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Introduction

In the following pages, numerous inspiring examples of successful and unsuccessful Remittances for Community Development practices are presented. These examples should be perceived as they are listed: purely as examples of practices that could be inspiring for other organizations, individuals or public/private institutions that are interested in engaging migrants and their communities in development activities in the country of origin. We are not offering a ready made solution to engaging migrant communities in development practices, nor are we offering best practice scenarios that are easily replicable in new circumstances. Engaging migrants in development activities will require more than copy-paste solutions, as do all development activities aimed at relieving poverty and contributing to social and economic strengthening of societies.

What we offer in this report is inspiration - inspiration based on past or ongoing practices worldwide in which partnerships have been formed, development goals have been identified and community potential has been stimulated. While some practices offered in this report might not have been successful in the long run, certain aspects of the project can still be taken on board to improve the plans of other organizations. Engaged stakeholders can learn from the highs and lows of other pilot projects in order to fine-tune their own activities and avoid reinventing the wheel.

The presentation of the projects is organized in such a way that key features are highlighted, such as the objectives, partnerships and activities of each project. We have also included the challenges that the projects endured, and the results that have been achieved (where applicable). We realize that not all information on the projects can be included in such an overview, and urge interested stakeholders to seek contact with the respective contact person for more information on any specific project.

Unfortunately, what seems to be a common trend among development initiatives aiming at leveraging remittances for community development is the lack of impact assessments of the project in the community. This is why, in the project overviews below, you will find a rough impact assessment for each project (Orozco & Welle 2005^2). In as far results were presented in project reports, the tables give a first indication. However, due to limited reporting on the impact on the communities, these tables only reflect our subjective perception.

---

Inspiring findings

In the tables further below you will find some issues that can be inspiring to future Remittances for Community Development projects drawn from the numerous examples provided in this report. The most inspiring examples show to have taken on board at least one of four key concerns when developing and implementing their projects: embeddedness in a broader network, good communication, getting government support for the project, and working closely with local organisations. To provide a better understanding of the features, we will offer some brief descriptions of our understanding of these aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key feature</th>
<th>Inspiring example</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness in broader</td>
<td>Dairy Cow, ERCOF, The Philippines</td>
<td>More ownership &amp; control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Valoration des produits locaux, Migrations et Développement, Morocco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing strong partnerships built on mutual trust and understanding, in which partners offer complementary capacities, enables RfCD projects to create more ownership and control over the project. As the capacity or organizational skills of initiating organizations of RfCD projects are not always sufficient, involving specialized third parties appears to attribute positively to the implementation of RfCD initiatives. Involving third parties in a partnership – whether local or transnational – may lead to the accumulation of economic, social and political capital for the organizations involved and the beneficiaries.

The inspiring example of the French-based migrant organization “Migrations et Développement” has established strong ties between local farmers, European traders and regulatory bodies in both host and countries of origin to establish European (fair) trading relations between Morocco and France. They have incorporated all necessary links of the trading chain (local producers, traders, markets and regulators) to enable transnational business relations. The different partners involved offer different components of the trading relation – thus owning ‘pieces of the transnational puzzle’, while being able to closely control sound project implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key feature</th>
<th>Inspiring example</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good communication</td>
<td>Marketing, Migration &amp; Development, AfroEuro, Ghana</td>
<td>More awareness and larger constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy, Tres por Uno, HTA, Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The flow of information and the ability to reach out to the selected communities (whether in host or in countries of origin) determines the level of awareness of the project, as well as contributes to the creation of a larger constituency.

The premise sounds simple: “If people don’t know about a project, they can’t support the project”. Yet, it often is noticed in practice that limited attention is given to the sharing of information on opportunities, the development of projects, as well as during the implementation phase of the project. Involving partners (local actors, migrant communities, financial institutions, etc) is one thing, but keeping partners involved throughout the process is another. The chance of losing interest, of getting “donor-fatigue”, or of not being satisfied with the project progress is present. Why? This is often due to investors, beneficiaries, or supporters of projects not being fully informed. Regular and continuous information back and forth between initiators, implementers, intermediaries and recipients stimulates the engagement of those involved and avoids early termination of the project due to misconceptions, lack of shared understanding of objectives, or limited monitoring of capital flows.
The **Rwanda Diaspora Mutual Fund**, which was initiated by the Government of Rwanda, has structured a large-scale **marketing** programme to advertise the opportunity for Rwandan migrants to pool capital in collective investments in their home country. While the outreach campaign did not reach the expected success, the government did realize they needed to market the product as any other commercial enterprise if they wanted to reach results. However, the Rwanda Diaspora Mutual Fund lacks a clear focus on “Diaspora Marketing”, not enabling them to fine-tune the marketing efforts as well as the Fund to the expected audience. Their target audience is described as “families of all levels, children, students, low and mid-income levels as well as high generated income, planning for the future” (Presentation Rwandan Diaspora General Directorate). While their motto sounds promising; “Mobilization by a good marketing!”, it seems difficult to mobilize such a large and diversified target audience to get engaged in one and the same programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key feature</th>
<th>Inspiring example</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government support</td>
<td></td>
<td>More willingness and trust among partners involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host country</td>
<td>IraqPartnership.org, USAID, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient country</td>
<td>Filipino country-side development fund, The Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In situations where the government in the country of origin or residence has created an environment in which migrant contributions are more easily used to achieve development goals, the projects seem to create more willingness among local partners as well as among migrant communities to engage in such projects.

