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What is this toolkit?

This toolkit is designed as an aid to organisations working with migrant communities to support their integration, primarily at local and regional levels. It provides guidance on the principles which should underpin projects and aim to achieve integration as “a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of EU countries” (1st EU Common Basic Principle on Integration).

It showcases promising practices in migrant integration to inform organisations that are looking for examples of good practice in this area of work. In so doing, this toolkit explains the ways in which migrant integration fits into the bigger picture of social policy and politics operating at the level of the European Union, the Member States, and the concerns of regional and local authorities. The toolkit also aims to influence other countries’ approaches and, crucially, the EU approach, impacting on constructive integration policies nationally and locally.

The toolkit draws on the work of migrant support organisations in six European countries. Each of these groups has, to a greater or lesser extent, considered its work in the context of the European Union’s ‘Common Basic Principles (CBPs)’ on migrant integration. The organisations that have contributed to this work are: Institut de recherche, formation et action sur les migrations, IRFAM - Belgium, Association for the Integration of Refugees and Migrants - Bulgaria, KISA - Action for Equality, Support, Anti-racism - Cyprus, Centro d’Iniziativa per l’Europa del Piemonte - Italy, Centre Against Racism - Sweden, and the UK Race and Europe Network - United Kingdom.

For whom is this toolkit?

This toolkit has been designed to help groups working with migrant communities in local and regional contexts in the field of integration. This toolkit is for everyone interested in the idea of good practice for migrant integration, and outlines how this can be promoted as a means to achieve greater equality and fairness throughout European society.

How can it be used?

If you believe that integration is a process of “mutual accommodation” that involves both the immigrant and host communities, then this toolkit can be used to clarify the practical principles, critical to all aspects of your activities.

It ought to aid in answering questions about:

- The objectives that migrant integration projects should be pursuing.
- The range of activities and actions that will move you towards fulfilling these objectives.
- How the work of the project can be kept under review to ensure that you are moving towards your objectives.
- How to communicate the outcomes of your work to wider audiences.

How was it developed?

In order to change the negative polemics around contemporary migration debates, the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) is convinced that migrant voices must be heard in EU and national policy making.
and that migrant organisations themselves are the most effective resource for identifying good practice in integration. To this end, the “Migrants, Rights and Integration Project” (MRIP) 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. In addition, an assessment of the positive and negative outcomes was to follow.

The MRIP project was designed to include groups that would bring a range of experiences under its scrutiny. These experiences have included those of countries with a relatively new experience of migration (Bulgaria and Cyprus); those which have been addressing integration and migration issues over the course of the last two decades (Italy and Sweden); and countries with longer histories of receiving migrants (Belgium and the UK). MRIP wanted to consider an array of different types of projects that were formulated around different objectives and involved different stakeholders. Taken collectively, the projects covered four themes, which were indicated in the EU’s Framework for the Integration of Third Country Nationals in the European Union1, namely employment (Cyprus and Sweden), civic engagement (Italy and the UK), media images (Bulgaria) and family welfare (Belgium).

How is the toolkit structured?

Section 1 starts by highlighting why integration is important for organisations working with migrant communities. This section explains both what ENAR and the EU mean by the term ‘integration’. It incorporates a table showing the relevance of ENAR’s “15 Principles for framing a positive approach to migration policy”2 to be considered when implementing local level integration projects. This section also reviews the EU’s proposals on integration objectives, and how EU integration policies’ impact can be measured. It further reveals the tensions that exist between integration and other areas of EU policy.

Section 2 provides concrete examples of integration projects by looking into the experiences of the MRIP partners’ projects in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

Section 3 goes into the heart of the matter and gives guidance on how to plan integration projects. It outlines the issues a ‘good’ migrant integration project should focus on and provides six ways to plan integration projects for outcomes that support the rights of migrants. The toolkit ends with a brief summary conclusion.

---

WHY IS INTEGRATION IMPORTANT IN OUR WORK?
ENAR believes in a European approach to integration that is progressive and recognises that anti-discrimination and social inclusion are prerequisites for successful integration strategies. We advocate for a departure from the current EU and national approaches, which view integration as a subset of migration policies. Integration needs to be a cross-cutting theme across a range of policy areas which include migration, social inclusion, citizenship, intercultural dialogue, education, and job activation. ENAR aims to devise better paradigms, tools, and measures to foster the development of integration paths most relevant to the specific needs of particular communities and their members.

What do we mean by integration?

This is a term with a complex history. For some politicians in the EU Member States, migrant integration means quite literally that newcomers adopt the same views and outlooks and behave in the same way as long-settled citizens. When integration is allowed to centre on these issues, migrants are placed at an obvious disadvantage. Attention is drawn to the fact that they are sometimes not proficient in the national language, or speak it with a foreign accent. There is little emphasis on the fact that, even when they do speak the receiving society language, a more fundamental unfairness is revealed by inequalities in employment, housing and health outcomes. The approach advocated in this toolkit certainly favours assisting migrants in learning the language of their host countries, but it is also important to show how language proficiency enables further progress in tackling the deep-rooted inequalities that exist in our societies. Unless integration contributes to achieving equality, our communities will remain divided.

The examples in the ‘quotes’ boxes render a rather limited understanding of integration, which would not suffice for our integration work. These quotes vastly oversimplify the real issues involved. They also serve to remove responsibility from other parties and instead put all the responsibility for creating community cohesion onto immigrants.

There are few examples of positive terminology being used by mainstream politicians themselves in the political discourse. It is more common to find diversity addressed as a problem, which can be improved by integration policies.

