



FONDAZIONE
ISMU
INIZIATIVE E STUDI
SULLA MULTINETNICITÀ

Co-funded by
the European Union



KING

Knowledge for INtegration Governance

Integration Practice: Initiatives and Innovations by Institutions and Civil Society

Rachel Humphris

with research support from Kamran Khan

KING Project – Applied Social Studies Unit
Desk Research Paper n. 15/July 2014



 "la Caixa" Foundation

 fondazione
cariplo

KING - Knowledge for INtegration Governance

The KING project is co-funded by the European Commission, Directorate-General Home Affairs, under the Action HOME/2012-2013/EIFX/CA/CFP/4000004268. Start date: 15 September 2013; end date: 15 March 2015.

The KING project's objective is to elaborate a report on the **state of play** of migrant integration in Europe through an interdisciplinary approach and to provide decision- and policy-makers with **evidence-based recommendations** on the design of migrant integration-related policies and on the way they should be articulated between different policy-making levels of governance.

Migrant integration is a truly multi-faceted process. The contribution of the insights offered by different disciplines is thus essential in order better to grasp the various aspects of the presence of migrants in European societies. This is why **multidisciplinarity** is at the core of the KING research project, whose Advisory Board comprises experts of seven different disciplines:

EU Policy – Yves Pascouau

Political Science - Alberto Martinelli

Public Administration – Walter Kindermann

Social Science – Rinus Penninx

Applied Social Studies – Jenny Phillimore

Economics – Martin Kahanec & Alessandra Venturini

Demography – Gian Carlo Blangiardo

The project consists in the conduct of preliminary **Desk Research** to be followed by an empirical in-depth analysis of specific key topics identified within the desk research. To carry out these two tasks, each Advisory Board member chose and coordinated a team of two to five researchers, who have been assigned a range of topics to cover.

The present paper belongs to the series of contributions produced by the researchers of the “Applied Social Studies” team directed by Professor Jenny Phillimore:

EU Policy	ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER	DESK RESEARCH PAPERS
Political Science		
Public Administration	JENNY PHILLIMORE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">“Migration and integration: a local and experiential perspective” by Gary Craig
Social Science	Overview Paper	<ul style="list-style-type: none">“Social Networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level – European literature review” by Marta Kindler
Applied Social Studies		<ul style="list-style-type: none">“Integration practice – initiatives and innovations by institutions and civil society” by Rachel Humphris
Economics		
Demography		

The project is coordinated by the **ISMU Foundation**, based in Milan (Italy).

Contacts:

Guia Gilardoni, Project Coordinator – g.gilardoni@ismu.org

Daniela Carrillo, Project Co-Coordinator – d.carrillo@ismu.org

Marina D’Odorico, Project Co-Coordinator – m.dodorico@ismu.org

Website: www.king.ismu.org

Twitter: @KING_Project_EU

ISMU Foundation - Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity

www.ismu.org

Via Copernico 1

20125 Milano

Italy

© 2014 Fondazione ISMU - Iniziative e Studi sulla Multietnicità. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, without the permission, in writing, from Fondazione ISMU – Iniziative e Studi sulla Multietnicità. Licensed to the European Union under conditions.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Integration Practice: Initiatives and Innovations by Institutions and Civil Society

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of civil society and local interventions to aid integration of migrants has been well established (CSES, 2013, 24). These institutions are often the first level to introduce innovative projects and approaches to integration focusing on specific issues faced by particular communities (Bücker-Gärtner, 2011). Reasons for this include flexible action plans, lower administrative costs and the embedded nature of organisations within local areas. They have an important role in creating the right conditions for third-country nationals to access information and services relating to employment, education, healthcare, housing and culture. In addition in several EU member states, NGOs and other civil society actors play a vital role in the resettlement process for refugees.

This review does not attempt to provide common solutions to integration that are transferable across all contexts. Comparing integration practices across countries is a very complex exercise, both in terms of methodological considerations and interpretation of results. Furthermore demonstrating good practice is not straightforward (EUMC, 2005; CLIP Network, 2006). The technique of benchmarking integration at the local level shows a larger and more diversified setting of integration approaches and strategies (See Appendix). What is good practice in integration depends on various factors. In addition, outcome indicators can only provide a partial picture. Rigorous impact evaluations can identify certain 'good practices' in terms of policies or programmes where impact has been proven in certain circumstances for certain target groups. Therefore despite some interconnectedness caution should be used when drawing links between them.

A number of networks have been established focusing on transferability of good integration practices. The LeCim project developed evaluation grids with a specific set of local indications to consider the possibility of a successful transfer of integration practice. The results concluded successful transfer did not necessarily rely on close comparability of two places (in terms of economy, social situation, education and training policies, organisational or informal structures) but more on matching the concept of the programme and on the willingness to adapt new models by those responsible in the target institution. In addition, certain processes behind successful integration policies may be transferable from case studies in different locations (Ponzo, 2013, 14).

With this in mind the structure of the paper is as follows. Firstly, the literature review highlights a number of key aspects to consider when assessing the merits of particular local initiatives and projects aimed at the improvement of the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities. The review focuses on specific successful practices in terms of planning, approach, delivery, evaluation and systemic changes in a variety of Member States, addressing different migration and legal categories across various aspects of everyday life.

This background was used to identify case studies where particularly interesting practices had been developed across countries and contexts. The aim therefore is to establish exactly how and why an

integration initiative was implemented, what it set out to achieve and to assess whether these targets had been achieved.

1.1 Methodology

There are a number of pertinent methodological issues relevant to this paper. Reviewed material includes academic literature, online libraries and sources, reports, studies, communications, policy documents and statistical information of national and regional governments, EU institutions, NGOs, civil society, think-tanks and other research bodies. Importantly networks of cities and urban centres make up the majority of widely publicised best practice examples. These networks are listed in the Appendix including their benchmarking criteria. Materials on evaluation and measurement of integration were also reviewed.

An exhaustive review of all civil society initiatives and projects in all 28 Member States was not possible within the timeframe of this review. This was mainly due to the lack of published data on integration targets and results (see also, European Court of Auditors, 2012, 6). In addition, it is difficult to access reports from private foundations and funders as they do not always publish targets and outcomes from funded projects. Therefore the literature review includes case studies of best practice evaluated by secondary literature. It is acknowledged that by analysing previously identified case studies the research is open to ignoring alternative approaches, practices which have not received previous publicity, or which have 'failed' but may nevertheless have 'promising' lessons to offer. This has been accounted for in a number of ways.

The methodologies utilised by previous evaluations are summarised in the Appendix to indicate where personal scope or limitations might lie. In addition, wherever possible, only case studies that had clear and measurable outcomes have been included in this study. However some initiatives that do not have quantifiable impacts but are nevertheless innovative or promising have also been included.

The second section of the paper identifies six member states as case studies. For addressing the research objectives in a representative and comprehensive manner, the method of case studies is an appropriate approach (see Yin, 1994; IOM, 2012). Selection of Member States was not based on 'best practice' initiatives as such, but on the basis of their differing and complex experiences of migration to their respective areas. The methodology for selecting case study countries is based on that undertaken by the European Court of Auditors (European Court of Auditors, 2012). The selection of these Member States was based on the number and proportion of third-country nationals, the share of European Integration Fund (EIF) commitments and the development of integration legislation as measured in the MIPEX. The case study countries are Czech Republic, Germany, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden and the UK. The methodology for selecting integration practices within case study locations is detailed in the Appendix.

1.2. Relevant trends in national integration policies

Civil society and particularly local level institutions and authorities are constrained by national rules and policy frameworks or approaches, while others have to share responsibilities with relevant bodies across different levels of governance. In addition, local authorities all have different legal frameworks for the promotion of equality and diversity which reflects how they develop and deliver services. The amount of financial resources, the way they are levied and the autonomy with which these taxes can be spent also differs. Finally, one should also bear in mind that political environments are not the same and, therefore, political priorities may also differ, affecting delivery of local integration practice.

In addition, civil society initiatives often respond to or are shaped by Member States integration policies and priorities through funding streams, expertise and capacity, integration culture and perceptions, specific events which shape public perceptions, needs of migrants in particular member states and other factors. There are some broad trends in national integration strategies which are important to note here in order to frame the discussion surrounding civil society initiatives.

There has been a shift in many Member States to place the responsibility of integration on the individual migrant and their labour market participation. Measures include prevention of unemployment through education and training, more effective systems to recognise qualifications, fighting against discrimination in the work place and promotion of employment for immigrant women.

Most Member States consider basic knowledge of the host society language as an essential element of integration. Many countries focus their integration strategies on introduction programmes, including (sometimes compulsory) language and civic orientation courses for newly-arrived. A growing number of Member States increase the flexibility of courses in terms of targeting specific needs. However, only a few Member States carry out in-depth evaluation of these activities (CEC, 2007).

There is a strong focus on targeted language classes and tuition to facilitate integration at school. Many initiatives promote respect for diversity in the educational environment and support for teachers. However, immigrant children and youth continue to face specific challenges across Europe (Center for Democracy, 2012). The participation of immigrants in the democratic process is increasingly perceived as a significant aspect of successful integration however measures to promote the interaction of immigrants and host society, including the setting up of shared forums, are still limited. Similarly forums promoting the importance of inter-and intra-faith dialogue has been recognised but has only recently been promoted in a structured manner.

Changing the structural elements of the integration process would have an effect on civil society initiatives. Some Member States have begun to develop cooperation between governmental stakeholders or have begun to engage the private sector in debates on integration. But this is not widespread. In a growing number of cases, migrants' representatives are involved in the elaboration and implementation of integration policies. However a limited number of Member States provide third-country nationals with voting rights in local elections.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section examines the different practices implemented across the EU to attempt to facilitate migrant integration at the local level. It provides a review of the types of actions that have been considered as successful (benchmarking and indicators used for each project are included in the Appendix). This review is separated into four sections: positive developments in approach and delivery of integration practice; promising systemic changes; innovative funding and evaluation processes and successful planning practices. The review focuses in particular on projects' practical application and outcomes and the situations in which they are useful.

2.1 Approach and delivery of integration practice

2.1.1 Cultural mediators for a ‘multiplier’ effect

Engaging cultural mediators has led to a number of successful projects. The forerunner of this approach is Consorzio Spinner a local consortium of research and economic development groups in Bologna, formed to encourage Chinese entrepreneurs to regularize their businesses by conforming to Italian labour standards. To overcome linguistic and cultural barriers, Spinner trained Chinese intercultural mediators and set up a network of 87 public and private organizations to support the transition process of Chinese workshops. They contacted 354 Chinese entrepreneurs (32 percent in the area), visited 187 businesses (17 percent of potential beneficiaries), trained 185 Chinese entrepreneurs, and delivered 38 consulting services. In addition, they trained 53 entrepreneurs on Safety and Security Law (90 percent finalized with certification). Success stemmed from the support and network of public and private organizations working towards a very clear, identified and agreed goal (Cities of Migration).

The model has also been used in education settings in Berlin, Hamburg, Genk and Rome through ‘parents companions’ and for addressing health inequalities (Bücker-Gärtner, 2011, 101; DIVE, 2013, 15; Intercultural Cities, 2013, 10; FRA, 2008, 25). For example in Bilbao, ‘Putting women’s health in women’s hands project’ (Cities of Migration, 2012, 60; URBACT II, EU-MIA) and in Hamburg through the MiMi project (Cities of Migration). The project, ‘Migrant Women as Doulas and Culture Interpreters’ was also externally evaluated positively (Akhavan, 2010). Similarly in Waltham Forest, UK, Health Preachers were trained from the borough’s Muslim, Christian and Sikh communities to draw on their position as faith leaders to communicate important messages on health to their congregations (OSF, 2011). This approach also gained success in other areas where there was an identified need for example ‘tenants helping tenants’ in Berlin or ‘mothers helping mothers’ (DIVE, 2010; OSF, 2011). All of these projects have received positive evaluations and made similar overall assessments that success rests on use of mother tongue and knowledge of local neighbourhoods and community spaces to engage with others.

A similar initiative was developed in Oslo where Master’s students acted as diversity mentors in secondary schools. Over the four years of the project the final evaluation reported a 30 percent increase in university admissions from these schools, compared to an average seven percent increase in Oslo schools more generally. A mentoring scheme for mature students from minority backgrounds helped to lower dropout. In 2012 there were 11 percent minority students with the target of 15 percent likely to be reached within the next two years. Encouragingly, Oslo University turned the project into a permanent diversity office (Intercultural Cities, 2013, 8).