Government institutions in the **country of origin** (whether local, regional, federal or national) can assist in channelling resources to specific development projects or can provide a friendlier policy framework to foster incentives for migrant development contributions to the homeland. Recipient or sending communities can identify such opportunities, and/or request support for government funds and expertise. The example presented below of the “**Tres Por Uno**” programme in Mexico shows how governments can provide incentives for migrants to not only support their relatives directly, but contribute to community projects simultaneously – indirectly benefiting their family and friends as well.

In the **host country**, governments can create partnerships with migrant organisations to engage in development activities in partner localities in the countries of origin. In France and Italy, local governments have been active in the field of “co-development” for decades, in which they support migrant communities in creating projects to foster social, economic or political development in their regions of origin. In host countries, stimulating engagement of migrant communities with the country of origin allows the organizations to become more involved in local politics, learn more on the institutional framework and participate directly in social and economic life in the host country, all benefiting the incorporation of migrant communities in the local setting. A good example of a host country offering incentives to the Diaspora to invest in development projects is the **Codev Initiative**, linking French and Senegalese governments to stimulate and attract migrant investments in the country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key feature</th>
<th>Inspiring example</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Longer life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association/cooperation</td>
<td>MARIA 4 MDG, Damayan, The Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Exploration</td>
<td>Seamstresses, GTZ, Rwanda; Family&amp;Friend Fund, IntEnt, the Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intensive cooperation with local organisations will contribute to achieving a more sustainable – longer life cycle – project. When dealing with development activities, it is key to address local needs and requirements rather than deciding from outside what is best for communities.
Migrant contributions should be no different in their approach in this sense than other development supporters. Through our “investigation goggles”, as one migrant association leader has put it, it is possible to identify existing needs and demands in communities or countries of origin. Based on this **local exploration**, projects will be more fitted to the local situation and therefore stimulate a longer life cycle of the project. In contrast, when projects are developed in communities for which no need was present, the funds in some cases might just go to waste.

Many inspiring projects seem to have decided to **create and/or cooperate with local associations or co-operations** to enhance the project’s sustainability and stimulate local engagement for the project. By involving local organized groups, a sense of ownership is stimulated, while entrusting local actors directly with implementing and monitoring tasks generates a form of social control. The example of *Maria 4 MDG* (previously known as “Maria Goes to Town”) in the Philippines provides a striking example of how the project’s appointed women’s association kindled a rethinking of gender roles, empowering women of a mostly patriarchal community to take on leadership positions within their community.
Future Attention

While the inspiring examples share some key features that stimulate Remittances for Community Development practices in countries or origin, some important factors are often still not addressed. Below, two core elements are introduced that can strengthen the impact of RfCD projects in the long run.

**Impact assessment**

Implementing projects and reacting to pleas from community members to invest in certain initiatives can stimulate development in the countries or communities of origin. But how do we know whether these funds actually contribute to development? When we speak of development, it can be a wide-range of things. We can think of women empowerment, such as the example provided above of Maria 4 MDG. We can look at poverty alleviation, or the stimulation of the local economy by investing in entrepreneurial investments creating job opportunities and self-sustaining facilities. Yet, how do we evaluate whether the objectives that were set out in the beginning of the project, actually were realized. When constructing a school, it can obviously easily be noticed whether the funds have been spent as planned – there should be a building. Yet, if there are no teachers or materials, will the school building contribute to development? Or if the community decides to limit the enrolment to boys only, and exclude girls from education facilities, can we then speak of development?

It is therefore suggested that RfCD initiatives include a self-evaluation tool when developing their projects. The tool does not have to be a straightjacket or be complicated. What the tool should encompass is a way to test whether the previously set goals have been reached. By asking some critical questions about who has been involved, who is benefiting, how many people have been reached, what obstacles were encountered, etc, a more sustainable outcome is likely to be reached for the evaluated project as well for future projects based on the lessons learned.

**Establish Trust**

Trust issues will always surface when engaging with partners in shared activities, whether they are familiar partners or unknown stakeholders. It is not surprising that people are sceptical when deciding to commit funds to a certain project, or to get engaged with partners that they have not yet worked with in the past. How to know whom to trust or how to know whether the funds will be used for the intended purposes when living abroad? Asking some critical questions can help to address these universal uncertainties. Wondering whether the involved organizations would trust themselves if, as an outsider, they would be presented with the project. Thinking about how the partners are communicating with each other – are all stakeholders informed and is information easily accessible to everybody. Questioning whether promises are delivered and if these promises are realistic. By asking these and other critical questions, trust relations between the different stakeholders can be improved, creating an added value to the practice of RfCD.
This table offers an overview of the actors involved at the sending and receiving end. The senders are those contributing to the realization of the project financially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Initiators</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Financial contributors</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

The RfCD performance criteria are drawn from Orozco and Welle (2005). It is an impact assessment form, which allows organizations to assess the potential impact of their projects on the community.

