could benefit the collaboration between the authorities and diaspora organisations. For instance, both the organisations and the government employees agree that more should be invested in the countries of origin, that potential immigrants should be better informed so that they can make informed decisions when they decide to migrate to the Netherlands and that returnees should be given better opportunities in the countries of origin. So government employees and diaspora organisations do indeed have shared concerns about the groups discussed in this report. However, they are for the time being unable to agree on how they can expand this common agenda, and their collaboration remains inadequate.

Chapter 1 Introduction

The significance of the so-called “diaspora” has often been pointed out during discussions on migration over the past few years. Although the term is defined in different ways, it is often referred to as “transnational communities of a particular kind, characterized by having experienced movement from an original homeland; a collective myth of home and strong ethnic-group consciousness; a sustained network of social relationships with group members; and, in some definitions, expectations of return to the homeland” (Clifford, 1994; Safran, 1991; Van Hear, 1998; Sinatti & Horst, 2015). Critics believe that the concept suggests that there are communities, while those who are considered to form part of the diaspora are often divided, fail to act as a community and have as much in common with people outside as inside the group (Turner & Kleist 2013). Migrants who are involved in activities in their country of origin have nevertheless largely adopted the term and claim that they do the things they do “in the name of the diaspora” (Kleist, 2008; Sinatti & Horst, 2015).

Despite the prevailing criticism of the concept, several countries still recognise the importance of diaspora organisations for today's migration flows. The diasporas are thought to be able to build bridges between communities and create transnational communities which are important for both the host community and the countries of origin (IOM 2013: 19; Keusch & Schuster, 2012). Moreover, it is generally recognised that migrants can make a significant contribution to the development of the countries of origin by means of transnational activities, such as remittances or (temporary) repatriation (De Haas, 2010; Nyberg-Sørensen et al., 2002; Portes, 2009; Van Naerssen et al., 2011; Sinatti & Horst, 2015). Government organisations in several countries assign an important role to diaspora organisations and steps are taken to facilitate their involvement.

For many years the Dutch authorities² have also regarded diaspora organisations as important actors in the current migration policy (Frouws & Grimmus, 2012). In this study, we will first examine the role which diaspora organisations play in migration practices and how this is

² In this study, “the Dutch authorities” refers specifically to the Ministry of Security and Justice, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment and municipalities.

assessed by Dutch government employees. We will then examine the obstacles and opportunities which the diaspora organisations believe mark their collaboration with the Dutch authorities in the implementation of migration practices. Finally, this raises the question of how Dutch government employees view this relationship.

Diaspora Organisations and Migration Practices: Defining the Scope

To avoid confusion about what is meant by “diaspora organisations”, we will first define the scope of the term, since it is important to be very clear about what is meant by this here in this study. As we will see further on, the Netherlands has a large number of migrant organisations. Migrant organisations are primarily oriented towards the countries of residence, where they mostly organise activities for their fellow countrymen. However, a smaller number of organisations are also oriented towards the countries of origin. We have therefore defined the scope of the term “diaspora organisations” as follows: “diaspora organisations” include migrant organisations which not only serve their fellow countrymen in their country of residence, but also contribute to the development of the countries of origin.

Diaspora organisations are involved in migration practices in different ways. For instance, they organise activities relating to emancipation, participation and integration, amongst other things, but they also promote their culture in the countries of residence and provide assistance in the countries of origin. However, in this study we are particularly interested in the activities of diaspora organisations which aim to encourage the integration of immigrants, prevent irregular immigration and promote voluntary repatriation. We have defined this scope in close consultation with the client.

Diaspora Organisations and the Relationships with the Countries of Origin

Since the end of the nineties, several European countries have pursued a policy geared towards stimulating development in the regions of origin. The Netherlands has also undergone a shift in thinking about migration and development (Nijenhuis & Broekhuis 2010: 249). For instance, with the publication of the memorandum *Development and Migration*, which was followed up by the *Policy Memorandum Migration and Development* in 2008 and the *Annual Policy Report 2014. Migration and Asylum in the*

Netherlands (2015), the country has since 2004 been pursuing a policy which focuses on migration and development. The countries of origin also seem to encourage emigrants to continue to dedicate their efforts to the development of these countries. These policy measures, also referred to as “diaspora engagement policies”, are about promoting the ties between migrants and their countries of origin, encouraging remittances, making financial investments in the countries of origin and contributing to the development of the country of origin (International Migration Institute, 2010: 3). Incidentally, it should be borne in mind here that these kinds of measures can also have undesired side-effects, such as creating relationships of dependence and political influence.

The Netherlands has for many years been encouraging the positive role which migrant organisations can play in the development of the countries of origin, although there seems to have been a recent change in attitude, as the interviews with government employees, amongst other things, will show further on in this report. The added value of migrant organisations in international cooperation is said to lie, amongst other things, in the fact that they speak the same language and know the culture of the countries of origin well, i.e. they possess specific human and cultural capital which is important for development cooperation. Transnational networks of immigrants and their organisations also create direct links to the local communities (Nijenhuis & Broekhuis 2010: 248). The financial contributions of migrant communities in the form of remittances are also considered to be appealing, and much is expected of the transnational networks which migrant organisations can establish, enabling them to contribute to a more permanent cooperation between the countries of residence and the countries of origin (North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, 2006; Kusters, 2007; Otieno Ongayo, 2014). For example, staff members of migrant organisations can be (temporarily) posted abroad or be involved in the implementation of projects, whereby migrant organisations raise funds in the Netherlands for setting up a project in the region of origin.

Policy-makers often have high expectations of the contribution of immigrants and their organisations to the development of the regions of origin (Ionescu, 2006; Schüttler, 2008; Bakewell, 2009). Although relatively little research has been carried out into specific initiatives and their actual results, the dissertation of Hein de Haas (2003) has been agenda-setting for the Netherlands since De Haas showed how the Moroccan diaspora contributed to the social and economic development

of the Todgha valley (an area in South Morocco) by means of remittances and other things. Since the publication of his dissertation, the importance of the contribution of immigrants and their organisations to the development of the regions of origin has often been highlighted in policy documents. However, there were of course also some doubts about the added value of involving migrants in development cooperation (Schüttler, 2008; Bakewell, 2009). Some authors are even rather sceptical (Grillo & Riccio, 2004; Nijenhuis & Broekhuis, 2010). For instance, they believe that the involvement of immigrants in development cooperation could result in the exclusion of immigrants in the country of residence since their involvement with the region of origin could easily be interpreted as a lack of loyalty. Moreover, immigrants in conflict areas do not necessarily have an added value and immigrants who have been away for a long time might no longer have access to local networks (Nijenhuis, 2013). Nijenhuis and Zoomers (2015) have studied the contribution of migrant organisations to the development of the regions of origin. They came to the conclusion that only a small minority of migrant organisations carried out transnational activities in the regions of origin within the formal scope of Dutch policy. The vast majority of organisations initiated activities themselves, carrying them out without any Dutch government involvement. There was also often no contact with the local authorities. In this context, the idea of migrants as mediators should be nuanced (Nijenhuis, 2013).

Diaspora Organisations and Migration Practices

As previously stated, a large number of highly divergent migrant organisations are active in Europe (Riccio 2008, 227; Cebolla Boado & López-Sala, 2012; Van Heelsum & Voorthuysen 2002; Van Heelsum 2004). This is also the case in the Netherlands (Nijenhuis, 2013). Some have a religious function, others focus on sports and leisure activities. Some are intended for specific groups: women, young people or members of certain ethnic minorities. Others dedicate their efforts specifically to the integration of their members, e.g. by providing information on work, language and integration courses and healthcare or by organising activities for immigrants, to facilitate the creation of migrant networks (Van Ewijk & Nijenhuis 2016: 134).

Most migrant organisations focus on the integration process of individual migrants in the Netherlands. A much smaller group also develop activities in the regions of origin in order to stimulate local development (Nijenhuis,

2013). Diaspora organisations also organise a wide range of activities for their target group. For instance, they organise cultural events in order to preserve their own culture. Some also try to encourage a smooth integration of their fellow countrymen. They try to promote trade relations with the countries of origin and support development projects. Furthermore, they protect and defend various interests and rights of fellow countrymen and play an important role in reducing irregular immigration to the Netherlands by providing information on the associated risks (Van Naerssen, Kusters & Schapendonk, 2006).

According to Van Ewijk and Nijenhuis, the reasons why migrant organisations are involved in transnational activities are fourfold: to create moral ties, to encourage political participation, to encourage economic initiatives and goodwill. Moral ties form the basis of many transnational activities of diaspora organisations. These ties are closely related to the relationships between immigrants in the host community and those who were left behind in the country of origin. For example, their aim is to implement economic changes in the long term by supporting economic initiatives. By investing in the local economy, diaspora organisations can bring about a situation which, if they were to return themselves, they would regard as improved (Schüttler, 2008; Lacroix, 2005; Henry & Mohan, 2003). Several other studies show that diaspora organisations often want to do something for the communities which stayed in the country of origin. They feel privileged as a result of the opportunities they were given in the host community and want to share some of this with the less fortunate who were left behind (Lacroix, 2010b; Nijenhuis & Zoomers, 2015).