When this model was applied to financial services it did not have the same effect. The Offenbach Project recruited and trained motivated Germans with migrant backgrounds as intercultural mediators who could help educate and guide others in the community on financial matters and with a view to improving their chances on the labour market (Cities of Migration). The key element of the project was the personal skills of the mediator chosen. The programme was not successful enough to be rolled out across the country as was initially hoped.

It seems for labour market participation cultural mediators alone cannot ensure success. The Austrian Economic Chamber (Wirtschaftskammer Österreich/WKÖ), the Austrian Integration Fund (Österreichischer Integrationsfonds/ÖIF) as well as the Public Employment Service (Arbeitsmarktservice/AMS) launched a joint initiative with the aim of integrating migrants into the labour market. In the framework of the initiative Mentoring for Migrants, persons with a migration background were matched to experienced members of the business community (Austrian Social Inclusion Document, 2008-2010).

Unlike the Offenbach Project this large scale project included diligent matching criteria and a strong support network for both the mentor and the mentee. Also training and other events were organised on a regular basis to reinforce networking. The project reports that it was popular amongst mentors and mentees with 75 percent of mentors stating that they would enter again into a mentoring partnership. In the most recent round 120 couples were paired in Vienna alone (Bittmann, 2011, 51).

2.1.2 Partnerships

Effective and relevant partnerships are often the key to effective integration projects (CEPS, 2009, 49). The importance of partnerships is most noticeable when they are absent. The Migrant Voter Project (Dublin) recognised the project lacked key partnerships such as elected members of the City Council who should have been encouraged to engage with participants in the programme (URBACT II, 2010). The police also needed to be a key partner in order to extend the deadline for stamping registration cards. The Basque Government also implemented a programme for legal advice with the Bar Association but after 2006 the partnership broke down resulting in a much less effective service (CSES, 2013).

A different approach was taken in the Generation Project which shifted the traditional roles and actions of public and private partnerships to reach disadvantaged young people in Amadora where the majority of residents are Cape Verdean in origin (Cities of Migration, Intercultural Cities). The project engaged teams of facilitators working in tandem with social workers and community volunteers. The range of people involved included anthropologists, economists, language professionals, enterprise managers, hair dressing teachers, musicians, psychologists, animators, violinists as well as librarians and a priest. Since 2005 over 1,000 children and young people have benefited from the project, the scale and resource required may be an impediment to its transferability. In addition, the project was aimed at one migrant group who had identified needs and engaged with targeted professionals to help arrive at solutions. This kind of project may not be transferable to more diverse populations.

2.1.3 Mainstreaming and Targeting

There is continuing debate regarding the benefits of targeted as opposed to mainstream projects. There is generally consensus that new migrants require specific assistance but targeting of groups particularly as 'problem' communities provokes fears of a backlash from the majority population who may feel that they are being denied scarce resources.

Effective strategies for including new migrants include the Foreigners' Forum in Poland. The Forum aimed to find remedies to issues faced by third-country nationals by bringing together representatives of non-governmental organisations, migrant communities and local government officials. This Forum proved to be effective for communicating issues regarding third-country migrants' integration to higher levels of government (CSES, 2013, 62).

Targeted approaches clearly require sensitivity but also a favourable political climate. For example, The German Islam Conference was founded in 2006 as a new space for dialogue and joint action to define and improve relations between the state and Muslim organisations. It received many criticisms mainly due to lack of transparency and 'top-down' approach. In contrast Berlin set up its own Islam Forum to bring together key stakeholders to discuss topics in a safe and private environment. Although the work of the Forum is not easily quantifiable it does seem to have the support and attendance of many key minority groups who do not have previous experience of working within a network. It also included key partners in the Berlin Senate and police (OSF, 2011). However this was in the context of Germany acknowledging Muslims to be part of Germany. The particularities of the political situation may have affected the

outcomes of these initiatives (Ramalingham, 2013, 6).

Engaging with religious groups in new ways, not by singling out one group for a particular programme but by creating an interfaith network has been increasingly implemented. Examples include the many Council of Faiths organisations in the UK or the Faith Leaders Forum in Leicester, a platform for the discussion of more sensitive and controversial matters concerning faith communities. The Forum represents all faiths and has been together since the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States. Similarly to Islam Forum it also includes representatives from the city council, the police and other agencies (OSF, 2011, 15). This type of initiative may be particularly useful for super-diverse communities with many different faith and ethnic groups.

The most effective and innovative projects may not be based directly around integration but on a wider issue or local problem that has brought people together. This took place in the 5 Estates Project in Dudley (Cities of Migration). Through Foundation funding a community development worker was employed to create opportunities for residents to come together for a shared goal to cultivate open discussions. Over 550 people participated in the 47 community meetings and events; 50 percent of whom were visible minorities. The diffuse nature of such projects may mean ‘integration outcomes’ go unnoticed and are not reported in the literature.

2.2. Systemic Changes

Small organisations often have the most trust from beneficiaries but the least capacity to share best practice or to engage in innovative evaluation processes. Furthermore outside large cities resource-intensive actions for example those which properly take into account the skills and competences of migrants and local employment demand are often too small scale to have a large impact. In addition levels of funding and other structures, often mean that support provided by civil society organisations is relatively short term and small scale, linked to a limited target group and/or delivered in a single location.

A key issue in integration initiatives is the short funding cycle. It may only provide enough time to begin to deliver an innovative project before funding ceases. In response to this, the UK Home Office changed ERF funding from 1 – 3 years but nonetheless most projects ceased after this time despite excellent evaluations (Waddington et al. 2008; Phillimore et al 2009). In addition, organisations often have a low critical mass and duplicate what other organisations or public services do, their expertise in the local labour market and their links with the employment services and colleges are especially weak (OECD, 2009b).

Further the sheer number of different actors who become involved at the local level, and the fact that services have often developed on a ‘bottom up’ basis, means that service providers can become relatively isolated; reducing their ability to guide migrants onto other relevant support and new opportunities.

This limited capacity is evident in language training provided by civil society organisations which can result in oversubscribed and overly basic level language programmes. Many successful initiatives have been implemented in partnerships with schools such as Frankfurt’s ‘Mama learns German – even Papa’ (Cities of Migration) however these programmes may not help parents meet the demands of knowledge and service related jobs.

One innovative approach that works within current systems has been developed through the Mercator Special Instruction Project in Germany. Mercator approached universities to ask if they would train their students to teach German as a second language. Through a series of negotiations with schools and universities, and with improved grades and positive testimonies from participants to evidence its success,

the teacher training model and curriculum has now officially been instituted throughout North Rhine-Westphalia by the state government. A change of law in 2008 now requires every university to implement the programme (Ramalingham, 2013, 57).

A further successful practice to overcome limited capacity for small organisations is to encourage forums and networks. The Migrants Rights Network (Ramalingham, 2013, 50); the Conseil Roubaisien de l'Interculturalité et de la Citoyenneté (CSES, 2013, 102) and COSIM in Dunkirk which has been successfully transferred to Santander (LeCim, 2012b) are examples of successful practice. However networks can also cause tensions due to different ways of working or conflicting priorities of organisations. Unless managed correctly networks can also increase workloads for participants and coordinating organisations and therefore have to be well-resourced to be effective. Interagency work should ideally compliment practitioners existing work, not add to or replicate it (MISTRA, 2012). The South Belfast Integration Project brought together a number of organisations however the evaluation conceded a full time member of staff was needed to successfully co-ordinate the various integration activities and to provide a continuous link between organisations (URBACT II, 2010). In Italy a number of initiatives have been shared through national networks. However the effect of recession has been felt on these networks which might limit the scope of their information sharing activities in the future (Pogliano, 2012, 9).

Universities have proven to be effective in providing coordination for networks. Glasgow University hosts Glasgow Refugee, Migrant and Asylum Seekers Network (GRAMNET) which brings together researchers, practitioners, NGOs and policy makers working with migrant groups to share knowledge, and also year piloted a collaborative Masters programme where students spend four weeks as interns with knowledge exchange partners (Jones, 2012).

2.3 Planning Integration Practices

Research on local service needs and subsequent detailed planning was pivotal to some projects' sustainability. The Ausbildung in Sicht (AiS) – Training in Sight (TiS) project in Berlin developed a strong methodology to check the service provider 'landscape' and the city structure to ensure replication was not taking place (MISTRA, 2012, 17).

In order to specifically address needs gaps consultation with a large range of organisations is required. The Forum, brought front-line staff together to problem-solve and identify key issues, gaps, and develop new initiatives. For example, out of a team 'power analysis' exercise conducted with support from the Carnegie Trust, the Forum's Digital Activism Project emerged, a project aimed to equip migrant and refugee community organisations with skills to excel in a digital society. The project explicitly filled an identified gap and is now seeking to implement digital training modules led by migrants for mainstream organisations, to promote visibility of migrants leading digital training in the mainstream (Ramalingham, 2013, 57).

As part of the Equal Youth project in Dublin, young people were trained as community researchers to conduct a needs assessment. A virtual planning exercise was undertaken where organisations agreed to discuss how a local budget would be spent to best meet the needs of young people. This reportedly enabled interagency working, and services that were targeted to the needs of the client (MISTRA, 2012, 22).

To successfully deliver employability measures specific research and planning is highlighted as the key to effective integration programmes. The most successful programmes contained an emphasis on identifying local employment needs relevant to communities living in specific areas. This has been effective in Lisbon through tailored placements of doctors; Reggio Emilia through matching migrants and adult social care

services; and in Paris through developing individual mobility plans for refugees (Cities of Migration).

Similarly, Matchingprojekt Integration aims to match unemployed migrants with private enterprises in Denmark. In total, 480 people participated in the programme in 2010. Of these, 20–25 percent of participants were engaged in employment three months after they had left the programme. So far 120 participants have obtained a trainee position or a partly subsidised job position. Importantly, a review of the programme emphasises that it has been more successful in getting migrants into employment than ethnic Danes (OSF, 2012).

These sorts of actions need to be based on the gathering and analysis of information on the local labour market, on local skills shortages and on the employment potential offered by migrants. Civil society organisations may also need support navigating the dynamics behind public administration. Making connections between migrant groups and employers, employment services and vocational training organisations to link demand with supply is also crucial. One successful project operates in Amsterdam where The Platform Arbeidsmarkt en Onderwijs (PAO) brings together key stakeholders and produces a twice yearly labour market monitor which provides the local administration with up-to-date data concerning the labour status of Amsterdam citizens, including those with a migrant background (DIVE, 2013, 16). However, this information is not shared with civil society organisations.

The plan for a particular project should also take into account the participation of the majority community. The importance of this can be highlighted by the outcome of the opening of a new Mosque in Duisburg (Cities of Migration). The Mosque advisory board contained a large range of different people including a Catholic priest. The outcome of the consultations meant that there was no tension surrounding the opening of the new Mosque. This can be compared to the planning of a new Mosque in Cologne which provoked considerable conflict.

However there are problems with participatory planning as it is sometimes difficult to achieve representativeness. This is a particular concern in very diverse places with increasing numbers of small migrant groups. In the participatory planning initiative for the Station Area in Reggio Emilia, the vast majority of citizens who got involved turned out to be natives, in an area where the majority of residents are of foreign origin (Pogliano, 2012, 8). However when given time participatory planning has been a success in Berlin. The Quartiermanagement (QM) programme was set up by the Senate in 1999 in 15 neighbourhoods, most of them with a high migrant population. A dedicated ‘resident fund’, a form of participative budgeting, led to previously unseen levels of local citizen involvement. With a particular focus on people with a migrant background, this participative policy enabled the city to have a better understanding of the needs and priorities of migrant communities. By involving migrant residents’ decisions to shape the use of ‘resident funds’ the feeling of shared ownership of local policies increased (DIVE, 2013). Also, developing effective structures which allow migrants to input their views on common community activities such as festivals and events encourages wide ranging participation as was the case with the Peoples of the World Festival in Bilbao (URBACT II, 2010, 13).

2.4 Funding and Evaluating Integration Practice

Firstly, when examining evaluation practice, it is important to note that some indicators do not seamlessly correlate with levels of integration. For example, the level of inter-ethnic contact is a popular indicator of integration, but it does not necessarily imply a positive correlation with integration outcomes like financial capital and social mobility (i.e. some migrant groups have low levels of inter-ethnic contact, but their social mobility is enhanced by the strength of their ties within a migrant community).

Secondly, there are many projects that engage in attitudinal change and anti-discrimination whose impacts are difficult to capture. For example ‘soft issues’ such as recognition, respect, feeling of belonging, tolerance and openness are difficult to evaluate. Even where detailed data is collected, it is not necessarily possible to make a direct link between an intervention and changes in outputs or outcomes (Jones, 2012) Some also noted that attitudinal change may take several years to be visible (particularly, for example, when approaches were focused on young people who may not be included in surveys of the general population until they reach adulthood). It was also noted in the AMICALL project that long-term work could easily be undermined by a serious local, national or international event (such as a terrorist attack) or changes to local services (Jones, 2012).

