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The article analyses European Commission and European Parliament documents — directives, communications, conclusions, recommendations — and best practices for EU member states’ international projects focusing on migrant integration in the EU states and the countries of origin of migrants. Special emphasis is placed on the role of diasporas and the efforts taken by the EU to involve them into the integration process. We stress the need for a new supranational EU immigration and integration policy concerning diaspora involvement, in the context of new migration trends and the so-called migrant crisis. The study shows that the EU integration policy is targeting migrants, the host countries and the countries of origin. Since the early 2010s, the involvement of various diaspora organisations in the implementation of the EU migrant integration policy has significantly increased. An analysis of the EU integration projects shows that diasporas have a potential of becoming one of key actor in the EU integration policy. We suggest expanding the list of the objectives for the national integration policy of the EU countries. This may be achieved by boosting efforts to reduce the gap in the socio-economic development of the host countries and the countries of origin, particularly, by promoting multilateral cooperation with diaspora organisations.
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Introduction

Migration issues are among the most important ones on the agenda of developed countries. The number of citizens of third countries (TCs) residing in the European Union (EU) has been growing recently and has reached 20.7 million people, or 4.1% of the EU population in 2016. Most TCs nationals choose one of the five EU states — Germany, the UK, Italy, Spain, and France. Citizens of TCs residing in these five countries account for 76% of the total number of immigrants.

The European migration patterns suggest that there are significant cross-country differences in the development of national and regional approaches and in the search for supranational measures shaping the European migration policy. These differences account for the particularities of national migration patterns and the number of EU and TCs immigrants residing in each state.

In some countries, a migrant integration policy was developed much earlier than that of the European Union. The formation of a government attitude towards migrants as part of the multiculturalism began across the ocean — in Canada and Australia. Later, at different times throughout the last third of the 20th century, this position was supported in the Netherlands, Sweden, and partly in the UK [1]. France embraced the assimilation concept as early as 120 years ago [2]. Since the late 1990s, common migration problems encouraged all the EU states to start a supranational dialogue on migration regulation. It resulted in a noticeable convergence of the national policies of the EU member states and the development of a common European migration policy. In the late 1990s, alarming social phenomena — such as a declining birth rate, the pension system crisis, job deficit in some industries, enclavisation of society, and growing irregular migration — emphasised the need for the EU states to pay close attention to the integration policy, which had previously fallen within the remit of national states.

A possible way towards greater integration of immigrants is launching initiatives aimed at involvement of diasporas and the countries of origin. Many studies have addressed this aspect of the EU immigration policy, although official documents of the European Commission (EC) did not mention diasporas as one of the major integration institution until the 2010s. As to the recent EC documents, the term ‘diaspora’ is used in the 2011 ‘European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals’ [1]. The 2016 ‘European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals’ [2] of 2016 name diasporas an important integration institution.

2 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the
Our analysis of the role of diasporas in the EU integration policy employs EU documents on immigration integration — directives, communications, legislative acts, and initiatives — focusing on the problems of the immigration policy aimed at the involvement of diasporas into immigrant integration at the supranational and national levels. In the first part of the article, we briefly analyse how the EU integration policy had been developing before 2010. In the second part, we address changes made to this policy in the aftermath of the so-called EU migrant crisis, which sparked off in 2014.\(^3\) In the third part, we consider the place of diaspora organisations of the EU states in the European supranational integration policy. Finally, in the fourth part, we describe the practices of diaspora involvement at the local and supranational levels. We identify lines of diaspora activities that seem to be promising from the perspective of their contribution to the European integration policy and the local and national experiences of the EU member states as well. In the conclusion, we summarise opportunities for the diaspora involvement in the integration of TCs nationals. In the article, we do not discuss the integration problem of the EU country nationals, although we think that this problem exists. For example, the abuse of the right to housing and to the freedom of movement of the Romanies residing in France was investigated by the Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers that conducts a regular monitoring of the cases of civil right and freedom violations across the EU.