Diaspora Organisations and Encouraging Integration

There has been much discussion over the last few years about whether diaspora organisations are able to encourage integration among their fellow countrymen in the countries of residence, both in the political and academic communities. While the general consensus among Dutch politicians at the end of the nineties seemed to be that transnational involvement and integration are at odds with each other and that the continuing identification with the country of origin or with internationally dispersed migrant communities (usually referred to as “the diaspora”) would form an obstacle to the integration in the country of residence, diaspora organisations have over the last few years been used increasingly to help promote the integration of their fellow countrymen.

There also seems to be a growing consensus that integration in a host community is an instrument of empowerment for diasporas, putting them in a better position to contribute to the development of their countries of origin (IOM 2013: 27).

Da Graça (2010) showed that the role which self-organisations play in the integration of their members is often an item for discussion during academic debates. Various authors (Van den Brink, 2006; Van der Zwan, 2003; Cliteur, 2004; Brink, Tromp & Odé, 2003) question the integration-enhancing role which these organisations can play. This view is in contrast to the view that self-organisations can indeed play a significant role in the integration of their own communities and that they do not hinder successful integration (Canatan, Oudijk & Ljamai, 2003; Sunier, 1996; Fennema et al., 2001; Rijkschroeff et al., 2004; Verweel & Janssens, 2005; Van Daal, 2006; Steijlen, 2004; Gowricharn, 2009). Snel, Engbersen and Leerkes (2004) showed that the alleged tensions between transnationalism and integration are significantly relativized in the international literature. For instance, Portes, Guarnizo & Landolt (1999) pointed out that transnational economic activities *could* be an alternative route to social success for young, disadvantaged migrants. In his study on migrants in the US, Portes (2002) showed that, on the one hand, successful migrants have strong ties with fellow countrymen, both in the United States and in their country of origin, but that, on the other hand, they are also well integrated into American society. The strong transnational involvement of migrants and their integration in the country of residence are therefore not mutually exclusive. Furthermore, several authors (Gans, 1992; Waters, 1990) showed that the relationship between transnationalism and integration can differ per social class. The rediscovery of their ethnic roots can have important symbolic value for settled migrants who have risen to the middle class in their country of residence without interfering with their integration. In contrast, operating in transnational areas may cause disadvantaged groups of migrants to turn their backs on the country of destination, thereby forfeiting their last opportunities to achieve social success (Joppke & Moraskwa, 2003; Levitt, 2003) (Snel, Engbersen & Leerkes 2004: 78). Van Ewijk & Nijenhuis also pointed out the positive relationship between transnational activities and integration in the host community, although they also emphasised that relatively little research has been carried out into this relationship, and that there is relatively little empirical proof of this. However, it has been shown that, for example, the implementation of transnational activities in the country of origin gives immigrants who are

not fully integrated access to a social environment which is linked to their own culture and identity in the host country (Marini, 2014). Secondly, members of migrant organisations get to know each other through transnational activities and share information and knowledge which promote integration among recent arrivals. Thirdly, the transnational activities of migrant organisations often depend on the support from other stakeholders, such as private organisations, the public sector and other diaspora organisations. This collaboration can result in improved access to information and networks. This can in turn have an effect on social cohesion (Van Ewijk & Nijenhuis 2016: 139). Since there seems to have been a growing consensus among Dutch politicians over the last few years that transnational involvement and integration do not necessarily need to clash, local authorities are increasingly encouraging diaspora organisations to develop transnational activities. In so doing, they hope to strengthen social cohesion and integration at a local level. Local authorities therefore enter into partnerships with cities in the countries of origin or support relevant initiatives of diaspora organisations (Van Ewijk & Nijenhuis 2016: 140). These partnerships often concern the transfer of knowledge and skills of cities in high-income countries to cities in low-income countries. Since 2000, Dutch local authorities have established partnerships with local authorities in countries from which a large part of their migrant population originate. These so-called “twinning arrangements” aim to promote mutual understanding between migrants and the host community and strengthen social cohesion and integration of migrants in Dutch cities through contact and exchanging knowledge with partner cities (Van Ewijk 2012: 15). Incidentally, there also seems to have been a change in this respect in the establishment of such initiatives over the last few years.

Diaspora Organisations and Irregular Immigration

Most studies on irregular immigrants and their social networks focus on the potential for support upon arrival and throughout the illegal residence of migrants in the countries of residence. The first mainly concerns the importance of transnational networks which facilitate the arrival of illegal aliens since, for example, family members or friends within the transnational network invite potential migrants and act as their guarantor, smuggle them into the country at the end of a holiday or arrange and finance a human smuggler for them (Staring, 2001). They also focus on the way irregular immigrants manage to take up residence in the host

community and the role which the social network plays here (Engbersen et al., 2002; Engbersen et al., 1999). This concerns the various forms of support within transnational networks which facilitate illegal residence (Staring et al., 2012: 9). There is also much attention paid to the areas of work, housing, contacts with authorities (e.g. in the areas of justice and medical care), leisure activities and social relationships (Engbersen & Burgers, 1999; Van der Leun, 2003; Leerkes et al., 2004). There is little to be found in the literature (if anything at all) on the role which diaspora organisations can play in reducing irregular immigration. The networks which provide assistance to irregular immigrants usually consist of people from the diaspora, but it seems they usually provide this assistance in a private capacity, and not in the name of an organisation. However, once again, we do not know enough about this issue to make well-informed statements here.

Diaspora Organisations and Voluntary Repatriation to the Countries of Origin

A lot of attention is paid in the academic literature to the repatriation of immigrants to their countries of origin (Black et al., 2004; Cassarino, 2004; Dustmann & Weiss, 2007; Van Kalmthout et al., 2004; Leerkes et al., 2010; Van Wijk, 2008), but most of these studies pay little (if any) attention to the role which diaspora organisations could play here. For example, Van Wijk (2008) sketched the interplay of various factors in the countries of residence and origin which determine whether irregular migrants stay or return to their native country, distinguishing between factors which *push* irregularly residing migrants out of the host country and factors which let them *stay*. At the same time, all kinds of factors are at play in the country of origin which *pull* on the irregularly residing migrants and persuade them to return or in fact *deter* them from doing so. He argued that irregular immigrants who are most likely to return voluntarily are confronted with a multiplicity of push and pull factors and a lack of stay and deter factors (Van Wijk 2008: 87). Staring et al. (2012: 89) examined the role which the transnational networks of potential returnees play in decisions regarding repatriation. They showed that these networks usually have a deterrent effect on repatriation. A person's "migration project" is sometimes closely connected with the expectations of the (extended) family which stayed behind, and his/her stay in the host community is specifically geared towards a successful return from which the entire family wants to benefit. Those who stayed behind therefore

often have high expectations (see also Choenni, 2002). Not being able to satisfy this criterion compels many immigrants not to return to their country of origin (for the time being) (Staring 2001, Van Wijk 2008). Moreover, as Staring et al. (2012: 96) showed, the local ties which irregular immigrants have with the people in their immediate environment do not necessarily stimulate a possible return. For example, repatriation is clearly not an issue in some communities until it is felt that irregular immigrants have tried everything to make their “migration project” a success. As long as in the opinion of the migrants there are still options to pursue, they will not provide any help to return and will advise against repatriation. On the basis of the results of their study, Staring et al. (2012: 100) advise organisations in the Netherlands to focus mainly on supporting so-called “liaisons” and self-organisations involved in providing information on repatriation or supporting actual repatriation. Sow (2010: 22) shares this view. He believes that diaspora organisations can play an important role in providing information on repatriation and in supervising and guiding this process. He also thinks it is important that, wherever possible, diaspora organisations are also involved in the reintegration process in the countries of origin, since they have not only gained knowledge and experience in the country of origin, but also in the Netherlands. Moreover, they are often well aware of the Dutch immigration policy and the problems faced by many undocumented asylum seekers and asylum seekers who have exhausted their appeals. For example, by means of development projects, they can contribute to the reintegration of returnees and to the development of the region.

In summary, the literature shows that some things are already known about the role which diaspora organisations play in the implementation of migration practices in terms of promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging voluntary repatriation. However, this information has not really been systematized. It is also not clear how diaspora organisations are involved in migration practices and how their way of working can be assessed.

The authorities are also uncertain about the role which diaspora organisations could play in the future. Moreover, a deeper understanding is required of the obstacles and opportunities which arise in the cooperation between the authorities and diaspora organisations. To help clarify these matters, this study aims to answer the following questions:

Research Questions

- What role do diaspora organisations play with regard to the implementation of migration practices in the Netherlands in terms of promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging voluntary repatriation? How do they go about this?
- How is this assessed by Dutch government employees?
- What obstacles and opportunities regarding migration practices do the diaspora organisations identify in their cooperation with the Dutch authorities and how is this perceived by Dutch government employees?

Research Design and Approach

The starting point of this study was a three-pronged research approach whereby various methods were used to answer the research questions. Firstly, a literature study was conducted on diaspora organisations in general and on the role which they might be able to play in migration practices in the Netherlands in particular. At the same time, a desk study was carried out in order to make an inventory of all the diaspora organisations which are active in the Netherlands. However, it quickly became apparent that this did not give an accurate picture of the diaspora organisations currently active in the Netherlands. At a later stage, during the interviews, it became apparent that small organisations are indeed not active on the internet since the costs are prohibitive. In contrast, large organisations usually do have a website. We then sought contact with eight key persons who could help us navigate the complex landscape of diaspora organisations active in the Netherlands. Please refer to Appendix 1 for an overview of the key figures who spoke to us. On the basis of these interviews and additional searches on the internet we obtained a picture of the diaspora organisations in the Netherlands involved in promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging voluntary repatriation.

