

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Vol. 40 (2014), Issue 7, pp. 1060-1078, available online: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369183X.2013.830889

Co-development as transnational governance: An analysis of the engagement of local authorities and migrant organizations in Madrid

Margit Fauser, Bielefeld University

Abstract

This article provides an analysis of the co-development engagement of local authorities and migrant organizations from the city of Madrid. ‘Co-development’ has become a key notion that relates to the transnational involvement of migrants in development (cooperation). It is argued that co-development serves as transnational governance in which local authorities and migrant organizations collaborate and where links are established between integration, development and migration control and management. In order to analyze and understand these forms of engagement, the article combines an approach to the rescaling of governance with a transnational perspective on cities and migrants.

Keywords: migration, governance, transnationalization, Madrid, migration control

Introduction

The importance of cities for migration, the policies of subnational governments and the role of local migrant organizations have received considerable attention in recent years (Penninx et al. 2004; Rogers and Tillie 2001; Tsuda 2006). However, most of this research considers

cities as spatial containers where migrants arrive, work and settle, with the result that the relationship between migrants and cities is analyzed with a special focus on the local integration and citizenship of migrants and the role of local policies and organizations to promote this end. Yet, current globalization and the related transnational dynamics from both above and below have a significant influence on the condition of cities and migrants (Sassen 1994; Smith and Guarnizo 1999). Critical voices in migration research have therefore called to expand the container view to include a scalar approach to locality and the city (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009; 2011a). The scalar approach draws on research from the areas of urban sociology and geography, which has argued that, in the wake of globalization and economic restructuring, cities have become subject to rescaling processes through which they acquire more prominent roles both in relation to the economy and as a level of government. These processes have not led to the demise of the national state, nor have they suspended the relevance of other scales. Rather, the political-territorial organization of state power is being transformed, leading to increasing importance and independence of the city scale (Brenner 1999; Smith 1995). This results in major changes of urban governance reflecting the struggle of today's cities for position in the national and global urban hierarchies. The scalar approach applies this perspective to the field of migration, arguing that it is in this political-economic restructuring and the rescaling of governance that migration, local settlement and migrants' transnational practices are embedded.

At the same time, migrants must also be seen as actively participating in and interacting with these processes, acting as scale makers (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009). Migrants contribute to the city and its global image in a variety of ways: as professionals and workers, as cultural brokers and in interaction with their transnational networks. As one element of globalization, migrants do not necessarily focus their attention on the local destination context alone. Manifold transnational networks of migrants that connect places of

destination and origin exist in relation to business and knowledge flows, or in the form of hometown associations and other transnational migrant organizations (Portes et al. 2007; Pries and Sezgin 2011). In the context of the migration-development debate, this involvement has become paramount to many migrants and is attracting enthusiastic support from policy stakeholders and international agencies. Further, the more recent ‘diaspora and development’ initiatives, also referred to as ‘co-development’, involve not only migrants’ transnational ties, but also highlight the key role of local authorities in the area of development (Faist and Fauser 2011). Some research exists on how local governments in regions of migrants’ origin connect with migrants abroad to channel their development engagement (Goldring 2002; Fitzgerald 2006), but little attention has been given to the transnational governance of authorities from immigration cities. In addition, these initiatives tend to establish a link between development and the control and management of migration, an issue that is often neglected.

This article provides an analysis of the co-development engagement of local authorities and migrant organizations from the city of Madrid. ‘Co-development’ has become a key notion that relates to the transnational involvement of migrants in development. A city with great global economic aspirations, Madrid has been confronted with significant international migration for only two decades, and mostly from less developed countries. State rescaling through decentralization, administrative modernization and welfare state restructuring in Spain over the past decades have contributed to the fact that regional and local governments have played an important role in the reception and integration of migrants from the beginning. This is also true of the role of non-state actors in the area of social service delivery (Gil 2006). In addition, Madrid has been engaged in decentralized development cooperation since the early 1990s (Ruiz Jiménez 2006), which is one indication of the more general trend of local authorities becoming transnational actors (Wellmann

1998). More recently, the now global migration-development debate has had a significant influence on authorities and actors in Madrid, as well as on other scales in Spain. The following analysis explains how local authorities and migrant organizations get involved in the areas of local integration and transnational development cooperation and, importantly, in the area of co-development. The analysis then shows how the different issues are placed in relation to one another in this endeavour. More specifically, it describes how integration 'here' and development 'there' are brought together, and further shows that the co-development agenda is intended to tackle the root causes of migration and to address irregular migration, return migration and prospective migration. It is argued that co-development indicates the existence of some elements of transnational governance, and that this brings local authorities and migrant organizations (i.e. institutions and agents from the city scale) together into the field of migration control, which so far has been considered key to state sovereignty solely located at the national scale.

Although local governments and migrant organizations are not the only actors tackling these issues, and although the (immigration) city is not the only relevant scale in this regard, analysis of these forms of engagement provides insights into important changes in the governance of migration. The fact that, at least for the time being, the current economic and financial crisis has given way to major cutbacks in government spending on local integration services and transnational cooperation in Madrid shows two things. First, it is an indication of how strongly these initiatives depend on the processes of scaling and the positioning of the city; and second, it points to the multiple rescaling settings in which transnational activities of migrant organizations are embedded and thus continue to exist.

This article combines an approach to the rescaling of governance with a transnational perspective on cities and migrants in order to analyze newly evolving governance arrangements which link integration, development and migration control and which,

importantly, involve institutions and actors from the city scale. The theoretical framework of the argument is developed in the following section. The third part presents the empirical analysis of the Madrid case study.¹ This is also to say that the empirical research concentrates on the immigration city, and is transnational only in the sense that it focuses on understandings, projects and structures, rather than discussing the impact on Madrid or across the border.