### The emergence of a new supranational immigration and integration policy in the EU

The common principles of a supranational immigration policy, which were enshrined in the Treaty of Rome (1957), the Schengen Agreement (1985), and the Maastricht (1993), Amsterdam (1999), and Lisbon (2009) Treaties, rest on the international *declarative* principles of general law enforcement practices. Since the late 1990s, the common European immigration and asylum policy has become part of the effort to create a ‘common space of freedom, security and justice’ in the EU. It was given

---

\(^3\) Here, we define the EU migrant crisis as the movement, which reached a level beyond the control of the EU border forces, of migrants from African and Asian TCs embroiled in war and economic crises in search for a refuge and better lives in the EU countries. Since Russia received almost the same number of refugees coming from Eastern Ukraine and the country did not face a migrant crisis, we believe that the problem lies on the politicisation of the absence of migration control. A crisis is any event that entails instability and uncertainty affecting not only individuals but also groups and society in general.
a boost within the subsequent five-year migration programmes (the Tamper Action Plan (1999), the Hague Programme (2004), the Stockholm Programme (2009), and the Ypres Guidelines (2014) [3].

The development of a coordinated integration and immigration policy across 27 member states became a major priority for the European Commission. The institution focuses on the ‘harmonisation’4 of the EU member states’ migration policy along four major lines: 1) effective development of regular immigration and a reduction in irregular immigration; 2) the development and improvement of immigrant integration programmes; 3) the creation of a common European asylum system; 4) the enhancement of cooperation with third countries in the area of migration [5].

The starting point of the common European integration model is the idea of immigrant employment as a self-support opportunity. This economic consideration contains a solution to the problems of accommodation, employment, free access to education, social and medical insurance, and of social engagement. A *sine qua non* of successful integration is the knowledge of local languages, the culture and structure of a receiving society.

In 2004, the European Union formulated the Common Basic Principles for the Immigrant Integration Policy, which viewed integration as a *bilateral process* of mutual adaptation of immigrants and native residents, based on the EU values.5 In 2005, the Policy Plan on Legal Migration6 was adopted. The cultural and religious diversity had to be ensured at the municipal and national levels if they are not in discord with the national regulations and traditions. The same year the Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union7 was approved for 2005—2010. This document provides the foundation for the revision of the integration policies by the EU member states.

Several funds with a total worth of 3.8 billion euros were established in 2007 to support the programme in 2007—2013. These were the Euro-

---

4 The harmonisation of law rests on Article 115 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (the Treaty of Rome and, later, the Treaty of Lisbon), which governs the convergence of legal provisions on regulation and administrative actions affecting the functioning of the common labour, capital, currency, and other markets. This is achieved by the convergence of national laws based on the harmonisation directives developed by the European Commission. See [4].


pean Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals (EIF, 825 million euros), the European Refugee Fund (ERF, 630 million euros), the European Return Fund (RF, 678 million euros), and the Extern Borders Fund (EBF, 1820 million euros). Additional funding for immigrant integration was allocated from the European Social Fund (ESF).

The EU member states became increasingly aware of the need to engage diaspora organisations as agents of the EU supranational integration policy, since it was deemed necessary to cooperate with the countries of origin. Cooperation with the non-EU countries of origin was first mentioned as a priority in the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, proposed by the European Council in 2005. From that moment on, the EU has been creating joint platforms for multilateral and bilateral trans-boundary dialogue with non-EU partners to discuss migration, integration, and diaspora collaborations (the Prague Process, A Silk Routes Partnership for Migration, the Africa — EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue, etc.). Bilateral mobility partnerships were signed with Morocco, Tunisia, Jordan, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and other countries. The European Pact on Immigration and Asylum was approved in 2008. The Pact emphasises that immigrant integration begins even before the departure from the country of origin, although it does take place in the country of destination. Thus, instead of the bilateral immigrant — receiving society cooperation, the European Commission proclaimed a commitment to tri-lateral integration actions with the involvement of the countries of origin. The EU is striving to incorporate a policy towards the countries of origin based on financing a series of programmes (for example, Africa — EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue and the European Neighbourhood Policy) into its integration policy, as well as to strengthen grassroots cooperation through developing action plans for cooperation between the EU and individual third countries.