Firstly, a list of possible organisations which seemed relevant for the study was submitted. This list was compiled on the basis of the literature study, the desk study and the exploratory discussions with the key informers. The definitive list was then compiled in consultation with the supervisory committee. Some organisations were deleted because they did not fit our definition of a diaspora organisation. Others were deleted because they had discontinued their activities or could not be traced. Then, when we went out into the field, it quickly became apparent that we

had to reset our goals since some of the organisations we had selected could not be located or contacted. Ten selected diaspora organisations were asked about their role in the implementation of migration practices. The cases were determined in close consultation with the supervisory committee. Please refer to Appendix 2 for an overview of the organisations which were interviewed in this study. The selected organisations were examined as individual cases. In this way, we broadly examined the objectives of the organisations, their areas of work, their relationships with the ministries involved, their attitudes towards repatriation and their ties with the country of origin. The selected organisations were then visited and (group) interviews were held with several staff members. In this way, we got a good impression of their way of working. We worked with a semi-structured interview guide. All the interviews were recorded with a voice recorder and written out word for word.

The acquired knowledge was then used to enter into a dialogue with Dutch government employees who deal specifically with migration practices and deal or work with diaspora organisations on a professional basis. Searches were initiated at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Security and Justice and several municipalities, since we expected to find government employees there who have contacts with diaspora organisations in the three areas (promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging repatriation) which are the focus of this study. However, it was difficult to find government employees working in these areas who actually have contacts with diaspora organisations. There were some contacts, but the government employees described them as “sporadic”, and therefore did not feel called upon to assess the work of diaspora organisations. Both personal and group interviews were eventually held with eight government employees. Please refer to Appendix 4 for a list of the selected employees. We tried to learn more during the interviews about the collaboration between government agencies and diaspora organisations; how this was going, what the opportunities and obstacles are. The interviews were held on the basis of a semi-structured interview guide. As with preceding parts of the study, the interviews were recorded with a voice recorder and then written out word for word. The transcriptions were analysed and used to write up the report.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that only a limited number of people were interviewed for this report, and that the conclusions must therefore

be read with due care. The statements on diaspora organisations were made on the basis of ten cases and are therefore in no way representative of the diaspora organisations in the Netherlands. Incidentally, we wonder if there are actually hundreds of diaspora organisations active in the Netherlands, as we had previously read in the literature, since it was very difficult to find diaspora organisations which were still active. Many still existed in name but, upon further investigation, no longer appeared to be active. In any case, our searches revealed that it is very difficult to obtain a good picture of the entire field, and we cannot say approximately how many diaspora organisations are still active in the Netherlands in 2016. All of this should be taken into account when interpreting the research data.

Chapter 2 Presentation of the Findings

In this study, we talked to staff members, board members and volunteers of ten diaspora organisations. We aimed for the greatest possible diversity of organisations. For instance, we selected organisations which receive government grants and make the implementation of migration practices their prime occupation (e.g. the *Dalmar Foundation*, the *Goedwerk Foundation*, *BARKA*). We also selected organisations which work exclusively with volunteers and which more or less represent the interests of fellow countrymen (e.g. *Sierra Leone Central Union*, *AGAP*, *Vereniging Abovian*). Some organisations receive an annual budget from the authorities while others are completely self-financed. We also included organisations which emanated from the diaspora but which later expanded their focus to a wider audience (e.g. the *Goedwerk Foundation*, *BARKA*). We also included organisations which primarily focus on the countries of origin (e.g. *BASUG*), whereby some focus on specific regions (e.g. the *Okyeman Foundation*). All the organisations described in this study have ties with the countries of origin, some more so than others. This usually concerns sending relief goods following disasters in the country of origin and restoring or building schools and hospitals. The organisations sometimes work with NGOs in the countries of origin. They rarely work with the authorities in the countries of origin since most organisations distrust them. *Vereniging Abovian*, *BASUG* and *BARKA* are practically the only diaspora organisations which have a fairly good working relationship with the authorities in the countries of origin.

To obtain a good overall picture, the organisations which were interviewed in this study were ranked according to the size of the community they represent in the Netherlands.

Table 1: Diaspora organisations and the size of the population which they represent in the Netherlands (by ethnic origin, on 1 January 2015)

Organisation	Country	Total	Including	
			1st Generation	2nd Generation
Emcemo	Morocco	380,755	168,451	212,304
BARKA	Poland	137,794	107,891	29,903
Stichting SAN	Afghanistan	43,732	33,058	10,674
Dalmar Foundation	Somalia	39,131	27,275	11,856
Okyeman Foundation	Ghana	22,881	13,742	9,139
Goedwerk Foundation	Ethiopia	13,709	8,935	4,774
Sierra Leone Central Union	Sierra Leone	5,905	4,003	1,902
Stichting AGAP	Guinea	4,206	2,511	1,695
Basug	Bangladesh	1,823	932	891
Vereniging Abovian	Armenia	903	874	29

Source population figures: Statistics Netherlands Statline, population statistics, consulted on 10 May 2016

Emcemo (Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Migration and Development) is a diaspora organisation for Moroccans in the Netherlands. The organisation, based in Amsterdam, was established in 1998, emerging from the Moroccan migrant organisation KMAN (Committee of Moroccan Workers in the Netherlands). *BARKA* is a Polish organisation in Utrecht which was established in Poland in 1989. It has been active in the Netherlands since 1996. *Stichting SAN* (Cooperation Afghanistan Netherlands, a foundation which focuses on development projects in Afghanistan) is a diaspora organisation in The Hague which has been active since 2004. The organisation is run by three volunteers who belong to the same Afghan family living in the Netherlands since 1997. The father works with refugees on a professional basis and, together with his son, is a volunteer with the Dutch Council for Refugees. He also has contacts with the organisation *Beyond Borders*. The father spent some time in Afghanistan within the context of the *Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals*, an IOM initiative. The *Dalmar Foundation* in The Hague is a diaspora organisation which looks after the interests of Somalis in the Netherlands in particular and Africans in general. The organisation was established in 1996. The *Okyeman Foundation* is a Ghanaian diaspora organisation in Amsterdam. This organisation, which was established in 1994, dedicates its efforts specifically to the development of the Akyem region in Ghana. It represents the interests of Ghanaians from this region in the Netherlands and the Benelux, although Ghanaians from other regions are more than welcome. The *Goedwerk Foundation* is a diaspora organisation which is based in Amsterdam. It was established in 2014 and is involved in the return to countries of

origin. The organisation has an affinity with Ethiopia since the founder is Ethiopian. It tries to set up projects there, but does not work exclusively for Ethiopians. *Sierra Leone Central Union* is an umbrella organisation of diaspora organisations which represent the interests of Sierra Leonians in the Netherlands. The organisation was established in 2006. There are affiliate organisations in fourteen cities, each of which organises activities for its members. *Stichting AGAP (Association des Guinéens et Amis aux Pays-Bas)* is a diaspora organisation which represents the interests of Guineans in the Netherlands and has its head office in Nijmegen, the place of residence of its chairperson. The organisation was established in 2007 and consists of subsections in nine different Dutch cities. *BASUG* is a Bengali diaspora organisation in The Hague. It was established in 2005 and not only has projects in Bangladesh, but also in Sri Lanka, Nepal and India. It also has daughter organisations in several European cities in countries such as England, Belgium, Germany and Italy. *Vereniging Abovian* is an Armenian diaspora organisation in The Hague which was established in 1984.

The objectives and activities of the different organisations, their reach, annual budget and driving force are dealt with in greater detail in Appendix 3.

Diaspora Organisations and Migration Practices

Promoting Integration

According to one of the interviewed staff members, *Emcemo* is mainly an interest group, in a very broad sense. They organise a wide range of activities relating to integration (such as promoting solidarity between the generations, improving the position of Moroccan women, encouraging political participation), although it would rather talk about citizenship than integration. The *Dalmar Foundation* also actively focuses on the integration of its members. The organisation uses its radio programme, but also its website and debates, to try and raise all kinds of difficult issues among its members. The organisations which form part of the *Sierra Leone Central Union* organise so-called “integration activities” for their members. This includes activities relating to, for example, eating behaviour and providing information on cancer and education. *AGAP*’s subsections organise activities relating to “immigration”, “participation” and “emancipation.” However, because, according to its chairperson,

there are large differences in the level of education of the members, they mainly organise “tailor-made” activities. For instance, difficult issues are raised at parties, i.e. “meetings”, and the organisation rarely convenes meetings. *BARKA* organises a large number of integration activities, both in Poland and in the Netherlands, geared towards helping vulnerable people find work. However, some organisations do not focus specifically on integration since it is not an issue among their members. For instance, the *Okyeman Foundation* does not organise many activities relating to integration since most of its members have been in the Netherlands for at least ten years and, according to the organisation's chairperson, they do not have any integration problems. *BASUG* also does not organise any activities in the Netherlands to promote the integration of its members. On the one hand, this is because the Bengalis only form a small community in the Netherlands. On the other, there is nothing which suggests there are integration problems in this group. Although integration is also not an issue among the members of *Vereniging Abovian*, it has organised, in addition to numerous activities relating to the Armenian language and culture, so-called “information days” at the request of the municipality over the last few years. During these information days, twelve of which are organised every year, general, social and health information is provided. The *Goedwerk Foundation* and *Stichting SAN* do not organise any integration activities, the former because it mainly provides assistance with repatriation, the latter because of insufficient funds.