Migration governance in rescaling cities

There is a growing body of literature highlighting the key role of cities for migration and for the practices, processes and policies of migrants' integration and citizenship (Penninx et al. 2004; Rogers and Tillie 2001; Tsuda 2006). The predominant view in this literature suggests that cities were disconnected territorial containers, and research has focused primarily on how newcomers relate to new places, and vice versa. The urban transformations which have resulted from the economic globalization since the 1970s are often neglected in this research, and transnational practices of migrants are largely ignored. The literature on local responses to migration, for instance, has offered typologies of integration models – assimilationist, multicultural and, more recently, intercultural types (Alexander 2003; Penninx et al. 2004a) – but largely ignores how these relate to a city's position in the global economy or to migrants' transnational ties.

Urban studies have given more attention to the globalization of cities (Sassen 1994) and to the relationship between migrant networks and locality (Smith and Guarnizo 1999). Major dynamic forces in this regard are the political and economic restructuring and the resulting urban politics of scale that are shaping migration and post-migration processes. Urban governance can be analyzed as a 'politics of scale' "that is emerging at the geographical interface between processes of urban restructuring and state territorial

restructuring” (Brenner 1999: 432; Smith 1995). However, it is important to consider how migrants’ agency is connected to these shaping forces in order to be able to understand “the dynamic relationship between migrants and the places of migrant departure and settlement” (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009: 177f.; Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011b). Here, migrants can act as scale makers, due to their being skilled professionals or informal workers, homeowners or cultural brokers, and agents of cultural industries and diversity marketing (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011a). This article focuses on migrants’ scale making as a result of their transnational activities and their participation in the arrangements of governance.

In the following, four major aspects are outlined that are central to the transformation of urban governance and its role for migration and migrants, as espoused by scholars advocating an approach to rescaling (see Brenner 1999; Purcell 2002; Smith 1995). Although it carries the risk of a certain degree of economic determinism, this approach, more so than others, has recognized the continued role of the state, and the general features listed in the following have also been observed by other scholars working on urban transformations.

(1) Governance is being rescaled. Advocates of scalar theory argue that global economic restructuring has led to processes in which “state territorial power is not being eroded, but rearticulated and reterritorialized in relation to both sub- and supra-state scales” (Brenner 1998: 3). Sub-national levels have been strengthened due to devolution of authority and competences from the national scale, allocating more pressure and more room for manoeuvre to them. This has increased the responsibility of regional and local institutions for economic development, infrastructure and social services (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998; García 2006).

(2) Policy is reoriented towards urban economies. With the greater independency from places for economic activities and the increased responsibilities of city governments, their policies have acquired a more competitive character (Purcell 2002: 100). Until the 1970s, the economic development of cities was largely subject to national policies and considerations

for the national economy as a whole. Today, as some scalar theorists have argued, local policy making has become dependent on economic development and competitiveness (Swyngedouw 1996). However, globalization has also led to an increasing sense of interdependency on the global scale, of which the growing number of municipal development programmes is one expression (InWEnt 2007). Cities' strategies reflect their struggle for position in the global landscape, as can be observed with the Madrid Global Strategy, which aims to portray Madrid "as the third city of Europe, after London and Paris". Its Chief Executive Officer explained in an interview that one of the main components of this strategy is "for Madrid [...] to become a node between cultures and continents, in particular between the American, European and North African triangle and Asia", adding that "the level of increase in business, migrant and tourism attraction are also good performance indicators" (EUKN 2009).

(3) Governance arrangements change. By outsourcing and delegating functions, local government has moved towards governance arrangements that involve private enterprises, public-private partnerships and civil society participation (García 2006). Social services have been delegated to non-state actors to make these services more efficient, flexible and responsive to the diversity of people's needs. In many places, this has also involved funding for ethnic minority and migrant organizations (Jenkins 1988). The literature on scaling has put more emphasis on the disenfranchisement of city inhabitants (Purcell 2002) and authoritarian ways of governing that restructuring has made possible through the influence of new power coalitions (Swyngedouw 1996). Some social scientists have also pointed to the changing participatory frameworks which have been institutionalized simultaneously and which allow for more civil society participation in local affairs (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998). About two thirds of municipalities in Spain have implemented regulations on citizenry

participation (Navarro Yáñez 2004), and many localities have participatory councils for migrant organizations which are also involved in the delivery of social services (see below).

(4) Transnational connections between cities are being strengthened. Scholars from various disciplines and areas of research have shown how in recent years transnational connections and urban foreign policies have taken shape which, at least in part, bypass the national scale of the state (Leitner 2004; Salomon 2008; van der Heiden 2010) and “jump scales” (Smith 1995). Interurban relations aim to jointly promote international trade, economic development, urban management or political representation. Other issues involve peace, security and human rights, as well as development cooperation between more and less developed localities (Wagner 1998; Zelinsky 1991: 8). The global urban government network UCLG estimates that 70 per cent of cities worldwide participate in some kind of transnational urban partnership, programme or project (cited in Bontenbal 2010: 463). Madrid, for instance, initiated the Union of Ibero-American Capital Cities as early as 1982 and also holds the presidency of the organization. By the early 1990s, the Spanish capital had become the world champion in town twinning, with 36 twinings across the world (Zelinsky 1991: 4). Since then, their number has grown to 39 (Madrid 2012).