RfCD performance criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Participation in decision-making</th>
<th>Participation in implementation</th>
<th>Control of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Project meets basic needs</td>
<td>Needs met are a dev priority</td>
<td>Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Enables development goals</td>
<td>Does not constitute burden or entail added costs</td>
<td>Long life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>Resources are easily available in other communities</td>
<td>Institutional environment is available in other communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form offers supplementary information on the project, the actors involved or the potential impact of the project.

Contribution to Development/Notes
Project Overview

1. Maria 4 MDG
2. Dairy Cow Investment Vehicle
3. IntEnt
4. PMIE
5. Migration & Development Programme
6. Valorisation des Produits Locaux
7. Surinam Capital Investment Fund
8. Dias de Cabo Verde
9. Ghanacoop
10. COSPE
11. Rwanda Diaspora Mutual Fund
12. OF Countryside Development Fund
13. RemitPlus-Fadugu
14. Diaspora Link
15. IraqPartnership.org
16. Seamstress Rwanda
17. Quatro Por Uno
18. Initiatives de Co-développement
**Maria for MDGs**
Mobilizing rural women towards running their own collective economic facility and enabling individual women entrepreneurs’ access to local markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mobilizing local government units, local women’s associations, rural banks and Diaspora community organizations in multi-stakeholder partnerships for the realization of women-run social enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>Damayan (NL) for JMDI EU-UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Directly: 1,200 women, 6,000 households Indirectly: 261,240 inhabitants of 6 rural municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>COS Utrecht (NL), Stichting Habagat (NL), Habagat PNID (PH), ERCOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>JMDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>• Social preparation of sites, training &amp; mobilization of rural women • Mobilization of Diaspora &amp; European counterparts • Co-dev platforms for rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>• Women associations formed • Profitable business for women entrepreneurs • Expansion of project to other project areas in The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>• Gender issues created some social tensions, which needed specific attention during implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

### RICD performance criteria:

#### Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

#### Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

#### Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

#### Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities

### Notes:

The key focus areas of the project are:
- Creating sustainable networks amongst migrant communities for development
- Promoting the involvement of women, refugees, asylum seekers in migrant/Diaspora organizations for development
- Leveraging the human and social development impact of remittances
- Reinforcing capacities of senders and recipients to further the impact of remittances on development

The project aims to meet MDGs 1, 2, 3, and 8 in rural areas of Southern Philippines. Since the start of the project in one municipality, the project has created a demand in neighbouring municipalities and has started similar social projects in 5 other municipalities.

No social or development impact study has been conducted prior or during implementation of the projects, and thus the development impact is in essence difficult to assess.
## Objective
Investment vehicle pushing the local dairy industry towards competitiveness, spurring growth in countryside, providing additional means of livelihood to farmers, encouraging cooperatives, investments for OFWs.

## Country
The Philippines

## Initiators
ERCOF

## Beneficiary
Local farmers, private actors, OFWs investors

## Partners
Talavera Dairy Cooperative, Inc. & DVF Farms

## Financial contributors
OFWs investors

## Activities
- ERCOF as monitoring agent and facilitator
- Creating partnerships with dairy processors, farmers and investors

## Results
- Give Filipinos good ROIs under relative secure investment environment
- Additional source of livelihood to marginal farmers and contributes to local economy
- “Investor gets physical satisfaction of having been able to help his country”

## Challenges
Risks such as death of cows, death of farmers, disagreement among partners, farmer’s inefficiency, etc

## Notes
The purchase of dairy cows is an investment option for overseas Filipino workers who may wish to earn potentially exponential profits through livestock offspring and milk production. It involves an investment by an overseas Filipino in a local dairy (milking) cow, that is dispersed to and taken care by individual farmers in rural areas, with ERCOF monitoring the transaction, dispersal, and care of the cows, in cooperation with a local dairy processor and cooperative.

The project is designed to be self-sustaining after 2.5 years. Expected pay-back period for investor is 2.4 years and thus implying that farmers are able to run the business without further investments other than personal savings. The project is easily transferable to other settings, when adjusted to local needs and requirements (the principle of cow rendering might be exchanged by another suitable farmer produce).
IntEnt
Providing business support to (migrant) entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Stimulate entrepreneurship among immigrants - offers fee-based support to entrepreneurs seeking assistance in developing their business plans to promote development in country of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Based in the Netherlands – activities in Morocco, Turkey, Surinam, Ghana, Turkey, Ethiopia, Afghanistan and Curacao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>IntEnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Migrant entrepreneurs and local counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>TRIODOS (Facet), TRIODOS bank, Stichting SEON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>Migrant investors and third parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities | ❖ Provide info about entrepreneurship  
               ❖ Orientation sessions and training  
               ❖ Counselling, networking  
               ❖ Management training  
               ❖ Market info, advisory services |
| Results   | 1998-2007: launch 236 businesses; finish 194 business plans; trained 1.176 participants; admitted 1.693 clients. These businesses created investment worth over 14.5 million euro/990 jobs. |
| Challenges | ❖ Credit limitations and interest rates in developing countries  
               ❖ Bureaucratic delays  
               ❖ Unknown market in developing countries  
               ❖ Limited actual statistical data |

Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Local authorities
- Private actors

RICD performance criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Participation in decision-making ✗ ✗</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in implementation ✗ ✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Project meets basic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs met are a dev priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Enables development goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not constitute burden or entail added costs ✗ ✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long life cycle ✗ ✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>Resources are easily available in other communities ✗ ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional environment is available in other communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
The methodology of IntEnt is based on the ideas of (development) entrepreneurship. The basis for the IntEnt method is the triangle of (entrepreneurial) attitude, (management) skills and (technical) know-how. IntEnt focus primarily on the “attitude” and “skills” component of the entrepreneurship triangle. It is expected that the potential entrepreneur possesses the know-how of the sector in which he/she wishes to invest.
Economic Initiatives and Migration Program (PMIE)
Facilitate implementation of economic projects by migrants

Objective
Facilitate the implementation of economic projects by migrants, overcoming technical, financial and administrative management difficulties for investing migrants.