8 The EIF supports projects contributing to the social, academic, cultural, religious, and linguistic integration of foreigners, which is expected to translate into greater social cohesion and the development of rights and freedoms in the EU.
9 Additional funding for immigrant integration was allocated from the European Social Fund (ESF).
10 The Fund is a financial instrument to support all legal residents of the EU.
11 Cooperation with the non-EU countries of origin was first mentioned as a priority in the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, proposed by the European Council in 2005. From that moment on, the EU has been creating joint platforms for multilateral and bilateral trans-boundary dialogue with non-EU partners to discuss migration, integration, and diaspora collaborations (the Prague Process, A Silk Routes Partnership for Migration, the Africa — EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue, etc.). Bilateral mobility partnerships were signed with Morocco, Tunisia, Jordan, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and other countries. The European Pact on Immigration and Asylum was approved in 2008. The Pact emphasises that immigrant integration begins even before the departure from the country of origin, although it does take place in the country of destination. Thus, instead of the bilateral immigrant — receiving society cooperation, the European Commission proclaimed a commitment to tri-lateral integration actions with the involvement of the countries of origin. The EU is striving to incorporate a policy towards the countries of origin based on financing a series of programmes (for example, Africa — EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue and the European Neighbourhood Policy) into its integration policy, as well as to strengthen grassroots cooperation through developing action plans for cooperation between the EU and individual third countries.
Such programmes can be either comprehensive or targeted (for instance, aimed at employment assistance, legal awareness, or social protection). Diasporas in the country of destination can make a major contribution to these programmes through raising awareness, encouraging immigrant education, providing accommodation and medical services, and assisting newcomers in finding employment and preventing discrimination. However, the above-mentioned EU and EC documents never mentioned diasporas as institutions directly.

In 2008, the ten Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy were developed. The European Commission presented them as part of A Common Immigration Policy for Europe: Principles, Actions and Tools, which laid the groundwork for the Stockholm Programme for 2010—2014 and the new Ypres Guidelines for 2015—2019. These principles demonstrate the commitment of the European countries to encouraging legal migration in line with the needs of the EU labour market and to partnerships with the countries of origin in the area of migration management. ¹⁴

However, the economic crisis of 2008—2009 suspended the EU integration initiatives for a short time, since the national funding of these programmes was cut. When the crisis was over, the European Commission stressed in its 2011 Global Approach to Migration and Mobility the need for a broader dialogue with diasporas, migrant groups, and other non-governmental organisations, in pursuit of greater efficiency of immigrant integration. An important landmark was the adoption of the European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in 2011.¹⁵

The document calls for a close cooperation between diaspora communities and the countries of origin in order to promote transnational entrepreneurship and international trade. The agenda introduces the European integration modules, whereas the Commission Staff Working Paper contains European initiatives to support immigrant integration.

---


The results of the intensification of the efforts to develop a common European integration policy in the form of ‘soft law’ are as follows:

— the establishment of a network of the National Contact Points on integration;
— the organisation of an annual European Migration Forum (European Integration Forum until 2015) that brings together over 100 EU non-profits;
— designing a European website on integration;
— regular publication of a Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners;
— the development of indicators for monitoring the EU immigrant integration policy.

The migrant crisis and the single European and national integration policies

The migration crisis of 2014 transformed the immigration, integration, and asylum policies of the EU member states, because of the inability of the EU to control external borders and refugees flows from Middle Eastern and African countries. The influx of asylum-seekers resulted in security issues replacing integration at the top of the EU agenda. In 2013, the four above-mentioned funds were consolidated into two — the 3.9 trillion euro-worth Internal Security Fund and the new 3.1 trillion euro-worth Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund for 2014—2020. The latter replaced the EBF, ERF, and RF. The total funding doubled. However, the problems of migrant integration were overshadowed by security issues.

Taken to the supranational level in line with the Treaty of Amsterdam, the immigration policy remains to a significant degree within the remit of national states, whereas the EU provides a framework for coordination, monitoring, performance evaluation, and information exchange in developing national integration policies and allocating funds for immigration policy initiatives [7]. Nevertheless, commitment to the common principles of immigrant integration significantly affects the work with refugees from third countries in some EU member states [8]. An EU justice and interior ministerial meeting, which took place on June 5—6, 2014,17 proposed the development and expansion of selected aspects of the common principles, in order to overcome discrimination, facilitate partnerships with the countries of origin, and prevent social isolation of the most vulnerable groups of immigrants.
In May 2015, the European Agenda on Migration\textsuperscript{18} was adopted. The document gave priority to rescue efforts in the Mediterranean and to the upgrade of the existing asylum provision system. Since then, the focus of the EU integration policy has been on refugee integration. The Action Plan on the Integration of Third-Country Nationals\textsuperscript{19} (below, the Plan), which was approved in 2016, also contains measures to solve some refugee problems, for instance, ensuring their access to education and professional training, and supporting social contacts between refugees and the receiving society.