For the purpose of this article, it is particularly worth noting that, beginning in the 1980s, cities in Europe have started to institutionalize transnational development cooperation (InWEnt 2007; Lacroix 2005; Wellmann 1998). Institutions from higher scales – whether national or, as in the case of the EU, supranational – increasingly promote this involvement of lower scales in transnational cooperation (Fröhlich and Lämmlin 2009). The current migration-development debate has put even more emphasis on transnational urban activity, specifically in initiatives promoting what has since become known as co-development (Faist and Fauser 2011; Lacroix 2005). This idea gives a greater role to local authorities and non-state actors in the area of development cooperation. Since the 1990s, this perspective has

expanded to include a key role for the transnational activities of migrants. Although used differently across Europe, the term ‘co-development’ has always been intended to promote development and, thereby, to reduce migration pressure, and it has often been tied in with return and repatriation politics (Giménez et al. 2006; Grillo and Riccio 2004; Lacroix 2005).

With the above in mind, the case study on the city of Madrid presented in the following section will describe the forms of engagement of local authorities and migrant organizations in integration and development cooperation, and especially in co-development. The specific character of these forms of engagement will then be analyzed with regard to the links established between integration, development and migration control and management.

The role of urban migration governance in Spain and Madrid

Since the 1990s, Madrid’s booming urban economy attracted ever more migrants. While in 1996 foreign residents represented 1.8 per cent of the local population, their percentage had increased to almost 18 per cent by 2008. Given the importance of the informal economy, the greater part of this immigration wave – as much as 50 per cent, according to some estimates – has also been irregular (Pájares 2004). At the time of this writing, the number of foreign residents is decreasing again, due to naturalization and return as a result of the severe economic and financial crisis (Madrid 2011).

State rescaling has been an influential context when one looks at the responses to international migration in Spain, which contributed to a specific “multi-level governance of migration” (Agrela and Dietz 2006; Aragón et al. 2009; Pájares 2006). Many scholars in Spain have argued that national institutions responded slowly to migrants’ arrival, the major focus of efforts being on migration and border control (Agrela and Dietz 2006; Blanco 2001). Reception and integration of newcomers, on the other hand, have been dealt with largely by regional and local authorities as part of local social policies and through newly evolving

instruments (Aragón et al. 2009; Pájares 2006). As in other similar areas, this has involved non-state actors delivering services, including emerging migrant organizations (Morén 2001; Veredas 2003).

Over time, reforms of the legislation on foreigners have contributed to an “integration model based on local authorities” (Rodríguez 2003). For example, local municipal registration (*empadronamiento*) became a major gateway to social services, in particular to healthcare. This gateway was open to all migrants regardless of their legal status, recognized in the national legislation since 2000 (Santolaya 2006). With the policy responses to the crisis access for irregulars has been made very difficult, though (BOE 98/2012). Migrants also enjoy local voting rights, but only those from a limited number of countries, due to the constitutional requirement of reciprocity agreements. Specific central government funding for local reception and integration has been scarce and often is project-based. In 2005, for the first time, a fund was created and allocated to regional and local governments. Through these, portions of the fund have been forwarded to non-state actors. In the first years, the total annual budget was €200 million (MTAS 2007). In 2011, due to the austerity policies implemented to address the crisis, this budget was reduced to less than €70,000, and cancelled for 2012 (Europapress.es).

While the local level has taken on a key role in responding to new immigration, responses also differ across localities and regions. Madrid has openly recognized the contributions of migrants to the urban economy and also officially recognizes every inhabitant as a citizen, as is reflected in the integration plan and in such slogans as *Madrid, ciudad de todos* (“Madrid, city of all”). In addition to the general social services and some specific ad-hoc measures, the city of Madrid has also provided non-state actors, including some emerging migrant organizations, with funding for social projects aimed at migrants since the early 1990s. In contrast, institutionalized participation did not exist before the

installation of the consultative Foro Madrid in 2006, where 10 of the more than 60 members are migrant organizations.

The role of migrant organizations is often considered critical in this situation, because they provide support to their members and the broader communities. However, various scholars have observed a move from “protest to services” among migrant organizations as a general feature, especially in major cities of Spain, and have pointed to their dependence on state funding. Several studies have also observed instances of co-optation by public authorities through selective involvement and funding (Morén 2001; Però 2007; Veredas 2003). Yet, some migrant organizations also consciously refrain from state funding to maintain their autonomy, and the vast majority have never received any substantial funding, whether willingly or unwillingly. This and other research has also found migrant organizations to complain about native Spanish actors taking the lead, receiving most of the funding and getting most of the political attention, to the detriment of migrant organizations (see also Morell 2005; Morén 2001). Despite the criticism, some of the representatives from migrant organizations interviewed for this research also see the attention and funding their activities receive as a recognition of their work and as a token of support for what they have always been doing or have always wanted to do. In addition to their local work, some of the organizations examined in Madrid focus on development in places of origin and make reference to co-development. However, several studies (Østergaard-Nielsen 2009; Ruiz 2003) have pointed out that many other organizations, usually of smaller size, do not wish to engage in transnational cooperation, considering other issues on their agendas to be more urgent, such as providing social and legal support to migrants. The analysis presented in the next section is based primarily on organizations involved in transnational activities.

The transnational engagement of local authorities and migrant actors in Madrid

Transnational involvement has become a key issue for local authorities and migrant organizations alike, and the debate on co-development has contributed to this trend. As early as 1995, when the development cooperation programme was officially launched in Madrid, some migrant organizations received funding for projects in their countries of origin.

Decentralized development cooperation is, in fact, an important feature of development policies in Spain, where local authorities provide around 5 per cent of the country's overseas development aid from their own budget (Ruiz Jiménez 2006; InWEnt 2007: 38). In Madrid, 1,380 projects have been implemented since the programme's inception, with a total budget of €200 million, the largest local budget dedicated to this issue by a Spanish locality (Madrid 2011b). For many years, the annual budget, about €20 million, represented 0.7 per cent of municipal tax revenues. Most of the funding goes to non-governmental organizations in the field, and a smaller portion is mainly used to support direct transnational cooperation with municipalities in developing regions.