Country
Based in France – implemented in French-speaking countries in Africa

Initiators
pS-EAU (FR)

Beneficiary
Migrant investors and local economy

Partners
French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Labour, Employment & Social Cohesion; EC; CCFD

Financial contributors
French Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Labour, Employment & Social Cohesion; EC; CCFD

Activities
Training and individual support on:
- Activities by return migrants
- Activities by compatriot & supported by migrants living in France
- Activities carried out in France

Results
18 support organisations in 7 French regions; per year: 1000 migrants

Challenges
unknown

Who is involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Associations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assoc or Coop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RICD performance criteria:

Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met are a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities

Notes:
French Programme Migrations et Initiatives Economiques (PMIE), a business support program with a return-oriented focus, jointly funded by the French Ministries of Social Affairs and of Foreign Affairs, and implemented by the French NGO pS-Eau. The program provides training, support and funding to legal and irregular African immigrants who wish to establish a business in France or in their places of origin. Migrants can use their savings as a guarantee to obtain a loan, which is granted in local currency and conditioned to the actual productive investment of the loan. They can sponsor the start up of businesses in sectors that are of interest to the host region as well (Migralink 2006).

The need was based on the observation that many migrants were creating companies in their country of origin, or were supporting projects there, but the financial investments they were making were not showing results, frequently due to technical, administrative and financial management difficulties. The observations and findings of the network revealed the importance of project preparation in France, of methodological and technical support and the need for close monitoring by a specialized operator on the ground.

Fields of activity are varied:
- Primary sector: market garden production, poultry farming, fishing, etc
- Secondary sector: construction, arts and crafts, agro-food processing, etc
- Tertiary sector: commerce (retail, wholesale, import/export), IT, tourism, driving schools, printing, services, etc.
Migration & Development programme
Improving livelihood of local community in rural Ghana

Objective
Improve the livelihood of the local community through formation of farmer’s associations and micro-credit schemes. 3 goals: (i) engage migrant community to leverage rem for dev purpose; (ii) identify investment opp’s in Ghana; (iii) create opp’s for seed capital and investments by migrants

Country
Ghana (based in the Netherlands)

Initiators
AfroEuro

Beneficiary
Women farmers in Ghana, traders and other actors in informal sector

Partners
Sinapi Aba Trust (micro-credit Ghana)

Financial contributors
migrants

Activities
- Formation of associations
- Partnership with association and micro-credit institutions
- Link migrants to local associations
- Project support

Results
- Permanent functioning management team for local farmer associations
- Associations can run micro-credit schemes

Challenges
In early stage, limited funding prevented broadening of the micro-credit scheme for local farmer’s associations as well as setting up new ones.

Who is involved?
- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

RICD performance criteria:

Ownership
- Participation in decision-making ✓
- Participation in implementation ✓
- Control of project □

Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs □
- Needs met are a dev priority ✓
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions □

Sustainability
- Enables development goals □
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs □
- Long life cycle □

Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities ✓
- Institutional environment is available in other communities □

Notes
Three goals were set at the start of the project:
- African migrants in Europe would be more aware of the role they can play in the development of their countries of origin
- The migrants will increasingly see the extent to which their remittances can further the development agenda of their countries of origin (rural development).
- Create opportunities through which the Ghanaian migrants can source seed capital and investors in Ghana.

AfroEuro foundation intensified its outreach activities by engaging in membership with migrant consortia (DFD, GIDI). In their view, the membership in such networks will provide avenues to achieve objectives to large extent. AfroEuro strongly believes in the impact of “social remittances” – the transfer of skills, experiences and knowledge to enhance capacities, organizational structures and institutional development. They encourage the participation of migrants in training programmes as part of the Migration & Development programme.

The livelihood support project includes the following processes: (i) Land preparation; (ii) Supply of seeds and fertilizers, (iii) financial literacy training; and (iv) marketing & distribution of products in the region.
Valorisation des produits locaux
Income-generating projects on rural solidarity-based tourism and local products and crafts

Objective
Stimulating social-economic development in province of Taroudannt through agrarian economic activities to combat poverty and vulnerability of the poor by creating jobs and investment opp’s

Country
Based in France, implemented in Morocco

Initiators
Migrations et Développement

Beneficiary
Cooperatives of involved communities (mostly women and youth)

Partners
Local producers, government units in Europe and Morocco, local associations

Financial contributors
Migrations et Développement

Activities
- Financial support to cooperatives
- Knowledge sharing and training
- Visits to France for cooperative members to learn productive methods
- Commercialization of products

Results
400 families have been involved in economic activities by offering of sustainable financial support in the region.