Thirdly, continued funding for integration projects is often contingent on demonstrable short-term results, yet integration progress will often only be seen over the course of many generations and can often be hard to disentangle from the impact of other developments.

One solution has been devised by The Institute for Social Research (SCP) in The Netherlands, a government agency which conducts research into the social aspects of government policy. It has implemented some innovative approaches to measuring integration by running experiments to test levels of discrimination in society. The SCP has recently run ‘experiments’ by sending 1,300 job applications for vacancies, one set using non-Dutch names and another set using Dutch names (the applications were of a similar quality); these were sent to employers to gather a data set on discrimination in the labour market (Ramalingham, 2013, 51).

Copenhagen is working hard to provide more concrete evidence of the diversity advantage. Through its Innoverity programme it recruited 30 companies and showed that diverse cleaning teams in ISS Facility Services generated 3.7 percent more earnings than homogenous teams. ISS has more than 11,000 employees in Denmark and, therefore they calculated that if every cleaning team in Denmark were as diverse, it could mean a growth in revenue of DK 100 million per annum. The Danish government has published an official report proving that diversity within an organization enhances innovative capacity by up to 30 percent (Intercultural Cities, 2013, 9).

Evaluations could also be shared between organisations so individuals can share innovative ways of capturing results and lessons learnt from previous projects. However, when funding is dependent on good outcomes this can also act as a strong disincentive to admitting failures. Funders and Foundations could change donor – recipient relationship in order to promote greater critical analysis of outcomes. Foundations could set longer terms goals such as Mercator Foundation in Germany which states an objective of reducing educational inequality by 70 percent between 2005 and 2025 (Ramalingham, 2013, 32).

Foundations can therefore be active in setting goals based on learning rather than outcomes. The Swedish Inheritance Fund Commission has been identified as unique as it requires its funded projects to test out new ideas, or to develop innovative methods and come up with solutions to social issues. It recognises that innovation may be accompanied by failure but considers this as part of a learning process. If funded projects fail, the Commission pairs the project with a trained researcher to work together to assess both processes and outcomes, analyse what did and didn’t work, and identify lessons to be learned. As Ramalingham notes ‘this method provides project staff with guidance from experienced researchers to undertake evaluation, but also ensures that project staff have ownership over the evaluation’. The Commission then publishes these learning points in a series of reports, available for public download on their website (Ramalingham 2013, 52).

2.5 Conclusion

Recurring themes emerged from the literature review of successful practices. A key issue to securing change from project learning was governance structure. In state rather than national governance legislative changes are more feasible and therefore successful project outcomes may have more impact. A second key theme that emerged from successful projects was a commitment to understanding both of the needs of target groups, the majority society and also relevant local services. However it is clear that small organisations often do not have the capacity to develop and maintain expertise in all these different areas. Thirdly, funding structures and donor-recipient relationships are pivotal not only to establishing a successful practice but also learning from and disseminating the outcomes. Innovative approaches to information sharing and promoting a culture where problems can be truthfully reported are being pioneered by some Foundations but this is not widespread. It was also surprising so few project evaluations did not disaggregated gender in their results or mention awareness of gender differentiation.

A key factor affecting all civil society actors at the current time is the economic downturn. A recent MPI study concluded the results of the economic situation on the integration outcomes of migrants will be contingent on the depth of the recession, the nature of immigration to each country and the length of time spent developing and implementing integration policies (Collett, 2011). Core policies for employment and training may be maintained but there may be little extra resource for new policies or innovative integration practices. NGO's are often the central service provider at the grassroots level but they depend on stable sources of funding for their own institutional survival. Furthermore, as shown above donor recipient relationships can have wide-ranging effects on project planning and implementation. Decreasing government and foundation support for NGOs leaves these organisations in a deeply vulnerable position (MRCF, 2011).

3. CASE STUDIES

The case study countries represent a range of approaches to integration policy. The United Kingdom (and The Netherlands) have historically adopted a multicultural approach and been open to supporting the retention of cultural differences and ethnic identities of migrants, although this approach is changing with the advent of the backlash against multiculturalism (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). The main feature of German and Scandinavian modes of integration has been the inclusion of immigrants into the general welfare state and social policy system. The immigration situation in Portugal and Southern Europe is characterised by large numbers of illegal migrants and ensuing amnesties. Because immigration is a relatively new phenomenon, national consistent integration policies are still absent. In the Eastern European countries, integration policy is still in a fledgling state. In these countries there are few formal regulations and only intermittent implementation through local initiatives. The very different integration outcomes experienced in each of those countries can be evidenced in their MIPEX scores (see below).

The policies and measures reviewed for the purpose of the selection of case studies in this section included initiatives at the national, local levels, or in a multilevel setting, implemented by the governments, public institutions, NGOs, grassroots groups, as well as interactive combinations of these institutions. The documentation utilised for the case studies included, where available: the most recent project evaluation, project publicity, learning materials produced and a full desk search of any other related material. Using these documents, an analysis was undertaken to determine the target outputs for each project and the extent to which they had met their targets. The main objective of the documentary analysis was to establish how well each project had done in terms of achieving its quantifiable aims and to establish what

works in certain situations.

MIPEX scores

	Czech Republic	Germany	Luxembourg	Portugal	Sweden	UK
Total (with education)	46	57	59	79	83	57
Total (without education)	46	60	60	81	84	56
Labour Market Mobility	55	77	48	94	100	55
Family Reunion	66	60	67	91	84	54
Education	44	43	52	63	77	58
Political Participation	13	64	78	70	75	53
Long Term Residence	65	50	56	69	78	31
Access to Nationality	33	59	66	82	79	59
Anti-Discrimination	44	48	48	84	88	86

3.1. Czech Republic

The process of accession to the European Union has influenced the objectives of the Czech migration policy over the past decade. Priorities include combating illegal migration, defining a comprehensive asylum policy and harmonizing migration policy with common standards of the EU. Therefore since 2000 migration policy has taken a more coherent shape. Similarly the importance of migrant integration was recognized in 1999, when the Principles of Policy for the Integration of Foreigners were adopted.

The Updated Concept on Integration 2005 stresses the individual attitude and self-responsibility of immigrants and the importance of their own effort to civic integration. It is mainly focused on the participation of immigrants in the labour market and their economic independence from the state. However it also underlines the rights of migrants, equal access to these rights and that integration is a two-sided process. The Updated Concept in 2005 identified four key prerequisites for successful immigrant integration under the conditions of the Czech Republic; knowledge of the Czech language; an immigrant's economic self-sufficiency; an immigrant's orientation in society and an immigrant's relations with members of the majority society.

In 2011, the government adopted the Updated Policy for Integration of Immigrants and in 2012 the Procedure of Implementation of the Updated Policy for Integration of Immigrants. The government also approved the much debated legislative intent of the new legal regulation of entry and residence of foreign citizens in the Czech Republic.

In terms of refugees the Czech Republic is characterised by small inflows, with refugees concentrated in specific areas. Wider migration fell sharply in the context of the economic crisis. The main purposes of immigration are family reunification, employment and education. The total number of immigrants holding a residence permit slightly increased in 2011 to about 434 000, which represented around 4 per cent of the total population. The major immigrant communities are Ukrainian, Slovak, Vietnamese and Russian (Directorate of Alien Police, Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, 2012).

The Czech Republic currently ranks nineteenth out of all 31 MIPEX countries evaluated in 2010. It significantly improved due to the adoption of the 2009 Anti-Discrimination Law. These EU minimum standards improve access to justice, regardless of nationality or background, and help all residents fully participate in society. However, political participation remains particularly low and therefore the country ranks the second least favourable for this area of the 31 countries. The Czech Government has been ineffective at signing treaties giving reciprocal voting rights for non-EU permanent residents, since adopted in 2001. Immigrants cannot join parties, nor found associations unless three Czech citizens are on the board.

According to the Living Together integration plan 10,000,000 CZK was dedicated to integration in 2011 including 7,700,000 CZK allocated to the Ministry of Interior. One of the key aims of the integration plan is the active role of the local and/or regional administration for immigrant integration in the regions. In order to achieve this, Foreign Nationals Integration Support Centres have been established.

The Centres have been established in 10 of the Czech Republic's 14 regions beginning in 2009 (Liberec, Karlovy Vary, Olomouc, Moravia-Silesia, Pardubice, Plzen, South Bohemia, South Moravia Ústí nad Labem and Zlín). A grant tender procedure is used to allocate funding. According to the 2011 integration plan, a civic organisation coordinates the centre in Poradna. The regional authority assumes this role in South Moravia. In the other eight other regions, the organisers are the Refugee Facility Management. The centres also work in conjunction with the Department of Migration and Asylum Policy as well as other governmental departments. At local level, partnerships have been established with several stakeholders involving NGOs, local departments and the police.

The collaboration of several stakeholders raises a number of issues. Tošnerová (2010) notes the example of Plzen where integration assistance, through municipal authorities had already been active prior to the opening of a centre. Similarly, NGOs had been fulfilling similar roles in Pardubice. Thus, while a unified approach was desired, negotiations are still on-going at a local level to ensure correct and adequate support.

The centres have several functions. Firstly, they serve as information points for everyday concerns such as housing, jobs and education. Secondly, they provide advice and legal counselling for immigration and work issues. In some cases, the centres offer Czech language courses as well internet access and libraries. Language support for foreign nationals is available through interpreters. In addition the centres 'provide for permanent monitoring of the situation of foreigners and support the development of civil society' (IOM, 2011, 8). Each centre has some level of autonomy to control staff levels and budgets (Tošnerová, 2010).

According to IOM (2011), in 2010, the target group outreach was between 8 and 13.4 percent. For newer centres, the figure was between 3.8 and 8.4 percent. Understanding the overall effectiveness the centres and wider integration policy is difficult at this stage. Vavrecková & Baštýr (2011, 17) in their study of integration indicators state, 'The Czech Republic still lacks a set of relevant monitoring indicators for regular evaluation of the course and effectiveness of the integration process'. Hence, while measures have been adopted and implemented in regards to integrating foreign nationals, more information is required in order to evaluate how successful these measures have been. The Integration Support centres are an example of how the national government has developed migrant and refugee integration measures within centralised

systems but municipalities have little authority and insignificant experience in this realm resulting in overlap of services.

3.1.1 Case study: Entrepreneurship as a Route out of Social Exclusion

It is within this context that GLE o.p.s., a non-profit-distributing agency for economic development, implemented the ‘Entrepreneurship as a route out of social exclusion’ project. It set out to encourage entrepreneurship as a way forward for people from disadvantaged groups to facilitate their social and economic inclusion. The project used tools developed in GLE (Greater London Enterprise) London and Brussels.

The project had several key objectives; to enable the target groups to acquire the skills needed to set up their own enterprise and to prepare a good business plan; to raise the awareness of entrepreneurship as a route out of social exclusion; to transfer good practice (especially from London and Brussels) in the field of business support for disadvantaged individuals in the Czech Republic; and to help develop the tools available to improve access to the labour market.

The project was targeted to three groups: immigrants with legal residence in the Czech Republic, unemployed parents caring for young people under the age of 15 and long-term unemployed people. As well as working directly with clients on a one-to-one basis, seminars were offered on a broad range of topics including drafting business plans and dealing with business taxes. Events were organized with representatives from financial institutions for clients to discuss ideas. Two networking events were also held for clients to share experiences, meet other people who were facing similar challenges and to make new contacts.

The project was due to run until March 2011. However, due to the large number of requests for support it was extended for seven months closing in October 2011. The initial target of supporting 100 clients was met within the first year of the project, and by October 2011, 258 clients have been supported. 204 clients successfully completed the programme against an initial target of 30. More than 500 individual consultations were undertaken and 93 percent client satisfaction was recorded. Unfortunately the results do not disaggregate for different client groups.

Evaluation was conducted in the first and second year of the project. 154 clients were contacted and asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their satisfaction with the service and their current employment situation. 46 clients (18 percent) had successfully set up businesses in a wide range of areas such as housing and clothing design, nutrition, family centres and websites for people with disabilities and physiotherapy services.

A new toolkit addressing business consultancy methodology for disadvantaged groups was developed and disseminated at events and is available to download from the project website. Lessons learnt from this project are being implemented in the new project ‘Work and business advisory services in Central Bohemian region’. This project targets immigrants, asylum seekers and individuals who are over 50 years old and are facing discrimination on the labour market where starting up their own business is one of the possible solutions to their situation. The project ended in October 2013.