At the same time that this programme was implemented international migration became increasingly apparent in the city. The new administrative structure for development in the Department of Social Affairs then also started to respond to immigration. In this situation, the newly-created funding schemes for projects of non-state actors dedicated to transnational development cooperation also funded reception and integration services. It may be argued that this is not least due to the fact that many of the local actors involved in development cooperation and transnational solidarity had also started to address the needs of newcomers. When asked about this development, public officials from the development department in Madrid regarded the reference to the migration-development nexus and the emergence of co-development policies as "something natural" (Interview, Madrid 2006). In this situation, co-development has also become an area of activity for migrant organizations, although some of its key aspects had already received some attention. In this regard, migrant

organizations reformulate their involvement with families and communities in their places of origin in terms of co-development, stressing that “we are always transnational” (Interview, Madrid 2007).

The first annual report on the city’s development cooperation activities to use the term ‘co-development’ is from 1999. A few years later, policy guidelines such as *Plan Madrid*, for the social and intercultural integration of immigrants, and *Plan Director*, for development cooperation, made detailed reference to the term (Madrid 2005; 2011b). A specific funding line for co-development projects came into existence in 2004, with a budget of €1.1 million, which had been increased to about €2 million by 2008 (see Table 1), representing 10 per cent of the total development budget (Madrid 2009). This money is used to contribute funding to projects of non-governmental organizations in the field of development, which include (but are not limited to) migrant organizations. In fact, the number of migrant organizations among the beneficiaries has increased only slowly, native social and development organizations being the predominating group. However, the programme guidelines reviewed and the public officials interviewed for this research specifically emphasize that collaboration with migrant communities, groups or organizations is a mandatory prerequisite for project funding. Due to the austerity policies of the city government, the development budget has been suspended since 2010, but two projects approved in 2009 were still continuing at the time of this writing.

[Table 1 about here]

Table 1: Madrid’s co-development budget (2004–09)

Year	Budget (in € million)	Funded projects	Funded by migrant organizations
2004	1.17	6	0

2005	1.54	7	1
2006	1.78	7	0
2007	1.80	8	0
2008	2.00	11	2
2009	1.97	9	4

Source: Madrid, various years, Memoria de actividades and BOAM

In their founding statutes and on their websites, the organizations investigated for this research, as well as many organizations documented in other research, express a dual orientation toward improving the living conditions ‘here’ (in Madrid) as well as ‘there’ (in the respective places of origin), regardless of whether they actually work on both sides or not. In fact, in Madrid, ‘homeland’ affairs and local development in places of origin are much more important items on the agendas of migrant organizations than in other localities in Spain (Morales and Jorba 2010). This is not least due to the size of some of the organizations, to the fact that various sources for funding are concentrated in the capital and, importantly, to the city’s strong and early focus on co-development (Giménez et al. 2006). Especially the larger and more established organizations in Madrid have been actively engaged in cross-border partnerships for several years, have founded counterparts and have worked with other partners in origin countries. Some of these organizations also have internal subdivisions for development cooperation, while others have founded separate organizations for this purpose, such as the Euro–Mediterranean Network for Development Cooperation (REMCODE), which was established by the Association of Moroccan Immigrant Workers in Spain (ATIME) as early as 1997. In interviews conducted for this study, migrants cited the responsibility they feel for the situation in their places of origin as a motive for personal and

collective involvement, with frequent mention of local development and concerns about out-migration (see also Østergaard-Nielsen 2009; Nijenhuis and Broekhuis 2010).

Mapping the co-development agenda

With regard to their involvement outside Spain, it was found that the migrant organizations investigated engage in more traditional development aid projects addressing malnutrition and access to healthcare, education and the labour market. These organizations have received financial support for some of their projects from the local development fund in Madrid, but also from many other sources, such as the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), the European Union, and private foundations and other governments, including those of their origin countries. In contrast to what studies have reported on transnational hometown associations in the US (for example Goldring 2002) financial contributions from migrants plays hardly any role in Madrid. Although the city's co-development guidelines focus on channelling remittances into educational projects, only one project was observed with migrants contributing money of their own, and this appears to be the rule in other localities in Spain as well (Østergaard-Nielsen 2009).

What, then, is the aim and purpose of the concept and policy of co-development? Three main themes can be identified through the analysis of documents, interviews and project descriptions:² (1) a close connection between local integration and transnational cooperation which conceptualizes migrants as intermediary agents; (2) the idea of making transnational development cooperation a means to combat the root causes of migration, and (3) involvement with various aspects of migration control and management, including support for returning and prospective migrants. It is this third aspect that is most important here, because this new role of local institutions and non-state actors is rarely, if ever, mentioned in the literature on co-development. It is also what distinguishes it from other local

experiences in Spain (Østergaard-Nielsen 2011) and in many other locations in Europe (Bontenbal and van Lindert 2009), where a concern for root causes often plays a role, but not the more specific issues relating to migration and migration management.