Challenges
Local degradation of environment

Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

RICD performance criteria:

Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met are a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities

Notes
The project offers support to economic activities in the agrarian sector of durable goods in the region such as local production of saffron and olives (oil) to help combat poverty. The project stimulates the creation of agrarian jobs, and offers local workshops for rural youngsters and single women taking care of children. MigDev has realized three projects thus far:

- “Le projet “Souktana”, Safran Quality” – 10 local farmers in connection with 2 enterprises in France
- “Projet de Transformation des Olives” – educational visits to French producers to stimulate production through new and durable technologies and to produce olive oil according to European norms and standards for export
- “Les ateliers pilotes “Amlou” – women associations constructed to produce argon oil
### Suriname Capital Investment Fund

**Mobilize Surinam entrepreneurs to jointly invest in SME in Surinam**

**Contact:**
Suriname Capital Investment Fund  
Grace Boldewijn  
+31 (0) 88 1050060

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>To simulate investments in Surinam in order to spur entrepreneurship in the country by giving them financial “injections”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Surinam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>SCIF (Surinam Capital Investment Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Local business development – entrepreneurs offered financial injections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Suriname Entrepreneurs Platform (SEP) in Surinam, Investors worldwide with Surinam affiliation – local entrepreneurs SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>Migrant investors and SEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities | ❖ Financing of starting local entrepreneurs  
❖ SCIF offers knowledge, coaching |
| Results | unknown                                                                                                           |
| Challenges | Risk of crisis in Surinam through political, monetary or other causes.                                               |

**Who is involved?**

- Individuals - S  
- Households - ☐  
- Businesses - ☒  
- Migrant Associations - ☒  
- Local Assoc or Coop - ☐  
- Civil Society Org - ☐  
- Professional NGO - ☐  
- Local authorities - ☐  
- Private actors - ☒  

**RfCD performance criteria:**

- **Ownership**  
  Participation in decision-making - ☒  
  Participation in implementation - ☐  
  Control of project - ☐  

- **Correspondence**  
  Project meets basic needs - ☐  
  Needs met are a dev priority - ☐  
  Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions - ☒  

- **Sustainability**  
  Enables development goals - ☒  
  Does not constitute burden or entail added costs - ☐  
  Long life cycle - ☐  

- **Replicability**  
  Resources are easily available in other communities - ☐  
  Institutional environment is available in other communities - ☐  

**Notes**
SCIF selects the investments on the basis of “human”, “planet” and “revenue”. Human factor stands for the humane treatment with employees, customers and partners and the social environment in which the business takes place. “Planet factor” relates to the sustainability of the business (sustainable usage of resources, waste and environment). The “revenue factor” refers to the choice for investments that will be based on potential risk and revenue.

While the project is different from other RfCD projects in the sense that it is a pure investment facilitating company, the basis for its existence comes forth out of its affiliation with Suriname (migrant initiative) and the stimulation of local investment and business climate to aid the development of the country.
**Objective**

Strengthening the capacity and competencies of professionals working in key dev sectors in CV. Gives Diaspora possibilities to engage in dev of CV by transferring skills and by developing entrepreneurial projects.

**Country**

Cape Verde & Diaspora in Portugal, Italy and the Netherlands

**Initiators**

Instituto das Comunidades de Cabo Verde (IC)

**Beneficiary**

- Profs in dev sectors in CV
- National, local, private institutions in CV
- CV entrepreneurs and business sector

**Partners**

International Organisation for Migration is implementing partner

**Financial contributors**

Co-financed by EC and Portuguese government

**Activities**

- map prof needs in key dev sectors
- dev website for interested people for training
- database of skilled CV'ians abroad
- short training missions
- networking missions co-dev projects
- dissemination of info regarding investment

**Results**

unknown

**Challenges**

unknown

**Who is involved?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assoc or Coop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RICD performance criteria:**

**Ownership**

- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation: ☒
- Control of project: ☐

**Correspondence**

- Project meets basic needs: ☐
- Needs met are a dev priority: ☐
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions: ☒

**Sustainability**

- Enables development goals: ☐
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs: ☐
- Long life cycle: ☐

**Replicability**

- Resources are easily available in other communities: ☒
- Institutional environment is available in other communities: ☐

**Notes**

The initiative provides an opportunity to mobilize Cape Verdians abroad to contribute, through their competences, to the benefit of Cape Verde and its key development sectors.
### Ghanacoop

Cooperative import-export enterprise to market Ghanaian and Italian fruit and local products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Ghanacoop was created as a social enterprise with the intent of promoting the competences of the Ghanaian migrants with a reciprocity purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Co-development initiative between Ghana and Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>Ghana National Association of Modena in 2004 (until 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Local economy, local private actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Local institutions and independent research agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>MIDA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Trading and transfair certification, Agro-food production, Sensitization on Ghanaian culture within Italy, Solidarity actions to help local comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Ceased to exist in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Funding, Sustainability, Credibility of migrants’ initiative, Improving partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contribution to Development
Ghanacoop was considered as a best practice in the field of Diaspora engagement in a global context because of:
- The active involvement of a whole migrants’ community for development of both the origin and destination countries;
- A mixed partnership (in terms of public-private and Ghanaian-Italian institutions);
- Its business-oriented activities, which discourage illegal migration and facilitate brain gain processes;
- Its sustainability assured by the strong motivation due to informal and familiar relations which encourage also the ones between communities of destination and origin;
- Its transferability within other migrant communities

In 2010 Ghanacoop ceased to exist. Possible obstacles to continuation of this “success story” are noted as: official unpaid invoices, possible mismanagement problems, and asymmetric relationship between Italian and Ghanaian stakeholders. It is said that Ghanacoop remains as a positive experience among local institutions.
### COSPE
**Alternative remittance transfer system to micro-finance institution**

**Objective**
To promote the involvement of immigrants in local dev processes in their countries. Specific objective to experiment an alternative mechanism for transferring remittances in remote rural areas.

