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Part I

Introduction

From 21 to 26 March 2010, the International Migration Institute (IMI) of the Oxford Department of International Development and the James Martin 21st Century School at the University of Oxford, organised the second study tour on migration and development as part of its research project ‘Transatlantic dialogues on migration and development issues: the Mexico–US and Morocco–EU experiences’. This study tour was organised in partnership with the research team from the centre for Region and Regionalisation (E3R) of the Mohamed V University of Rabat-Agdal, Morocco, led by Professor Mohamed Berriane. The ‘Transatlantic dialogues on migration and development issues’ project, which started in 2008, aims to encourage academic–policy dialogues and advance knowledge on migration and development theories and practices through field visits that allow a systematic comparison between the Mexican and Moroccan experiences. The first study tour took place in March 2009 in the Mexican state of Zacatecas, while in the second year of the project the field visits were organised in the region of Ouarzazate, in Southern Morocco.

Field visits are a key component of this project because they encourage participants to make direct observations of the development impacts of migration in major sending areas. Participants’ observations provided a basis for discussions in the field and during the ensuing wrap-up seminars, during which the comparison between Moroccan and Mexican experiences remained central. These events provided the opportunity for researchers, policy makers and representatives of immigrant organisations from the US, Mexico, Europe and Morocco to observe not only direct and indirect investments of emigrants and returnees, but also the wider socio-economic, demographic and political impacts of migration. The confrontation with realities in the field also exposed participants to the diversity of migration impact, and sparked discussions about which conditions explain such diversity, and how policies can contribute to increasing the positive development impacts of migration.

Participants were selected on the basis of their experience with migration and development issues, their involvement in migration policies or their work with migrants, migrant organisations and development initiatives. In addition, invitees were chosen in accordance with 1) their willingness and openness to enrich their knowledge and to challenge their assumptions, and 2) their motivation
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to use new insights on migration and development gained during this event to inform their work. Altogether, 16 researchers, six policy makers and four civil society representatives took part in the event, 14 of whom had participated in the field visit in Mexico.

**Study tour in Mexico**

The 2009 study tour in Zacatecas gathered 19 participants from Mexico, Morocco, the EU and the US. In addition to presentations about the Mexican migration context and policies, field visits were organised to observe migrant-led economic investments (e.g. a mezcal distillery, a tortilla factory and agricultural projects), infrastructural projects (e.g. roads and plazas, schools and churches) and rural villages that have been experiencing migration-induced depopulation.

A number of important points were raised by participants after the field visits in Mexico. These were elaborated in the 2009 report\(^1\) and are summarised below:

- It is essential to forge a ‘Southern’ (i.e. origin country) perspective on migration and development. Hitherto, the debate has been led by Northern views which are biased by perceived concerns over security and immigration controls. In this context, migrants and remittances are often conceived as a convenient vector of development, which may even take over part of the states’ responsibilities for generating positive development conditions. In general, empirical research has never supported these views according to which migration is a panacea for development. Rather, the literature suggests that migration can, depending on general development and investment conditions, be either beneficial or an impediment for wider development processes.

- Moroccan and Mexican migration patterns have undergone significant transformations over the last two decades due to the transformations in the economic and policy context. While the main destination countries have increasingly welcomed highly skilled workers, increasing restrictions have been imposed on the migration of the predominantly un- and low-skilled workers from countries such as Mexico and Morocco. This has led to an increase of illegal immigration and has stimulated family reunification and permanent settlement in destination countries. Both Moroccan and Mexican migration present a strong diversification in terms of areas of departure and destination as well as the socio-economic background of migrants.

- Migration spurs social transformation. Migrants affect the sending communities through a variety of channels: remittances; development and philanthropic projects set up by

\(^1\) The report can be downloaded from the IMI website: [www.imi.ox.ac.uk/research/transatlantic-dialogues-on-migration-and-development-issues](http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/research/transatlantic-dialogues-on-migration-and-development-issues)
emigrants and organisations; investments; regular visits and more permanent return such as after retirement. The impacts themselves vary in time. In the first decades after departure, migrants’ remittances tend to be used to fulfill immediate family needs and investments such as the construction of a family home and the education of children, while investments in economic enterprises, if they occur, tend to follow only in the longer term. Impacts vary also depending on the level of commitment by the national government to improve public policies and basic infrastructure which can create an environment conducive to migrants’ investments.

- The participation of migrants in development initiatives and the type of commitment are manifold. Productive investments tend to be promoted by individual migrants or returnees, whereas projects of a philanthropic nature (e.g. infrastructural projects, technical support of private initiatives, etc.) tend to be favoured by (collective) migrant organisations such as ‘home town associations’. It is a mistake, however, to assume that all migrants are interested in and want to be responsible for the development of their origin regions and countries, or that they would all be entrepreneurs.

- Mexico’s migration and development policies should be reviewed based on the evidence in the field: in several cases there is quite some discrepancy between the projects promoted by migrants and the most pressing needs of the local populations. Notwithstanding the diversity of projects, there is an absence of a common strategic vision which embeds migrants’ migration and development initiatives into broader national development programmes.

**Study tour in Morocco**

**Day 1: background presentations**

On the first day of the study tour in the region of Ouarzazate, a series of presentations outlined the objectives of the project and this study tour, and reviewed the main results from the previous field visit in Zacatecas. The presentations provided a comparative perspective on the interactions between migration and development in Mexico and Morocco, including a review of the activities of the Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents à l’Étranger and an insight into Mexican policies for migration and development.
One of the presentations provided background information on Moroccan migration as well as an introduction into the region of Ouarzazate (see map). This prepared the participants for the field visits that took place over the following three days. Ouarzazate is characterised by desert landscapes and dry riverbeds, but also gorges and rivers abundant with water, which is where oases and main towns are located. Traditionally, two populations live in this region: sedentary agriculturalists and nomadic pastoralists (although almost all pastoralists have now become sedentary). Particularly since the 1960s, many inhabitants of this region have migrated to Europe. Initially, most migration was concentrated on France, although there were pockets of migration to the Netherlands and Belgium. Since the 1980s, an increasing number of people have migrated to Spain and Italy. In this region, migrants initially contributed to providing basic services for their families, but more and more they are showing interest in entrepreneurial activities. It is still common for migrants to build homes with the intention of visiting during the holidays and eventually settling down after retirement. In most situations, the construction occurs outside of the oasis, along the major routes.
Day 2: Migrations et Développement

The morning session was dedicated to a presentation about the activities of Migrations et Développement (M&D), an immigrant development organisation based in Marseille that has been working in southern Morocco for 25 years. The association’s activities started with infrastructural projects (e.g. electrification, health centres, schools, water systems, etc.) in the early 1990s in Morocco. It gradually broadened the scope of its activities to social projects (e.g. women’s education) and to economic projects (e.g. manufacturing of carpets, cultivation of saffron, tourist guesthouses).