Connecting local integration and transnational cooperation

In the concepts and projects of co-development, local integration and transnational cooperation are related in various ways. Naturally, both the impact of development and the implications for the integration of migrants are difficult to determine. However, the interest here is to understand how this nexus is conceptualized and put into practice. First of all, the official co-development agenda is evidence that local integration and transnational attachments are believed to be compatible. In addition, involvement in co-development is articulated as contributing to as well as benefiting from migrants' integration. Official documents and project descriptions frequently demand that co-development be based on 'good integration' and that it should contribute to effective integration, because participation in these projects brings migrants, groups and organizations in closer contact with authorities, other local actors and the broader society. For example, according to *Plan Madrid* (Madrid 2005), the local integration plan, the primary objective of *codesarrollo* (co-development) is to "to relate the migrant communities to the social and economic development of their countries of origin, given their integration into the local society of Madrid and their contributions to the development of 'our city'." In line with this, co-development projects aim at supporting organizational networks among migrants in the city and across borders. This also reflects the fact that many of the groups which could otherwise be beneficiaries of this programme were found to be poorly organized, with resources, capacities and knowledge that were insufficient to build networks and improve their own situation 'here' or 'there'. Whether this is planned

or in response to this observation, some projects start with measures aimed at strengthening local and transnational networks (Various interviews, Madrid 2006 and 2007).

Migrant organizations, for their part, also see themselves as intermediaries and work with actors and public institutions from various political scales in Madrid and the places of origin, one of the aims being to support exchange. For example, in one of its annual reports, the Madrid-based Voluntary Association of Dominican Mothers (VOMADE) describes one of its major activities:

Last year, we successfully brought together the mayors of the localities in the Dominican Republic where the immigrants come from with the Spanish mayors [in the metropolitan area of Madrid], who received them to address the various problems surrounding emigration.

Combating the root causes of migration through development

The combat of the root causes of migration is at the heart not only of the general migration-development debate but also of the current co-development initiatives. The improvement of living conditions and job opportunities in the places of origin through development is generally seen as a contribution to the reduction of migration. One indication here is the geographical priorities of Madrid's development cooperation as a whole, which is explicitly focused on regions with high rates of emigration to the city. Ecuador, Colombia, Morocco, the Dominican Republic and Peru have received special attention in this regard since the second half of the 1990s, as have Bolivia, Senegal and Romania since 2005.

This perspective is shared by some of the migrant organizations interviewed for this research. When asked how and why their organization was involved in development cooperation, several interviewees mentioned the need for improved living conditions in their

places of origin and their particular responsibility as migrants to address this need to improve people's choices and to limit what they called unorganized migration.

The situation in the country of origin is definitely one of the important factors of immigration. Someone leaves the country of origin because something is happening there – this doesn't apply to everyone, of course, there are exceptions – but what happens then? We feel that if we don't start working with the population of origin, immigration will continue to be a problem. I don't think it's an entirely negative thing because I feel that emigration should exist, but it should be regulated. So, for example, one of the first development cooperation projects we did was directly related to the region, which, when we looked at the statistics, we realized was the region the majority of Madrid's immigrant population come from (Interview, Madrid 2006).

This explains why many transnational projects explicitly aim at providing job opportunities and 'rootedness' in the region to prevent further emigration. Such measures are not necessarily intended to stop migration altogether. Rather, several interviewees specifically mentioned human rights concerns and what is referred to as the right to stay.

Controlling and managing migration abroad

The third aspect that can be identified in relation to co-development concerns the realm of migration control and management. It reflects the idea that migration should be channelled and organized comprehensively, with migrants being selected and prepared for migration in their places of origin. One expression of this can be found in the lines of activities of the Madrid programme (Madrid 2009), which deals with the migratory dynamics. It states that support should be given to projects

“which improve the dynamics of migration (secure emigration, voluntary return and re-integration) from the logic of the migratory cycle: integrated projects which involve the provision of information, assistance and advice to support responsible migration until return is possible (projects with and for individuals residing in priority areas for emigration to Madrid, which involve the prevention of violations of migrants’ human rights and the provision of psychosocial, judicial-administrative and socio-occupational assistance).”

All of the organizations investigated in this study were founded in Madrid, but several of them now have migration information facilities in their countries of origin, in some cases even in several different localities. In order to provide information to local communities in places of origin, migrant organizations also use websites, radio programmes or networks they share with other associations. They also respond to emails from outside Spain or collaborate with various institutions and lawyers in the countries of origin to provide assistance and information to family members and other interested individuals on the procedures for emigration to Spain (Fauser 2011; 2012). A look at the clearest expression of the collaborative engagement of local institutions and migrant organizations through the funded projects (see Table 2) shows that two of the four projects of migrant organizations for which funding was approved in 2009 explicitly address return, the prevention of irregular migration and the provision of information to prospective migrants. A third project, *Nuestras manos en Madrid* (“Our Hands in Madrid”; see Table 2) is intended to offer women an income as an alternative to migration, thus contributing to their ‘rootedness’. The number of projects may be low but, at nearly €300,000 each, the budgets are relatively large. In 2009, for example, this and other funding allowed the organization AESCO to provide advice to more than 10,000 people in various Colombian localities (El Diario, 29 December 2009).

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2: Co-development projects by migrant organizations approved in 2009

Project title (Country)	Total budget (in €)
Strengthening of the programme for voluntary return and the prevention of unorganized migration to Spain in five Colombian city regions, 3rd phase	256,128
<i>Nuestras manos en Madrid</i> : Solidarity project for women in Colombia (continued), incl. a Fair Trade store in Madrid	289,736
Improvement of migratory dynamics between Bolivia and Madrid: Responsible migration, return and reintegration	227,448
School for capacity building and analysis of co-development in Morocco	77,540

Source: BOAM (2010)

Given that the organizations analyzed here have several years of experience in providing services to migrants in relation to social support, legal advice on residence and work, and access to the local labour market, some interviewees believed they were intermediaries well-versed in managing migration and supporting migrants:

“[The organization] wants to be involved in this process, both with the offices in [the origin country] that we have and with us in the central office [in Madrid]. To try to do everything related to adaptation. The idea is to give the people [in the origin country] some information, familiarize them with the reality in Spain, the politics in Spain, with what they will find there, what they need to know, so they can learn a little more

before they come here. At least so they know where to buy a ticket for the metro, how to get their healthcare card, things that are the most basic, but which they must know. And once they are here, it's all about social services, to support them in the process of adaptation, psychological advice. Everything" (Interview, Madrid, 2006).