**Country**
Morocco, Italy

**Initiators**
COSPE

**Beneficiary**
Moroccan immigrants transferring funds to family in Morocco, communities of province of Khenifra (Morocco)

**Partners**
AMOS (local micro finance institution) - Morocco, Monte dei Paschi di Siena (Bank) - Italy, Ass. of Moroccan immigrants of Province of Livorno

**Financial contributors**
Public (Tuscany Region) and private (COSPE and Moroccan partners)

**Activities**
- Training (handbook)
- Information & awareness activities
- Dev of technical aspects of system
- Project management

**Results**
unknown

**Challenges**
unknown

### Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

### RICD performance criteria:

#### Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

#### Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met are a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

#### Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

#### Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities

### Notes
Despite the limited number of operations carried on during the project, the experience showed that it's possible to reduce the cost of operations and that is also possible to reach rural communities involving committed and appropriate local actors such as MFIs. It also indicate that it's important to associate immigrants in Italy to develop a system coherent with their needs and their constraints so they could effectively be involved in promoting development processes participated and co-owned by local communities. Another aspect positively characterising the initiative was the involvement of different, private and public, actors in Italy and Morocco ensuring to cover all technical and communication aspects according to the mission of each one of these actors (migration4development.org).
## Rwanda Diaspora Mutual Fund

**Act as a pool of capital from Rwandans in the Diaspora for collective investments in Rwanda**

### Objective

The mission of the Fund is to promote the financial well-being of the Rwandan Diaspora while participating in the socio-economic growth of the motherland.

### Country

Rwanda

### Initiators

National Bank of Rwanda (NRB), Rwandan Diaspora

### Beneficiary

Rwandan Diaspora and friends, national economy

### Partners

Bank of Kigali (and affiliated international branches)

### Financial contributors

Rwandan Diaspora, national government

### Activities

The Fund invests in high quality, short-term debt securities (such as treasury bills, government guaranteed notes, etc)

### Results

Not yes as successful due to government owned Fund. Trying to privatize the Fund creating more competition and legroom for potential investors.

### Challenges

- Trust in public ownership of fund
- Investment risks

### Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

### RICD performance criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision-making</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in implementation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of project</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meets basic needs</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs met are a dev priority</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables development goals</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not constitute burden or entail added costs</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long life cycle</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are easily available in other communities</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional environment is available in other communities</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

---

### Notes

The Fund can have a direct impact on national economy by investing in government assets. Simultaneously, the investment certificates can be used as a collateral for e.g. loans stimulating economic growth further at a more localized level.

---

Contact:

http://www.rwandandiaspora.gov.rw
The Overseas Filipino Countryside Dev Fund
Sourcing of funds for infrastructure projects in rural areas using migrant investments in local government bonds

Contact:
www.ercof.org

Objective
OFCDF focuses on ensuring that proceeds of migrants sponsored bonds are directed at community development and simultaneously to create returns to migrant investors.

Country
The Philippines

Initiators
Local Government Units (LGU)

Beneficiary
Migrant investors, local communities in the Philippines, LGU

Partners
ERCOF

Financial contributors
LGU, migrant investors, ERCOF

Activities
- Identify hometown projects
- Referred to ERCOF for evaluation
- Formation of associations of investors’ consortiums
- Monitoring & evaluation

Results
In 2010 brochure reports of 7 ongoing projects requiring investments.

Challenges
unknown

Who is involved?

- Individuals
- Households
- Businesses
- Migrant Associations
- Local Assoc or Coop
- Civil Society Org
- Professional NGO
- Local authorities
- Private actors

RICD performance criteria:

Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met are a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities

Contribution to Development
The OFCDF offers an alternative to depositing money into bank, financial institution, savings and loan associations or merely making donations. It offers (quoted from OFCDF brochure):
- Opportunity to directly assist home town, municipality, province or region through the financing of development projects, family or individually owned micro-enterprise businesses;
- The prospects to create more employment, farmer-fish folk household livelihood opportunities, a brighter future for the children, your constituents and your region through participation in:
  - Agriculture/aquacultural projects;
  - Micro-enterprise financing projects;
  - Food processing and production facilities;
  - Cold storage and supply chains, marketing linkages
  - Etc
- Opportunity to develop own insurance or pre-need programs that address both OFWs needs and other Filipinos
- “Pa-lupa” plan can be conceived, allowing farmer households to acquire land on a lease-to-own program
- Fisher folk household can be assisted by investments in manufacturing and tooling facilities
### RemitPlus – Fadugu Fund
Pilot Project Remittance Matching Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>The project seeks to optimise the impact of remittances by improving options for money transfers and linking remittances to other financial and business development services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>Afford UK with FADUGU Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Rural and urban population in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Afford UK, Fadugu Limited, other MTOs, remittance MTOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>Co-funded by IFAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities | - Financial literacy training  
- Investment and savings training  
- Business advice and support  
- Enterprise development |
| Results   | - Remittance matching program not successful  
- TA to businesses and financial literacy training underway  
- Partnerships established |
| Challenges| - Institutional capacity of Fadugu too weak  
- Limited capacity to implement project. Now, more efforts for cap building, then retry of project. |