The M&D president stressed that the association promotes capacity-building activities to provide the local development association and individuals (with whom the association forms partnerships to implement projects) with the appropriate skills to support development. In addition, the association teaches the younger generation the skills needed to promote local economic development and to offer alternatives to migration. The association relies on one main methodology which involves working with village development associations that represent village communities, and with emigrants who originate from these villages, to implement the projects. In parallel, they liaise with local, national Moroccan and European authorities to elaborate development plans and seek funding.

One of the strategies pursued by the association is to use their development work to ‘provoke’ the Moroccan state by highlighting the failures of state development policies and the ability of local communities and migrants with limited resources to coordinate efforts and produce lasting results. M&D has recently helped to bring electrification, drinking water and other rural development projects to regions that were deemed ‘too remote’ and ‘too difficult’ for such projects to succeed. This has been followed up by state-initiated rural development programmes.

---

2 This revealed a view of migration as an ultimately negative phenomenon that has to be curbed – through migrants’ involvement in development. Participants did disagree on the appropriateness of this view.
In the afternoon, a visit to a saffron cooperative in the vicinity of the small town of Taliouine highlighted the sorts of rural development projects carried out by Migrations et Développement. M&D had played a key role in initiating this development by installing wells, pumps and a collective irrigation system as well as by organising the farmers into a cooperative. The farmers’ own contribution consisted of making the soil arable by breaking the crust, removing stones and ploughing. M&D further supports the cooperative by developing opportunities for the commercialisation of saffron, including the opening of a saffron shop and the organisation of an annual saffron festival in Taliouine. Although initiated by migrants, many non-migrants participate in this project, as all families in this village have been allocated a plot. These plots now form an agricultural extension in the semi-desertic land surrounding the village. Saffron agriculture has proved to be very profitable and many farmers have embarked on this type of farming. The successful initiative of the association and individual farmers has had a ‘demonstration effect’ on other migrants who, on return, now start cultivating land again that was abandoned by their parents.

**Day 3: Rose essence distillery, guesthouse and date palm groves**

The third day of the study tour led the participants to the Dades valley east of Ouarzazate. The day started with a visit to a distillery of rose essence. This enterprise was set up by two brothers, one a chemistry engineer based in France and the other brother based in Morocco, where he manages the distillery. The roses are grown by local farmers, then they are collected and distilled into an essence. Approximately 50 per cent of the product is sent to France where the migrant brother uses it to manufacture various cosmetic products, which are sold mainly in regional markets, or to big cosmetics companies. The migrant brother had the idea of setting up this enterprise after he migrated to France, and since then he has been the driving force behind this project. I has not received any support from a funding body or association. In order to improve the marketing of the product, the two brothers are trying to create a cooperative among local rose essence producers. They have also applied to obtain an ‘eco–label’ to strengthen their commercialisation strategy.
The second part of the morning was dedicated to a visit to another migration-related income-generating initiative: a guesthouse owned by a retired emigrant and his son in the village of Ait Ali Oulhaj. Contrary to the previous initiative, which was begun by the migrant and entirely relied on private resources, this investment was initiated and made possible through the support of a range of development organisations. The project is part of a programme that supports about 20 guesthouses in southern Morocco and is implemented by the association Migrations et Développement, the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) and the Agence de Développement Social (ADS). The aim of this programme is to encourage migrants to set up tourist enterprises in southern Morocco, which would create durable income-generating activities as well as capitalise on and reinforce tourist-sector development in Morocco. Local entrepreneurs can participate in this investment scheme if they have at least one migrant in their immediate family. So this particular guesthouse was started by the family as a result of M&D’s information dissemination activities; it was not a direct result of the migrant’s experience abroad. M&D saw this family as suitable beneficiaries of the tourism development scheme supported by the Moroccan state. The project was started in 2003 and has received support from AFD amounting to 30 per cent of the initial investment sum, plus technical assistance. The guesthouse opened its doors in 2007, it has five bedrooms and it offers its guests traditional Moroccan cuisine prepared by the family. To date this guesthouse has received only customers who have been sent through M&D. The owners aim to broaden their customer base through marketing activities, but no such strategy has been defined yet.

A visit to the town of Tinghir followed, where Hein de Haas presented findings from his PhD fieldwork in the Todgha valley on migration and development. Half a century of large-scale migration from this valley to Europe has fundamentally transformed this oasis. While general standards of living have considerably increased due to remittances, migration-related investments have accelerated urbanisation trends and have fuelled the development of new agricultural enterprises in the desert, outside of the traditional oasis. At the same time, migration has led to new socio-economic inequalities between migrant and non-migrant households, which have been particularly superimposed on traditional ethnic inequalities.

The ensuing visit to an agricultural project for the cultivation of date palm trees in a stretch of semi-desert adjacent to the oasis offered additional insights into role played by migrants in local development. The investment was initiated by Afanour, a village association located in a village of that name. The plots were delimited on formerly collective pasture land and distributed to the village families who are in charge of planting and
maintaining the trees. The water is provided by a collective solar energy pump. The project is supported by the Catalan development agency Fons Catala and the Moroccan Consultative Council of Human Rights, which is providing reparations for the human-rights abuses experienced in the village in the 1970s. So, while the idea of the project originated with non-migrant leaders of the association, the migration dimension of this project consists of the fact that a migrant, whose origins are in the village, works for the agency Fons Catala, which has facilitated finding access to funding. As this project was initiated only a few years ago, it is too early to evaluate its success.

**Day 4: Oasis agricultural system, migrant houses and guesthouses**

The last field visit took place in the Drâa Valley, in the region around the town of Agdz. The tour started with a visit to a palm grove where the traditional agricultural system has been undergoing significant transformations caused by a combination of factors. The trigger was a large dam, Mansour Ed-Dahbi, which was built in the upstream part of the Drâa river near Ouarzazate in 1971 to facilitate year-round irrigation and to prevent flooding. The irrigation infrastructure includes five smaller dams and a complex system of irrigation channels leading the water from the dam to individual villages. However, the state has not effectively managed the intra-village access to river water. In parallel, the state authorities demanded that the *jemâa*, the traditional institution (‘village council’) in charge of village affairs, adopt the formal status of association. This state policy led to a radical weakening of the *jemâa* and a breakdown of the collective management of water resources. A multitude of unresolved problems and village-level conflicts around the collective management and allocation of irrigation water provided by the Mansour Ed-Dahbi dam has led to a situation in which much river and dam water is not used.