Preventing Irregular Immigration

A few organisations actively try to warn potential migrants in the countries of origin about an irregular existence in the Netherlands. “We give examples of how people live here,” said an *Emcemo* staff member. “But there are always people who'll tell you they want to try it anyway. We also provided information together with certain Moroccan NGOs since people often came here with false contracts. Then there's the marriage problem. We don't tell people they can't come, but we provide them with the right information. But they have to decide for themselves.” The organisation also tries to provide assistance to fellow countrymen who lead an irregular existence in the Netherlands. “We try to assist these people,” explained an organisation staff member. “Some people have health problems. There are physicians, so the least you can do is try and arrange help for them. We also make sure that people are fed, for

example, via mosques. We try to help them with legal matters, since they may still qualify for residency status. We help them until they realise that they have exhausted all their legal means.” Together with Oxfam Novib, *Emcemo* set up a few projects in Morocco in the past for people who resided irregularly in the Netherlands. “We adopted a model from India,” he said, “for setting up social loans, so someone could open a small shop, set up a small business.” The founder of *Stichting SAN* claims that he proposed providing Afghans with information on irregular immigration to the Netherlands at the Dutch embassy in Afghanistan, but did not receive any assistance. “We could do this very well from Europe,” he said. “The German ambassador is going to tell you that you shouldn’t come to Germany because it’s not paradise. But then everyone says, well of course he’s going to say that, he’s the ambassador. But it would be different if an Afghan living in the Netherlands were to say such a thing.” The *Dalmar Foundation* “raises awareness”, both in the Netherlands and in Somalia, to warn people about an irregular existence in the Netherlands. “Because people who have been to Europe often have positive tales to tell,” said an organisation staff member. “That they have a nice car and a nice house. But we try to organise debates about this in order to raise awareness.” When asked if this message is also relayed to Somalia, he replied: “They also organise debates and discussions in Somalia. And we also have discussions with the people here who send money to their families. We tell them it’s better to send them money they can use than to pay for their trip. We also have discussions about remittances. What good do they do? You will live in poverty here if you send all that money, and you will make the people there dependent on you.” The staff member also pointed out that, in addition to the awareness-raising sessions they organise now, it would be useful to work more systematically on the matter of irregular immigration, because he believes that people are now often ignorant about the Netherlands. He thinks it is important to provide more information in the country of origin on what it means to live an irregular existence in Europe. “Because the only thing you see and hear are the good stories. In Somalia, you don’t see what the situation is like in Greece, or the people who die at sea. What you do see are the Somalis who left, who found work and built a house.” The chairperson of the *Okyeman Foundation* told us that the organisation does not provide any information on illegal residence to their fellow countrymen in Ghana, although he does think it would be useful. However, he believes that this would need to be a formal assignment given by the Dutch authorities. He believes that diaspora organisations

can do very little without such an assignment. “You can do so if you are given a formal government assignment. We would then also be prepared to think about how to go about this. But only if we were asked. Because it would cost money.” Reflecting on the question whether, as an organisation, they would provide assistance if the Dutch authorities asked them to try and reduce irregular immigration from Ghana, he replied: “Yes, because we have been living here for a very long time, and things are not as rosy as the people in Ghana think. People still think that paradise lies over the sea. People must be able to make what we call “informed choices.” People only see the attractive side of things, not the difficult side.”

The staff members of some organisations said they did not want to warn people about the life of an irregular immigrant in the Netherlands because they do not consider this to be their task and they think that everyone has the right to migrate to the Netherlands, as they did at the time. The chairperson of *Sierra Leone Central Union* said: “We don't do anything here. In my view, these people should do whatever they want with their lives. Because if you're going to tell them it would be better not to come, this could get you into trouble. People could then say, “So why are you there then? Why don't you come back?”” These organisations do provide assistance to fellow countrymen who lead an irregular existence in the Netherlands. For instance, the chairperson of *AGAP* often checks whether the asylum seekers whose appeals have been exhausted went through the procedure correctly and, if requested, writes letters to the agencies concerned, although he said he has never received an answer. They also provide assistance to irregular fellow countrymen in the areas of housing, food and healthcare. According to the chairperson of *AGAP*, there is enough solidarity among Guineans in the Netherlands to always make it possible to find families who are prepared to take in people who reside illegally in the country. Moreover, the mutual contacts of the members of the organisation can be used to provide people with the healthcare they need. *BASUG* claims it has intentionally never got involved with irregular immigrants. According to one of the volunteers active in the organisation, this is because it is not their area of expertise. “We did not want to get involved,” said an organisation staff member. “That was a risk for us as an organisation since we want the authorities to regard us as a reliable partner in the implementation of development projects. We have received calls from people who reside here illegally, but we could not help them. We did bring them into contact with community leaders. They have a huge network and were in a better

position to help them.” *Vereniging Abovian* does not provide any information on irregular immigration since this is not an issue among its target group. However, the board members are aware of Armenians in the Netherlands who have not yet acquired residency status, but they are not members. *BARKA* and the *Goedwerk Foundation* also do not provide any information on irregular immigration. This is not an issue at *BARKA* since its target group largely consists of EU citizens. The *Goedwerk Foundation* only provides assistance with repatriation, although, as the interview with two staff members revealed, they also intend to provide information on irregular immigration. However, they are not able to do so at this point.

Encourage Voluntary Repatriation

The organisations have very different attitudes towards repatriation. The interviews revealed that it is a very sensitive issue for several organisations. Some organisations have nevertheless made repatriation their core task.

For example, thanks to *BARKA*'s approach, many of the people they assist return to their country of origin, in this case Poland, although, as EU citizens, they can return to the Netherlands at any time. *BARKA* was established in 1989 during Poland's transformation period. Realising that there were no civil society organisations at the time, two psychologists founded a community where addicts, homeless people, people with psychiatric problems and other vulnerable people could go, since many of them had become homeless during the transformation period. The first community they established was housed in a former school in the west of Poland. People lived together here and were held responsible for certain tasks. They also provided for themselves, for example, by growing vegetables. The model was adopted by other communities. There are now about twenty in Poland. *BARKA* also runs a large number of educational and employment-training projects. The organisation mainly works with “hands-on” experts. Men and women who have been addicted and homeless themselves and who have spent a long time in a community can become “leaders.” These leaders regularly come over to the Netherlands from Poland for a few months to go out on the street as field workers, establish contacts and win the trust of the homeless and the addicts and interest them in joining one of the communities in Poland. Because the organisation staff members mainly speak Polish, they can easily make contact with Polish addicts and homeless people. That is

more difficult to do with people from other countries. They nevertheless also try to help these people through their networks. There is a great deal of interest in *BARKA*, but the staff members are reluctant to set up similar projects in other countries. "This is under discussion," said a staff member, "but the set-up of the *BARKA* community was very bottom-up. We would not want to introduce a top-down approach now, so it takes a long time to build such communities. And the Dutch authorities seem to prefer quick solutions. Give someone a ticket and let him return to his country of origin. But that is not going to work, especially not for addicts. And the objective of our approach is not to send people back to their country of origin. If we were able to assist them here, we would do so." They are currently thinking about setting up a shelter, similar to the one *BARKA* has, in Romania, since one of its employees is Romanian and has established a large network there. But this will not be rolled out to any other countries for the time being. However, certain social enterprises that were established by this organisation are a source of inspiration for others. For instance, there is a project in Kenya where the model of one of the social integration centres is applied.

The core activity of the *Goedwerk Foundation* is to provide assistance with repatriation. "People want to go home. We find out what they need to go back with a modicum of respect and to reintegrate permanently into their country of origin," is how a staff member described the organisation's objective. This organisation also claims to invest in countries of origin. For example, it is setting up transit houses in Algeria where repatriated Algerians can initially be sheltered, and it is working on the idea of introducing auto rickshaws in Ethiopia. However, according to the staff members, repatriation is not without snags. For instance, the amount of money which the persons concerned receive from the authorities upon their return is said to be far too little to build a life in the countries of origin. "The ministry sometimes gives the impression that these people have returned safely and are well integrated. But they only get a very small amount of money. Partly for this reason, you must not set your ambitions and goals too high. Make sure that they have a small job. And for some of them, that's all that is possible." The organisation is also very critical of the Dutch authorities, which, according to the staff members, are not prepared to help devise structural repatriation solutions. "I went to Ethiopia with Cordaid to see what could be done at Heineken. But my fellow countrymen work illegally in the Netherlands, earning 3-4 hundred euro per month. (...) If they were to return to Ethiopia and start to work for Heineken, they would earn less than forty

euro per month. So that is not very appealing for these people.” Another staff member added: “Unless people are completely down-and-out here, they have no reason whatsoever to go back. Therefore, if the authorities really want to take repatriation seriously, they will have to trust the civil society organisations and give them the opportunity to do minor things for the people concerned that can stand them in good stead in terms of entrepreneurship.”