### Contribution to Development
Using remittances and migrant capital to promote rural and enterprise development through improvements in the performance of new and existing businesses. Due to internal organizational struggles, the project managed to offer business trainings but was not able to kick-start the remittance-matching fund. Fadugu managed decided to first improve the organizational capacity, before retrying to launch the matching programme, addressing internal struggles first before wanting to implement activities.

### Who is involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Associations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assoc or Coop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Org</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional NGO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private actors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RICD performance criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Participation in decision-making</th>
<th>Participation in implementation</th>
<th>Control of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Project meets basic needs</td>
<td>Needs met are a dev priority</td>
<td>Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Enables development goals</td>
<td>Does not constitute burden or entail added costs</td>
<td>Long life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicability</td>
<td>Resources are easily available in other communities</td>
<td>Institutional environment is available in other communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact:
www.fadugu.com
### DIASPORALINK

**Wireless money transfer cooperating with third parties that leverage remittances via microfinance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Provides a cooperative remittance service for Diaspora in EU, which acts as remittance transfer solution and provides rural outreach through community accounts and related services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>EU to world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>Individuals: Prof. Bengt Henoch &amp; Mr. Arne Nilsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Local micro-finance beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Diaspora associations identify microfinance and investment projects, private sector, NGOs, banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>Private funding: migrant investors, private investors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities                 | Creating partnerships  
Offering financial services                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Results                    | unknown                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Challenges                 | Receiver needs to have Visa bank card to collect money at ATM or local bank, limiting potential outreach among those who do not have access to bank account                                               |

**Who is involved?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Associations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assoc or Coop</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Org</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional NGO</td>
<td>❌ ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private actors</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RICD performance criteria:**

**Ownership**

- Participation in decision-making ❌
- Participation in implementation ❌
- Control of project ❌

**Correspondence**

- Project meets basic needs ❌
- Needs met are a dev priority ❌
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions ❌

**Sustainability**

- Enables development goals ❌
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs ❌
- Long life cycle ❌

**Replicability**

- Resources are easily available in other communities ❌
- Institutional environment is available in other communities ❌

**Notes**

By linking remittances directly to microfinance and business opportunities, communities have the opportunity to increase their financial development and strengthen economic growth in their locality.

**Contact:**

http://www.diasporalink.eu/
IraqPartnership.org
Website offers options for Diaspora to donate to community-led initiatives under USAID’s Community Action Program

Contact:
www.iraqpartnership.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>The focus of the initiative lies on community mobilization, social and economic infrastructure development and income generation, environmental protection and management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Iraq and USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>USAID and GlobalGiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Iraqi communities in 18 governates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>USAID CAP, NGOs, local government, local associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>USAID, migrant donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Provide opportunities to Diaspora and others to support projects in Iraq initiated by the local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>After 3 months, the initiative raised only $1,500. Due to request of mere contributions, not providing a role for the donators (Diaspora) to actually directly get involved in project…continue below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who is involved?

- □ Individuals
- □ Households
- □ Businesses
- □ Migrant Associations
- □ Local Assoc or Coop
- □ Civil Society Org
- □ Professional NGO
- □ Local authorities
- □ Private actors

RICD performance criteria:

Ownership
- Participation in decision-making □
- Participation in implementation □
- Control of project □

Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs □
- Needs met are a dev priority □
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions □

Sustainability
- Enables development goals □
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs □
- Long life cycle □

Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities □
- Institutional environment is available in other communities □

Contribution to Development

…and assure them that their contributions are meaningful, interest was scarce among the Diaspora to support these projects. The project eventually did not meet its objectives and can be described as an unsuccessful attempt by a government agency in a host country to engage the Diaspora and others to invest in development projects in countries of origin.

The initial idea was to support projects through “citizen donations”. Unfortunately, the project backfired, and little donations were made, limiting the development impact on projects by USAID under the IraqPartnership programme.
Promotion of Seamstresses in Rwanda
GTZ funded project offering migrant associations support to start similar projects in countries of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>To help women start up their own business and offer the opportunity to practice their skills in the association’s rooms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Rwanda and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiators</td>
<td>Ruandische Diaspora in Deutschland e.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Seamstresses in Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Local partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contributors</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities | ❖ Training on producing high-quality products  
❖ Management skills and business training     |
| Results | ❖ 46 pupils have earned a certificate of completion  
❖ 30 sewing machines for training purposes  
❖ Most graduates own business     |
| Challenges | unknown                                                                                                                                 |
| Who is involved? | Individuals ☐  
Households ☐  
Businesses ☐  
Migrant Associations ☐  
Local Assoc or Coop ☐  
Civil Society Org ☐  
Professional NGO ☒  
Local authorities ☐  
Private actors ☐  |
| RICD performance criteria: | Ownership Participation in decision-making ☒  
Participation in implementation ☒  
Control of project ☒  |
| Correspondence | Project meets basic needs ☒  
Needs met are a dev priority ☒  
Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions ☒  |
| Sustainability | Enables development goals ☒  
Does not constitute burden or entail added costs ☒  
Long life cycle ☒  |
| Replicability | Resources are easily available in other communities ☒  
Institutional environment is available in other communities ☒  |

**Contribution to Development**
Since 2007 GTZ on behalf of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is supporting numerous non-profit projects of migrant associations in their countries of origin with technical advice as well as financial grants.