Conclusion

This article has shown how, against the background of the co-development agenda, local authorities and migrant organizations in Madrid are exploring new areas of activity. While the role of both types of actors in the area of integration has already received some attention, the transnational initiatives are a more recent element that involves them in development and in migration control and management. The few existing studies on co-development initiatives in other European localities stress that these initiatives are no panacea to resolve the problems of development and migration (Grillo and Riccio 2004). Yet, they are one element in the rescaling of governance in the area of migration.

Scholars recently arguing in favour of applying the scalar approach in migration studies have suggested that greater attention should be paid to the global and transnational dynamics that affect cities and migrants (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011a). Globalization and economic restructuring have led to rescaling processes which have changed the role of cities in relation to the economy and which have transformed urban governance. Non-state actors now also play an increasingly important role in policy making and implementation in the changing arrangements of governance. Cities strengthen their transnational connections and collaborate to promote economic and social development, thus bringing an additional spatial dimension to the local, a part of the politics of scale that has only recently been receiving some academic attention (see Leitner 2004; van der Heiden 2010). These frameworks not only shape migrants' involvement but are themselves influenced because of their active local

agency and their transnational networks. Although the co-development agenda of the globalizing metropolis of Madrid is still in its initial stages of development and although its future is uncertain, it may be taken as an indication of emergent forms of governance based on the city scale, which display transnational connectivity and involve new (migrant) actors.

This analysis has identified changing arrangements of governance in which local authorities and migrant organizations cooperate in the local and transnational spaces. This has carried along the recognition of the simultaneity of integration ‘here’ and of development ‘there’, the focus on combating the root causes of migration through development (cooperation) and involvement in migration control and management, all of which have evolved against the background of the co-development agenda. Given their active involvement in co-development projects, migrants also partake in scale-making (see Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011b). Further research should be undertaken to reveal exactly what happens when projects are implemented and how these projects respond to Madrid’s globalized urban economy. At this stage, it remains an open question whether or not Madrid’s changing economic situation limits the government’s and the migrants’ room for manoeuvre, and if so, how.

Migration scholars have argued that local governments are likely to be tolerant of migrants and their transnational ties and have considered urban belonging and citizenship to be “the homebase for cosmopolitan democracy” (Bauböck 2003). In a similar vein, transnational migrants have been regarded as ideal cosmopolitans (see Glick Schiller et al. 2011), and co-development initiatives in some Catalan municipalities were found to portray migrants as new cosmopolitan agents (Østergaard-Nielsen 2009). Tolerance on the local level is generally contrasted with positions from national-level authorities, which tend to believe that transnational engagement is in conflict with national loyalties. Moreover, control over cross-border mobility (Torpey 2000) is central to the historical formation and understanding

of the nation state and national sovereignty. With regard to Spain, many scholars have argued that responses to migration are characterized by a national–local divide. Institutions at the national scale were more active in matters of migration control and management, whereas sub-national institutions and actors were more concerned with satisfying day-to-day needs and providing integration services to newcomers (Agrela and Dietz 2006). This analysis has shown that local authorities, along with non-state actors and, importantly, migrants, engage in areas previously more strictly related to territorial sovereignty at the national scale.

Over the past few decades, lower scales have started to get involved in migration control. In addition to addressing supranationalization and privatization, national governments have shifted migration control competences ‘down’ to lower scales (Lahav 1998). Local authorities have taken on new roles in family reunion schemes as well as in the deportation of rejected asylum seekers and irregular migrants, often using these instruments as means of restriction (Lahav 1998; Varsanyi 2011). Co-development has opened up new ways for a transnational dimension to this governance. It is open to debate whether this is a way for cities to “jump scales” (Smith 1995) more autonomously and to bypass the state, or whether it is a strategy for states seeking more effective control through the involvement of other scales and actors (Lahav 1998; Lahav and Guiraudon 2000). However, it is clear that changes are underway in the governance of migration, as a result of which the city scale, local authorities and migrants’ transnational ties become important factors. Political institutions from higher scales, such as from the national and the European levels, contribute to promoting these initiatives. Rather than putting an end to state control, this development is an indication of rescaled forms of political-territorial organization.

Notes

1 Most of the data used here are from interviews and from online and printed documents. Data collection for this article started out as part of a larger project on migrant organizations and local governments in Spanish metropolises. The data collected in Madrid consists of some 30 interviews conducted between 2006 and 2007 with public officials from the municipality and other levels of government, representatives from non-governmental organizations, and presidents, volunteers and staff members from migrant organizations, all of whom are engaged in integration or development, and in many cases in both areas. In addition, official documents provided by these actors and data collected online were used.

2 It should be noted that these themes are not strictly limited to the more specific area of co-development; rather, their application in other areas, the wider development cooperation frameworks or other transnational projects by migrant organizations are based on this discussion.