The main reason why organisations collaborate on repatriation is that they realise that their fellow countrymen in the Netherlands are in such a vulnerable position that repatriation to the country of origin is perhaps their only option. For instance, an *Emcemo* staff member said that, in the past, the organisation was not open to helping with the repatriation of fellow countrymen to the country of origin, but that they now think differently about this. “Our ideal used to be that everyone should be given a residence permit, but you have to be pragmatic about this at some point. You have to be pragmatic and realistic in your ideals and reality. We don’t advertise this, but we also see that some people don’t have a future here. We see the dismal position of people who are not insured, who have nothing to eat and no place to sleep, so you have to look for alternatives.” In the past, *Emcemo* ran small-scale projects in Morocco to help people return to their homeland. “But it has now become very difficult,” said a staff member, “since the (Dutch, MvS) policy is opposed to helping these people build a future in their country of origin. The authorities see this as a “gift” which can have a magnet effect.” The *Dalmar Foundation* is running a project until 2017 which focuses on people going back to Somalia with good prospects for their future. This is because organisation staff had often heard during consultations that people wanted to go back to Somalia but did not know how to go about it. However, the organisation staff realise that people do not have many future prospects in their country of origin. “Our project is called “voluntary repatriation with prospects”. So you want to offer people prospects. But the Dutch authorities are not really prepared to offer prospects. People go back with a statutory amount and that’s it.” He is nevertheless convinced it is possible to offer people a future in their countries of origin. “I’ve been thinking of giving people the opportunity to, for example, take a course that will be useful to them here and which will also stand them in good stead when they go back. That would be much more efficient. You could also learn a trade in demand. And instead of having people wandering around for two years, you could motivate them to get a diploma and inform the authorities in the country of origin about this. People would then

have better prospects for the future. We have often raised this subject, but to no avail.”

Organisations such as *AGAP* and *Sierra Leone Central Union* say they do not want to collaborate on the repatriation of their fellow countrymen. “Even if they offered me a million, I'd tell them to get lost. I'm not corrupt,” said the chairperson of *AGAP*. “I know many organisations which cooperate and get money. I'll let you in on a secret. I closed our account because we don't get any money anyway. I'm poor, but I'm proud.” According to the organisation's chairperson, collaboration on repatriation is not open to discussion until the situation in the countries of origin is clear, since people will otherwise go back to a country where they have no future. “If people come to the Netherlands, they must have the opportunity to stay here. That's the common view of the Sierra Leonian community,” said the chairperson of *Sierra Leone Central Union*. “If people want to go back voluntarily, that's their own decision. (...) And there are organisations such as the IOM which will help them to do so. But the assistance which is offered is sometimes very short-lived. So we need a lasting solution for taking people back and helping them to find work, etc.” *BASUG* does not carry out any repatriation-related activities since this is not an issue among its community members. According to a volunteer with the organisation, this will not be an issue until migrants from Bangladesh have earned enough money in Europe to return to their country of origin. “All Bengalis, of every generation, think about going back,” he said. “Even those who were born and raised here. They want to earn money so they can eventually go home. In England they have enough facilities to stay there. But their communities in other countries are very small and don't have enough facilities. So they eventually all want to go back some day.” Repatriation is also not an issue for *Vereniging Abovian*, the *Okyeman Foundation* and *Stichting SAN* since it is not an issue among their members or they lack the funds to take any action.

Dutch Government Employees on Diaspora Organisations and Migration Practices

We also interviewed Dutch government employees in this study in order to find out how they rate their collaboration with diaspora organisations regarding the implementation of migration practices. However, it was very difficult to find government employees who deal with diaspora organisations in the course of their daily duties. There are not many

contacts between government employees and diaspora organisations, especially not in the area of integration. When these contacts did exist, the government employees described them as “sporadic”. Government employees involved in the implementation of the integration policy in particular said that they do not have many contacts with diaspora organisations. They therefore do not feel called upon to assess the work of diaspora organisations.

We did not speak to many government employees who deal with diaspora organisations professionally within the context of irregular immigration. A staff member of the Migration Policy Department is convinced that diaspora organisations could play a role in preventing irregular immigration. “Not so much to discourage this kind of migration,” he said, “but so that people will give it more thought. Because living illegally in Europe is not really a good option. You should therefore invest a lot in people who are about to make the trip to Europe. You should at least persuade them to make an informed decision. I think the diasporas could play a role here, but I don't know if they'll always be willing to give them this message, and if the others will want to hear it. They could very well say, “That's easy for you to say — you've got it made. If *you* can make it there, surely I will too.” A female staff member of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs indicated that her ministry has not yet determined how diaspora organisations could be used to prevent irregular immigration. “We do know that the diaspora plays a role here, since it is a network and can thus pay for tickets,” she said. “At the same time, there is a countermovement of diaspora organisations which say they don't want to encourage this since it would only result in dangerous arrangements, and criminal networks, and we should in fact not encourage this in the minds of our people. We're now also looking at how we can set up awareness-raising campaigns in the countries of origin. We're also going to support Ethiopia, which receives small budgets to hold discussions in their communities to prevent young people from leaving. And you could then also look at what role the diaspora organisations could take here. But we have not yet decided how to go about this.”

Diaspora organisations and Dutch government agencies collaborate on repatriation. However, according to government employees, some organisations would rather keep this from their members. According to the government employees, there are also organisations which realise that living as an illegal alien is far from easy and therefore actively contact people to talk to them about repatriation. Because it is difficult for

the authorities to contact certain groups, they often let diaspora organisations act as intermediaries. For example, the Municipality of Amsterdam works with the *Goedwerk Foundation* to contact people in so-called “bed, bath and bread” shelters and “enter into discussions with them about their future.”

The staff members of government agencies said they were aware that they often have very little to offer migrants who are returning to their countries of origin. According to several government employees, the problem with repatriation is that it often concerns less educated people who do not have much of a future in the Netherlands. It is hard to create opportunities for these people when they return to their countries of origin. Several staff members nevertheless believe that there is another way. For example, most of them believe that there is not much point in giving people who are being repatriated a certain amount of money, that it would be much more beneficial if they were taught certain skills in the Netherlands which they can use to their advantage in their country of origin in the longer term. “So it's good if you can offer people some training,” said a staff member of the Repatriation and Departure Service. “With the help of an organisation, we got twelve women out of prostitution. One of the members of this organisation had a hairdresser's salon. He trained these women to be hairdressers and provided them with his own diploma. The women returned to Nigeria full of pride. We were able to support this financially and also provided the necessary tools, like scissors. They took all these things with them.” According to the government employees, various attempts have been made in the past to ensure that immigrants who returned to their countries of origin could be provided with work. However, most of these attempts failed. “Our approach is to join forces with initiatives which already exist in the country,” said one of the staff members of the Migration Policy Department. “But if a school is being built in Burundi and someone goes back there, it would of course be perfect if he could work in this school, but it's still difficult to link them together. With regard to repatriation, we mainly work with the IOM, which maintains the contacts in the countries of origin. There is also contact with organisations in the countries of origin, but I think that their link to diaspora organisations in the Netherlands is very tenuous.” The Repatriation and Departure Service had contacts with, amongst others, Heineken, Unilever and Shell, but these contacts also failed to produce the expected results. Several staff members of government agencies therefore argued for setting up small-scale initiatives in the countries of origin. “Stop with the long-term

perspectives,” said a staff member of the Repatriation and Departure Service. “I think you should have a few small NGOs in each municipality. I believe that’s where it could work. And keep things small, because it’s not going to work at all if you start doling out millions for these kinds of projects.” But a case is also made for not being so ready to hand out grants to diaspora organisations, since there have been too many cases in the past of paying out large amounts of money to a few organisations, which did not always produce the desired results. “It’s often the case that a few elite organisations qualify for a grant, and that things often still go wrong because although they have very good contacts in the field, they are not accountants,” said a staff member of the Repatriation and Departure Service. “They have to submit every receipt, and that’s where things often go wrong. Some organisations went into liquidation because of the grants. You should therefore not give out enormous grants for repatriation. Why don’t we simply give a grant sufficient for five returnees? And then, when they have gone back to their country of origin, increase this to eight. That will keep things nice and orderly. Right now, a few organisations receive a few hundred thousand euros, and if things go wrong, you’ll lose, say, four hundred thousand euros. Instead, you could give a lump sum of thirty or forty thousand. That way it’s on a small scale and you can keep track of it.”

Obstacles and Opportunities which arise in the Cooperation between Diaspora Organisations and the Dutch Authorities

With a few exceptions, the diaspora organisations are generally negative about their cooperation with the Dutch authorities. A staff member of *Emcemo* was critical of the fact that authorities do not like to consult with diaspora organisations since they prefer to set the agenda themselves. “The authorities consult no one,” he said. “They use the services of certain experts or bigwigs to implement their policies, but there is no honest dialogue.” One of the staff members of the *Dalmar Foundation* thinks the authorities would definitely benefit from better cooperation with diaspora organisations. “We’re Dutch, but we’re also familiar with the situation in the countries of origin. We could give advice which they could then follow. What is plentiful? What is in demand? How could we help the people in the countries of origin? As things stand, projects that are developed often fail because there is no demand for them, because they weren’t properly thought through.” Several organisation staff members also said that the Dutch authorities shut their eyes too often to the

situation in the countries of origin, that they do not have sufficient trust in diaspora organisations and that most of the funds go to organisations which do not have sufficient contacts in the countries of origin. "They invest a million euro in organisations they already know," said a staff member of the *Goedwerk Foundation*, "and then tell them to do something about repatriation. However, there's nothing in the DNA of the Dutch Council for Refugees to convince an African that his migration to the Netherlands has failed, that he has to go back. However, the authorities are simply not able to think out of the box, and that's their biggest pitfall. The car, swimming-pool and seven servants of the director of Cordaid are apparently much more important. A large part of the funds is spent on the salaries of these kinds of people." Although not all organisations are so completely negative, most of them are critical of development organisations which are active in the countries of origin. In their view, they do not pay enough attention to the problems in these countries.