This crisis around the collective management of water resources has encouraged land owners to dig private wells and install diesel pumps on their plots. Those who did so were primarily emigrants, as remittances enabled them to make these
investment. The digging of private wells enabled farmers to ignore the traditional, rigid and conflict-ridden collective water allocation system. Many pump-owning families now sell water to generally poorer families who do not own a pump and private well. So, although this collective water management crisis is of a more general nature and can be found in most of Morocco, migration and remittance-fuelled investment have accelerated the trends towards further privatisation of land and water. Land acquisition and people’s relation to the land in the oasis economy have also been impacted by emigration in highly diverse ways. While some migrants prefer to sell their land in the oasis, others rely on family members who reside in the oasis to purchase available land, and to increase investment. Others prefer to keep their plot of land as a way of preserving their personal attachment to the area, without adopting any investment strategy.

The visit to another oasis in the vicinity of Agdz provided further evidence of the impact of emigration on the oasis economy. The group visited a former emigrant to France who built his house in the palm grove, challenging traditional customs which prohibit building in the palm grove, where the land is scarce, extremely fertile, at risk of flooding and highly priced. Rather, houses are built on the edges of the palm grove to avoid any loss of farmable land, on a slightly elevated area without risk of flooding. The migrant is politically active in Morocco, and was also a unionist and associative leader in France. He has a second residence in Casablanca, where he spends a lot of time, and is head of the local village development association. The aims of this association are to promote innovative initiatives in support of poor people, mainly through the construction of homes and the promotion of women’s literacy programmes, and also to create a network that offers assistance to migrants abroad.

The field trip ended with a visit to two guesthouses owned by emigrants. The first one, near the Zaouiat Bono oasis, is one of the 21 hostels supported by the solidarity tourism programme of M&D, AFD and ADS mentioned previously. The same labour division which prevailed in the hostel in the Dades valley was at work here: the emigrant who invested in the project has delegated the management of the
enterprise to a family member. The guesthouse was opened in 2002 but received an AFD subvention in 2005 which enabled the owners (i.e. the emigrant owner and his nephew managing the hostel) to enlarge the hosting capacity of the building. The second hostel was built in a nearby Casbah. The building was transformed into a hostel and camping site by the son of the owner and his French wife. The project is entirely self-funded and self-managed. Aware of the need to disseminate information on their hostel and the Drâa Valley as a tourist destination, these entrepreneurs have established an information bureau in France, which is managed by the wife’s family members. This venture is part of the couple’s long-term plans, as the husband and former migrant received training in hotel management and catering in France with a view to opening this business in Morocco. The couple has also established contacts with German craftsmen and university students who come every year to continue the restoration of the Casbah.

**Day 5: Discussion on field observations**

On the last day of the study tour, the participants gathered to discuss and comment on the field observations. The first presentation consisted of a synthesis of the lessons learned from the Moroccan field observations from a Mexican perspective. Subsequent discussion focused on the most striking observations and surprises as well as the main similarities and differences between the Moroccan and the Mexican cases.

Many participants raised the need to re-think the relationship between migration and development. There is a particular need to better take into account the specific policy and the social and economic context which can help us explain why the development impacts of migration tend to be so diverse. The field visits provided a wealth of cases highlighting the diversity of the migration impacts on sending areas, which should forestall any blanket generalisations on the issue. Positive and negative impacts often co-exist within the same location and region, and the degree and nature of these impacts differ greatly from one place to another. Likewise, migration impacts vary greatly depending on the specific socio-economic, education and migratory profile of emigrants. The event concluded with a discussion about the possibility of setting up a comparative research project based on a systematic comparison of several emigration regions in Mexico and Morocco. Such a project is crucial in order to improve our understanding of why migration leads to rather positive development responses in some cases, and more negative development responses in others.
Part II

Lessons learnt

The study tour has yielded a wealth of cases, surprises and questions pertaining to the relation between migration and development. In general, the event led to greater awareness among participants about the need to consider the broader regional development context in which migration occurs, in order to understand the variety in impacts. The discussions revolved around four themes: the presence and absence of the state, the diverse role of migrants in development, the impacts of migration on development and reframing the migration and development perspective.

1. The presence and the absence of the state

Particularly in the wake of structural adjustment policies, the relative absence and even withdrawal of the Moroccan state from rural development has left a vacuum which encouraged emigrant organisations and village associations to take charge. In Mexico, the lack of a national development agenda that includes the provision of services to promote rural development has led to similar substitution effects. In both countries, governments have implemented co-funding schemes to support civil society initiatives in domains which are normally the state’s responsibility: the ‘Tres por uno’ initiative in Mexico, and co-funding electrification (PERG), drinking water systems (PAGER) and road building (PNCRR) schemes in Morocco. Many participants raised the question: should collective development initiatives be supported? This issue has been tackled by migrant organisations such as M&D and Immigration, Démocratie, Développement which strive to persuade state authorities to fulfill their duties in the domain of local development through demonstrating that this is their responsibility. However, this seems to entail the risk that these ‘bottom-up’ initiatives distract states from their responsibilities.

The role played by European receiving states is highlighted through the funding of emigrant projects (e.g. guesthouses and agricultural cooperatives) by European governments or state-funded development agencies. Such ‘co-development’ policies are as paradoxical as sending-country policies concerning migration and development. They are, at the same time, based on the idea of encouraging return migration and decreasing migration through creating local economic and employment opportunities. So, migration paradoxically becomes a medicine to
stop migration. The second paradox is that ‘co-development’ schemes are supposed to fulfill a demand for assistance among emigrants eager to engage in development activities. Yet, in practice the relationship seems often the other way around, since ‘co-development’ policies create a funding possibility for specific projects for migrants who did not necessarily have a pre-established intention to invest. So, these projects not only respond to but also actively create a demand for support. In some instances it is therefore questionable as to whether such preferential treatment should be granted to migrants, who might already be more advantaged than non-migrants, and if scarce resources might not be better allocated by satisfying the existing demands of non-migrants.

These paradoxes highlight the need for better communication and debate between migrants and state authorities. So far, state policy makers have emphasised the responsibility and the duties of migrants to contribute to the development of origin countries. It was widely felt that this emphasis is one-sided and that expectations that migrants alone can bring development in generally unattractive investment environments are largely unrealistic. Instead, a greater concern should be paid to migrants’ rights. Many Moroccan and Mexican migrants in the EU and the US are currently marginalised, partly as a result of restrictive immigration policies, illegality and discrimination in the labour market. Participants from Morocco and Mexico also voiced a crucial need for a more common voice of southern countries on migration and development issues. To date, sending countries are still constrained by bilateral relations and have little leverage on the design of ‘co-development’ and migration and development policies.