Integration cannot be presented as a process of assimilation, in which newcomers are expected to lose all the main aspects of their identities in order to become ‘more like us’. Modern communities prosper more through their diversity and capacity for building respect and reciprocity across the different sectors than they do by demanding uniformity and obedience. The objective of integration policy should be to strengthen the capacity of communities to deliver this mutual respect and sense of shared obligation.

Thus:

- We are not aiming for simplistic outcomes which presume that newcomers will be assimilated into being people ‘like us’.
- We look for dialogue between groups that have different starting points in terms of their cultural heritage, with mutual respect at the core of the discussion.
- We aim towards a language which speaks of diversity as being part of the potential of modern society.

David Cameron, Prime Minister, United Kingdom:

“...real integration takes time. That’s why, when there have been significant numbers of new people arriving in neighbourhhoods, perhaps not able to speak the same language as those living there, on occasions not really wanting or even willing to integrate, that has created a kind of discomfort and disjointedness in some neighbourhhoods. This has been the experience for many people in our country - and I believe it is untruthful and unfair not to speak about it and address it.”

Speech in Hampshire, 14 April 2011

Angela Merkel, Chancellor, Germany:

“These who want to take part must not only obey our laws, they must also master our language.”

Speech in Potsdam, 16 October 2010
something integration policies can help us realise. For this work to develop, we need to bring a wide range of different stakeholders and partners to the table, including representatives of local government, education and other public services, professional associations, trade unions, faith organisations, and national government departments.

We encourage organisations to consider ENAR’s 15 Principles when devising migrant integration activities (see page 13).

What does the EU mean by integration and what is its role in implementation?

During the last decade, the foundations of a common EU migration policy were gradually established. In 2004, the EU Council adopted the Hague Programme for Justice and Home Affairs, which set out that the effective management of migration by EU Member States is in the interest of all and brings benefits such as stronger economies, greater social cohesion, an increased feeling of security, and cultural diversity. Strategies for the successful integration of legally residing immigrants and their descendants were needed as a part of this overall objective of effectively managing migration. The Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBPs), a set of non-binding guidelines, were therefore adopted by EU Member States as part of the Hague Programme, and aimed to serve as a point of reference for their national integration policies.

In 2005 the EU presented a Framework for the Integration of Third Country Nationals in the European Union, which proposed concrete measures for putting the Common Basic Principles into practice at EU and national levels. This Framework set out what needed to be done at national level to advance the principles, as well as the EU’s role in supporting these initiatives.

Though EU integration policy takes the form of non-binding principles, it also suggests definite courses of action for policy-makers and practitioners to take. Following the structure of the Common Basic Principles (CBPs), the EU Framework on Integration takes each principle in turn, considers its relevance for national policy, and indicates the ways in which it could be taken up for practical means. Some of the key proposals are set out in the boxes in this chapter.

Whilst the EU Framework maintained the basic thrust of the CBPs, the European Council embarked on a second line of thinking about migration policy in 2005, which was to be developed in parallel to the integration strategy. The Global Approach to Migration focused on migration from the African and Mediterranean countries. Its prime concern was to reduce illegal and irregular immigration policies.

“Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of EU countries.”

The EU framework proposes to:

- Emphasise civic orientation in introductionary programmes at national level.
- Include the integration of non-EU nationals in future programmes of the EU Fundamental Rights Agency.
- Strengthen the ability of the host society to adjust to diversity.
- Enhance the role of private bodies in managing diversity.
- Promote trust and good relations within neighbourhoods.
- Encourage cooperation with the media.

---

EU Common Basic Principles on Integration:

1. Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.

2. Integration implies respect for the basic values of the European Union.

3. Employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the participation of immigrants, to the contributions immigrants make to the host society, and to making such contributions visible.

4. Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.

5. Efforts in education are critical to preparing immigrants, and particularly their descendants, to be more successful and more active participants in society.

6. Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way is a critical foundation for better integration.

7. Frequent interaction between immigrants and Member State citizens is a fundamental mechanism for integration. Shared forums, inter-cultural dialogue, education about immigrants and immigrant cultures, and stimulating living conditions in urban environments enhance the interactions between immigrants and Member State citizens.

8. The practice of diverse cultures and religions is guaranteed under the Charter of Fundamental Rights and must be safeguarded, unless practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law.

9. The participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies and measures, especially at the local level, supports their integration.

10. Mainstreaming integration policies and measures in all relevant policy portfolios and levels of government and public services is an important consideration in public policy formation and implementation.

11. Developing clear goals, indicators, and evaluation mechanisms are necessary to adjust policy, evaluate progress on integration, and to make the exchange of information more effective.

migration flows and to build capacity to better manage migration, including by maximising the benefits of legal migration.7

Despite references to maximise the benefits of legal migration, which until now had provided the starting point for integration policy considerations, the new approach, with the objective of achieving integration based on ‘mutual accommodation’, has failed to consider the emergence of tensions arising as a result of the numerous proposals to strengthen border controls and monitor flows from countries of origin. The potential for friction between the Global Approach and the commitment to integration policy appears not to have been considered by either the European Council or the European Commission (see page 11 for examples).

EU Heads of state returned to these themes in 2008 when they adopted the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum8, which set out that the EU does not have sufficient resources to admit all migrants and that poorly managed migration could disrupt the social cohesion of the host countries. The Pact’s primary focus was and continues to be on control of irregular immigration through a security and penal approach. In addition, integration has not been presented as a two-way process, but focuses only on the obligations of migrants.

The Hague Programme came to an end in 2009. Its successor, the Stockholm Programme, was adopted in that year. The Action Plan of the Stockholm Programme,9 though largely based on the work done by its predecessors, also makes explicit reference to the Global Approach as a component of its reasoning. It affirms its aim to cooperate with sending countries of migration as the highest priority. In the context of the Global Approach, this implies increased efforts to police migration flows more stringently in order to reduce levels of irregular migration.