In contrast, the government employees who were interviewed were, in general, considerably more positive about their cooperation with diaspora organisations, although they also had criticisms. One staff member of the Repatriation and Departure Service said that he was in favour of really strengthening contacts with the diaspora organisations, since he believes they can play an important role in making contact with immigrants who would otherwise be beyond the reach of the service. A Migration Policy Department staff member who often deals with diaspora organisations professionally said he had a high regard for the different approach of diaspora organisations to problems. Moreover, he feels that people who form part of diaspora organisations usually take "a positive approach" and "want to do something for their fellow men." A staff member of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs indicated that she had "very varying" experiences with diaspora organisations. She regrets the fact that there is so little continuity in the collaboration between the authorities and the organisations, because the diaspora organisations come and go. However, she said that she had good experiences with members of the diaspora, who are often highly educated and have good contacts with the countries of origin and the "younger generation diaspora members", who no longer form organisations, as their parents did, but often have "innovative ideas."

Incidentally, the interviews with the government employees revealed that the diaspora organisations are not all alike. The government employees

described some of them as “very professional”, others much less so. Most government employees prefer to enter into collaborations with “established organisations”. For example, one female staff member of the Municipality of Amsterdam said she did not want to risk dealing with “small organisations”. “I have no objections to them,” she said, “but, as a municipality, you're not inclined to give them a grant since you don't know what you'll get in return.” This ties in with the story of a staff member of the Department for Integration and Society. “There's the central government, and there's the municipal government. And some organisations are so small that the central government can't do anything for them,” he said. “We only sit round the table with large organisations. I therefore think it's mainly the responsibility of the municipal authorities to sit round the table with these organisations. However, municipalities often don't want to sit round the table with organisations since they're only interested in grants.” “Moreover,” added a staff member of the Department for Integration and Society, “the fact that the authorities follow a generic policy also plays a role in the relationship between the authorities and diaspora organisations. They no longer follow a target group policy. The politicians have also emphasised personal responsibility over the last few years. That's a conscious choice by the authorities. Incidentally, this applies not only to the integration policy; the scope is much wider. People are expected to assume more responsibility themselves.” He therefore believes that contacts with diaspora organisations have gradually decreased over the last few years. Moreover, some government employees think the influence of the countries of origin could interfere with the collaboration between diaspora organisations and the authorities. “That sometimes makes it difficult. After all, who is behind these diaspora organisations?” a staff member of the Repatriation and Departure Service wondered. “Do they back the regimes in their own countries? They're often far removed from the democracies we know. And that can complicate our interactions because you get mixed messages about the spheres of influence.”

In summary, it may be said that diaspora organisations which receive government grants in any case seem to have greater scope for action in the implementation of migration practices than organisations which depend on their own resources. An oft-heard complaint from organisations is that they would like to initiate all manner of things but lack the financial resources to do so. Moreover, initiatives are easier to take when they are embedded in a cooperation with the Dutch authorities. For the very same reason, organisations which work

exclusively with volunteers are considerably less ambitious in what they wish to achieve and therefore have less influence on migration practices than organisations which have employees on the payroll and where migration practices form part of their daily operations. Moreover, it seems that organisations which have good contacts and networks in the countries of origin and which moreover maintain good contacts with NGOs in the countries of origin have more opportunities to play a role in migration practices in the Netherlands. When such contacts do not exist, their role is usually very limited.

Chapter 3 Conclusion

In conclusion, we will summarise the research questions and answers which are the focus of this report one by one. We should also emphasise once again that we only interviewed a limited number of diaspora organisations and government employees; these conclusions must be formulated with due care therefore.

What role do diaspora organisations play with regard to the implementation of migration practices in the Netherlands in terms of promoting integration, preventing irregular immigration and encouraging voluntary repatriation? And how do they go about this?

Diaspora organisations organise all kinds of activities which are conducive to integration, sometimes with government assistance, sometimes self-financed. The activities they organise are usually in response to the demand of their members. The authorities sometimes ask the organisations to focus on integration and, if requested, make a financial contribution to this. Only a few of the organisations which are the focus of this study are involved in the reduction of irregular immigration. They recognise the problem, but have no idea how to deal with it. However, the organisations do, in general, provide assistance and support to fellow countrymen residing irregularly in the Netherlands. Some organisations have made repatriation their core business. Others are strongly opposed to the repatriation of fellow countrymen to their country of origin. They believe that returnees should first be offered a future in their countries of origin. As long as they feel that this is not adequately being done, they are not prepared to cooperate on repatriation.

How is this assessed by Dutch government employees?

The assessments of the activities of the diaspora organisations by government employees vary considerably. They believe that some of the organisations do good work, but are much less enthusiastic about other organisations. Incidentally, this study shows that there are not very many contacts between Dutch government agencies and diaspora organisations. Most government employees therefore do not feel called upon to assess the activities of diaspora organisations. A problem which

most government employees do signal is that, in their view, diaspora organisations often have good contacts with their fellow countrymen in the countries of origin but have difficulty with the financial management of their organisation. The respondents believe that this is the reason why most diaspora organisations do not exist for very long. This could be resolved by no longer giving enormous amounts of money to a few organisations, and instead awarding much smaller grants and dividing them proportionally between the organisations which demonstrably do good work.

What obstacles and opportunities regarding migration practices do the diaspora organisations identify in their collaboration with the Dutch authorities and how is this perceived by Dutch government employees?

Most of the diaspora organisations are critical of their cooperation with the Dutch authorities. They believe that this is generally non-existent. They are critical of the fact that, in their view, the authorities are not interested in consulting diaspora organisations but prefer to make all decisions independently. The government employees are considerably more positive about their relationship with the diaspora organisations, although there is some distrust and they admit they would rather not work with some of the organisations. It also appears that most of the diaspora organisations are not on good terms with the authorities in the countries of origin and that there is usually a lot of distrust of these authorities. This study found little evidence for the assertion that diaspora organisations could mediate between the Netherlands and the authorities in the countries of origin, something which is often suggested in the literature.

One may also conclude that diaspora organisations which receive government grants in any case seem to have greater scope for action in the implementation of migration practices than organisations which depend on their own resources. An oft-heard complaint from organisations is that they would like to initiate all manner of things but lack the financial resources to do so. Moreover, initiatives are easier to take when they are embedded in a cooperation with the Dutch authorities. For the very same reason, organisations which work exclusively with volunteers are considerably less ambitious in what they wish to achieve and therefore have less influence on migration practices than organisations which have employees on the payroll and where migration practices form part of their daily operations.

Other trends can nevertheless also be identified. For instance, it seems that organisations which have good contacts and networks in the countries of origin and which moreover maintain good contacts with NGOs in the countries of origin have more opportunities to play a role in migration practices in the Netherlands. When such contacts do not exist, their role is usually very limited.

There are also opportunities which could benefit the collaboration between the authorities and diaspora organisations. For instance, both the organisations and government employees agree that more should be invested in the countries of origin, that potential immigrants should be better informed so that they can make informed decisions when they decide to migrate to the Netherlands and that returnees should be given better opportunities in the countries of origin. Therefore, government employees and diaspora organisations do indeed have shared concerns about the groups discussed in this report. However, they are for the time being unable to agree on how they can expand their common agenda, probably due to the mutual distrust. It has also emerged that the authorities have been following a generic policy over the last few years, resulting in the gradual decrease in contacts between government employees and diaspora organisations. Cooperation between the authorities and diaspora organisations therefore remains inadequate, despite their shared concerns. It will take quite some doing in the future to break this deadlock.

Consulted Literature, Documents and Websites

Bakewell, O. (2009) Migration, Diasporas and Development. Some Critical Perspectives, *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 229 (6), 787-802.

Black, R., Koser, K., Munk, K., Atfield, G., D'Onofrio, L., & Tiemoko, R. (2004) *Understanding voluntary return*. Londen: Home Office.

Brink, G. van den (red.) (2006) *Culturele contrasten. Het verhaal van de migranten in Rotterdam*, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Brink, M., Tromp, E. & Odé, A. (2003) *De participatie en integratieactiviteiten van stedelijke allochtone zelforganisaties in Amsterdam*, Amsterdam: Regioplan Beleidsonderzoek.

Canatan, K., C.H. Oudijk & Ljamai, A. (2003) *De Maatschappelijke Rol van de Rotterdamse Moskeeën*, Rotterdam: Centrum voor Onderzoek en Statistiek.

Cassarino, J. (2004) Theorising return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253-279.

Cebolla Boado, H., & A. López-Sala (2012) A top-down model of transnational immigrant associations, *Paper prepared for the transnational immigrant organisations seminar*, Princeton, 11–12 May.

Choenni, C. (2002) *Ghanezen in Nederland. Een profiel*, Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties.

Clifford J. (1994) Diasporas, *Cultural Anthropology*, 9: 302–338.

Cliteur, P. (2004) *Tegen de decadentie. De democratische rechtstaat in verval*, Amsterdam: De Arbeiderspers.