References

- Agrela, B. and Dietz, G. (2006) 'Nongovernmental versus Governmental Actors? Multilevel Governance and Immigrant Integration Policy in Spain', in Tsuda, T. (ed.) *Local Citizenship in Recent Countries of Immigration: Japan in Comparative Perspective*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 205–33.
- Alexander, M. (2003) 'Local policies toward migrants as an expansion of host–stranger relations: A proposed typology', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(3), 411–30.
- Andrew, C. and Goldsmith, M. (1998) 'From Local Government to Local Governance – and Beyond?', *International Political Science Review*, 19(2), 101–17.
- Aragón Medina, J., Artiaga Leiras, A., Haidour, M. A., Martínez Poza, A. and Rocha Sánchez, F. (2009) *Las políticas locales para la integración de los inmigrantes y la participación de los agentes sociales*. Madrid: Catarata.
- Bauböck, R. (2003) 'Reinventing Urban Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 139–60.
- Blanco Fernández de Valderrama, C. (2001), 'La integración de los inmigrantes: Fundamentos para abordar una política global de intervención', *Migraciones*, 10, 207–48.
- BOAM (2010) *Boletín Oficial del Ayuntamiento de Madrid*, 6106, 22 January 2010, Ayuntamiento de Madrid.
- BOE 98/2012, Real Decreto-ley 16/2012, de 20 de abril, de medidas urgentes para garantizar la sostenibilidad del Sistema Nacional de Salud y mejorar la calidad y seguridad de sus prestaciones.
- Bontenbal, M. (2010) 'City networking with the “global south”: Dutch policy and practice', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 101(4), 462–72.
- Bontenbal, M. and Lindert, P. van (eds.) (2009) 'Transnational city-to-city cooperation: Issues arising from theory and practice', *Habitat International*, Special Issue (33).

- Brenner, N. (1998) 'Global cities, glocal states: Global city formation and state territorial restructuring in contemporary Europe', *Review of International Political Economy*, 5(1), 1–37.
- Brenner, N. (1999) 'Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union', *Urban Studies*, 36(3), 431–51.
- El Diario, 29 December 2009.
- El País, 8 May 2012.
- Escrivà, A. and Ribas, N. (2004) 'La investigación sobre migración, desarrollo y transnacionalismo: Contribuciones para un debate desde España', in Escrivà, A. and Ribas, N. (eds.) *Migración y Desarrollo: Estudios sobre remesas y otras prácticas transnacionales en España*. Córdoba: Colección Politeya, 11–51.
- EUKN (2009), Interview with Ignacio Niño, Chief Executive Officer of Madrid Global, 19 August 2009, URL: <http://www.eukn.org/Interviews/2009>, accessed 1 June 2011.
- Europapress.es, accessed 8 November 2012.
- Faist, T. and Fauser, M. (2011) 'The Migration–Development Nexus: Toward a Transnational Perspective', in Faist, T., Fauser, M. and Kivisto, P. (eds.) *The Migration–Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–26.
- Fauser, M. (2011) 'How receiving cities contribute to simultaneous engagements for incorporation and development', in Faist, T., Fauser, M. and Kivisto, P. (eds.) *The Migration–Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 134–58.
- Fauser, M. (2012) *Migrants and Cities: The Accommodation of Migrant Organizations in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Fitzgerald, D. (2006) 'Inside the Sending State: The Politics of Mexican Emigration Control', *International Migration Review*, 40(2), 259–93.
- Fröhlich, K. and Lämmlein, B. (2009) *Kommunale Entwicklungspolitik in Deutschland: Studie zum entwicklungspolitischen Engagement deutscher Städte, Gemeinden und Landkreise*. Discussion paper 1/2009, Bonn: Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik.
- García, M. (2006) 'Citizenship Practices and Urban Governance in European Cities', *Urban Studies*, 43(4), 745–65.
- Gil Araújo, S. (2006) *Las argucias de la integración: Construcción nacional y gobierno de lo social a través de las políticas de integración de inmigrantes: Los casos de Cataluña y Madrid*. Doctoral thesis. The Complutense University of Madrid.
- Giménez Romero, C., Martínez Martínez, J. L., Fernández García, M. and Cortés Maisonave, A. (2006) *El Codesarrollo en España: Protagonistas, Discursos y Experiencias*. Madrid: Catarata.
- Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. (2009) 'Toward a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(2), 177–202.
- Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. (eds.) (2011a) *Locating Migration: Rescaling cities and migrants*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. (2011b) 'Introduction: Migrants and Cities', in Glick Schiller, N. and Çağlar, A. (eds.) *Locating Migration: Rescaling cities and migrants*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1–22.
- Glick Schiller, N., Darieva, T. and Gruner-Domic, S. (2011) 'Defining cosmopolitan sociability in a transnational age: An introduction', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(3), 399–418.

- Goldring, L. (2002) 'The Mexican State and Transmigrant Organizations: Negotiating the Boundaries of Membership and Participation', *Latin American Research Review*, 37(3), 55–99.
- Grillo, R. and Riccio, B. (2004) 'Translocal Development: Italy–Senegal', *Population, Space and Place*, 10, 99–111.
- Heiden, N. van der (2010) *Urban foreign policy and domestic dilemmas: Insights from Swiss and EU city-regions*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- InWent (2007) 'Die kommunale Entwicklungszusammenarbeit in ausgewählten europäischen Ländern: Fallstudien zu Frankreich, Norwegen und Spanien', *Material – Schriftenreihe der Servicestelle*, 29.
- Jenkins, S. (ed.) (1988) *Ethnic Associations and the Welfare State: Services to Immigrants in Five Countries*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lacroix, T. (2005) *Les réseaux marocains du développement: Géographie du transnational et politiques du territorial*. Paris: Presses de la fondation nationale des sciences politiques.
- Lahav, G. (1998) 'Immigration and the State: The Devolution and Privatisation of Immigration Control in the EU', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 24(4), 675–94.
- Leitner, H. (2004) 'The politics of scale and networks of spatial connectivity: Transnational interurban networks and the rescaling of political governance in Europe', in Sheppard, E. and McMaster, R. B. (eds.) *Scale and geographic inquiry: Nature, society, and method*. Oxford: Blackwell, 236–55.
- Madrid (2005) 'Plan Madrid de Convivencia Social e Intercultural', Ayuntamiento de Madrid.
- Madrid (2009) *Boletín Oficial del Ayuntamiento de Madrid*, 5928, 5 May 2009, Ayuntamiento de Madrid.