3.2 Luxembourg

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has a population of 537,000 of which 43 percent are considered

foreigners. Almost half of third country nationals originate from former Yugoslavia. Russia, USA and China make up 14 percent and Africa eight percent of TCNs. Luxembourg also has a large majority of migrants from Cape Verde.

The Government passed a law on 16th December 2008 which outlined the country's commitment to integration in accordance with the changing demography. The overarching principles and objectives are laid out in a four year plan (2010 – 2014) however priorities are set each year in a National Action Plan for Integration and Against Discrimination. In 2009 the first National Action Plan delineated a set of initiatives from 2010 to 2011. It involved 14 ministries and governmental administrations (Ministry of Family and Integration, 2009).

Under the plan, a project to improve integration was created. Playing a lead role was OLAI (Luxembourg Reception and Integration Office). The role of OLAI was to coordinate and implement a national integration strategy. The plan involved four key factors (Ministry of Family and Integration, 2009), firstly, guidance for newcomers; secondly, assistance in social, economic, political and cultural integration; thirdly, to fight discrimination; and finally, to study migration.

One key element of the integration plan was the Welcome and Integration Contract (CAI). The CAI is a two year contract aimed at any foreigner over the age of 16 years old living legally in Luxembourg. The contract has also been seen as holding symbolic value as it is not obligatory. It has therefore been seen as indicative of an individual's willingness to commit to integration and settlement in Luxembourg (EMN, 2012). The contract involves a free civic training integration course which is taught English, French, German, Luxembourgish and Portuguese. Reduced price language classes are also available in Luxembourgish, French or German. Participants must attain at least A1.1 on the Common European Framework of Reference. Completion of the contract is taken into consideration if an individual applies for long term residence.

CAI was implemented on 2nd September 2011. In 2012, 972 candidates signed to the contract of whom 40 percent were third country nationals (EMN, 2012). Since the programme began the contract gained 1,006 signatories, from 99 different nationalities. The most represented nationalities were: Portuguese (34 percent), French (5 percent) and Italian, Spanish and Cape Verdean (4 percent). 62 percent of signatories were women and 38 percent, men. 91 percent were aged between 25 and 65. At the time of signing the contract, 53 percent were active in the labour market, 30 percent were looking for a job, and 6 percent were unemployed and inactive. 18 percent resided in Luxembourg for less than one year, 76 percent between one and five years and 6 percent for more than five years. An evaluation of the plan is expected after five years (Ministry of Family and Integration, 2009).

With these recent reforms, Luxembourg made the second greatest progress on integration of all 31 MIPEX countries. It has particularly improved on access to nationality with immigrants taking paths to citizenship similar to other established and reforming countries. The way EU law was transposed granted clearer rights for all non-EU families to reunite and participate fully in society, but granted more rights to fewer long-term residents. However there have been negligible improvements in areas such as political participation.

3.2.1 Case Study: 100% Luxembourg

In November 2012 institutions and organisations from Luxembourg joined forces in a campaign to put an end to racism and promote solidarity among people living in the Grand Duchy. The Making Luxembourg campaign wants to show that people from different backgrounds and walks of life contribute to make Luxembourg. It is similar to many other high profile city campaigns such as 'We Amsterdammers', 'Yours Istanbul', 'Belonging to Dewsbury' or 'Hamburg. My Port. Germany. My Home' (CLIP, 2010, 6).

However the effect of these programmes is very difficult to evaluate as they rest on providing a collective local identity. Some measures of success of this approach can be measured in other areas such as up-take of language services. This has been seen in places such as Wuppertal, Germany, which is a nation-wide leader for language class attendance. However integration in Wuppertal has been described as a social movement rather than a city service and has the support of the mayor, the city manager and all democratic parties in the city council, and is regarded as a model of social and economic success to other German cities (Cities of Migration, 2012, 48).

More than one hundred companies, foundations and community organisations have become a partner of the 100 % Luxembourg Campaign, pledging to support diversity and tackle racism in their business and operations. Individuals can also create their own avatar to take on the issue of racism and discrimination in everyday life.

To become an ambassador for the scheme, individuals design an avatar on-line listing three things that make up '100 % Luxembourg and 0 % racist'. This can then be shared on Facebook and turned in to t-shirt. The Facebook page currently has more than 1,000 likes. The website also tries to clear up some common stereotypes, addressing such questions as foreigners stealing jobs or not being interested in the country. To date, there have been more than 2000 avatars and t-shirts created from a total of around 85,000 people currently residing in Luxembourg City.

3.2.2. Case Study: Multi-Learn

Luxembourg has initiated an innovative project in multi-lingualism. Luxembourg is a particularly multilingual country. There are three official languages: Luxembourgish, French and German. Other languages used on a daily basis are those of the large immigrant communities and English.

Partly funded by the EIF, multi-LEARN promotes a specific concept of functional multilingualism in educational initiatives, which are taught in all the three languages of the Luxembourg scientific context: English, French and German. Training sessions require participants to be functionally proficient in at least two of the languages the topic is taught in. English also needs to be functional for academic use (reading, discussing, and writing) as trainers with international background contribute to the multi-LEARN activities. Students are carefully paired with a mentor and then decide together which language competencies to develop (e.g. improving scientific writing in one language, presentational skills in another language).

The project has not yet been evaluated but the blog page contains a cluster map to provide real time analytics of the users and countries of origin. From 4th April 2011 the website has attracted more than 6,000 visitors from 95 countries. This programme is highly transferable and can operate across national boundaries due to its digital nature. It has particular uses for highly skilled migrants establishing themselves in new countries either within or outside European Member States.

3.3 Germany

The German population of 81.9 million includes 16 million people with a migration background; among those are 7.2 million people who have a foreign citizenship (OECD, statistical library). More than 50 percent of migrants are from the following 10 countries of origin: Turkey, Italy, Poland, Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo, Greece, Croatia, Russian Federation, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and The Netherlands.

Migrants from Turkey amount to almost a quarter of all foreigners living in Germany. Berlin's percentage of

foreigners (13.6 percent) is highest in Germany, followed by Hamburg (13.5 percent). The lowest percentage of foreigners is found in Saxony-Anhalt (1.8 percent). According to MIPEX, Germany's policies on new arrivals and family reunion are comparable to other major immigration countries as analysed in the 2010 MIPEX evaluation. In education MIPEX reports good intentions and well-evaluated projects rather than actual entitlements however Germany has significantly increased its education scores from the previous MIPEX analysis in 2007. Germany is far below on equality policies and long-term residence conditions but does score highly in labour market mobility.

The social situation of the German population is mainly determined by employment. Whereas far more than 60 percent of Germans and those from South-Western Europe (Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain) work full time or part time, this accounts for barely 60 percent of the ethnic German immigrants and migrants from former Yugoslavia and 45 percent of the Turkish migrants.

Today, integration has become a top priority at the local level, with many city mayors launching local integration strategies. In 2011, Germany developed a new integration strategy through a set of participatory 'forums for dialogue', involving a number of stakeholders across a set of themes including sports, culture, immigrants in public service, early childhood education, and labour market and professional life. The National Integration Plan arose from these forums, and sets out measurable and binding goals for integration in Germany.

Particular focus has been placed on 'intercultural opening': efforts to better serve migrant communities' needs by recruiting more personnel with a migration background, and developing consultative bodies of migrants to amplify their voice in local politics. Germany has begun to provide intercultural and migrant-oriented training to staff of the Federal Employment Agency as part of this increased focus on intercultural values.

Other areas of focus include civic integration courses that combine language learning with orientation to Germany, as a prerequisite to naturalisation, as well as increased investment into education, through language learning courses, individual counselling, civic education and knowledge testing, and changing school systems and curricula to adapt to migrant pupils. Interestingly, the German Integrationskurse (integration course) simply extends a programme to foreign-born residents that had been in place for ethnic Germans. There has been some debate in recent years surrounding the obligatory nature of these courses, and who is to pay (the migrant, or the federal government, the lander, or municipalities).

3.3.1. Case Study: IUBA - International Companies Providing Vocational Training in Frankfurt

Frankfurt has been described as a super-diverse city. This can be shown by highlighting some of the key characteristics (Stadt Frankfurt, 2009): migrants from more than 170 different countries; large variety of ethnic, religious, racial and cultural traditions; increasing variety of different migration trajectories; different legal statuses of migrants; larger variations in the demographic and socioeconomic conditions of migrations; sustainability of super-diversity over a longer period of time as this super-diversity existed in Frankfurt already at the end of the 1990s. In 2010, Frankfurt am Main had a population of 679,571 persons with a 24 percent share of foreign nationals. In 2010, Frankfurt am Main had a population of 679,571 persons with a 24 per cent share of foreign nationals. While the average age of natives in Frankfurt is 42 years, foreigners are younger: their statistical average age is 39 years. As a result, 32 percent of persons aged 18-65 in 2010 were foreigners (Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 2010).

A large project to engage young migrants in apprenticeships with migrant entrepreneurs took place in Frankfurt. The project "Internationale Unternehmen bilden aus" (IUBA - International Companies Providing Vocational Training) was launched in 2001 and is still in operation. It aims to raise the number of companies

run by migrant owners providing vocational training for apprentices.

In Frankfurt, many stakeholders are involved in labour market integration of less skilled persons. The coordinating organisation Frankfurt Hauptschule Project (Koordinierungsstelle Frankfurter Hauptschulprojekt) is central to this process. This organisation was created by the Association for Youth Employment, which is affiliated with the city government (Stadtnaher Verein "Gesellschaft Jugendbeschäftigung"). Among other tasks, it establishes profiles of young people seeking vocational training positions and matches these with the respective vacant positions for vocational training in companies.

In order to reach the goal of creating additional apprenticeships in international enterprises, the IHK Frankfurt put a special adviser in place, to encourage ethnic entrepreneurs to create apprenticeship training positions and provide help with formalities. This extra resource was required in order to engage with ethnic entrepreneurs but provided an additional benefit for the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (IHK Hesse) to engage with a group which previously it had limited contact.

In cooperation with different migrant and industry associations, mosques, other institutions information events were organised and publicized in the mass media to create awareness among the general public. Successful migrant entrepreneurs participated in these events to share their experiences with the pupils and their parents in German or in their mother tongue. Similar events for teachers, pupils and their parents took place in public schools.

Entrepreneurs' proficiency in the mother tongue of a part of the audience was utilised to help facilitate the communication of information. The common cultural background of migrant employers, the counsellors and many of the consulted persons was presumed to facilitate contact and to raise trust between the participants of the process.

The IUBA project was evaluated by the INBAS Institute focusing on the project outcomes. According to experts' reports, about 5,000 positions for vocational training in migrant owned companies were created in Hesse since 2001, most of them in Frankfurt am Main and its surroundings. It was estimated about 80 percent of these positions were filled with young apprentices both with and without immigrant background, the most relevant sectors being hospitality and catering, trade, public and private services, and real estate management. Most entrepreneurs who created apprenticeship places are Turkish (38 percent), followed by Italian entrepreneurs (10 percent).

Overall, 16 percent of the entrepreneurs have the nationality of another EU country, and 36 percent are third-country nationals. Young apprentices benefiting from the project are predominantly German (59 percent), often with a migration background, or Turkish (20 percent). The fourth stage of the project (from 2011 – 2013) is focusing on rural areas and SME's.

An unexpected outcome of the project included the matching potential of apprentices and entrepreneurs. Many of migrant entrepreneurs preferred being considered simply as entrepreneurs and were looking for an appropriate apprentice who would fit the company needs irrespective of the background. This lesson is now being implemented through the matching process for apprentices and entrepreneurs.

The project's success seems based on matching the identified needs within the population to the priorities of the municipality. Frankfurt reports that more than 50 percent of all recent start-ups are ethnic entrepreneurs and therefore this type of initiative might not have such success in localities with different dynamics (CLIP, 2011). However the project was devised to use established systems and work with partner organisations such as the Association for Youth Employment. It also brought together many different organisations working to support lower skilled citizens gain entry into the labour market and those that

engage with young people such as mosques. The resources and communication of the project such as the use of a mass media campaign and the development of a website may have assisted the sustainability of the project and the number of entrepreneurs involved.

This project is not bound to a particular legal framework so transferability is possible. But of course there are some points which are closely tied to its original context. The most important point is the well-structured training ‘landscape’ in Frankfurt. The different training providers are the fundamental basis of the project and are absolutely necessary for building up something similar in another city.