The document specifically mentions the efforts of diasporas, alongside those of other non-governmental and religious organisations. Today, the Plan is shaping the dialogue with diaspora organisations. In particular, it spans such initiatives as the European Integration Network, the European Migration Forum, partnerships within the Urban Agenda for the EU, and the roundtables with the Commission and mayors of major European cities.

In 2014—2020, the EU will support integration initiatives of diaspora organisations through the European Development Fund (EDF), the Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) programme, the Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, various international organisations (IOM, UNHCR, UNDP), and national ministries and funds of EU member states.

The migrant crisis has shown that the declared common position on migrants and especially refugee integration is not shared by all the EU member states. There are pronounced national, regional, and local differences \cite{9; 10}. The southern EU member states — Portugal, Italy, and Spain — pursue an active integration policy, whereas countries with a long history of immigration — the UK and the Netherlands succumbed to weariness and disappointment over immigration \cite[2, p. 218]{2}. The Visegrád Group — Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia — adamantly refuse to participate in the refugee distribution and integration programs.

Today there is no common legal framework for evaluation the level of migrant integration in individual EU countries \cite{11}. A promising tool is the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, Table 1), which rates on a scale from 0 to 100 such parameters as labour market mobility, education, anti-discrimination and health, political participation, access to nationality, long-term residence, and family reunion. The latest data (2014) suggest that most EU member states (14 out of 27) have middling MIPEX scores, i.e. they pursue an active integration policy only partially. There are many obstacles to the engagement of immigrants in the social, economic, and political life of the receiving society. Only eight EU member


states score highly and boast laws that contribute to the active (or mostly active) immigrant integration. Experts stress that these countries’ integration policies ensure maximum equality of rights and opportunities of immigrants and local residents. The other five EU member states pay little attention to immigrant integration and thus they are classified as pursuing a passive integration policy. In these countries, immigrants are often faced with adaptation and integration problems and exposed to the anti-immigrant rhetoric of authorities (Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Index 2007</th>
<th>Index 2010</th>
<th>Index 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td><strong>53.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some countries abandoned the earlier accepted common basic principles of migration regulation and embarked on a search for individual solutions to acute migration problems. For instance, in 2016, the Austrian authorities suspended the Schengen Treaty, whereas Sweden adopted a temporary law introducing stricter rules for obtaining a residence permit. Hungary, Romania, Macedonia, Croatia, Norway, and some of the Baltics are erecting walls along the borders with third countries.

Since the 50-year population projections for Africa and Asia indicate that their population will increase at a high rate amid ongoing conflicts in Africa and the Middle East, the EU countries are full of fears on an influx of refugees and displaced persons. Thus, the problem of increasing the efficiency of cooperation with non-EU countries of migrants’ origin is coming to the fore in foreign, immigration, and integration policies. Therefore, we argue that the use of the existing potential of ethnic communities and diasporas is an important and promising line of action.

The place of diaspora organisations of the EU member states in the European integration policy

It is hardly possible to evaluate the precise number of diaspora groups in the EU. This is explained by the vagueness of the term ‘diaspora’ and the diversity of institutional forms and legal statuses of such organisations, their wide spectrum of activities ranging from cultural, social, and religious to political, economic, and legal ones. Diaspora organisations often are formed based on different principles — the country of birth or origin, ethnicity or religion, occupation, social status, age, sex, etc. Diasporas can emerge at either a grassroots or national level. Our research has shown that diaspora organisations often act as a ‘bridge’ connecting three major agents of integration — immigrants, the country

of origin, and the country of destination. As a rule, collaborations with diaspora organisations take place across different levels — those of supranational and national, regional and local institutions, of business communities, trade unions, religious, and other non-governmental organisations, and of individual persons.

An analysis of collaborations of diaspora organisations with immigrants and the countries of origin shows that the basic areas of this cooperation almost match the eleven Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union23 and the priorities of the national integration policies of the EU member states (table 2). Today, the engagement of diaspora organisations in integration processes and the integration policy of the EU should exploit the potential of diaspora collaboration with immigrants and their countries of origin. Our analysis demonstrates that the contribution of diaspora organisations to integration is most significant in facilitating a cross-cultural dialogue between the receiving society and immigrants, in providing support for immigrant and diaspora businesses, and in assisting immigrants in finding employment.