2. The diverse role of migrants in development

Although not all migrants are, or want to be, ‘development actors’, this is still a common assumption in the migration and development debate. Migrants should not generally be considered as ‘development workers’, because they often do not perceive themselves as such. Their behaviour is primarily guided by the legitimate interests and needs of their own families, and not by the development strategies of their states. While migrants have been at the centre of attention of policy makers and development agencies for many years, the attitude of the latter is still rather patronising, as is reflected in the idea that migrants and remittances need to be ‘guided’ and ‘channelled’ into productive investments. Because some migrant-led initiatives have the potential to improve the well-being of local communities, the challenge is how to integrate these individual initiatives within wider development dynamics rather than how to change migrants’ preferences or to ‘teach’ migrants how to ‘do’ development. Governments should recognise that migrants are already mobilised for development on their own initiative. Rather than ‘mobilising migrants for development’, development actors themselves should be ‘mobilised’ to engage with and to learn from migrants in development cooperation so as to establish a genuine two-way working relationship.
Another observation is that migrants are far from being a homogeneous category, and that the diversity of their background and experiences is also linked to the variety in the development impacts of migration.

- **Migrants who are still away** (either internally or abroad): When these migrants choose to invest in their country of origin they very often rely on a family member to manage their investment in their absence. The rose essence distillery and one of the guesthouses visited were cases in point.

- **Retired ‘pendulum’ migrants**: Some migrants choose to share their lives between the country of origin and the country of settlement. This is often the case for retired migrants. As in the case of migrants who remain abroad, mobile retired migrants frequently rely on transnational family connections to manage their investment.

- **Returned migrants**: Return is sometimes, but not necessarily, accompanied by productive investments, particularly when return is planned and the project has been contemplated and prepared from abroad. The conversion of the Casbah into a guesthouse was a long-term plan on the part of the entrepreneur who acquired hotel-building and management skills in France. Return migration due to failed migration is not likely to yield strong and sustained development dynamics.

- **Highly skilled migrants**: These migrants can be graduates induced to emigrate by the lack of job opportunities in the national market or highly skilled workers leaving the country for better job conditions, despite a need for such workers in origin countries. Highly skilled emigrants can contribute to development either through direct investment (as in the case of the rose distillery) or through skill transfer initiatives (e.g. the owner of the Casbah guesthouse who trained in France and who provides on-site training for the local staff).

- **Internal migrants**: These people are rarely taken into account by researchers and policy makers in the migration and development dynamics. One of the surprises of the study tour is their presence in development projects. Internal migrants and organisations do play an important role in local development. Moreover, migrants themselves do not seem to differentiate between both categories: international migrants can have strong connections with and own houses in large Moroccan cities or can even belong to hometown organisations created by internal migrants. The distinction between internal and international migrants is often blurred as many international migrants have been internal migrants, and the other way around.
The role of women in migration

- During the visits there was a striking absence of evidence for women’s role in migration. Women and children of emigrants were very much part of the landscape during the study tour, but little was learned about their part in development dynamics. The role of women seems to be not as innovators and initiators of activities, but rather confined to the workforce in development projects as they work in the fields, weave carpets and produce handicrafts for tourists.

- **Hometown organisations (HTOs) and migrant NGOs:** This is a category of – collective – migrant actors. Contrary to individual migrants, they are more inclined to regard themselves as development actors. HTOs tend to pool resources for public infrastructure and social projects, as evident in the Mexican case where HTOs have established projects all over the country in partnership with local authorities and local leaders and with the financial support of migrants and local, regional and national authorities. The work of Moroccan HTOs is also conducted in partnership and agreement with local communities, and funding is received by migrants, villages and Moroccan institutions. In Moroccan HTO projects, an important role is played by receiving countries’ development agencies which provide technical coordination and development expertise. Involvement of the receiving countries’ governments (mainly the US) is strikingly absent in the Mexican case. The relative lack of nation-wide confederations of hometown organisations within Moroccan civil society abroad limits their capacity for collective action. Unlike their Mexican counterparts, Moroccan hometown associations seem to be less influential and less able to exert influence on Moroccan and European authorities. Despite the efforts by Moroccan authorities during the last few years through the creation of the Consultative Council of the Moroccan Community Abroad (CCME), there seems to be a lack of professionalisation and representation among Moroccan hometown organisations. In comparison to the Mexican case, the diversity of destination countries and of destination country languages is a specific obstacle for the development of a common Moroccan migrants’ voice. This impedes the creation of pan-European Moroccan migrants’ organisation and multiplies the number of organisations and policies with which Moroccan migrants and the Moroccan states are confronted.

**Additional observations on HTOs**

A study on the feasibility of the Mexican ‘Tres por uno’ model commissioned by GTZ and carried out by the centre for Region and Regionalisation (E3R) of the Mohamed V University, which was presented at the study tour, pointed to the large differences between the Moroccan and Mexican associational structures, and stated that adaptation of the Mexican model is not evident. The Moroccan associations are more recent, less numerous, less well organised and
less structured than the Mexican associations. The Mexican associational movement is older, better organised and thus more powerful and effective. There are no federations of Moroccan migrant organisations that resemble the well-organised Mexican migrant federations. One of the reasons for this weak organisation is the dispersion of Moroccan migrants in numerous European countries while the large majority of Mexicans concentrate in particular US states. For instance, the concentration of Zacatecan migrants in California explains the organisational force of Zacatecan migrants in this US state. In addition, the Mexican model works on the basis of local initiatives, which has mobilised migration organisations in the US.

Income-generating projects carried out by associations in Mexico and Morocco take the form of cooperative or individual enterprises that contribute part of their profits to fund the respective village association. In both countries, there are examples of HTO-supported enterprises that show signs of great entrepreneurial spirit and could achieve long-term sustainability, and others whose future is uncertain. The specific circumstances as well as the regional political and economic context in which these enterprises have been created reveal important insights about the sustainability of such activities. In general, a possible downside of too high an involvement of HTOs is the potential fostering of dependency and a lack of entrepreneurial spirit. In spite of the good will, a difficult future can be expected for the mescal factory in Juchipila, which was supported by the ‘Tres por uno’ programme but was stunted by an impenetrable market due to the high competitiveness from tequila producers in the neighbouring region, and also for the guesthouse in the village of Ait Ali Oulhaj where there were no particular obstacles to increasing the customer base, but after about three years of operation, the owners still completely relied on the business created by the HTO. On the other hand, enterprises that are facilitated but not dependent on HTOs, such as the guesthouse near the Zaouiat Bono oasis, which reached out to the M&D programme only five years after the project had been started with private funds, show great entrepreneurial spirit and a high chance of sustainability.