3.4 Portugal

Despite austere economic choices it is reported that national consensus and support for integration has not reduced in Portugal (MPIEX Portugal Country Report). Portugal has recently worked more than most Member States to secure long-term residence (2007 Immigration Law) and target immigrants’ specific employment situations (Immigrant Integration Plans, Recognition of Qualifications). Portugal’s nationality law, based on 2006’s coherent reform, promotes common citizenship. It is also reported that the country benefits from more integration researchers and evaluations in Portugal (e.g. Immigration Observatory), whose recommendations can improve policies, decisions and public awareness.

In response to the level of migration to Portugal, a new position was created by the Government. In 2004, the Portuguese High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI) was formed in order to aid integration and to create initiatives working with non-governmental and governmental organisations.

The obstacles to integration identified in 2005, in the ‘Common Agenda for Integration’ had also been seen at a national level in Portugal (IOM, 2009). For example, migrants would often have to deal with a range of institutions which lacked of institutional uniformity in procedures and services. Furthermore, government services were often situated in dispersed locations a situation compounded by linguistic and cultural differences. In order to address these complexities, a ‘one stop shop’ model was adopted to offer a coherent, unified central point of information, guidance and services. This model was based on a similar ‘citizenship shop’ which had been used to address similar bureaucratic problems faced by Portuguese residents.

The one stop shops known as CNAI (National Immigrant Support Centres) were created in Lisbon and Porto. CNAI placed the following departments in one location: the Foreign Nationals and Border Service, Social Security, Labour General Inspectorate, the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health. In addition, there has in some locations been support from other places such as the Employment Support Office (IOM, 2009). Each CNAI employs socio-cultural mediators, fluent in Portuguese and migrant languages. The aim was to provide a physical, central point of information for initial support for new migrants and integration. The CNAI also allowed quicker resolutions for queries and issues, improved coordination between department and better communication through the socio-cultural mediation (Penninx, 2009). In addition to CNAI, a helpline was made available called SOS Imigrante providing advice and support in nine languages on issues such as citizenship and immigration law. CNAI also developed services outside the main urban centres. Socio-cultural mediators travel to more regional locations to provide assistance for migrants. This has proved to be successful and has resulted in reported increased trust and credibility of CNAI’s work among migrants (IOM, 2009).

The program has been evaluated by the IOM (International Organization for Migration) twice, in 2006 and 2009. The 2006 evaluation operated on four levels: project design, operational implementation, project evaluation and impact analysis. Primary data were collected through questionnaire for migrant service

users (250 in Lisbon and 50 in Porto) as well interviews with staff members. Secondary data such as CNAI and administrative documentation was also collected and analysed. The 2009 evaluation report interviewed public agencies and civil society (9 interviews in Lisbon and 2 in Porto). All CNAI workers were interviewed. Migrant voices were captured through 600 surveys in Lisbon and 100 in Porto.

Lessons were learnt from the 2006 evaluation and resulted in increased service satisfaction three years later in the 2009 evaluation. The 2006 IOM reported that 93.2 percent of users in Porto and 86 percent in Lisbon felt that they had received better service in resolving issues at the CNAI. Those working at the institutions felt they were more effective in providing resolutions and more effective in following up. It was noted also that the workers felt supported by the language assistance available from the socio-cultural mediators. In some cases, the socio-mediators come from migrant backgrounds which have proved to be both a practical and strategic advantage in terms of language and experience (ACIME, 2005). Of particular benefit were the integrated services, friendliness of assistance and quality of living from the project (IOM, 2006).

The main uses of CNAI were for visa renewal (IOM, 2009): 46.8 percent of enquiries in Lisbon and 37.9 percent in Porto. One of the key forms assistance provided was for those considered illegal migrants. Legalization of status accounted for 13.2 percent in Lisbon and 8.8 percent in Porto. CNAI services can be accessed by those with an irregular status leading to increased integration opportunities. Citizenship represented 14.8 percent of enquiries in Lisbon and 5.8 percent in Porto. An initial concern was that CNAI would only be used by migrants for initial entry into Portugal.

However, the 2009 IOM report notes that services were not only used for visa renewal and citizenship but also for subsequent family reunification and juridical support.

The IOM 2006 report raised concerns about the size of the Lisbon CNAI. However, this was later addressed with two new locations. Although the resolutions provided by CNAI and quality of services evaluated well, waiting times were considered to be an issue. By the 2009 report, this was considered to be less problematic.

One of the recommendations of IOM (2006) was the establishment of an international network using the Portuguese case as a model. This was developed involving partners from six other EU member states (Oliveira et al., 2009; Penninx, 2009). Furthermore, a handbook demonstrating how the one stop shop approach could be both adopted and adapted was written (Oliveira et al., 2009). Thus, evidence of the Portuguese model has been recorded, circulated and transferred successfully to other Member States.

3.5 Sweden

Although Sweden is not a traditional immigration country, a relatively high number of foreign-born persons have settled in the country over the last fifty years. Most of the immigrants coming to Sweden have traditionally been from the other Nordic or Western European States but increasingly people from Asia, Africa and European non-EU countries have migrated to Sweden as refugees or following family reunification. Sweden is now characterised by high refugee inflows, with refugees dispersed throughout the country. It operates a decentralised system of migrant and refugee integration that renders significant authority and responsibility to the local level (municipalities and provinces). In total, 20 percent of the population in Sweden has a foreign background (15 percent with one foreign born parent and 5 percent with two foreign born parents (Ministry of Labour, 2013).

In 1997, the Swedish government began to pursue a more comprehensive integration strategy, and

established the Integration Board to oversee integration efforts throughout society. This was replaced in 2007 by a new Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality.

The goal of integration policy passed by Parliament in 2008 is: ‘equal rights, obligations and opportunities for everybody, independent of one’s ethnic and cultural background’. In 2010 a new reform became effective with the goal of a quicker establishment of new immigrants on the labour market and in society. The idea of the new law is to give immigrants better opportunities for learning Swedish quickly and for obtaining better job opportunities. The law is valid for all workable foreigners aged 20 – 64 and also for persons between 18 and 19 who came to Sweden without their parents. All migrants receive a personalised ‘integration plan’ and assistance to help find a job and housing. To validate the free language course, Swedish for Immigrants (SFI), job preparation such as internships, and work experience are mandatory. The goal is to offer 40 hours of full time activity per week for a maximum of 24 months. The plan has to be completed two months after the decision on their residence permit at the latest.

From 2011, integration has been delivered largely out of the Ministry of Employment through mainstream policies. The overall emphasis is on increasing the supply and demand of labour, and ensuring equality in schools, based on the logic that the main barrier to integration is an inability to access work.

Sweden’s ‘mainstreaming’ approach works to improve equal opportunities in practice and the country has consistently scored the highest in MIPEX evaluations. The key elements of their high ranking include comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation. Within Sweden’s social model, each individual is also legally entitled to support that addresses their specific needs (e.g. labour market introduction, orientation programmes, Swedish language and mother tongue courses).

In 2011 the area of integration received about 5.7 million Kronor (about 650 million Euros) out of the Swedish national budget. The major part is spent on the admission and care for refugees by the municipalities.

3.5.1. Case Study: The World in Västerbotten

The project aims to increase the use of libraries and use them as a site of integration for young migrants. There is an identified and increasing gap in educational achievements between young people with and without a Swedish background (Center for Study of Democracy, 2012, 194). The project is funded by the National Arts Council in collaboration with educational associations SISU and aimed to stimulate reading among athletically active children.

This project represents an innovative approach by using systems already in place to improve integration outcomes. The project hoped to promote immigrant youth participation in Swedish cultural life; intercultural exchange through writing, storytelling and other art forms between Swedish and migrant youth and to develop the role of libraries in integration process by developing partnerships and networks. The project identified the importance of an equal gender balance and project evaluation disaggregated findings for male and female participants.

The project built on cooperation between different networks in different regions including recreation centres in Wilhelmina and Åsele and with Student Association's departments in Nordmalingsfjärden, Umeå and Wilhelmina. Children in asylum accommodation were targeted as were children from rural areas.

The project established a steering group with the head of the county library and a peer group of young people from Umeå, Nordmalingsfjärden and Wilhelmina. Some young people were employed by the holiday camps resulting in more relevant and successful activities, recruitment and participation. The

evaluation states that main success of the project rested on three adult leaders who remained involved in all project activities. Between activities, contacts were maintained via email and Facebook. It was noted the ability to relate to young people's use of social media has also opened new opportunities for libraries. Facebook was a key way to keep young people involved, to interact with each other and to gauge the success of project activities to ensure future participation.

Another key success of the project was the key partner organisation, Umeå Legend Club. Partnership between a library and a boxing club was an innovative way to engage young people. The club was established by a 25 year old Iraqi youth leader and athlete with a refugee background.

Overall, the project exceeded its targets and reached over 500 young people. Most have only participated in a single activity (such as a camp or workshop), but about 50 young people participated in more than two activities and a network developed. Four tours of schools were completed on the theme of boxing books reaching 300 young people.

The project leader worked within the network of libraries to disseminate the lessons learnt. One support worker attended conferences to publicise the work of the project. As the partnership seemed innovative it also spread by word of mouth and a similar project is taking place in Umeå. The County Library in Västernorrland is also using the model.

In order for lessons to be learnt from projects (particularly those with limited funding) co-ordinators should be encouraged and have the resources to attend conferences to share best practice. The formation of migrant networks in civil society might support this. This project also could signal an alternative to the 'Neighbourhood House' in Turin (EU MIA, 2013); 'World Culture House' model developed in Denmark (OSF, 2011) or 'World Culture House' in Tilburg (Intercultural cities, 2013). As has been noted in other projects, (see Libraries for All - A European Strategy for Multicultural Education) regional towns may not have resources to develop centres but could encourage libraries to offer educative and cultural services and activities, promote public services, and encourage participation to cultural events. Physical spaces or hubs where communities and organisations can come together can help build trust across communities, projects and NGOs. Libraries can act as these local meeting spaces, where people can meet informally. Creating spaces for people to come together can allow ideas to be exchanged among those with shared objectives perhaps leading to development of new integration initiatives.

3.5.2. Case Study: The Simba Project

The Centre Against Racism was involved in establishing the Simba Centre in conjunction with the Afro-Swedish Association in 1998. The target group for the new centre was unemployed African women. Though evidence suggested that many from this group had a good standard of education, their success in getting employment commensurate with their skills was lower than that of African men, who themselves fared less well than their Swedish counterparts.

The objectives of the project were to improve employment outcomes for African migrant women and to challenge stereotypes. It also aimed to educate and inform employers and employment agencies about the potential of migrants, to demonstrate to migrants their own capacity for leadership, and to build stronger bridges with other sections of Swedish labour, such as trade unions, private companies, civil society, the Swedish Employment Agency and the social welfare services.

The Simba Centre provided an advice and counselling service to African women who had been unemployed for more than six months and who were referred to the Centre by the Swedish Employment Agency. Simba Centre advisors, themselves mainly Swedish women of African origin, worked with the women to prepare

individual work plans based on each woman's background, education and vocational qualifications, work experience, and also according to her employment and career aspirations.

The Centre had the capacity to work with 80 job seekers at any one time. It developed strong networks to be able to match jobs with jobseekers by developing a database of 800 companies. It also worked closely with the Swedish Employment Agency and the social welfare services to deliver training on intercultural dialogue techniques. In addition, the Centre also initiated a partnership with Manpower, a private sector employment agency.

Thirty percent of participants were placed in employment during the time they were with the Simba Centre. This is a higher rate than had been achieved by the Swedish Employment Agency. But even this rate still meant that more than two-thirds of the client group remained long-term unemployed. Also, the work found for clients tended to be in the low-skill sector, which often provided casual or insecure employment. If clients lost their jobs they would return to the Swedish Employment Agency for use of their services another period of up to six months.

The Swedish Employment Agency changed its contract to require the Centre to receive referrals for more categories of long-term unemployed. The Centre has been obliged to accept these terms, being dependent on this contract for funding. This development is not considered a problem, since it demonstrates that a community initiated project, led by African women, can play a wider role. This project indicates how a targeted initiative dedicated to the needs of a specific group has been developed to include a wider range of participants. It also indicates how a smaller scale project, which is embedded in the community it hopes to serve, can be developed to offer wider more mainstream services.

3.6 United Kingdom

The UK has a long history of migration, a tradition of working towards the integration of migrant communities and an active civil society. There is no UK national policy framework on integration. There are integration policies relating to refugees, and to those applying for settlement and UK citizenship. There are policies that have included migrants within their remit for example on discrimination and community cohesion. As a result, no single department takes responsibility for migrants. The UK Border Agency (UKBA) within the Home Office is responsible for refugee integration and for settlement and citizenship policy. The Department for Communities and Local Government leads on community cohesion while the Government Equality Office is responsible for anti - discrimination.