Of special importance is the engagement of diaspora organisations in the protection of the rights and freedoms of immigrants and in support for the most vulnerable groups of newcomers. Another major line of the EU member states’ integration policy that might fall within the remit of diaspora organisations is narrowing the gap in the socioeconomic development of the countries of origin and the countries of destination through facilitating progress in the former. These measures seem to be urgent due to several reasons. Firstly, it is much easier for the receiving society to integrate the immigrant and for the immigrant to become integrated, if both belong to the same social and economic strata. Secondly, a reduction in socioeconomic disproportions will translate into a higher level of education in potential immigrants. This, in turn, will result in greater trust of and tolerance to immigrants in the receiving society and will help to manage immigration more efficiently in view of the needs of the receiving labour market.

A number of projects, for instance, IOM’s Migration for Development in Africa, which is run in Belgium, represent the best EU practices [14—15]. The groundwork for the gap-narrowing approach was laid in the common European immigrant integration policy (see the 2011 European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals).

### Table 2

**Major areas of cooperation of diaspora organisations’ with immigrants and the countries of origin.**

**Elements of the EU member states national integration policies**¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic principles 1, 2</th>
<th>Activities of diaspora organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a sense of responsibility and respect for the receiving society (particularly, via mass media). Organisation of orientation and language courses. Prevention of ethnic conflicts.</td>
<td>Initiatives targeting immigrants in the EU countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of a cross-cultural dialogue between the countries of origin and destination. Raising awareness in the counties of origin of life in the receiving society.</td>
<td>Collaborations of diaspora organisations in the EU member states with the countries of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Basic principle 11 | Dissemination of information on the rules of entry, stay, and residence in the country of destination, on various aspects of contacts with the receiving society, on the provision of public services in the country of destination, etc. Pre-emigration support for potential immigrants, organisation of pre-emigration courses (via mass media and on the Internet). Knowledge and competence transfer to the country of origin. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the EU member states’ national policy in line with the common basic principles for immigrant integration policy in the EU</th>
<th>Activities of diaspora organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 1, 2, 4, 7</td>
<td>Initiatives targeting immigrants in the EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural dialogue</td>
<td>Collaborations of diaspora organisations in the EU member states with the countries of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of the national culture and support for cross-cultural dialogue between the countries of origin and destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 3, 7</td>
<td>Support for immigrant and diaspora businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for immigrant and diaspora businesses</td>
<td>Support for diaspora businesses in the countries of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for business activity in the countries of destination; Assistance in obtaining necessary documents and in contacts with authorities. Information support. Helping members of diasporas to obtain new knowledge that they can use upon return. Teaching the basics of entrepreneurship, business mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for international cooperation and development. Support for bilateral trade between the countries of origin and the countries of destination. Development of socioeconomic and infrastructure projects in the rural areas of the countries of origin. Projects aimed at encouraging the investment of diaspora capitals and immigrants’ money transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 9, 10</td>
<td>Protection of basic rights and freedoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal protection of the rights and freedoms of immigrants and members of their families. Assistance in obtaining necessary documents and in contacts with authorities. Assistance in re-integration in the country of origin. Information support. Assistance in solving everyday problems, finding housing and employment. Social care in emergencies situations. Teaching the basics languages knowledge in the countries of destination</td>
<td>Assistance in reintegration in the country of origin’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 1, 6, 10</td>
<td>Social engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 1, 7, 8</td>
<td>Political engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 3, 5</td>
<td>Equality and access to the labour market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles 6, 11</td>
<td>Support for the most vulnerable groups of immigrants (refugees, children and adolescents, women, senior immigrants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principle 11</td>
<td>Family reunion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principle 4</td>
<td>Equality and access to educational services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic principle 4</td>
<td>Equality and access to healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elements of the EU member states’ national policy in line with the common basic principles for immigrant integration policy in the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic principles 6, 7, 8</th>
<th>Initiatives targeting immigrants in the EU countries</th>
<th>Activities of diaspora organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and access to private services</strong></td>
<td>Assistance in social contacts with the receiving society. Assistance in finding housing. Information support. Legal, language, and other kinds of support</td>
<td>Collaborations of diaspora organisations in the EU member states with the countries of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and access to nationality</strong></td>
<td>Assistance in obtaining necessary documents and in contacts with authorities. Information support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention of territorial segregation and isolation of immigrant communities</strong></td>
<td>Information support. Assistance in finding housing. Financial assistance to rent-payers (private loans). Development of public spaces and a cultural environment for immigrants (construction of temples, schools, cultural centres, etc.)</td>
<td>Development of return and reintegration programmes for immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrowing the gap in the socioeconomic development of the countries of origin and destination through facilitating progress in the former</strong></td>
<td>Assistance in the development of small businesses in the country of origin. Assistance in the effective use of money transfers. Promotion of the idea of tax exemptions for money transfers. Joint business support programmes run by the countries of origin and destination</td>
<td>Support for communications between immigrants and the country of origin. Support for the development of rural areas and local communities (children, adolescents, vulnerable groups, etc.) in the countries of origin. Support for bilateral trade and tourism between the countries of origin and destination. Raising awareness in the countries of origins of business resources available in the countries of destination (including finances); support for international cooperation and development. Transfer of knowledge, competences, innovations, and social interaction models to the country of origin. Environment protecting actions in the countries of origin. Lower cost of money transfers. Political engagement in the country of origin. Investment in the country of origin (agriculture, healthcare, education, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our analysis on collaborations of diaspora organisations with immigrants and the countries of origin shows that there is a wide range of tools for such cooperation. In particular, these are:

1) Mass media (websites, newspapers, magazines, television, etc.) and awareness campaigns;
2) Platforms for dialogue (workshops, forums, etc.);
3) Cultural, religious, sports, art, and other events in the countries of destination (festivals, exhibition, etc.);
4) Financial support (funds, membership and other fees, income from services rendered, public and private financing);
5) Educational programmes;
6) Projects run in the countries of origin and destination;
7) A network of centres for collaborations between migrants and the countries of origin (with a focus on education, access to the labour market, etc.);
8) Databases, contacts of immigrants and relevant actors in both the country of origin and the country of destination.

The most successful practice of the integration of immigrants is associated with the assistance of an integrated diaspora to the development of its homeland [18]. The EU member states usually engage diasporas and diaspora organisations in the integration of migrants through awareness campaigns and consultations, support for diaspora businesses and knowledge and technology transfer, competence development, the encouragement of local associations, and financial support for migration and development initiatives [19]. A good example is the Federal Impulse Fund for Migrant Policy (FIM) in Belgium or Centre for International Migration and Development in Germany (CIM), which operate in the countries of origin. Some of the EU member states have established platforms and centres for collaborations between diaspora and ‘national’ organisations (for instance, the Diaspora Network in Norway, the Africa-Europe Diaspora Development Platform (ADEPT) in the UK). This issue was also addressed within the European Local Cooperation for Integration programme ELCI, which was run in 2011—2012 in France, Spain, Italy, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Germany, and Belgium. The programme aimed at closer cooperation in the area of integration between local authorities and immigrant organisations.¹

Until 2000, the Dutch non-governmental organisation IntEnt provided business mentorship services for immigrants in the Netherlands and for native residents in Ghana, Suriname, Morocco, and Turkey. After 2000,

the programme expanded its geography in both the EU and third countries. Similar organisations were set up in France, the UK, and Germany. The recipient countries are Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, and Curaçao. Fifty-two new companies were established in 2009. A total of 350 businesses have been started since the establishment of IntEnt. In 2009, the organisation set up the Friends & Family Fund, which grants up to 50,000 euros to migrant entrepreneurs [15].

Diaspora engagement in the local-level integration

Regions and municipalities account for the bulk of work with diaspora organisations, as concerns immigrant integration. This fits well with the European trend towards the decentralisation of integration policy and top-down delegation of authority to the levels of a city, a district, or a province. A major mechanism of interaction is the establishment of platforms for dialogue on migration and integration (for instance, the The National Minorities Platform Landelijk Overleg Minderheden, or LOM) and the establishment of local advisory bodies with the participation of diaspora members. These bodies advise authorities in devising regulations on migration, integration, etc. A good example is the target group set up in the city of Gdynia (Poland), which brings together representatives of local authorities, welfare and employment organisations, business communities, and NGOs specialising in immigration issues.² In some European countries, state-supported centres were established to provide individual services for diaspora organisations (for instance, the 4th Pillar of the Flemish Development Cooperation in Flanders). These centres assist diasporas in finding financial support for their initiatives through consulting, training, awareness campaigns, etc.