Other themes present in the Stockholm Programme are:
- Maximising the positive impacts of migration on development;
- A concerted policy for keeping migration in line with labour market needs;
- A proactive policy based on European status for legal migrants;
- An EU agenda for integration;
- Better controls on irregular migration;
- An EU common approach on unaccompanied minors;
- An integrated approach to the management of external borders;
- For intra-EU migration, upholding the commitment to the full exercise of the rights of free movement.

---

7 Ibid
On 20 July 2011 the European Commission published, as part of the Stockholm Programme, a Communication setting out a European Agenda for the Integration of Third Country Nationals. Managing integration has been described as a ‘shared responsibility’ between the EU and its Member States. However, the Communication stresses the involvement of countries of origin through pre-departure measures and mobility partnerships, thereby requiring that the integration process start before the migrant even reaches his/her destination. This shifts the focus of responsibility to the country of origin and clearly reflects the EU’s current reasoning on migration issues – also noticeable in the EU’s migration package adopted in June 2011. This package of measures, developed in the wake of the Arab Spring, aims to ensure a better management of migration flows from the Southern Mediterranean region, as well as amendments to the Visa Regulation to ensure that visa-free travel does not result in misuse and abuse. It also highlights the responsibility of the countries of origin. Integration strategies themselves are the prerogative of the Member States, with the EU providing a framework for monitoring, benchmarking, and the exchange of good practice.

How do we assess the EU integration policies’ impact?

In this section we introduce the notion of benchmarking. Benchmarking is an important tool for policy making, as it helps to set targets and monitor achievements. It also enables us to measure the progress that policy makes towards achieving its stated goals and objectives. If one of the objectives of integration policy is to develop societies in which newcomers feel welcome, as outlined in the Hague Programme, then we should expect to see some definite goals clearly identified. These indicators signify the measure of success by which we rate our levels of achievement in this broad objective. How would we measure, for example, success in ‘making newcomers feel welcome’? Even more difficult, but not impossible, how would we know that our policies have played a role in bringing into existence the ‘spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation’ needed between hosts and newcomers?

Assuming that we can set clear and precise goals, what is the timeframe for achieving them: one, five, or ten years? How do we check our work and make sure that we are on course for meeting our goals and objectives over time?

The task of setting goals and benchmarking the progress of integration policies has generated a mass of literature in recent years. Important examples of this work are the Council of Europe’s Indicators for Integration, the Migration Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), the EUROCITIES “IN-TI-CITIES” project, and the “Housing and integration of migrants in Europe” project of the European Network of Cities for Local Integration Policies for Migrants (CLIP).

The MIPEX approach to assessing integration policy

The Migrant Integration Policy Index is an interactive tool which aims to assist practitioners and policymakers to assess, compare and improve policy. It is produced by the British Council and the Migration Policy Group.

MIPEX looks at work in seven policy areas: labour mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality, and anti-discrimination.

148 policy indicators exist which are used in each of these policy areas to benchmark performance. Each country’s performance is peer reviewed by an independent expert to come up with a scale as to how well it is doing in comparison to other national authorities.

For more information: www.mipex.eu

---

12 For more information: www.integratingcities.eu
13 For more information: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/cliphousing.htm
## SECTION 1

**WHY IS INTEGRATION IMPORTANT IN OUR WORK?**

### The Council of Europe Indicators for Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Non-discrimination</th>
<th>Dignity</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to local voting rights</td>
<td>contact between immigrants and nationals</td>
<td>inter-cultural and inter-religious competencies</td>
<td>voting rights outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viable pathways to naturalisation</td>
<td>questioning freedom of religious expression</td>
<td>access to European media</td>
<td>membership in political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>training of religious personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>membership in trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vulnerability to radicalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>function of local consultative bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>migrant volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>access to social housing and housing support</td>
<td>respect for special needs in social housing</td>
<td>concentration in disadvantaged neighbourhoods</td>
<td>participation in housing consultation structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to social housing homelessness among immigrant groups</td>
<td>excessive and infeasible renting requirements</td>
<td>awareness of available housing support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrimination in the housing hunt</td>
<td>social segregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>access to healthcare services for all</td>
<td>intercultural mediation between patients and clients</td>
<td>information on health services</td>
<td>involvement in health-related decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to mental health services</td>
<td>special needs of elderly, female and young</td>
<td>translation and interpretation services</td>
<td>monitoring of migrant health and health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>costs of healthcare services</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotion of healthy lifestyles and exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physical accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>access to employment for all</td>
<td>transparent, timely and affordable procedures</td>
<td>career guidance and job lifelong and language training</td>
<td>unemployment gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to public sector employment opportunities</td>
<td>security of residence and work status</td>
<td>mobility within the labour market</td>
<td>labour market situation of immigrant women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to welfare and unemployment benefits</td>
<td>recognition of skills and qualifications</td>
<td>specific needs of immigrant entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-discrimination in the job hunt</td>
<td>fair work conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>respect for diversity in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>access to benefits for elderly immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic participation</td>
<td>access to all categories of education</td>
<td>respect for diversity in daily school life</td>
<td>support measures beyond initial settlement phase</td>
<td>greater focus on intercultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessment of newcomers educational attainment</td>
<td>access to training in and of mother tongue</td>
<td>support measures beyond language</td>
<td>evaluation of support measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>early-leaver/dropout rates</td>
<td>teacher trainings for a diverse classroom</td>
<td>involvement of immigrant parents in school life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquisition of key competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Cohesion

- Access to social housing and housing support
- Access to social housing support
- Homelessness among immigrant groups
- Concentration in disadvantaged neighbourhoods
- Awareness of available housing support
- Participation in housing consultation structures