The impact of integration

The field visits confirmed that integration in receiving societies often coincides with increased capabilities to invest in Morocco. Migrants’ socio-economic status and education, as well as their integration in receiving countries, have been crucial factors enabling their investments in Morocco as well as their participation in collective development initiatives. For instance, the rose distillery was initiated by a chemist trained in Morocco and in France who relied on his technical
skills and commercial contacts in France as well as his family relations in Morocco to develop his enterprise while remaining abroad. Likewise, the Casbah project was made possible thanks to the successful mobilisation of family and financial resources in both Morocco and Europe. This also questions the idea that migration, remittances and investments necessarily lead to poverty alleviation. Many emigrant investors seem to belong to village elite families and they often rely on family or on support from migrant organisations to pay for their investments.

### 3. The impacts of migration on development

**Defining development**

In Zacatecas, the participants in the study tour felt the need for a more precise definition of development. Debates on migration and development are often confusing because people have very different definitions of what development entails. Governments and also researchers have often been disappointed with migration and development because they – naively – expected migration and remittances to trigger national, ‘take-off’ development through massive industrial, agricultural and other investments. On the other hand, if concrete increases in the well-being, living standards and education of migrant families and communities constitute a yardstick by which to ‘measure’ development, a much more optimistic conclusion would be reached. Some participants suggested focusing on the ‘development of livelihoods’ (of families, communities and people) rather than ‘development of places’. For instance, one might find that particular villages or towns have faced population decline and economic stagnation which is associated with migration. However, is ‘depopulation’ necessarily ‘bad’ if the living standards of migrants and those staying behind have significantly improved?

**Ambiguities of development impacts**

The visits in southern Morocco took place in urban and rural landscapes that have been profoundly transformed by migrants and their activities. The visits highlighted the sheer diversity and the ambiguities of the development impacts of migration. In several cases, migrants had been a positive force for local development not only through various types of investments, but also through the accumulated effects of day-to-day remittances expenditure as well as personal investments, notably in housing, which have created employment in migrant sending areas. Migrants have capitalised on and reinforced existing tendencies towards urbanisation, as many investments tend to be concentrated in migrant boomtowns located within such areas. The town of Tinghir in the Todgha valley provided an excellent example of such dynamics, in which remittance-fuelled employment and income growth have transformed such regions into *destination areas* for internal migrants. This also highlights the need not only to focus on so-called ‘productive enterprises’, but also on the potentially positive multiplier effects of more day-to-day remittance expenditure on housing and consumption items.
On the other hand, the visit also made it clear that it is difficult to define migration impacts as either ‘positive’ or ‘negative’, because the outcome of evaluations of migration impacts fundamentally depends on whose perspective is taken into account, as well as the relative importance attached to the diverse social, cultural, economic and political dimensions of migration. The effects of remittances on income inequality provide an excellent example to illustrate this. Migration to Europe has enabled many migrant sending families and entire communities to improve their living standards, buy land and water, and in some cases to invest in commercial enterprises. However, such generic increases in income and living standards often coincide with increases in social and economic inequalities within and between communities.

Another example is the impact of migration on traditional social institutions such as the jemâa. Migration has often accelerated the breakdown of such institutions and led to agricultural crises, declining productivity and increased reliance on individual water pumping. While this is usually seen as economically and ecologically negative, the other side of the coin is that ‘traditional’ oasis society was intrinsically unequal, and that the jemâa in Moroccan oases was usually dominated by powerful landowning families to the exclusion of the majority of the population consisting of sharecroppers and, sometimes, slaves.

**Considering the timeframe**

Evaluations of ‘migration and development’ also depend on the timeframe adopted. Migration impacts might be more negative in the short run but more positive in the long run, or the type of investments by migrants might change over time, as settlement progresses and migrants start returning or, importantly, if development and investment conditions in origin countries change.

The case of southern Morocco seems to illustrate this point. Until the 1990s, most investments were in land, housing and individual enterprises such as taxis. Investments in land have had mixed effects on agricultural development. For example, the digging of individual wells in individual plots in the oases has ensured a year-long water supply to the owners. On the other hand, it has accelerated the breakdown of village institutions responsible for the traditional collective management of water resources which entails an increased risk of depletion of underground water resources. The direct beneficiaries of these wells, often the
relatives of migrants, have gained resources and sometimes additional land and power from this structural shift. Non-migrant households might be disadvantaged in this new arrangement, but they might have found some benefits and opportunities from other, non-agricultural activities introduced by migrants, such as the massive construction and renovation of houses, urban investments in small enterprises, and investments in guesthouses and other tourist development.

Housing investment has benefited local building enterprises and has encouraged unplanned urbanisation with the multiplication of large, modern but often vacant houses. This is often seen as negative, but it should also be taken into account that for many migrants such houses represent a form of life insurance and very safe investment in an insecure investment environment. It gives migrants the guarantee of having a comfortable place to return to for the holidays and when they retire. Others invest in urban housing in order to make a profit through selling property. The fact that many houses are vacant is primarily to do with the frequent occurrence of ‘squatting’ (tenants who do not pay rent and refuse to leave) and lack of legal protection house-owners receive, which is why migrants often prefer to leave houses empty instead of letting them out.

Investments by migrants and, sometimes, their organisations cover a broad span and seem to have increased and diversified in recent decades. These include an increasing number of income-generating projects in domains as varied as tourism, agriculture and agriculture-related industry. One of the novelties seems to be the growing number of economic projects supported by village and migrant associations. They take the form of economic cooperatives built on modernised norms of collective land management as we saw for the saffron and date palm projects. For instance, the saffron project has injected new income-generating opportunities for migrants and non-migrants and has even contributed to a more equal allocation of productive land to segments of the village population which have traditionally been disadvantaged and landless. However, it remains to be seen if these collective economic initiatives are sustainable. Some cooperatives were subsidised by time-limited funding from state or development agencies. Others that promote specialised activities and embark on high risk ventures (e.g. the cultivation of 80 hectares of land outside of the oasis for the production of dates) might increase their sustainability if government agencies could support the associations’ efforts by providing training and ongoing technical assistance.

The context of economic and political shifts
A crucial observation is that many of the more positive migration impacts on development can only be explained when considering more general economic and political shifts that occurred in Morocco. For instance, during the visit the participants witnessed the establishment of many new olive plantations in the desert as well as the rapid expansion of drip irrigation (a technique
which saves water and fertilizer by allowing water to drip slowly to the roots of plants. Although migrants are often at the forefront of such agricultural investments because remittances allow them to invest, it is important to observe that these developments have primarily been enabled by new rural and agricultural development schemes by the Moroccan state. The national agricultural development programme ‘le Plan Vert’ (the Green Plan) comprises a specific programme, ‘le Pilier deux’, dedicated to ‘small agriculture’ in marginal zones such as mountains and oases, which aims to help farmers modernise agriculture. For instance, as part of such programmes, farmers can buy irrigation equipment for reduced prices while agricultural extension services may provide advice. Likewise, as part of a national programme to increase the olive production in Morocco, farmers can obtain olive saplings at reduced prices. In addition, municipalities are required by national regulations to develop local strategies for future development (‘Plan de Développement Communal’), which also provide opportunities for migrants and HTOs. Unfortunately, to date, a lack of transparency in the design and implementation of these plans is lamented by migrants and their organisations.