In contrast to some other European countries there is no targeted introductory language and orientation programme for new arrivals to the UK. Mainstream government funds did not include local initiatives to promote aspects of integration such as employability skills and civic participation. There is little provision to engage migrants' representatives in the policy making process at national or local level, in contrast to formal arrangements in some EU states (MIPEX 2011). Furthermore, the adoption of policies promoting 'earned citizenship' meant that the UK fell significantly when compared to other EU Member States in MIPEX analysis in 2010. However the UK has adopted some of strongest anti-discrimination laws and equality policies in Europe. The top ten non-UK countries of birth of usual residents in England and Wales in 2011 were India, Poland, Pakistan, Ireland, Germany, Bangladesh, Nigeria, South Africa, United States, and Jamaica. (ONS, Census 2011).

3.6.1. Case study: Scotland Guardianship Service

The Scottish Guardianship Service (SGS) ran as a 30-month Pilot from September 2010, managed by the Scottish Refugee Council and Aberlour Child Care Trust, and jointly funded by the Big Lottery Fund, Scottish Government and Paul Hamlyn Foundation. The Pilot was established in response to concerns about the experiences of unaccompanied asylum seeking children in Scotland. Importantly, additional funding was granted by The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund to evaluate the project focusing in particular on how asylum seeking children's rights could best be protected in the context of interagency working.

The evaluation process represents an innovative and potentially transferable approach to measuring the outcomes of a complex project. Particularly where targets might be difficult to assign or the benefits of the project easily captured. The formative evaluation process began shortly after the SGS was established. The evaluation utilised a reflexive research methodology and a mixed methods approach based on a series of evaluation events and activities including 20 evaluation visits.

In order to capture the complex and inter-connected nature of the work of Guardians, the evaluation initially explored aspects relating to asylum and well-being. However it became clear the Guardians had a pivotal role to play in young people's social networks and so a third strand of evaluation was added to capture this. The project evaluation therefore moved from measuring specific outcomes to improved engagement in a number of domains.

A number of improvements were made from lessons learned through the life of the project. It was established a clear definition of the role of the Guardian was needed to establish stronger and more efficient partnerships. Therefore clarity around the role of the Guardian increased significantly in Year 2 as a result of a Joint Protocol drafted with Social Workers and UKBA and resulted in improved day-to-day communication and working. There is now a clear definition of a Guardian, operationalized across services in line with the needs, wishes, feelings and rights of children seeking asylum. This is reflected in the Protocol and increased understanding among stakeholders, 82 percent of who are probably or definitely clear about what a Guardian is and does.

It was also identified through the project that due to the non-statutory nature of the Guardian role, strong partnerships were needed with other agencies so that all stakeholders could see the 'added value' of a Guardian's presence.

Overall it was found that 74 percent of stakeholders agreed or strongly agreed that the Guardian helped to communicate an understanding of the young person's experiences. Some 74 percent of stakeholders agreed or strongly agreed that the Guardian helped the young person to participate as fully as possible in the asylum process. Critically, following the Year 1 evaluation, changes were made to the project which resulted in improvements in all measured outcomes.

The evaluators chose a methodology that was flexible enough to incorporate new aspects into the programme, identify clear actions that would assist in work of Guardians which in turn increased the success of the project. This required additional resources from a separate fund and an innovative evaluation framework that was developed at the outset. The evaluators also had a strong relationship with key organisations and stakeholders which improved feedback, communication and lessons learnt as the project developed.

This case study indicates the value of a plan for the evaluation of projects in order to fully capture the range of outcomes. The transferability of this project relies on the lessons evaluators were able to identify. Many projects may not have the resources to apply for funding to complete this kind of evaluation. One more transferable method may be peer review or a commitment by Foundations to provide extra resources for evaluation and sharing best practice.

3.6.2. Case Study: Lead to Inspire

The Lead to Inspire project, developed by The Arbour, began in October 2012, and established a leadership training programme for newly arrived migrant women. Participants were from nine different countries (Bangladesh, Somali, Sudanese, Afghani, Indian, Moroccan, Chinese, Pakistani, Brazilian) who arrived in the UK from countries outside Europe within the past five years, and entered the country on a visa category that may lead to permanent settlement.

The most promising female leaders from migrant communities were identified and given intensive training, skills and opportunities. The project aimed to develop a new generation of emerging community leaders by supporting its beneficiaries to represent migrant issues, to be active in communities and to instigate local initiatives which promote local community cohesion and support other newly-arrived migrant women in their integration process and active citizenship.

A personal development programme was developed to support a wide range of skills and expertise required for grassroots community engagement, public speaking, facilitation of trainings and project management. After the initial three months personal training programme participants were challenged to a three month experiential learning programme. This included community outreach where they acted as cultural mediators for local government or other local initiatives. The second part of the programme involved user-led projects which were conceived by beneficiaries and independently run by them.

The project was free to ensure participation from a wide variety of women from different backgrounds. It was grounded in identified needs of the community including the lack of programmes designed for newly arrived migrant women aspiring to create local change; lack of grassroots initiatives for migrant women led by the beneficiaries themselves; and underrepresentation of newly arrived migrant women in many of the existing platforms for local consultation and decision-making.

The project delivered or exceeded its targets apart from a slight decline in the number of women involved in the project from beginning to end. The outcomes included: all participants demonstrated the active use of key English skills necessary to settle in the UK; felt more confident in their ability to speak positively about themselves and who they are; report they have improved quality of life; increased their self-awareness and the ability to formulate plans for the future and all took part in an event or meeting with representatives of civil society.

The user-led projects included forming new partnerships with the local Fire Service, healthy eating and exercise classes, IT classes, migrant's rights classes, and promoting the Sustainable Communities Act to other migrant women in Tower Hamlets.

The transferability of the project relied on successful targeting of migrant women through the organisations embedded nature in the local community. The project goes beyond the 'cultural mediator' model through intensive training in leadership and public speaking allowing the participants to design their own projects and deliver them on issues that are important to them.

3.6.3. Case Study: Reach In

The Reach In project developed by HACT – the housing action charity, began in April 2009 for three years. The project had a number of goals including to improve refugee employment prospects, to address the skills gap within housing, to improve housing services for migrants and to help housing providers create cohesive communities. A formative evaluation was built into the project meaning that evaluators were involved from the outset, able to establish a baseline against which to measure success but also to identify

and help overcome challenges as they emerged (Allen & Phillimore 2011). It was noted by the evaluators following the first stage of the project that HACT's approach was innovative because, unlike similar volunteering projects, this project met a wider range of aims and objectives that were not only focused on producing outcomes for refugees. Innovation through the development of new approaches by housing institutions was also a key aim of the programme.

HACT developed a volunteer placement project that involved 82 refugees having up to six-month volunteer placements with housing providers across England. Three waves of placements took place. In addition all volunteers could participate in a training module that resulted in a Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) accredited certificate (Level 3) for each successful participant. Funding was provided by the European Refugee Fund III administered by the UK Borders Agency and matched by financial support from 13 funding partners themselves housing providers.

The placements were flexible in content and structure, designed to meet the needs of the provider organisation and the volunteer. Each placement lasted a minimum of three months on a full-time basis. The minimum commitment was 20 hours per week. Housing providers were also encouraged to offer volunteers shadowing opportunities within the wider organisation to enrich the participant's understanding of the housing sector.

The training project developed enabled 58 volunteers to gain an accredited qualification and led some to go on to wider studies. Reach In succeeding in setting up 82 work placements which resulted in 17 refugees gaining employment within the housing sector.

As a result of their participation in Reach In housing providers developed new relationships and ways of working. Significantly the project evaluation reported that there was a shift in thinking from refugee communities being viewed as clients to being seen as partners. Critically housing providers reported that the insight gained through the project enabled them to re-evaluate their work and adopt different working practices that prioritised improved front-line services for vulnerable clients and outreach to vulnerable communities. The good practice accumulated through the development and operation of the Reach In project has been compiled by HACT and is available on the Reach In micro-site (www.reachin-hact.org.uk). This includes materials such as volunteering policies, guidelines, role descriptions and checklists. Two further rounds of the Reach In project have been funded and some of the housing organisations who participated now run their own volunteering programmes based on the Reach In model.

4. CONCLUSION

It is clear that the flexibility of civil society institutions, in the range of migrants to whom they can provide support and versatility in services provided and tasks undertaken, enables them to provide pivotal integration support. While there are clearly interventions which are more appropriate for national government or municipalities, there are also those most suited to civil society organisations, particularly but not exclusively those at the local level.

Some broad trends are clear. Participation, through the greatest possible involvement of all stakeholders leads to better projects. The most effective and sustainable projects had a clear strategy for identifying the problem that required addressing and identified exactly what was taking place in that field. This might be more difficult for smaller organisations or those in more rural areas.

Projects should examine issues in context, looking at both the socio-economic and local situations and the

backgrounds and profiles of each target group involved. The best projects are strongly embedded in the locality. This is achieved through sending link workers into the community, distributing information in different languages, recruiting volunteers from the community as cultural mediators, and actively working with community contact points.

This may become increasingly important as Europe's migrant population becomes increasingly diverse. It may be less possible or desirable to implement projects for just one group based on ethnicity, legal status or migration trajectory (Vertovec, 2007). Furthermore different projects need to fully take into account the many differences and potential tensions between migrant, ethnic or religious groups and also levels of previous engagement. For example some groups are more experienced at campaigns and political participation. Furthermore the proliferation of different legal statuses may create confusion regarding eligibility resulting in services and projects becoming fragmented.

In addition, increasingly non urban areas are encountering the effects of migration. Rural or semi-urban areas often have neither little previous knowledge nor the service infrastructure to effectively provide for migrant populations meaning that migrants risk exclusion from services and society. There is also evidence from Italy that suggests that the size of the neighbourhood makes a difference when sharing information, and overcoming mistrust between natives and immigrants. Smaller municipalities have more opportunities to effectively communicate their political commitment to integration, taking advantage, better than large municipalities, of communication between local officials and citizens. However to realise this advantage sufficient knowledge about what and resources are required.

More needs to be done to share good practice and to collect good practice case studies both within and between Member States. Cities of Migration acts as a pioneering initiative however, this requires extra resources. Sharing results and strategies for learning from projects should be part of the project planning and developed at the inception of the project. The lack of mentality around sharing best practice is reflected in the amount of projects funded under Priority 4 of the EIF 'Exchange of experiences, good practices and information on integration between the Member States'. The summary evaluation found each year of the period (2007 – 2009) had a Member State with no projects under Priority 4.

The CLIP Network found that EIF funding may not be delivered in the most appropriate way to encourage local level innovation. Most of its means (93 percent) are dedicated to national programmes, whereas up to 7 percent may be used to finance 'Community actions'. Within the remit of the EIF, no direct funding is provided to cities for local integration programmes and practices. All funding for local activities has to be channelled through programmes and allocation decisions of the Member States (CLIP, 2013, 33). The evaluation of the EIF by the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) shows that substantial funds are used centrally without reaching the local level at all (CEPS, 2009).

The European Court of Auditors stated: 'the effectiveness of funds has been hampered by the design of the SOLID programme, which is fragmented, burdensome and inadequately coordinated with other EU funds. The splitting of funding for target groups which have similar needs has created problems for authorities and beneficiaries. This, together with the combination of multiple funds and annual programming, plus a long chain of controls by three authorities, has led to excessive administration out of proportion to the size of the funds involved' (European Court of Auditors, 2012). A further concern stems from the need to innovate to secure funds for projects that might already be working well (Bücker-Gärtner, 2011, 100).

A balance needs to be found between using approaches found to be successful elsewhere, and responding to the particularities of individual local situations, where previous experience may not be directly applicable. As is evident throughout this paper variables affecting transferability include: the national, regional and local frameworks for inclusion and integration, political climate, resourcing and the way that this is structured, the historical development of policies and civil society response, the historical

perceptions of migrants or a specific group, the local complexity of a situation including the specific political, economic and social context of an area, and make-up of migrants and speed of migration, the local reception, spatial elements including housing and provision of services and how this is managed.

However it is clear that the local level is pivotal in providing the conditions for successful integration. The flexibility inherent in civil society may become more pertinent as migrant groups evolve, new issues emerge or political issues shift in saliency.

APPENDIX 1 - Benchmarking criteria utilised by secondary sources

In the last decade, several EU-funded research studies have attempted to benchmark and measure integration of migrants across EU countries. In addition, evaluation reports and networks of cities have developed their own methods for defining successful integration practices. The problems inherent in benchmarking have been identified by a recent study by Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS, 2009, 62) including, lack of common approach, ideological nature, personal scope, uncertainty of the benchmarking community, and methodological weaknesses. A brief overview of the different networks and reports detailing their methodologies and approaches are listed below.