### Health

- Access to healthcare services for all
- Access to mental health services
- Costs of healthcare services
- Intercultural mediation between patients and clients
- Special needs of elderly, female and young
- Information on health services
- Translation and interpretation services
- Promotion of healthy lifestyles and exercise
- Involvement in health-related decision-making
- Monitoring of migrant health and health services

### Economic Participation

- Access to employment for all
- Access to public sector employment opportunities
- Access to welfare and unemployment benefits
- Transparent, timely and affordable procedures
- Security of residence and work status
- Recognition of skills and qualifications
- Fair work conditions
- Respect for diversity in the workplace
- Access to benefits for elderly immigrants
- Career guidance and job lifelong and language training
- Mobility within the labour market
- Specific needs of immigrant entrepreneurs
- Unemployment gaps
- Labour market situation of immigrant women
- Greater focus on intercultural education
- Evaluation of support measures

---

**Non-discrimination**

- Access to local voting rights
- Viable pathways to naturalisation

**Dignity**

- Contact between immigrants and nationals
- Questioning freedom of religious expression
- Training of religious personnel
- Vulnerability to radicalisation

**Development**

- Inter-cultural and inter-religious competencies
- Access to European media

**Participation**

- Voting rights outreach
- Membership in political parties
- Membership in trade unions
- Function of local consultative bodies
- Migrant volunteering
EU policy pulled in two directions: Which will come out on top?

The tensions that exist between integration and other areas of EU public policy, in particular the Global Approach to Migration, implies that the objectives to be achieved in one direction are capable of being undermined in another. At the very least this means that integration goals can be diluted and in some instances completely subverted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies consistent with Common Basic Principles</th>
<th>Policies required by the Global Approach</th>
<th>Areas of tension and concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and maintain societies in which newcomers feel welcome.</td>
<td>Make border controls more effective and increase capacity to act against irregular migrants</td>
<td>There is a danger that immigration controls may generate obstacles, which tend to disadvantage migrants and make them vulnerable to adverse treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address employment as a key part of the integration process.</td>
<td>Create policy that keeps migration in line with labour market needs.</td>
<td>Migrants’ needs for decent work might be squeezed by labour market competition and related needs for cheap, casual workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable access to public and private goods and services on an equal basis to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way.</td>
<td>Organise immigration in accordance with government ‘capabilities’, to be decided by each Member State.</td>
<td>Government assessment of its state’s ‘capabilities’ might lead it to exclude vulnerable migrants from seeking access to public welfare services. Despite the commitment to implement human rights obligations in immigration and integration policy, national state authorities frequently resist this, as government priorities more likely maintain strict control over immigration flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard practices of diverse cultures and religions.</td>
<td>Require migrants to learn the receiving state’s language, respect its laws and national identities.</td>
<td>The Global Approach emphasis on ‘duties’ of the migrant might force integration activities in the direction of assimilation. EU principles stress ‘mutual accommodation’ but do not develop the idea that respect is critical to integration processes. Respect is a positive value, based on appreciation of the value of others as a pre-condition for constructive interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream integration in all policy portfolios.</td>
<td>Strengthen measures to identify and facilitate the removal of irregular migrants.</td>
<td>Danger that policies aimed at monitoring integration will become surveillance instruments for detecting undocumented migrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above highlights a number of tensions that exist in regard to the practical implementation of migrant integration policies. In addition to these, the following list of concerns raises additional inconsistencies and challenges in the implementation of integration projects:

- The extent to which human rights instruments apply is often hotly contested by governments and other authorities. Consideration needs to be given to legal strategies to challenge non-compliance.
- The relation between integration and social cohesion needs to be stated in positive terms. Well integrated communities will be in a better position to advance the interests of everyone in the community, leaving no one behind.
- Evidence of unfair treatment and labour exploitation needs to be addressed more directly. Integration projects need to identify the gaps in the levels
of protection currently provided by labour law to migrants compared to host workers.

Addressing inequalities in the labour force is one of the most important issues for integration projects. It holds out good prospects for building alliances with key bodies like trade unions and employer federations, and working together with workplace inspection agencies on matters of common concern. The gaps in the EU position need to be filled with this sort of work.

A real danger exists regarding policy coherence being jeopardised by the immigration control and enforcement agenda, represented by the Global Approach to Migration. Public authorities whose core mission is to promote integration and equality need to be named the lead bodies in developing policy, driving forward an agenda that provides protection and promotes equality.

The undeveloped state of policy in these areas leaves a very wide space open, which integration projects can work to fill. But how can integration projects ensure that information is gathered in democratic, transparent ways, with migrants fully involved in interpreting key messages? How do we develop communication and advocacy strategies from evidence-based research? Without a clear message that migrant integration is joined to wider efforts to challenge discrimination and disadvantage our projects can be misrepresented as calling for extra rights for migrants, which are not available to others in the community.

The CBPs and the EU Framework for Integration are good places to start making the case for participation. In addition, help to improve the delivery of services to migrant communities should be considered to foster the participation of migrants in democratic processes at local level and to help direct the work of local government and public services.

There is a good level of agreement on what can be accomplished in relation to education for the promotion of integration. There is a pressing need to make the case for a progressive engagement with countries of origin, concentrating on how migrants can be better prepared and supported as they enter into migration. This should be framed as a project requiring partnership and commitment to work with migrants, rather than merely policing their movements as they approach European borders.

More work is required to make sure that these principles really do inform the design of integration projects at the local level.

“The daily diet served up by many politicians and much of our media is one that stigmatises minorities and blames them for failing to integrate. The media are most likely to portray minorities as holding on to alien customs that threaten Europe’s Enlightenment values, and depict ‘immigrants’ as choosing to self-segregate in parallel societies.”