An interesting case is integration and diaspora policies of some Belgian cities. In Belgium, this aspect of migration policy is within the remit of regions and municipalities. In 2004, the Government of Flanders established a ministry for immigrant integration (today, Ministry for Local and Provincial Government, Civic Integration, Housing, Equal Opportunities and Poverty Reduction), which is officially responsible for financing municipal projects in the areas of integration policy and ethnic diversity [24]. Moreover, in 2015, the Government of Flanders financed the establishment of an independent institution — the Integration Agency, which incorporated a number of integration monitoring structures. The Agency operates in five municipalities of Flanders and in the Brussels-Ca-

pital region. It cooperates closely with diaspora organisations and immigrants. In particular, the Agency provides consulting, interpreting, educational, and other services. A public regional status was granted to the Flemish Minority Forum — Minderheden Forum. First held in 2000, it brings together over 1500 members of diaspora organisations from 18 ethnicultural associations annually. The forum encourages joint projects and research. Its Scan-4-Diversity.be site promotes events organised by local diaspora associations and disseminates diaspora views on migration and integration problems.3

In Hungary, details on events held by local diaspora NGOs are available on the websites of smaller cities’ local administrations (for example, Kaposvár). Each year, Budapest hosts roundtables and consultations for representatives of diaspora NGOs, which receive support in solving various problems, for instance, in preparing grant applications. Hungary boasts a thought-through policy towards the country’s eleven minorities (eight originating from the neighbouring states, Germans, the Romany, and Armenians). They have a right to organise self-government at the local level, to run for municipal positions, to establish NGOs, and to lobby for their interests. The twin city system helps the country of destination to become acquainted with immigrants’ homelands. Usually, the twins are located in the prevalent countries of origin. Hungary’s National Radio broadcasts for migrants from China, Russia, Armenia, and other countries.

In 2010—2011, to help immigrants and refugees to get a better understanding of the Budapest labour market, the Budapest Chance non-profit launched the European Commission-supported Learning Cities for Migrants Inclusion project.4 The Budapest municipality adopted guidelines for social services employees in order to provide better access to the labour market for migrants and to improve the skills of public employees in working with immigrants and members of diasporas.

Conclusions

Although the EU does not influence the national integration policies of its member states directly, it develops regulations on migration policies. These documents have an indirect effect on integration processes and allocate dedicated funds. The coordination and cooperation pursued


4 Learning Cities for Migrants Inclusion.
by the European Commission should and does result in the harmonisation of national laws with the EU directives and guidelines. The process is supported by different European funds. However, with the onset of the so-called migration crisis, the EU abandoned the idea of equating as much as possible the rights of migrants with those of EU citizens. This revision was necessitated by the objective reality faced by the EU member states, particularly, Central European (Visagrad 4 countries), that deny the EU resettlement policy. The complexity and ambiguity of migration processes leave little room for a common European policy for refugee redistribution and resettlement either in the EU or beyond it (for example, in Turkey) [25].

The analysis of the key areas and tools for collaborations of diaspora organisations with immigrants and their countries of origin shows that these initiatives can significantly contribute to the adaptation and integration of immigrants. At the same time, the efforts of supranational and national bodies aimed to engage diaspora organisations in integration processes are obviously insufficient. We hold that a greater emphasis should be placed on the current efforts of diasporas to promote the common European integration policy. They can be supported through the development of a regulatory framework for the coordination of diaspora organisations in the EU and through the simplification of financial assistance to such associations. In particular, A Common Agenda for Migration (2015) calls for the development of better tools for recruiting in-demand specialists. Thus, it seems promising to engage diaspora organisations in planning labour emigration from the countries of origin in line with the needs of the EU member states and in creating centres for professional training in both the countries of destination and origin.

Moreover, the current supranational integration agenda should be expanded to include a new objective, namely, narrowing the gap between the socioeconomic development of the countries of origin and the countries of destination. There is also a need to diversify the integration policy tools through the engagement of diaspora organisations in integration processes. In this respect, it might be useful to draw on the experience of the regions and municipalities that have established advisory bodies with diaspora participation to produce recommendations to public authorities on the problems of integration.
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