- Madrid (2011a) 'La población extranjera en la ciudad de Madrid: Dossier de magnitudes básicas'. Ayuntamiento de Madrid.
- Madrid (2011b) 'Plan General de Cooperación', Ayuntamiento de Madrid.
- Madrid (2012) www.madrid.es, accessed 23 January 2012.
- Morales, L. and Jorba, L. (2010) 'The transnational links and practices of migrants' organisations in Spain', in Bauböck, R. and Faist, T. (eds.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Morell Blanch, A. (2005) 'El papel de las asociaciones de inmigrantes en la sociedad de acogida: Cuestiones teóricas y evidencia empírica', *Migraciones*, 17, 111–42.
- Morén Alegret, R. (2001) 'Tuning the Channels: Local Government Policies and Immigrants' Participation in Barcelona', in Rogers, A. and Tillie, J. (eds.) *Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 61–85.
- MTAS (2007) *Plan Estratégico Ciudadanía e Integración 2007–2010*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajos y Asuntos Sociales.
- Navarro Yáñez, C. J. (2004) 'Participatory Democracy and Political Opportunism: Municipal Experience in Italy and Spain (1960–93)', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(4), 819–38.
- Nijenhuis, G. and Broekhuis, A. (2010) 'Institutionalising transnational migrants' activities: The impact of co-development programmes', *International Development Planning Review*, 32(3/4), 245–65.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2009) 'Mobilising the Moroccans: Policies and perceptions of transnational co-development engagement among Moroccan migrants in Catalonia', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(10), 1623–42.

- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2011) 'Codevelopment and citizenship: The nexus between policies on local migrant incorporation and migrant transnational practices in Spain', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(1), 20–39.
- Pájares, M. (2004) *Inmigración irregular en Cataluña: Análisis y propuestas*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis i Recerca Sindicals.
- Pájares, M. (2006) 'Las políticas locales en el ámbito de la inmigración', in Aja, E. and Arango, J. (eds.) *Veinte Años de Inmigración en España: Perspectivas Jurídicas y Sociológicas (1985–2004)*. Barcelona: Fundació Centre d'Estudis i Documentació Internacionals a Barcelona, 369–92.
- Penninx, R., Kraal, K., Martiniello, M. and Vertovec, S. (2004) *Citizenship in European cities: Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Però, D. (2007) Migrants and the politics of governance: The case of Barcelona, *Social Anthropology*, 15(3), 271–86.
- Portes, A., Escobar, C. and Walton Radford, A. (2007) 'Immigrant Transnational Organizations and Development: A Comparative Study', *International Migration Review*, 41(1), 242–81.
- Pries, L. and Sezgin, Z. (eds.) (2010) *Jenseits von 'Identität oder Integration': Grenzen überspannende Migrantenorganisationen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Purcell, M. (2002) 'Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant', *GeoJournal*, 58: 99–108.
- Rodríguez i Villaescusa, E. (2003) 'La inmigración: Contexto general y población en Barcelona y su región metropolitana', in Rodríguez i Villaescusa, E. (ed.) *Inmigración y política urbana en la Región Metropolitana de Barcelona*. Barcelona: Fundació Carles Pi i Sunyer, 49–64.

- Rogers, A. and Tillie, J. (eds.) (2001) *Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ruiz, I. (2003) *Estratègies Associatives dels Col·lectius Marroquins a Barcelona: Informe de recerca*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Africans.
- Ruiz Jiménez, L. (2006) *Información Coordinada: Cooperación Efectiva: Un proyecto Informativo sobre la Cooperación de España y Portugal con América Latina*. Madrid: Instituto Ortega y Gasset.
- Salomon, M. (2008) *Local governments as foreign policy actors and global cities network-makers: The cases of Barcelona and Porto Alegre*. Paper presented at the 49th Annual ISA Convention in San Francisco.
- Santolaya, P. (2006) 'Los inmigrantes en situación irregular: Derechos, expulsión y regularización (1990–2004)', in Aja, E. and Arango, J. (eds.) *Veinte Años de Inmigración en España: Perspectivas Jurídicas y Sociológicas (1985–2004)*. Barcelona: Fundació Centre d'Estudis i Documentació Internacionals, 129–41.
- Sassen, S. (1994) *Cities in the World Economy*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Smith, M. P. and Guarnizo, L. E. (eds.) (1999) *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Smith, N. (1995) 'Remaking scale: Competition and cooperation in prenational and postnational Europe', in Eskelinen, H. and Snickars, F. (eds.) *Competitive European Peripheries*. Berlin: Springer, 59–74.
- Swyngedouw, E. (1996) 'Reconstructing citizenship, the re-scaling of the state and the new authoritarianism: Closing the Belgian Mines', *Urban Studies*, 33(8), 1499–521.
- Torpey, J. C. (2000) *The invention of the passport*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsuda, T. (ed.) (2006) *Local Citizenship in Recent Countries of Immigration: Japan in Comparative Perspective*. Lanham: Lexington.

- Varsanyi, M. W. (2011) 'Neoliberalism and Nativism: Local anti-immigrant policy activism and an emerging politics of scale', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(2), 295–311.
- Veredas Muñoz, S. (2003) 'Las asociaciones de inmigrantes en España: Práctica clientelar y cooptación política', *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, 36, 207–25.
- Wellmann, C. (ed.) (1998) *From Town to Town: Local authorities as transnational actors*. Hamburg: Lit.
- Zelinsky, W. (1991) 'The twinning of the world: Sister cities in geographic and historical perspective', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 81(1), 1–31.