CLIP Network (Cities for Integration Local Policies), was established in 2006 by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, the city of Stuttgart and Eurofound with the support of the Committee of the Regions and the Council of European Municipalities and Regions and terminated at the end of 2012. The network comprised of a steering committee, a group of expert European research centres and around thirty European cities. It was divided in yearly thematic modules (housing, diversity policy, intercultural policy, ethnic business) and it produced city reports based on case studies and compiled by the CLIP research team in cooperation with the partner cities, aimed at enabling local authorities to learn from each other and to deliver more effective integration policies.

The CLIP network organised a shared learning process between the participating cities, between the cities and a group of expert European research centres as well as between policy makers on the local and European level. Methods of good practice are identified through in-depth research in case study locations and often include interviews with project stakeholders. Good practice guides have been developed for each of the four modules based on this data.

<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/clip.htm>

Cities of Migration is promoted by The Maytree Foundation in Canada. The project addresses integration issues that relate broadly to international migrants and their families seeking to improve local integration practices in major immigrant receiving cities worldwide through information sharing and learning exchange. The website acts as a repository for promising practices in integration and a set of integrated tools that provide innovative and practical solutions to common problems and challenges to help city-level practitioners, community and funder networks to develop stronger ties and increase the effectiveness of local integration practices. Cities of Migration define a good idea in integration as practical, innovative, successful and transferable.

<http://citiesofmigration.ca/>

DIVE, the “Diversity and Equality in European Cities” project (December 2008-April 2010) facilitated learning on innovative approaches to local governance that enables cities to meet the challenges of ever more diverse urban societies.

The project was led by EUROCITIES and involved the cities of Amsterdam, Berlin, Leeds, London and Rome, as well as the Migration Policy Group and ethical partnership. The project combined benchmarking and peer reviewing exercises to assess cities’ approaches to incorporating diversity and equality principles in their integration policies.

These peer reviews evaluate how city governments promote and manage diversity and equality in their roles as buyers of goods and services, as employers, as policymakers and providers of services. The assessment follows a structured format, based on a set of benchmarks on the promotion of diversity and equality management and interviews and empirical research carried out by senior city officials. During intensive visits to the Peer Review cities, peers will meet with a range of stakeholders including their counterparts in the administration, local politicians and representatives of civil society.

www.integratingcities.eu

EU-MIA is a research and action project, funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third Country Nationals (EIF), delivered by the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation (ITC-ILO), the International and European Forum of Migration Research (FIERI) and the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) of the University of Oxford. The aim of the project is to establish dynamic and operational connections between researchers, practitioners and training institutions in Europe.

The project developed a complex methodology for selecting functioning practices. It reviewed a wide variety of literature from many different platforms including city networks and national repositories of information. An online survey was also distributed to experts on migration across Europe and a call for practices from local stakeholders to identify good practice.

A long-list of practices was developed. Inclusion criteria involved measures; in any fields which have clear goals in terms of integration of people with a migrant background; carried out at local level; involving public authorities; live or recently closed; belonging to a variety of policy fields. The long list was then refined to select 10 Functioning Practices based on degree of innovation, degree of success, degree of economic and financial sustainability, degree of transferability, capacity and willingness of the local actors to learn showed by the availability of being involved in an in-depth independent research and training project.

<http://www.eu-mia.eu/>

EUROCITIES constitutes a network of 130 large cities across 30 European countries. Created in 1986, it aims to provide 'a platform for its member cities to share knowledge and ideas, exchange experiences, analyse common problems and develop innovative solutions through a wide range of Forums, Working Groups, Projects, activities and events'. Its activities cover a wide range of policy areas affecting cities, such as 'social affairs' for which it has set up a Working Group on Migration and Integration. It is the umbrella organisation for many of the following platforms.

<http://www.eurocities.eu/>

The **European Website on Integration** is jointly operated by the DG Home Affairs and the DG for Communication, Networks, Content and Technology. The website includes a database providing details of projects demonstrating good practices with regard to integration.

'Good practices' are defined by the website as 'strategies, approaches and/or activities that have been shown through research and evaluation to be effective, efficient, sustainable and/or transferable, and to reliably lead to a desired result'. The website goes on to explain that good practices are collected through a template, which has been developed specifically to that effect and comprises all the information needed to judge whether the practice is adaptable to other contexts.

Results from CSES evaluation of EIF found the largest EU Member States tend to account for the largest proportion of the records; approaching half the total (47.2 per cent) is accounted for by Germany, France, Italy, Spain and the UK. That said, while Germany and Spain account for a relatively high proportion, the number of records for France, Italy and the UK are much lower. The Netherlands have also contributed a relatively high proportion of good practice examples.

<http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/>

IBIS (Integration - Building Inclusive Societies) is an interactive community jointly built by the UN Alliance of Civilizations and the International Organization for Migration to collect and highlight successful models of integration of migrants to counter polarizing speech and stereotypes and to encourage the replication of these models in other contexts. Practices included in IBIS have not been used for this review as there is no formal evaluation of initiatives. Rather the aim is to show the rich diversity of initiatives related to integration and therefore they have not been examined neither in terms of practical successes nor formal evaluation.

<http://www.unaoc.org/ibis>

The **INTEGRACE** project involved five main partners – three institutions from Western Europe (the Censis Foundation, Italy, the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights, Austria, and Halmstad University, Sweden) and two NGOs from Eastern Europe (the Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria, and the Peace Institute, Slovenia). The project partners with a history of immigration shared their knowledge and greater experience in refugee and/or immigration research and initiatives and in protecting vulnerable groups with NGOs from newer migration receiving countries.

Intercultural Cities is a Council of Europe's programme which includes a wide range of actors in the city: local authorities, professionals, social services, civil society organisations, and the media. It provides policy-auditing expertise, strategy development guidance, networking and learning opportunities for cities. A second strand of the programme, carried out in partnership with EUROCITIES, is aimed at facilitating dialogue and exchange of good practices between politicians, citizens and municipal service providers.

The Intercultural City Index enables benchmarking between the different cities in the programme. Analysis is based on a questionnaire involving 66 questions grouped in 14 indicators with three distinct types of data. Indicators are weighed for relative importance. For each indicator, the participating cities can reach up to 100 points (which are consolidated for the general ICC Index). These indicators comprise: commitment; education system; neighbourhoods; public services; business and labour market; cultural and civil life policies; public spaces; mediation and conflict resolution; language; media; international outlook; intelligence/competence; welcoming and governance.

www.coe.int/interculturalcities

The **INTI-CITIES** project (Benchmarking Integration Governance in European Cities) was co-financed by the INTI Funding Programme for Preparatory Actions of the European Commission's DG JLS. The project was coordinated by EUROCITIES in cooperation with the Migration Policy Group (MPG) and 'Ethics etc'. The Final Report of the Project was published in January 2009 and is entitled 'Benchmarking Integration Governance in European Cities: Lessons from the INTI-CITIES project'.

The project used peer reviews to assess general migrant-related integration policies in European cities. The project measured policies against a benchmark of high standards to deliver expert validated, comparative knowledge on local practices, focusing on four pillars: general governance, individual empowerment, administrative cooperation, working partnerships. A set of indicators was designed to enable peers to assess cities' progress against the benchmark standards for each governance pillar. Indicators were: ambition, leadership, resources, implementation and evaluation. The report shares findings on eight core aspects of urban integration governance: needs assessment and data collection, integration in the municipality, target setting and evaluation, leadership, promoting diversity within administration, governance co-operation, working with partners, and empowering migrants.

The network was made up of 12 cities: Amarousson, Belfast, Barcelona, Düsseldorf, Genoa, Helsinki, Lyon, Malmö, Milan, Rotterdam, Tampere and Utrecht. The rationale of the project was 'to assist cities in developing and improving their integration policies and linking the local level to policy-makers at national and European level' and 'by assessing (their) integration policies by using the method of peer review'.
www.integratingcities.eu

LeCiM (Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion) was a mainstreaming project aimed at optimising the impact of education and vocational training actions for migrants carried out in medium-sized European cities. Local workshops were arranged and local partnerships were established in Budapest (Hungary), Catania (Italy) and Santander (Spain), whose aim was to analyse, organise and realise the transfer of good practices from Berlin (Germany), Bologna (Italy) and Dunkerque (France). Preliminary research was carried out to support the choice of concrete initiatives and to draw up a position paper containing recommendations for policymakers in regard to integration processes for migrants. A working group, coordinated by the German partner (GSUB Projektegesellschaft mbH) and joined by researchers of partner organisations, - was specifically set up for research activities and to develop research grids in order to select case studies. A research study was carried out based on interviews with stakeholders from the six country locations.

The **MiStra** project aimed to involve policy makers, local authorities and public and private stakeholders on initiatives directed to the integration of policies and targeted interventions for the social inclusion of migrants, Roma and other minorities, identified as good practices at European level. The project provided the transfer of four good practices, from the cities of Dublin, Berlin, Vienna and Bologna, in four target cities, Taranto, Burgas, Prague and Budapest. The four best practices were chosen within the transnational partnership involved in the project, based on previous experiences of success on the theme of social inclusion, while the four target cities were identified on a needs analysis held by the partners of the cities involved.

<http://www.mistraproject.eu/>

MRIP (Migrants, Rights and Integration Project) was developed by ENAR and began its work in 2009. The MRIP partnership was made up of ENAR member organisations in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. They were asked to identify projects taking place in their countries, which would be amenable to a peer review and which would cast some light on the ways in which integration has been addressed. The aim was to attain insight into the way project plans were formulated; the issues were addressed; the viewpoints of key stakeholders like local government, professionals, trades unions and community leaders were integrated; and to consider the extent to which migrants themselves were involved to provide leadership and direction in this work. Case studies of best practice were chosen by

ENAR member organisations and subject to peer review.

<http://www.enar-eu.org/Page.asp?docid=28318&langue=EN>

The **OPENCities** Monitor is a new city benchmark developed by BAK Basel Economics on behalf of the British Council. The OPENCities Monitor is a collaboration and learning tool to measure city openness, defined as “the capacity of a city to attract international populations and to enable them to contribute to the future success of the city”. It is based on 53 indicators of city openness that have been grouped into eleven areas; migration, freedom, barriers of entry, international events, international presence, education, international flows, infrastructure, quality of living, standard of living and diversity actions.

Data was gained from a large number of official sources (international, national, regional or city statistics) and surveyed and collected information from a wide range of other sources (embassies, private and public organisations). The cities are undergoing a constant process of benchmarking within their ‘league’ of comparable cities and cases of best practice are developed from this benchmarking process.

<http://www.opencities.eu>

APPENDIX 2 - Methodology for choosing case studies

Examples of initiatives and projects included in this review are given for illustration purposes only. Inclusion in the guide does not constitute an endorsement of any project or service. There is no responsibility for the content or reliability of linked websites. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information supplied, it is recommended all information be verified with relevant government agencies or other organisations referred to in the text.

The study does not aim to evaluate refugee or migrant integration, nor does it aim to evaluate policies or programming relating to integration at either local, national or EU level. Within the literature review, the study considered what approaches to integration appeared to have positive or successful outcomes, and sought to identify examples of good or interesting practice. However, practices identified in this report are not the outcome of any evaluation nor are the cited examples of practice exhaustive.

In Czech Republic, the Ministry of Interior allocate how funding for integration practices is administered. Almost all of the funding for integration measures is from EIF sources. Information about region specific integration is found on <http://www.integracnicentra.cz/Onas/InformaceOProjektech.aspx>

In Germany, a number of different platforms are available. The German Federal Agency for Migration and Integration provides an overview over policies implemented at the national level. As to the local level, the Bertelsmann Stiftung Foundation has since 2004 compiled a collection of integration practices. These are organised according to thematic categories and include practices implemented in cities as well as in smaller towns and rural areas.

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg set up OLAI (Luxembourg Reception and Integration Agency) which lists all national projects funded and co-financed for integration of third country nationals and refugees. OLAI oversee and implement the national action plans which are presented each year (2010 – 2014). A number of local platforms were also consulted including Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés, associations for particular ethnic groups (and the local contact points for International NGO's (Caritas and Red Cross).

In Portugal, the main platform was the ACIDI (High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue) publications. ACIDI are responsible for channelling funding towards integration projects and the implementation of integration strategies.

In Sweden, the main platform used to identify practices was the Swedish Integration Fund. It is managed by The Swedish ESF Council, a government agency under the Ministry of Labour, and it is part of the EU Integration Fund, which looks at the management of migration streams. The Fund supports projects that aim to improve systems for reception and integration of third country nationals in Sweden, contributing to the implementation of the 11 EU common basic principles for integration in the country.