Daal, H. J. van (2006) *Kleur in sport: op zoek naar goede praktijken in multiculturele sportverenigingen*, Utrecht: Verwey Yonker Instituut.

Dustmann, C. & Weiss, Y. (2007). Return migration: Theory and empirical evidence from the UK, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(2), 236-256.

Engbersen, G. & J. Burgers (red.) (1999) *De ongekende stad 1. Illegale Migranten in Nederland*, Amsterdam: Boom.

Engbersen, G., J. van der Leun, R. Staring & J. Kehla (1999) *De ongekende stad 2. Inbedding en uitsluiting van illegale vreemdelingen*, Amsterdam: Boom.

Engbersen, G., R. Staring, J. van der Leun, J. de Boom, P. van der Heijden, M. Cruiff (2002) *Illegale Vreemdelingen in Nederland. Omvang, overkomst, verblijf en uitzetting*, Rotterdam: RISBO.

Ewijk van, E. & G. Nijenhuis (2016) Translocal Activities of Local Governments and Migrant Organizations, in: B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (eds.), *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe - Contexts, Levels and Actors*, Dordrecht: Springer International Publishing, 127-145.

Ewijk van, E. (2012) Window on the Netherlands. Mutual Learning in Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch-Turkish Municipal Partnerships, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 103 (1), 101-109.

Fennema, M., Tillie, J., Heelsum, A. van, Berger, M. & Wolff, R. (2001) De politieke integratie van etnische minderheden in Nederland, *Migrantenstudies*, 17 (3), 142-168.

Frouws, B. & T. Grimmus (2012) *Migratie en Ontwikkeling. Beleidsevaluatie van het Nederlandse Migratie- en Ontwikkelingsbeleid sinds 2008*, Zoetermeer.

Gans, H. (1992) Comment: ethnic invention and acculturation: a bumpy-line approach, *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 11, 42-52.

Gowricharn, R.S. (2009) Changing Forms of Transnationalism, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(9), 1619-1638.

Graça da, A.A. (2010) *Etnische zelforganisaties in het integratieproces. Een case study in de Kaapverdise gemeenschap in Rotterdam*, Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Grillo, R. & B. Riccio (2004) Translocal development: Italy–Senegal, *Population, Space and Place*, 10, 99–111.

- Haas, de, H. (2003) *Migration and Development in Southern Morocco: The Disparate Socio-Economic Impacts of Out-Migration on the Todgha Oasis Valley*, Nijmegen: University of Nijmegen.
- Haas de, H. (2010) Migration and development: A theoretical perspective, *International Migration Review*, 44: 227–264.
- Hear van, N. (1998) *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*, London: UCL Press.
- Heelsum van, A. (2004) *Migrantenorganisaties in Nederland*, Utrecht: FORUM.
- Heelsum van, A. & E. Voorthuysen (2002) *Surinaamse organisaties in Nederland: Een netwerkanalyse*, Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Henry, L., & G. Mohan (2003) Making homes: The Ghanaian diaspora, institutions and development, *Journal of International Development*, 15 (5), 611–622.
- International Migration Institute (2010) *Diaspora engagement policies of Ghana, India and Serbia*, University of Oxford.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2013) *Diasporas and Development: Bridging Societies and States*, Geneva: IOM.
- Itzigsohn, J. (2000) Immigration and the boundaries of citizenship: The institutions of immigrants' political transnationalism. *International Migration Review*, 34 (4), 1126–1154.
- Ionescu, D. (2006) *Engaging diasporas as development partners for home and destination countries; challenges for policy makers* (Migration Research Series No. 26), Geneva, International Organisation for Migration.
- Joppke, C. & E. Moraskwa (2003) Integrating immigrants in liberal nation-states: policies and practices, In: C. Joppke & E. Morawska (eds.) *Toward assimilation and citizenship. Immigrants in liberal nation-states*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-36.
- Kalmthout, A van, Graft, A., Hansen, L., & Hadrouk, M. (2004) *Terugkeermogelijkheden van vreemdelingen in vreemdelingenbewaring: Deel 2. Evaluatie terugkeerprojecten*, Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.

Kleist, N. (2008) In the Name of Diaspora: Between struggles for Recognition and Political Aspirations, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(7): 1127-1143.

Keusch, M. & N. Schuster (2012) *European Good Practice Examples of Migration and Development Initiatives, with a Particular Focus on Diaspora Engagement*, Vienna: Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation.

Kusters, J. (2007) *De Somalische Diaspora in Nederland. Een onderzoek naar de rol van migranten bij de sociaal economische ontwikkelingen van ontwikkelingslanden*, Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit.

Lacroix, T. (2005) *Les réseaux marocains du développement: Géographie du transnational et politique du territorial*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Lacroix, T. (2010) *Hometown organisations and development practices. IMI working papers 28*, Oxford: International Migration Institute.

Leerkes, A., M. van San, G. Engbersen, M. Cruijff & P. van der Heijden (2004) *Wijken voor illegalen. Over ruimtelijke spreiding, huisvesting en leefbaarheid*, Den Haag: SdU.

Leerkes, A., M. Galloway & M. Kromhout (2010) *Kiezen tussen twee kwaden: Determinanten van terugkeerintenties onder (bijna) uitgeprocedeerde asielmigranten*, Den Haag: WODC, Cahier 2010-5.

Levitt, P. (2003) Keeping feet in both worlds: transnational practices and immigrant incorporation in the United States. In: C. Joppke & E. Morawska (eds.) *Toward assimilation and citizenship. Immigrants in liberal nation-states*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 177-194.

Marini, F. (2014) Transnationalism and integration: What kind of relationship? Empirical evidence from the analysis of co-development's dynamics, *Migration and Development*, 3(2), 306-320.

Naerssen T. van , J. Kusters & J. Schapendonk (2006) *Afrikaanse migrantenorganisaties in Nederland. Ontwikkelingsactiviteiten en opinies over ontwikkelingssamenwerking*, Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit.

Naerssen T. van, E. Spaan & A. Zoomers (2011) *Global Migration and Development*, London: Routledge.

Nijenhuis, G. & A. Broekhuis (2010) Institutionalising transnational migrants' activities: the impact of co-development programmes *International Development Planning Review*, 32 (3-4), 245-265.

Nijenhuis, G. & A. Zoomers (2015) Transnational Activities of Immigrant Organizations in the Netherlands: Do Ghanaian, Moroccan and Surinamese Diaspora Organizations Enhance Development? In: A. Portes & P. Fernandez-Kelly, *Development at a Distance: Immigrant Organizations and the Progress of Sending Nations*, Russell Sage Foundation.

Nijenhuis, G. (2013) Migrantenorganisaties: Bruggebouwers in ontwikkeling?, *Internationale Spectator*, 67, 3-8.

North-South Centre of the Council of Europe (2006) *Social Remittances of the African Diasporas in Europe. Case studies: Netherlands and Portugal*, Brussels: Council of Europe.

Nyberg-Sørensen N, N. Van Hear & P. Engberg-Pedersen (2002) The migration-development nexus evidence and policy options. State-of-the-art overview, *International Migration*, 40, 3-47.

Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003) The politics of migrants' transnational political practices, *International Migration Review*, 37 (3), 760-786.

Otieno Ongáyo, A. (2014) *Diaspora Engagement in a Constricted Political Space. The Case of Ethiopian Diaspora Organizations in the Netherlands*, Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.

Portes, A. (2002) Transnational entrepreneurs: an alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation, *American Sociological Review*, 67(2), 278-298.

Portes, A. (2009) Migration and development: Reconciling opposite views, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32 (1), 5-22.

Portes, A., L. Guarnizo & P. Landolt (1999) The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217-237.

- Riccio, B. (2008) West African transnationalisms compared: Ghanaians and Senegalese in Italy, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34 (2), 217–234.
- Rijkschroeff, R. & J.W. Duyvendak (2004) De omstreden betekenis van zelforganisaties, *Sociologisch Gids*, 51 (1), 18-35.
- Safran W. (1991) Diasporas in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return, *Diaspora*, 1(1), 83–99.
- Schüttler, K. (2008) *The contribution of migrant organisations to income-generating activities in their countries of origin*, Working paper 50. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Sinatti, G. & C. Horst (2015) Migrants as agents of development: Diaspora engagement discourse and practice in Europe, *Ethnicities*, 15(1), 134-152.
- Snel, E., G. Engbersen & A. Leerkes (2004) Voorbij landsgrenzen. Transnationale betrokkenheid als belemmering voor integratie?, *Sociologische Gids*, 51, 75-100.
- Sow, A. (2011) *Terugkeer met toekomst. Wensen, kansen en belemmeringen rond duurzame terugkeer van uitgeprocedeerde asielzoekers en ongedocumenteerde migranten*, Utrecht: Stichting Mondiale Ontwikkeling.
- Staring, R. (2001) *Reizen onder regie. Het migratieproces van illegale Turken in Nederland*, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Staring, R., J. Alves d' Almeida, S. D. Noya & M. van Schijndel (2012) *Ondersteuning bij zelfstandige terugkeer. Over de betekenissen van (transnationale) sociale netwerken voor de terugkeer van onrechtmatig in Nederland verblijvende migranten uit Brazilië, Colombia, Ghana en Nigeria naar hun land van herkomst*, Sectie Criminologie: EUR.
- Steijlen, F. (2004) Molukkers in Nederland: geschiedenis van een transnationale relatie. *Migranten Studies*, 20 (4), 238-251.
- Sunier, T. (1996) *Islam in beweging: Turkse jongeren en islamitische organisaties*, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Turner, S. & N. Kleist (2013) Agents of change? Staging and governing diasporas and the African state, *African Studies*, 72, 192–206.