Likewise, the surging investments in small hotels, restaurants, camping grounds and guesthouses (modern or traditional urban-style riads which are sprouting up throughout the Moroccan countryside), which we witnessed during the study tour, cannot be dissociated from the general boom in tourism to Morocco and the national ‘2010 Vision’ campaign to boost tourism to Morocco, which targets migrants both as potential visitors as well as investors. Investments in tourism are actively stimulated by the government, which has for instance simplified procedures to obtain licences to start small hotels and has apparently contributed to a rapid increase in the number of small tourist guesthouses in the Moroccan countryside. In addition, the growing numbers of tourists – including a rapid rise in ‘recreational-vehicle based’ tourism by European retirees – has fuelled investments in guesthouses, restaurants and campsites in southern Morocco.

This all seems to suggest that migration by itself does not trigger regional or national economic development beyond investments in housing, but that the extent to which such investments occur fundamentally depends on more general development and investment conditions. In the case of southern Morocco, the ancient trading traditions found in the region might explain some of the dynamism found among migrants and their associations. Nonetheless, evidence suggests that migrants seem to capitalise on, and hence reinforce certain general political and economic changes which have created new, promising investment opportunities in agriculture and tourism.
4. Reframing the migration and development perspective

As in Mexico, the study tour in southern Morocco demonstrated the need to ‘reverse’ the dominant perspective on the migration and development nexus. Prevalent ideas about ‘migration and development’ are based on the assumption that migrants are willing development actors whose initiatives will trigger local, regional and national development. This reveals a vision of a one-way process in which migration works for development. The field observations have shown that this view is problematic for two reasons. First, the choices made by migrants primarily reflect their legitimate individual interest in improving the livelihoods of their own families and, to a certain extent, communities. Second, the nature and level of migrants’ investments is fundamentally conditioned by more general economic and political conditions at the local, regional and national level. This highlights the need to reverse the perspective on migration and development and understand how development can work for migration.

In Zacatecas, it became apparent that substantial regional development was needed (triggered by land and agrarian reforms and government-sponsored development strategies) to create an environment that could attract entrepreneurial activities – largely irrespective of whether investors are migrants or not. The Moroccan visits confirmed the validity of this idea as Moroccan migrants who invest often tend to do so in sectors that are booming under the influence of national development strategies or international trends (such as the increase of tourism from Europe), or make use of the available mechanisms to promote collective initiatives. However, important obstacles to regional and national economic development still persist and limit the extent to which migrants are able and willing to invest. For instance, small investors still have difficulties getting loans from banks or business support from the chamber of commerce, which are typically oriented towards large entrepreneurs and elite families. In fact, migration has often been a strategy to overcome such obstacles through self-generating investment capital. However, it should not be expected that migrants would be willing to take huge investment risks as long as unfavourable investment conditions and legal insecurity prevail.

The difficult position of these self-funded entrepreneurs shows that general development is a condition for large-scale investments by migrants to occur, so that they can insert themselves and accelerate such positive development. It was therefore suggested that it is preferable to talk about ‘development and migration’ instead of ‘migration and development’, and ‘migration in development’ instead of ‘migration for development’.

Adopting a ‘development and migration’ approach can compel policy makers to stop asking what migrants can do to support development, but rather ‘how can we make the institutions,
infrastructure and investment conditions attractive so that migrants will find investment opportunities in their communities of origin?'

However, in no way does this new approach relieve us from considering migration policies, their potential impact, and how they could be designed to support a ‘development and migration’ perspective. Control policies imposed on international mobility by receiving states are a known obstacle to mobility and to any desire of international migrants to circulate as needed. Policies that are more sympathetic to the needs of transnational entrepreneurs – ranging from right to re-entry after staying in the origin country for long periods to the portability of pensions – would limit the constraints currently faced by migrants who want to pursue investment in both the country of origin and the country of destination.

**Perspectives for future research**

The objectives of first phase of the ‘Transatlantic dialogues’ project has been to generate new insights, ideas and hypotheses, to be fully explored in a future, comparative research project. The study tours in Zacatecas in 2009 and in Ouarzazate in 2010 have been very positive both as educational events and as opportunities to talk among representatives from different sectors with various ideas about the nature and objectives of migration and development. The project has particularly helped to deepen understanding of the complex links between development and migration processes and has generated numerous questions which should be explored by future research.

One prevalent observation was that the Mexico–US and the Morocco–EU migration systems display many similar traits, while concurrently having significant differences in history, political systems and cultural, linguistic and religious traditions. A multi-team comparative study of the two systems could investigate both similarities and differences. The high degree of variation in migration patterns within each country suggests that a comparative study should be conducted at the regional level to allow a more valid and meaningful comparison.

The challenge of a comparison between Morocco and Mexico is then to respond to a methodological difficulty inherent to the study of the migration and development nexus, i.e. how do we move beyond a micro-level study that accounts for migration impacts that are tightly linked to the local context and are also embedded into a macro-level system without disconnecting from local realities? By adopting a regional approach that explores social dynamics at the micro, meso (transnational networks) and macro levels, this research would produce a comprehensive view of migration that accounts for global convergence and regional differentiations.
In the spirit of the ‘Transatlantic dialogues’ project, research should be conducted to meet all academic standards but should also maintain communication with migrant organisations and policy makers in various phases of the project. Their involvement would become particularly helpful at the time when research begins to generate findings, as both migrant representatives and policy makers could inform the researchers on how to generate materials for dissemination that are evidence-based yet in formats that are accessible outside of academia.

Six approaches have been suggested:

- Embed the analysis of the interactions between migration and development into wider dynamics of social change induced at the local level by political, economic and cultural global forces.
- Focus on specific forms of migrations likely to spur the interest of policy makers, i.e. circulatory migration and return.
- Quantify and classify the costs and benefits of migration in order to have a more comprehensive idea of what the departure of emigrants implies for their families and the sending areas.
- Investigate the connections between internal and international migration and the duration of migration based on ethnic and rural/urban characteristics of the population.
- Analyse the diverging perceptions of development which inform the strategies and policies implemented by migrants, migrant organisations, the local population, stakeholders, and state authorities and how they conflate to shape the impacts of migration.
- Address the migration impacts on development not according to the pattern of migration and/or of remittances (as is usually done), but according to the type of development dynamics affecting local areas. Areas engaged in negative development dynamics are more likely also to be negatively affected by emigration; areas of growth like large urban centres are more likely to benefit from immigrants’ investments. In ‘intermediate’ areas where development dynamics have not taken a clear direction, such as small towns in rural areas, migration can play a crucial role in propping up positive dynamics.
**Informing migration and development policies**

The Ouarzazate study tour ended with a round table on how to improve interactions between academics, civil society organisations and policy makers to inform existing migration and development policies. The discussions were focused not only on the content of what should be disseminated, but also on possible strategies to reach and convince public authorities.