“Alternative Voices on Integration”

A study of integration policies in five EU countries (Austria, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK), published by the Institute for Race Relations in 2010, suggests that the balance between democratic integration policies and state-led assimilation has already moved decisively in the latter direction. Alternative Voices on Integration argues that “the debate on integration has ceased to be a two-way process based on dialogue, consultation and mutual respect”.

Can locally-initiated projects help shift the balance back towards a more inclusive and democratic approach?

Our experience is that they can, but to do this, the approach has to be carefully planned to ensure that optimum effects are achieved.
ENAR’s 15 Principles for framing a positive approach to migration

This section seeks to provide insight from the perspective of grassroots workers on how best to support migrant integration activities. ENAR has developed 15 Principles that can help to design and implement migrant integration projects, especially given that local integration projects may encounter conflicting stakeholder interests.

Tensions and frictions should not be a cause for despondency. On the contrary, the value and importance of the work we are proposing is that various parties with an interest in migrant integration are encouraged to work through issues in a systematic way, finding out what works and what doesn’t, and what can be developed into new levels of activity and what should be regarded as a blind alley. The MRIP project partners are essentially advocating that integration projects be viewed as a learning process in which we work to find out more about the potential of our local communities to adapt to diversity and interculturalism, uncover the evidence and data that is likely to influence policy makers, and build up the skills of the people who will be playing a key role as communicators and advocates.

The table on the next page sets out the ways in which ENAR’s 15 principles are relevant to the design of integration projects.

---

### Section 1

**WHY IS INTEGRATION IMPORTANT IN OUR WORK?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENAR principles</th>
<th>Relevance to migrant integration project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote positive values, conceptions and principles</td>
<td>Positive values of integration are promoting equality in diversity, active participation and access to rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use positive terminology in the political discourse</td>
<td>Positive terminology in political discourse means emphasis on the fact that we are working together to build a better future for all. Diversity is a resource available to a society that is rising to meet the challenges of our modern times. Migration is not something we merely adjust to, but the way in which greater knowledge and experience of modernity is internalised in our societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Take a human rights based approach to migration</td>
<td>Human rights are important to integration through the requirement for respect for private and family life, equality and non-discrimination, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comply with human rights</td>
<td>Compliance with the letter of human rights instruments represents the bottom line for integration projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make use of demographic data, challenging assumptions</td>
<td>Participatory action research methodologies can complement integration strategies, encouraging collaboration between migrant communities and researchers and sharing of information and data. Communication and advocacy platforms can be built on this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensure anti-discrimination for all</td>
<td>Integration projects require bridges to be built with other parts of societies which experience disadvantage in ways similar to migrants. This ‘bridge-building’ needs to be built into project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect the links between anti-discrimination, integration and social inclusion</td>
<td>Integration makes little sense without the vision of a more equal society. Integration is not limited to saying ‘we want what you’ve got.’ Rather it is a commitment saying, ‘we want to work with you, to ensure that everyone gets a fairer deal.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enforce existing labour law</td>
<td>Integration projects should acknowledge the special place of employment in achieving positive goals. Laws to protect workers from unfair treatment, low wages and poor conditions of health and safety should, as a matter of priority, extend to cover migrants in the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Protect workers’ rights</td>
<td>As well as enforcing existing labour law consideration needs to be given to the need for new laws which would increase the level of protection to vulnerable groups of workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ensure policy coherence</td>
<td>There are powerful inter-relationships between key areas of policy, like employment, housing, healthcare and family welfare which produce reinforcing effects. Community-based integration projects provide good opportunities to consider the ways in which these factors interact with each and can help authorities to formulate better policies as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Promote gender sensitive and age sensitive policy making</td>
<td>The ‘feminisation of migration’ is one of the most notable features of the global movement as it has developed in recent years. Women not only make up an increasing proportion of the flow of migrants, they are also concentrated in areas of economic and social life where risks and dangers are at the highest levels. Integration policies need to be sensitive to these facts and advocate measures to promote empowerment. There is also an age dimension to integration, as a segment of the post-war migrant generation reaches their older years. Health services in particular need to be more attuned to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ensure participation and the migrants’ voice</td>
<td>The achievement of higher levels of participation in civic life and the amplification of the migrant voice should be one of the central goals of integration policy from the standpoint of community initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ensure equality in education</td>
<td>Education services for both children and adults from migrant communities are already a major part of the work of integration projects at local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Recognise the global context</td>
<td>Migrants play an important role in facilitating the economic development of their home countries. There is a tendency for this to be reduced as they become more integrated over time. There is evidence that this can be rebuilt with different types of migration diaspora initiatives and this can be explored at the level of local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Be proactive not reactive</td>
<td>Integration should be a plan for the future and not just something which aims to remedy the problems of the past and present. Projects should focus on the need to build better communities and to draw in more people from wider sections. Migrant community organisations need to build their capacity to deal with challenges and to provide leadership and direction in this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2

PRINCIPLES INTO PRACTICE: MRIP PARTNERS’ INTEGRATION PROJECTS
In this section we look at the work of the MRIP partners in the six countries involved in this project. In each case we look at:

- Key immigration facts
- The project itself, including the motivation for establishing the project, its objectives, stakeholders involved, and the methodology used for its work
- A peer review of project achievements

**Belgium: Integration and the youth of migrant families**

**IRFAM - Institut de Recherche, Formation et Action sur les Migrations**
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**About the partner organisation**

IRFAM, founded in 1996 by field workers and university researchers, is for professionals working in the fields of social action and education. Using a multidisciplinary approach, IRFAM aims to construct links between psychology research and the field of integration and development, as well as anti-discrimination and diversity management.