Van der Leun, J. (2003) *Looking for Loopholes. Processes of Incorporation of Illegal Immigrants in the Netherlands*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Verweel, P. & J.W. Janssens (2005) *Kleurrijke Zuilen: Over de ontwikkeling van sociaal kapitaal door allochtonen in eigen en gemengde sportverenigingen*, Utrecht. 's-Hertogenbosch.

Waters, M. (1990) *Ethnic options: choosing identities in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wijk, J. van (2008) *Reaching out to the unknown: Native counselling and the decision making process of irregular migrants and rejected asylum seekers on voluntary return*, Den Haag: IOM.

Zwan, A. van der (2003) *De uitdaging van het populisme*, Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.

Appendix 1 Consulted Key Informers

Staff member, Cordaid

Staff member, Cordaid

Staff member, IOM

Researcher, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford

Researcher, International Development Studies, Utrecht University

Staff member, Dutch Council for Refugees

Staff member, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Staff member, Repatriation and Departure Service (Ministry of Security and Justice)

Appendix 2 Selected Diaspora Organisations

AGAP – Guinean diaspora organisation, Nijmegen

Barka – Polish diaspora organisation, Utrecht

BASUG - Bengali diaspora organisation, The Hague

Dalmar Foundation – Somali diaspora organisation, The Hague

Emcemo – Moroccan diaspora organisation, Amsterdam

Goedwerk Foundation – Ethiopian diaspora organisation, Amsterdam

Okyeman Foundation - Ghanese diaspora organisation, Amsterdam

Sierra Leone Central Union – Sierra Leonian diaspora organisation,
Breda

Stichting SAN – Afghan diaspora organisation, The Hague

Vereniging Abovian – Armenian diaspora organisation, The Hague

Appendix 3 Characteristics of Diaspora Organisations

Name of the Organisation	Active in	Objectives	Activities (current/completed)	Annual Reach	Personnel	Annual Budget
Emcemo	Morocco Netherlands	To encourage migrants in Western countries of residence to be socially active and dedicate their efforts to community development. In relation to the Netherlands and Europe: To encourage the social (education, jobs) and political participation of the Moroccan and other migrant communities in the Netherlands. To promote the peaceful co-existence of various population groups and to fight discrimination and racism. To fight and prevent all kinds of forms of (religious) extremism. In relation to Morocco: To contribute to the economic, social, political and cultural development of the countries south of the Mediterranean Sea, in particular Morocco. To give shape to the concept of citizenship in the belief that migrants residing in Europe can play a double role as intermediaries and active participants in development.	Advice and information (consultations 3x per week, Islamophobia telephone hotline). Developing and encouraging collaborations. Organising debates.	>1,000 people	Volunteers (>100)	Ca. EUR 200,000
Barka	Poland Netherlands	To give advice, training and support to migrants from Central Europe and Eastern Europe who have complex needs and are looking for work in the Netherlands.	The organisation has a so-called "social economy office" in Utrecht, where the homeless can go for help and advice. Help in finding work. Sheltering addicts in one of the communities in Poland. Helping former addicts to find work when they return to their native country.	Ca. 3,000 homeless and other vulnerable people receive assistance. Ca. 600 people receive help with repatriation. Ca. 600 people receive help with other requests for assistance. Ca. 40 persons are helped to find work.	Salaried workers (21) Volunteers (3)	EUR 1,000,000
Stichting SAN	Afghanistan Netherlands	To raise funds for the reconstruction of Afghanistan among Afghans living in the Netherlands.	Giving aid to Afghanistan (wheelchairs). Translating the diary of Anne Frank and having it distributed in Afghanistan. Publishing (photography) books in Afghanistan .	Unknown	Volunteers (3)	EUR 0
Dalmar	Somalia	To encourage the participation of the Somali and	Providing professional assistance, mainly	>1,000 people	Salaried workers (4)	Unknown

Name of the Organisation	Active in	Objectives	Activities (current/completed)	Annual Reach	Personnel	Annual Budget
Foundation	Netherlands	African communities in Dutch society. To build a bridge between the Somali/African community and other population groups.	to African self-organisations, in the areas of relationship-building, interaction and cooperation with local authorities, welfare organisations, schools and community centres. Giving training and guidance to organisations and giving advice to (welfare) organisations and authorities. Managing Radio Dalmar, which broadcasts for Somalis in The Hague and Amsterdam. Projects, e.g. learning Dutch on Radio Dalmar. National campaign against genital mutilation. Campaign against the use of khat by Somalis in the Haaglanden region (2009). Brain Gain Project (2015). Sports activities. Homework assistance. Organising weekly meetings and conventions. AMVs Project. Repatriation to Somalia with Prospects Project. Daily consultations. <i>Parent in Action</i> (parenting issues).		Volunteers (20)	

Name of the Organisation	Active in	Objectives	Activities (current/completed)	Annual Reach	Personnel	Annual Budget
Okyeman Foundation	Ghana Netherlands	To contribute to the preservation of the culture and traditions of Akyem (a region in Ghana). To satisfy the needs of people from the Akyem region who live in the Netherlands and the Benelux. Ghanaians who are not from this region but would like to contribute to the development of Akyem are more than welcome. To promote the integration of its members into Dutch society. To contribute to cultural diversity in the Netherlands. To demand attention for the provision of healthcare to its members while taking account of their culture and traditions.	Project which focuses on political movements in Ghana, water and hygiene project in Ghana, biweekly meetings in the Netherlands during which all kinds of assistance is provided to the participants (schooling, health problems, parenting problems, etc.), providing information on HIV and AIDS to Ghanaians in the Netherlands.	50 families	Volunteers	EUR 50,000
Goedwerk Foundation	Various countries	To help migrants (former asylum seekers, regular, irregular) with voluntary repatriation to their country of origin	Helping migrants who want to go back with the following: inspiring intake interviews (counselling), removing obstacles to repatriation, arranging travel documents, maintaining contacts with embassies and consulates, preparing for repatriation, providing assistance in the country of origin (after-care service)	>100	Salaried workers (3) Volunteers (40)	EUR 300,000
Sierra Leone Central Union	Sierra Leone Netherlands	To support the integration of Sierra Leonians in the Netherlands within the Dutch policy framework and to encourage the members to make an active contribution to the development of Sierra Leone.	Organising educational meetings. Organising social meetings. Organising an annual festival. Building a school in Sierra Leone. Sending relief goods to Sierra Leone. Project Peace Caravan in the Netherlands.	Ca. 1,000	Volunteers Affiliate organisations in fourteen cities in the Netherlands which organise activities for their members	EUR 10,000
Stichting AGAP	Guinea Netherlands	To look after the interests of Guineans in the Netherlands and development in Guinea.	Subsections in cities organise activities relating to immigration, participation and emancipation. Organising practical assistance for members. Sending relief goods to Guinea.	Ca. 400 members	Volunteers (9)	EUR 0

Name of the Organisation	Active in	Objectives	Activities (current/completed)	Annual Reach	Personnel	Annual Budget
BASUG	Bangladesh Sri Lanka Nepal India Netherlands	To contribute to the development of Bangladesh and neighbouring countries.	Microcredit, education, gender equality campaigns, more specifically, domestic violence campaigns, programmes to raise awareness of remittances, influencing policy, development projects targeted at disadvantaged women and children in Bangladesh.	Assists ca. 360 women and children p.a. The number of Bengalis reached in the Netherlands is unknown.	Three permanent staff members (unpaid) Volunteers (10-12)	Ca. EUR 70,000
Vereniging Abovian	Armenia Netherlands	To look after the interests of and promote the integration and participation of the (members of the) Armenian community in the Netherlands whilst preserving the Armenian identity. To promote friendly relations between the Armenian community and Dutch society. And anything related or conducive to, directly or indirectly, the above, in the broadest sense.	Organising activities relating to the Armenian language and culture (Armenian language classes, Armenian folk dance lessons, lectures on Armenian art and culture). Organising information days during which general, social and health information is provided Organising social evenings. Active in the 24 April Committee for Recognition and Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide. Taking part in conferences and other activities relating to Armenia.	120 members 4,000-5,000 people via mailing list (this concerns Armenians in Armenia and other European countries)	Volunteers (30)	EUR 30,000

Appendix 4 Selected Staff Members

Government Agencies

Staff member, Repatriation and Departure Service (Ministry of Security and Justice)

Staff member, Repatriation and Departure Service (Ministry of Security and Justice)

Staff member, Migration Policy Department (Ministry of Security and Justice)

Staff member, Migration Policy Department (Ministry of Security and Justice)

Staff member Department for Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Staff member, Department for Integration and Society (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment)

Staff member, Department for Integration and Society (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment)

Staff member, Municipality of Amsterdam

Appendix 5 Supervisory Committee

Chairman

Prof. Roel Fernhout (Radboud University Nijmegen)

Members

Frerik Kampman MA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Dr Maureen Turina-Tumewu (Scientific Research and Documentation
Centre, Ministry of Security and Justice)

Dr Gery Nijenhuis (Utrecht University)

Luuk Verhoeven (Ministry of Security and Justice)