- One of the recurring observations concerned the different ways in which HTOs operate. On the one hand we find the ability of Mexican organisations to organise into a national network; on the other hand, we see the weak coordination of Moroccan organisations across the multiple EU destination countries. Participants agreed that it is beneficial for migrant organisations to organise in networks to promote greater dialogue with policy makers in both the countries of origin and those of destination, as shown by the effectiveness of the national network of Mexican HTOs in promoting migrants’ interests.

- The debates on migration and development are loaded with false assumptions. The assumption that emigrants should take charge of and are responsible for the development of origin countries is still all too prevalent. In the same vein, there is a general focus on the benefits of migration, but very little on its costs, especially the costs induced by restrictive immigration policies. Academics should be more effective in informing policy makers about these common insights.

- There was some dissatisfaction among participants regarding the male bias of the field visits. Although female migration has gained recent attention, the presence of women in the field was minor, and typically their role was reduced to implementation of activities rather than innovation. Similarly, the role of young adults was rather unclear from the initiatives visited. The impacts of migration on women and young adults, and their role in development activities, therefore remained unknown.

- There is a need to improve the design of local and regional development strategies in order to address the local conditions and create participation opportunities for migrants and non-migrants alike. As observed in our visits, a large number of emigrants’ investments and initiatives yielded more positive effects if they were connected to an overall development strategy and if investments took place in growth sectors. For example, in the absence of the scheme that supports the development of solidarity tourism, one of the guesthouse owners indicated that he and his family would have invested their money in a more traditional manner by buying land and goats. Faced with the absence of a regional development plan or any investment guidance, a small family near Jerez in Zacatecas started a *tortilla* factory in a small depopulating village, which offered little business potential.
• Greater efforts should be made to improve the communication between migrants, academics and policy makers. Creating platforms for discussion between the different categories of actors would open the possibility for considering migrant, Southern and Northern interests. The expectations and yearnings of migrants must find an echo in the definition of new policies.

Conclusion

The two study tours organised as part of the ‘Transatlantic dialogues’ project highlighted the diversity and complexity of the connections between migration and development. Participants were able to learn from the experience of two very distinct migrant-sending countries where emigration has gradually become an intrinsic part of life, immigration has begun to make an appearance in the national debate, and the Mexican and Moroccan governments have included migration in their national development strategies.

The visits highlighted the presence of various and sometimes conflicting interests that influence relations among migrants, their organisations and governments in the countries of origin and destination. In addition, it became clear that the migration and development policies and the initiatives that aim to attract migrants’ resources are still built on assumptions of what drives migrants’ decisions to participate in development activities and might influence their decisions to eventually return. A first step in a new direction is to reframe the concept that migration and development is about attracting migrants to development programmes and instead to ask ourselves what would be the development conditions which could attract migrants to invest in their origin countries. In particular, we should change our perspective and ask ourselves ‘how can we make the institutions, infrastructure and investment conditions attractive so that migrants will find investment opportunities in their communities of origin?’

The International Migration Institute (IMI), E3R at the University of Rabat-Adgal and the University of Zacatecas agree that further research is needed to refine our understanding of the conditions which foster migration-fuelled development, either through private investments or HTOs’ collaborative projects. The presence of striking similarities in migration patterns in these two countries – countries that are marked by profound political, social, cultural, and religious differences – also needs further exploration. IMI is committed to continuing the work started in Zacatecas in 2009 with future collaborative research and the perpetuation of a collaborative network on migration and development to disseminate evidence-based findings to migrants, associations, policy makers and academics alike.
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Transatlantic dialogues on migration and development issues
Morocco–EU and Mexico–US Experiences
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Monday 22 March

9.00 – 9.30 Registration
9.30 – 10.00 Welcome address

Hein de Haas, Senior Research Officer, IMI
Mohammed Berriane, Director, Equipe E3R, Université Mohammed V – Agdal
Regina Bauerochse-Barbosa, Migration and Development, GTZ GmbH
Omar Aziman, President, Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents à l’Etranger

10.00 – 10.30 Transatlantic dialogues on migration and development issues: last year’s results, objectives of the 2010 study-tour, activities, and work-plan
Hein de Haas, Senior Research Officer, IMI

10.30 – 11.00 Coffee break

11.00 – 11.45 Presentation of the field: the Anti Atlas, the oasis of Southern Morocco and their migration system
Chair: Richard Jones, Professor, University of Texas, San Antonio
Presenter: Mohammed Berriane, Director, Equipe E3R, Université Mohammed V – Agdal

11.45 – 12:45 Southern perspectives on migration and development
Presenters:
Raúl Delgado Wise, Director, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas
Stephen Castles, Associate Director, IMI

12:45 – 13:15 Activities of the Foundation Hassan II
Presenter: Abdeslam Ftoih, Director of the economic programme, Fondation Hassan II
13.15 – 14.30  Lunch

14.30 - 16.30  Channelling collective remittances: a comparative perspective
   Chair: Paul Gosselink, Head of Unit, International Migration and Development Division, Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
   Collective remittances: comparing the Moroccan to the Mexican experiences
   Presenter: Thomas Lacroix, Research Officer, IMI
   Opportunity and feasibility of the ‘Tres por uno’ programme in Morocco
   Presenter: Mohammed Aderghal, Equipe E3R, Université Mohammed V – Agdal

16.30 – 16.45  Coffee break

16.45 – 17.15  Migration and development: Mexican policy
   Chair: Jose Luis Gutierrez, Associate Director, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALACC)
   Presenter: Rodolfo Zamora, Senior Researcher, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas

17.15 – 18.00  Discussion led by Kathleen Newland, Director, Migration Policy Institute
   - The contributions of high-skilled migrants to development and ‘brain circulation’ programmes
   - Return migration (e.g. for retirement, expulsion or return due to economic crisis) and its effect on development

20.00  Dinner – Restaurant “Chez Dimitri”

Tuesday 23 March

7.00  Departure for field visit in Taliouine
   Briefing on the schedule for the day en route

9.30 – 12.00  Presentation at the “Maison du Développement” by the Association Migration et Développement

12.00 – 13.30  Lunch in Taliouine

13.30 – 14.00  Visit of the two sites Amkerra and Tassousfit to see the cultivation and production of saffron and olive oil

16.45 – 19.15  Return trip to Ouarzazate
Wednesday 24 March

7.00         Departure for field visit in the Dades and Todgha valleys
             Briefing on the schedule for the day en route