**Key immigration facts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project description**

IRFAM’s project “Youth Integration Policies” focused on the position of youth (under the age of 20) in the Marolles district in Brussels. The local population consists of low-income Belgian nationals and very diverse migrant communities in which over 100 nationalities are represented. A quarter of the population in this district is less than 20 years old, and experiences the following problems:

- difficulties in identity construction and cultural references;
- cultural conflicts between cultures of origin and "young western" culture;
- gender stereotypes and discrimination;
- lack of effective sex education;
- lack of education on parenthood;
- feeling of social exclusion;
- school drop-outs and early leaving;
- difficulties in finding and keeping jobs;
- behavioural problems and absence of respect for citizenship norms;
- communication problems in oral and written French.

These problems had become emblematic of the wider perception in Brussels that integration in general had failed in the Marolles district and that a dangerous sub-culture had emerged as a consequence.

The project was motivated by the view that much would be gained from understanding what the Marolles looked like from the standpoint of young migrants. At the core was the question of whether the response of these young people to their environment was to reconstruct the culture of their migrant parents in the heart of Brussels, or a different approach in which the youth made use of whatever resources were available to construct basic survival strategies in conditions marked by precariousness.

Other stakeholders involved in the project were “Le Club de jeunesse”. Created in 1956, “Le Club de jeunesse” (youth club) is open to people from 0 to 26 years old and their families. In practice its biggest user group is boys and girls from 8 to 18 years old. It organises activities such as a games library, a literature library, homework assistance activities, and sport and holiday camps.
The AMO “Centre d’Accompagnement et de Réinsertion Sociale” works with the same young people involved in “Le Club de jeunesse” and offers individuals help within the competence of social services. It also organises collective actions, some of which are in collaboration with “Le club de jeunesse”.

The project centred on exploring how the concept of ‘transversality’ could inform the practice of social workers, teachers and other professionals in their work with the youth of immigrant families. The term refers to the overlapping of different perspectives and competences in the lives of the group under consideration. If a common outcome in situations of transversality is for the subject to be defeated by the competing and contradictory demands made on him, consideration should be given to identifying the reasons why this happens and whether strategies can be developed that provide remedies.

An alternative outcome for transversality might be that the competencies developed to deal with one aspect of the conflicts help the individual develop skills and actions to deal with other problem areas. In this way, the friction between different cultures could be used to generate new positive perspectives that draw on the skills gained by a person who has learnt to live with and benefit from transversality.

The achievement of this broad goal for the migrant youth led to a series of specific objectives for social workers and other professionals working with them. These were:

- to assist the young person in situating him or herself within the overlapping currents of transversality and to answer his/her questions about how apparent conflicts might become complementary to one another;
- to articulate competencies which allow tension to be managed around a collective project;
- to ensure that collaboration between the professional and the young person genuinely meets the needs of the latter;
- to play a bridging role between different cultural perspectives, and to make their respective structures known;
- to better identify and know the other actors in the zone;
- to support the autonomy of the young person;
- to widen the young person’s engagement with the public realm of his district;
- to address financial issues;
- to support logistical needs;
- to exchange learning from these practices with other professionals.

The project’s partners engaged with the young people in a series of strands of work, including:

**The Young Girls Club**

This involved work with a group of approximately 30 girls in weekly sessions with activities like sports, arts and creative workshops, cooking, fashion, and site visits. The objectives of these activities were to:

- create a space for conversations around themes like adolescence, cultural conflicts between family and society, workplace insertion, personal respect, citizenship, and religion;
assist young girls in becoming fully involved in the projects;
create links between them to help build a sense of commonality and collective awareness;
facilitate their contact with AMO if they are in trouble;
encourage them to support the ‘Maison de Jeunes’ which Le Club de jeunesse operates from;
facilitate and value cultural exchanges.

The newsletter "News from Home" (Les nouvelles de chez nous)
The newsletter, entirely produced by young people between 8 and 15, is the result of a partnership between the Maison de Jeunes, AMO, and a third association, "Les mercredis artistiques" (arty Wednesdays).

Its objective is to help the youth develop a sense of value for their own lives, to practise the use of oral and written French and to allow them to give their opinion about positive subjects generally linked to citizenship.

All 150 editions of the journal have been issued 3 or 4 times a year. Each edition is distributed across the Marnies district.

"Petite enfance - Badaboum" (Early childhood Badaboum)
The AMO and the Maison de Jeunes work in partnership on activities aimed toward children under 6 years of age who are accompanied by their parents. At each meeting, the organiser of the Maison de Jeunes organises activities with the children and during this time, the AMO staff member is available to interact with the parents, answer questions, advise and generally counsel them.

The objectives of this work are:

- to support and stimulate expression and communication;
- to advise parents on their educational responsibilities;
- to support and encourage the children to develop a positive image of themselves;
- to encourage their support for the rules of citizenship;
- to become more sensitive to the value of leisure and family relaxation;
- to support intergenerational communication;
- to prevent and counter depression/despondency on the parents’ behalf.

Establishment of a project aimed at 16-year-olds
More recently, a project partnership has been established to integrate the older young people of the district. It aims to encourage them to behave in a responsible manner. Those involved are often young people who had previously been involved in the Club but who quit their involvement and activities when they felt that they had become too old.

Peer review of the project’s achievements
Each project is regularly evaluated jointly by the persons in charge of the actions and the directors of both associations. The partnership in itself is especially analysed with regard to the respective roles of the organisers.

A global evaluation of all the projects is also carried out twice a year with the teams and the young people. For each project, teaching and operational objectives are
defined as well as quantitative and qualitative criteria. These evaluations give place to a confidential internal report, which gives suggestions to improve the actions.