In the UK, a wide range of organisations and private Foundations were examined including National Refugee Council's, regional migration networks and forums. The UK Border Agency Website was also consulted which lists all EIF funded projects from 2007 and all ERF co - funded projects from 2005.

REFERENCES

- Allen, C. & Phillimore, J. (2011) *Building the capacity of housing providers and refugee communities.* London: Hact.
- ACIME. 2005, *Welcoming and Integrating. Three years at the service of immigrants* Activity Report Of the High Commission for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities (2002/2005). Lisbon: ACIME.
- Akhavan S. & I. Lundgren 2010, "Midwives' experiences of doula support for immigrant women in Sweden—A qualitative study" *Midwifery* November 2010
- Arango J. & E. Brey 2012, *AMICALL Final Country Report – Spain*, University Complutense of Madrid: AMICALL May 2012
- Bittman T. 2011, *Mentoring for Migrants – Labour Market Integration of Migrants in Austria: An example of a significant and effective integration model?* MA Masters Thesis in Advanced European and International Studies 2010 – 2011, Centre International de Formation Européenne
- Bücker-Gärtner H. (ed) 2011, *Europe Needs Innovative Ideas to Integrate Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities – Challenges and Creative Activities in Education and Civil Society (a Comparison of Five European Countries)* Report of an International Seminar March 13th to 25th 2011, Sweden: Linnéuniversitet Kalmar/Växjö
- Collett E. 2011, *Immigrant Integration in Europe in a time of austerity* Transatlantic Council on Migration, Migration Policy Institute
- Cooke S. & S. Spencer 2006, *The contribution of the Voluntary Sector to Migrant Integration in Europe* Eurobriefing, Brussels, 20 March 2006
- CECODHAS European Social Housing Observatory 2007, "Social Housing and Integration of Immigrants in the European Union" *Exchange Tools for Social Housing Providers Special Edition* Brussels: CECODHAS European Social Housing Observatory, Autumn 2007
- Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES) 2013, *Study on Practices of Integration of Third-Country Nationals at Local and Regional Level in the European Union* Brussels: European Union April 2013
- Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) 2009, *The role and potential of local and regional authorities in the EU framework for the integration of immigrants* Brussels: European Union, April 2009
- CLIP Network 2013, *Building intercultural bridges in European cities. Lessons for local migrant integration policy* European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions EF/13/06/EN Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
- CLIP Network 2010, *Intercultural policies in European cities* European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions EF/10/32/EN Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
- CLIP Network 2009, *Housing and integration of migrants in Europe: Good practice guide* EF/08/18/EN Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
- CLIP Network 2009, *Housing Segregation of Migrants Case study: Vienna, Austria* EF/09/49/EN 6

Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

CLIP Network 2009, *Housing Segregation of Migrants Case study: Stuttgart, Germany* EF/09/49/EN 4
Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

CLIP Network 2009b, *Housing Segregation of Migrants Case study: Terrassa, Spain* EF/09/49/EN 5
Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

CLIP Network 2007, *Local integration policies for migrants in Europe* Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

CLIP Network 2006, *Cities for local integration policies. Draft Concept Paper for the Module on Housing.* Input for the first meeting of technical experts of the CLIP Network 11/12 September 2006, Dublin.
Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

CLIP Network 2006b, *Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities* EF/06/22/EN
Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Cities of Migration 2012, *Good Ideas from Successful Cities Municipal Leadership on Immigrant Integration* Toronto: The Maytree Foundation

Cities of Migration 2012b, *Practice to Policy. Lessons from Local Leadership on Immigrant Integration* Toronto: The Maytree Foundation

Commission of the European Communities 2007, 'Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration' *Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions* Brussels, September 2007

Committee of the Regions 2013, *European Platform against Poverty and social exclusion. Survey of the EU local and regional authorities. Final Report* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

Committee of the Regions 2010, 'Integration of immigrants in urban areas' Background Note. *Subsidiarity Monitoring Network Action Plan. Working Group on Integration of immigrants* Committee of the Regions

Committee of the Regions 2010b, 'Integration of immigrants in urban areas' *Subsidiarity Monitoring Network Action Plan 2010 Integration of immigrants* Committee of the Regions

Council of Europe 2011, *Living together – Combining diversity and freedom in 21st-century in Europe*, Report of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Direktorat General for Internal Policies 2013, 'Comparative Study on the best practices for the integration of resettled refugees in the EU Member States' *Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs* Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union

Direktorat General Justice, Freedom and Security 2006, *The Evaluation of the INTI Program.* Final Report JLS/2006/A1/004 European Commission,

DIVE 2013, *Cities Accommodating Diversity. Findings and recommendations from the peer review project* DIVE final report, Brussels: Eurocities

Eurocities 2008, *Benchmarking Integration Governance in Europe's Cities: Lessons from the INTI-CITIES Project* Brussels: Eurocities

Eurocities 2006, *EUROCITIES Response to the Communication on a Common Agenda for Integration – Integration: Cities make the difference* Brussels: Eurocities

Eurocities 2004, *Immigration and Integration at the Local Level: Political Recommendations to National Governments and the EU Institutions* Brussels: Eurocities

European Commission 2005, *The business case for diversity: Good practices in the workplace*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg

European Commission 2004, *Common basic principles for immigrant integration policy*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg

European Migration Network (EMN) 2012, *Policy Report on Migration and Asylum*, Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg

European Network Against Racism (ENAR) 2011, Toolkit, *Working on Integration at Local Level*, Brussels: ENAR

European Court of Auditors 2012, *Do the European Integration Fund and European Refugee Fund contribute effectively to the integration of third-country nationals?*, Special Report No 22/2012, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union

European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) 2005, *Migrants, Minorities and Housing: Exclusion, Discrimination and anti-discrimination in 15 Member states of the European Union*, Vienna, EUMC

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) 2008, *Community cohesion at local level: addressing the needs of Muslim Communities Examples of local initiatives*, Vienna, FRA

Federal Ministry of Social Affairs Vienna 2008, *Austrian Report on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010*, Federal Ministry of Social Affairs, Vienna, September 2008

Guidoum Y. 2009, *Handbook Developing Local Action Plans for the Operational Programmes of the European Union Structural Funds For Cities and Managing Authorities Engaging in URBACT II Projects*, Brussels, URBACT

International Organisation on Migration 2012, *Labour Market Inclusion of the Less Skilled Migrants in the European Union*, Brussels, IOM

International Organisation on Migration 2011, *ELCI Study. Country Report Template. Local Authorities and Migrant Organizations*, IOM-Czech Republic. Paris; Marseille: IOM France.

International Organisation on Migration 2009, *Compendium of Migrant Integration Policies and Practices*, Geneva, IOM

International Organisation on Migration 2009b, *Evaluation of the National Immigrant Support Services in Portugal (ACIDI)*, Lisbon, IOM

International Organisation on Migration 2006, *Evaluation of National Immigrant Support Centres*, Portugal, Lisbon, IOM

Intercultural Cities 2013, *The Outcomes and Impact of the Intercultural Cities Programme 2008-2013*, Brussels, Council of Europe

Intercultural Cities 2013b, 'Guidance for city policy-makers with good practice examples' Joint action of the Council of Europe and of the European Commission, Brussels, Council of Europe

Jones H. 2012, *AMICALL Country report – United Kingdom*, Oxford, COMPAS, April 2012

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Final Report*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012b, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Model report: Dunkerque, France*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012c, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Model report: Berlin, Germany*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012d, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Model report: Bologna, Italy*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012e, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Needs Assessment: Santander, Spain*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012f, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Needs Assessment: Budapest, Hungary*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) 2012g, *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Needs Assessment: Cantania, Italy*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF) 2011, *Migrant Communities and the 'Big Society' Struggling to Belong in the Age of Austerity*, London, Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum, March 2011

Migrant Inclusion Strategies in European Cities (MiStra) 2013, *Model report: Vienna, Austria*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Migrant Inclusion Strategies in European Cities (MiStra) 2013, *Model report: Dublin, Ireland*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Migrant Inclusion Strategies in European Cities (MiStra) 2013, *Model report: Berlin, Germany*, Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency

Ministry of Employment, Sweden 2011, *Pocket facts 2010 – statistics on integration*, Ministry of Employment, Stockholm. June 2011.

Ministry of Labour, Sweden 2013, *Nordic Pocket Facts 2013– statistics on integration*, Ministry of Labour, Stockholm. 2013.

Ministry of Family and Integration 2009, *Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010-2014*, Luxembourg: Ministry of Family and Integration

Nonchev A. & N. Tagarov 2012, *Integrating Refugee and Asylum-seeking Children in the Educational Systems of EU Member States*, Sophia, Bulgaria, Center for the Study of Democracy

OECD 2010, *Open for Business: Migrant Entrepreneurship in OECD Countries*, OECD Publications. 2010

OECD 2009, ‘*Managing highly-skilled labour migration: a comparative analysis of migration policies and challenges in OECD countries*’, *OECD Employment, Labour and Social Affairs Working paper 79*, OECD Publications

OECD/Mountford D. 2009b, *Organising for local development: the role of local development agencies. Summary Report*, 26-27 November 2009, working document, CFE/LEED, OECD

OECD 2006, *From Immigration to Integration: Local Approaches Policy Brief*, OECD Publications

OECD 2003, *The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration. Social Integration of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities. Policies to Combat Discrimination*, OECD Publications

Oliveira C. R., M. Abrantes & C. Healy 2009, *Handbook on how to implement a one-stop-shop for immigrant integration*, Lisbon: António Coelho Dias

Open Society Foundations 2012, *At Home in Europe Project. Living Together. Projects Promoting Inclusion in 11 EU cities*, Open Society Foundations

Open Society Foundations 2011, *At Home in Europe Project. Muslims in Marseille Findings and Recommendations*, Open Society Foundations

Open Society Foundations 2010, *The Education of Migrant Children An NGO Guide to EU Policies and Actions*, Open Society Foundations

Penninx R. 2009, *Evaluation of the One-Stop-Shop Project - Executive Summary*, Lisbon: ACIDI.

Penninx R. et al. 2004, *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies Research in Migration and Ethnic Relations Series*, Ashgate: Hampshire

Phillimore, J., Goodson, L., Watts, J. & Waddington, S. (2009) *The European Refugee Fund (ERF) II 2005–2007: an evaluation of ERF II 2007*, Croydon: Home Office.

Platform for the International Collaboration for Undocumented Migrants (PICUM) 2013, ‘*Guaranteeing Access to Health Care for Undocumented Migrants in Europe: What Role Can Local and Regional Authorities Play?*’ *Report from Roundtable Discussion*, PICUM: Brussels

Pogliano A. 2012, *AMICALL Country report*, Italy FIERI, April 2012

Ponzo I, et al. 2013, *Researching Functioning Policy Practices in Local Integration in Europe: A Conceptual and Methodological Discussion Paper*, International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization

-
- Ramalingham V. 2013, *Integration: What Works? Research Report*, London, Institute of Strategic Dialogue
- Ray B. 2003, *The Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration*, Migration Policy Institute
- Tošnerová, B. 2011, *Integration in the Czech regions – Regional Integration Centres*, Prague: Multicultural Center
- URBACT II 2010, *Integration and Inclusion Case Study Summaries*, URBACT II OpenCities 2010
- Vavrecková J.& I. Baštýr 2011, *Indicators of the integration of third-country nationals into Czech society in the context of the requirements of European institutions*, Prague: RILSA Prague.
- Verbeek S., P. Scholten & H. Entzinger 2012, *AMICALL Final Country Report - The Netherlands*, Netherlands, Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), May 2012
- Vertovec S. 2007, *New complexities of cohesion in Britain: Super diversity, transnationalism and civil integration*, London, Commission on Integration and Cohesion, June 2007
- Vertovec S. & S. Wessendorf, 2010 *Backlash against Multiculturalism? European discourses, policies and practices*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Waddington, S., Phillimore, J., & Goodson, L., (2008) The European Refugee Fund (ERF) II 2005–2007: *an evaluation of ERF II 2006*, Croydon: Home Office.
- Wiest D. & V. Krobisch 2012, *AMICALL Final Country Report – Germany Bamberg*, European Forum for Migration Studies (efms), April 2012
- Wrench J. 2007, *Diversity management and discrimination, immigrants and ethnic minorities in the EU*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Wood S. & C. Landry 2008, *The intercultural city: Planning for diversity advantage*, London, Earthscan
- Yin R. K. 2009, *Case study research: Design and methods*, Vol. 5, Sage, 2009