8.30 – 9.30  Visit of the two sites Zaouiet Aguerd – distillere of rose water - and El Kelaa de Mgouna for a presentation of the migration trends and urbanization in the valley

9.30         Departure for Dadès Valley

10.45 – 11.30 Visit of Hotel Aït Ali ou Lhaj with presentation of the project

11.30 – 12.30 Lunch at Hotel Aït Ali ou Lhaj

12.30        Departure for Tinghir

13.45 – 14.45 Presentation of the Todgha oasis valley

14.45 – 15.45 Visit of the project AFANOUR, repartition of collective land for the cultivation of “Majhoul” dates

15.45 – 17.30 Visit of the Todgha Valley

17.30 – 20.15 Return trip to Ouarzazate

20.30        Dinner in the hotel in Ouarzazate

Thursday 25 March

8.00         Departure for field visit to Agdz and Zagora (Draa Valley)
             Briefing on the schedule for the day en route

9.30 – 12.00 Arrival in Agdz and presentation of the palm grove of Fezouata and visit of Hotel Chez Yaakoub

12.00 – 13.30 Lunch at Hotel Chez Yaakoub

13.30        Departure for Tamegroute

15.00 – 16.00 Visit of two sites: a private migrant enterprise and a collective project by the Association Ami de l’Environnement (Friend of the Environment)
16.00 – 19.00  Return trip to Ouarzazate

20.30  Dinner in the hotel in Ouarzazate

Friday 26 March

9.00 – 10.15  Evaluation of the field visits: sharing observations about the development impacts of migration, the contributions by return migrants, the evidence of the obstacles and the effects of migration comparing the different regions visited

   Chair: Oscar Veyna, Senior Researcher, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas

10.15 – 10.45  Coffee break

10.45 – 12.30  Comparing the 2009 and 2010 study tours: A discussion comparing the evidence in Morocco with evidence in Mexico. What are the similarities and differences and what seem to be the causes of these similarities and differences?

   Chair: Luis Guarnizo, Professor, University of California, Davis

12.30 – 14.00  Lunch

14.00 – 15.00  Towards a comparative research project: A discussion on the aims and methodological setup of a research project comparing migration-development interactions in Moroccan and Mexican sending regions.

   Chair: Mohamed Berriane, Director, Equipe E3R, Université Mohammed V – Agdal

15.00 – 16.00  Where do we go from here? Future directions for policies and research

   Chair: Stephen Castles, Associate Director, IMI

20.30  Dinner in Ouarzazate
Appendix 2: List of participants

Transatlantic dialogues on migration and development issues: Lessons from the Mexico–US and Morocco–EU experiences

*International Migration Institute*

**Study tour in Ouarzazate, Morocco** 22–26 March 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jaime Mira Salama</td>
<td>Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmira@fiiapp.org">jmira@fiiapp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regina Bauerochse Barbosa</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Regina.Bauerochse@gtz.de">Regina.Bauerochse@gtz.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paul Gosselink</td>
<td>International Migration and Development Division, Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pwj.gosselink@minbuza.nl">pwj.gosselink@minbuza.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chadia Arab</td>
<td>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chadia.arab@univ-angers.fr">chadia.arab@univ-angers.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lahossain Jamal</td>
<td>Migration et Développement</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamal@migdev.org">jamal@migdev.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dr. Abderrahmane Zahi</td>
<td>Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents a l’Etranger</td>
<td>contact via Mohamed Sairi, <a href="mailto:sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com">sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Omar Aziman</td>
<td>President, Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents a l’Etranger</td>
<td>contact via Mohamed Sairi, <a href="mailto:sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com">sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Abdeslam Ftouh</td>
<td>Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents a l’Etranger</td>
<td>contact via Mohamed Sairi, <a href="mailto:sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com">sairi.mohammed@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Raul Delgado Wise</td>
<td>Universidad Autonoma de Zacatecas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rdwise@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net">rdwise@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oscar Pérez Veyna</td>
<td>Universidad Autonoma de Zacatecas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pveyna@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net">pveyna@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rodolfo Zamora</td>
<td>Universidad Autonoma de Zacatecas / Foro Migraciones</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rgarciaz@prodigy.net.mx">rgarciaz@prodigy.net.mx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eneida Reynoso</td>
<td>‘Tres por uno’ Programme, Government of Michoacan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eneidamigrante@michoacan.gob.mx">eneidamigrante@michoacan.gob.mx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luis Guarnizo</td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leguarnizo@ucdavis.edu">leguarnizo@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kathleen Newland</td>
<td>Migration Policy Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KNewland@MigrationPolicy.Org">KNewland@MigrationPolicy.Org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jose Luis Gutierrez</td>
<td>National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALACC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgutierrez@nalacc.org">jgutierrez@nalacc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Richard Jones</td>
<td>University of Texas-San Antonio</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Richard.Jones@utsa.edu">Richard.Jones@utsa.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mohamed Berriane</td>
<td>University Mohamed V, Rabat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mohamed.berriane@yahoo.fr">mohamed.berriane@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mohamed Aderghal</td>
<td>University Mohamed V, Rabat</td>
<td>m.adерж<a href="mailto:hal@gmail.com">hal@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lahoucine Amzil</td>
<td>University Mohamed V, Rabat</td>
<td>Lahoucine Amzil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Abdellah Oussi</td>
<td>University Mohamed V, Rabat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abdellah.oussi@gmail.com">abdellah.oussi@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hein de Haas</td>
<td>International Migration Institute (IMI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hein.dehaas@qeh.ox.ac.uk">hein.dehaas@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Simona Vezzoli</td>
<td>International Migration Institute (IMI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:simona.vezzoli@qeh.ox.ac.uk">simona.vezzoli@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Stephen Castles</td>
<td>International Migration Institute (IMI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephen.castles@qeh.ox.ac.uk">stephen.castles@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Thomas Lacroix</td>
<td>International Migration Institute (IMI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.lacroix@qeh.ox.ac.uk">thomas.lacroix@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Evelyn Ersanilli</td>
<td>International Migration Institute (IMI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:evelyn.ersanilli@qeh.ox.ac.uk">evelyn.ersanilli@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Melissa Siegel</td>
<td>Maastricht University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.siegel@maastrichtuniversity.nl">melissa.siegel@maastrichtuniversity.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jean-François Troin</td>
<td>Universite de Tours</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jf-troin@wanadoo.fr">jf-troin@wanadoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jose Manuel Acevedo</td>
<td>Centro Universitario de Michoacan S.C Centro de Estudios Superiores Nova Spania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Background literature and relevant websites


**Websites**

Fondation Hassan II pour les Marocains Résidents à l’Etranger at [http://www.alwatan.ma/](http://www.alwatan.ma/)