The young people using the services now have easier access from the Club to the advice and counselling offered by the AMO. Even if the young people do not visualise who belongs to which institution, they trust in the collective activities and learn very quickly that they can seek individual help.

Where difficulties exist, they often relate to differences in professional culture and basic training between the organisers of the two structures and the various projects. With time, these difficulties have become less prominent, as review and discussion have expanded the areas of common understanding of each other’s positions.

**Conclusion**

The Belgian project provides an example of a community-based approach that makes use of the role of established professionals using mainstream social and youth work methodologies to develop an integration project.

The approach is consistent with the principles advocated by ENAR in that it aimed for a negotiation between a range of parties in the community to move towards a mutual accommodation of the needs and interests of the different groups. Structures were established that aimed to empower the young people, both at the level of communication (through the newsletter) but also in relation to the position of migrant parents. An important dimension was that of the support given to girls from the migrant communities, being conscious of the special needs that they have in laying claim to a safe space where they could develop a sense of common understanding with their peers and, in turn, go beyond the group to play a role in the wider community.

### Bulgaria: Working to influence public perceptions of immigrants

**Association for the Integration of Refugees and Migrants (AIRM)**

**About the partner organisation**

AIRM was established in 2004 to promote the social and cultural integration of migrants and recognised refugees who intend to stay in Bulgaria. It works to promote strategies for the integration of migrants, and to secure the support of civil society in Bulgaria for this process. Building on the work of earlier integration programmes aimed at refugee communities, AIRM now extends its activities to cover the growing community of economic migrants who are settling in the country.

### Key immigration facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic migration: Armenians</td>
<td>104,000 (Source: UN Population Division 2005)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1989 migration: Africans, Albanians, Arabs, Chinese, Russians, Turks and Ukrainians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

Bulgarians have a documented intolerance towards traditional minorities, such as Roma and Turks, and recent surveys suggest that the general public perceive third country nationals with suspicion and as a threat to society. As Bulgaria is beginning to feel the effects of the global economic downturn, this public hostility toward third country nationals, particularly from Asia and Africa, has increased. There has been concern that the national media provides inadequate reporting on immigration. To date, immigration strategies have not relied on the media for raising awareness, and as a result civil society
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has remained largely detached from the needs of migrants.

The project “Immigrants: There is bread for everyone” was conceived as a means to counter negative attitudes amongst sections of the population and also to increase awareness amongst sections of the media about their duty to act responsibly in reporting the issue of migration. It was designed to run as a campaign for a period of 5 months over the period 1 August - 31 December 2009. The assertion that ‘there is bread for everyone’ was intended to allay anxieties that the presence of migrants reduced the resources available to host citizens. It was hoped that the alternative idea that migrants contribute to public welfare would take root in the course of the campaign.

The overarching objective of this campaign was to foster a more positive attitude towards immigrants and their integration amongst Bulgarian citizens. Specifically, it worked to:

- attract media and NGOs as key lobbying actors in the process of building a positive attitude towards the integration of immigrants;
- generate public interest and positive attitudes in the host society by creating media interest in immigrant integration policy;
- raise public awareness about migration by presenting powerful information to the media and the public about immigrants in Bulgaria.

The project was funded wholly by the European Integration Fund through the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. This funding enabled the project to hire the services of IntelDay Solutions, a private Bulgarian public relations and advertising company. IntelDay Solutions was able to bring in expertise in dealing with national media companies and planning a publicity campaign.

AIRM participated as an organisation with the best contacts with migrant communities. It also worked to ensure that the messages conveyed by the campaign were consistent with the interests of migrants. The project was designed as an information campaign that worked to convey messages across five key elements:

- analysis of existing media attitudes and stereotypes that functioned as factors shaping public opinion on migration matters;
- the production and distribution of fliers with facts and information about immigrants in Bulgaria;
- the production of information material for journalists and regular and active communication with media representatives;
- the organisation of an expert forum on the integration process of immigrants in Bulgaria that would supplement the broad messages conveyed in the campaign with more detail and data;
- the organisation of a special national event to attract public and media interest on issues concerning immigrants and their integration.

Peer review of the project’s achievements

The project was able to meet most of its stated objectives in terms of the production of outputs, such as reports, a media kit, and the organisation of key events. Its working practices encouraged a learning process across all the strands of the campaign’s work, with experts, activists, and media representatives reporting to each other on the progress they were making, the issues they faced, and the ways they handled challenges. The achieved outcomes included:

- The publication of a 52-page report analysing media coverage of the activities, including a media kit used to support its work.
- The media kit which included a CD, contained basic data and information, reports, and statistics about immigrants in the country.
- Two press releases were issued on topics aimed at positive perception of immigrants in Bulgaria. They contributed to attracting media interest on the Special Event and the Expert Forum, and portrayal of immigrants and their difficulties in integration, including interviews with immigrants and immigration and integration experts.
- A press conference was held. The results of the media and the comparative analysis were presented and the media kit was distributed to journalists.
Clear messages were agreed between partners on the position of migrants. This required agreement on the values shared by the two partner organisations regarding the integration of immigrants into Bulgarian society. It also required continual reflection on the project’s objectives as the campaign developed to ensure that it remained on target.

A peer review reference group was subsequently established to measure specific impacts and outcomes. It recalled the fact that the project’s designers had hoped that the campaign would increase the level of public awareness of migrants in Bulgarian society and assist in gaining positive acceptance of their presence. The media was central to their concerns because, given the low density of migrants in most parts of the country, the majority of Bulgarians formed their views not from direct contact with newcomers, but from the way they were presented and discussed in the broadcast and print media.