Many young women in Rwanda have little or no formal education. In the district of Musanze, Northern Rwanda, a school for seamstresses offers women the opportunity to do a training course. However, participants still lacked on-the-job practice and the know-how they need to start a business. The training course offered by the Rwandan migrant organization provides them with these skills.
## Tres/Quatro por Uno
Remittance matching programme in Mexico

### Objective
- For HTA: chance to contribute to development in comm of origin
- For governments: powerful tool to attract resources for local dev
- Common: establish transnat ties

### Country
Mexico - USA

### Initiators
Home town associations (HTA)

### Beneficiary
Local Mexican communities

### Partners
Private sector, 3 government levels (national, state, local)

### Financial contributors
Public (government match) and private (collective remittance)

### Activities
- Financial support to community infrastructure projects
- Fundraising activities among constituency

### Results
Impact on poverty reduction has been limited and local labour markets still weak.

### Challenges
- Recipient communities not aware of existence of programme (limited public awareness/communication)
- Local level structural weaknesses (transparency, accountability, M&E)
- Might favour limited groups of community

### Notes
Some difficulties arose around the coordination of the different interests of central and local governments particularly with regard to the approval of specific projects. According to the evaluation, the local level still shows structural weaknesses in terms of transparency, accountability, monitoring and follow-up of approved projects. Local and regional economies of recipient communities shall show little improvement in poverty reduction or in diffusing decent working conditions. Yet, not to forget, the 3x1 has yielded significantly wider social benefits for origin communities than common remittance channels.

### Who is involved?
- S: Individuals
- R: Households
- S: Businesses
- S: Migrant Associations
- S: Local Assoc or Coop
- S: Civil Society Org
- S: Professional NGO
- S: Local authorities
- S: Private actors

### RICD performance criteria:

#### Ownership
- Participation in decision-making
- Participation in implementation
- Control of project

#### Correspondence
- Project meets basic needs
- Needs met are a dev priority
- Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions

#### Sustainability
- Enables development goals
- Does not constitute burden or entail added costs
- Long life cycle

#### Replicability
- Resources are easily available in other communities
- Institutional environment is available in other communities
### Initiatives de Co-développement
**Co-development initiative for infrastructural projects**

**Objective**
A bilateral pilot programme functioning as supportive framework for the strengthening and "structuring" of migrant’s enterprises – optimizing the chances of success of initiatives that would have taken place anyway (Datola 2011)

**Country**
France - Senegal

**Initiators**
Government of France in cooperation with migrant community

**Beneficiary**
Individual migrant (entrepreneurs), migrant associations – indirect: local communities

**Partners**
Senegalese and French government, migrant associations, private actors

**Financial contributors**
Joint administration & funding by governments of France & Senegal

**Activities**
- Professional mentoring and coaching for migrants wishing to start-up an income-generating activity in country of origin
- Mobilization of young & high-skilled Diaspora
- Co-funding of infrastructural projects promoted by Diaspora organizations

**Results**
- Success rate of start-up business has 20% superior rate to those start-up business in France
- 131 infrastructural projects

**Challenges**
- Persistence of French link of co-development to migration control
- Scope of Codev limited to migrants residing in France and to French organizations

**Who is involved?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Associations</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assoc or Coop</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Org</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional NGO</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private actors</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RICD performance criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision-making</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in implementation</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of project</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meets basic needs</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs met are a dev priority</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation in assoc or coordination with other institutions</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables development goals</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not constitute burden or entail added costs</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long life cycle</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replicability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are easily available in other communities</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional environment is available in other communities</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact:**
http://www.co-developpement.org/

**Notes**
The project is rooted in the “Convention Générale de Co-développement” signed by France and Senegal in 2000. Co-development stands for “the process through which immigrants contribute to the socio-economic development of their country of origin while integrating into the country to which they have immigrated, to the mutual benefit of both countries”.

Codev Initiative is not intended to promote unfair competition between Senegalese migrants “accompanied” by the project in starting-up their own business and local Senegalese entrepreneurs. The Codev instead limits itself to financing related activities such as training and management assistance (e.g. the elaboration of a business plan).

The third component of the project focuses on supporting Senegalese diaspora associations financially to fund projects finalized to the development of the home-country (construction of hospitals, schools, wells, irrigations systems and other infrastructures). Co-funding is based on two principles: realizing infrastructural projects is expensive and needs financial backing (up to 70% if in line with Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper), and such a co-funded project might have positive impact on thousands of people and on whole villages and regions (instead of localized business enterprise). “The different ‘extent’ of the expected effects justifies the greater ‘generosity’ of the Codev initiative in the third component” (Datola 2011).