The project partners had hoped that a current might be formed amongst journalists and commentators in the media, which was committed to the idea that the growth of migration to Bulgaria was an important and interesting phenomenon and merited objective and balanced reporting. In particular, they wanted acknowledgement of the fact that the rights of migrants need to be respected if integration is to proceed as a smooth process based on discussion and negotiation and greater understanding of the respective interests of stakeholders. The emergence of this sympathetic bloc of media workers would be marked by an increase in both the quantity and quality of news items and opinion/editorial coverage on television, radio, and in newspapers and journals.

The peer review reference group expressed the view that the campaign had worked well in bringing together the themes of integration and the rights of migrants, and presenting these as important aspects of the European policies, which the Bulgarian authorities...
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were committed to following. Some key indicators of what was achieved were the relative success of the project website, which received more hits than had originally been predicted, and the project’s position as a finalist for an EMEA Sabre award. The EMEA Sabre is a competition for projects that aim to facilitate change in public attitudes and is sponsored by the leading public relations industry magazine The Holmes Report.

Overall, the reference group was of the view that the project had contributed to an increase in media reports and comments about immigration issues during the period of its work, steadily rising from four featured items in August 2009 (start of the campaign) to 42 by November. They also detected an increase in the percentage of positive media comments. One example was the bTV show “Welcome to Bulgaria”, which provides immigrants with an opportunity to share their culture and personal stories.

Whilst evidence of the success of the campaign is encouraging, the reference group still felt that immigration remains peripheral to the consciousness of most Bulgarians. The positive side of this is that public opinion remains broadly neutral on most important points and the level of anxiety and even hostility present in other EU countries has yet to reach a significant pitch. But this is almost certainly influenced by the fact that, with less than 2% of the country being immigrants, the still low presence of newcomers has yet to cause the concern seen in other parts of Europe.

AIRM sees the likelihood that further Bulgarian integration into the EU will bring about an increase in migrant density, perhaps rising to the 10% plus levels seen in most other Member States. The challenge of maintaining the balance of public opinion at the neutral/positive end of the spectrum will be greater when this happens. The real value of the ‘There is bread for everyone’ campaign is that, in advance of these developments, it has begun to identify currents and build up resources, which will prove their worth in defending migrant communities and their rights if and when times become more challenging.

Conclusion
The ‘There is bread for everyone’ campaign provides a clear example of an integration project that structured its work around a clear set of positive values and principles (ENAR principle 1). Centred around the popular theme of the types of food, specifically bread, which migrants bring to the country of settlement, the campaign made use of positive language in its intervention into the mainstream political discourse (ENAR principle 2).

Other strong features were its insistence on an anti-discrimination perspective that stretched across all communities (the ‘everyone’ in the campaign title) (ENAR principle 1). Its linkage with the theme of food - the new availability of foreign cuisine being an aspect of migration that meets with spontaneous popular approval - adds to the theme of sharing and abundance.

The question for this campaign is its sustainability. The project’s designers banked heavily on it precipitating the emergence of a new grouping of multicultural advocates amongst the Bulgarian media. How its innovative approach can be sustained over a longer period of time, and how it can acquire its own dynamic of anti-racist solidarity with migrants remains unanswered.
Cyprus: Campaigning for the rights of migrant domestic workers

KISA - Action for Equality, Support, Antiracism

About the partner organisation

KISA works on issues relating to migration, asylum, racism, discrimination and trafficking. Activities include awareness-raising and lobbying in order to influence the legal and structural framework in Cyprus. KISA runs free information, support, advocacy and mediation services for migrants, refugees, victims of trafficking and racism/discrimination, and ethnic minorities in general. It cooperates with various other stakeholders and independent institutions, at national and European levels, as well as European and international NGOs and networks related to its aims and objectives.

Key immigration facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU nationals</td>
<td>100,000 - 120,000</td>
<td>10-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mainly British, Greeks, Romanians, Bulgarians, Poles, Slovaksians and Latvians)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third country nationals</td>
<td>80,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>8-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mainly Sri Lankans, Filipinos, Vietnamese, Indians, Moldavians, &amp; Chinese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The objective of the project was to undertake a peer review of the new employment policy related to domestic workers (NEPMW) in Cyprus. The aim was to raise awareness of the growth of the phenomenon of domestic work in the country, as well as to highlight its gender dimension.

Female third-country migrants with regular migration status, mostly employed in the domestic sector, make up the majority of all third-country migrants in Cyprus. According to the Ministry of Interior some 36,000 female migrants are in domestic work, where they make up the overwhelming majority (97%) of the sector’s labour force, about 9% of the country’s total labour force and nearly 20% of the total female labour force. Estimates suggest that more than 26 nationalities are represented in this group, with just four countries - the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Vietnam and India - making up more than three-quarters of the total.

These domestic workers often find themselves in a very precarious position with labour and human rights abuses arising from multiple discrimination grounded in gender, ethnicity and religion. Their status as workers in private households is not fully acknowledged as a form of employment and is not sufficiently protected by the law.

In addition, Cyprus government rules regulating the immigration status of domestic workers is also seen by many as contributing to insecurity. Residence permits are normally dependent on the worker remaining with a named employer and last for a period of four years. If

---
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18 In view, therefore, of the feminisation of migration and migrant domestic work in particular, the term ‘domestic worker’ will refer to female migrant domestic workers unless otherwise indicated.

19 During the course of the project, in June 2011 the 100th Session of the International Labour Conference of the ILO adopted the Domestic Workers Convention and Recommendation, which has to be ratified before it is implemented.
the worker leaves this employer to take a position with better conditions, he/she will be considered in breach of his/her residence permit and liable to be expelled from the country.

Peer review of integration measures for migrant domestic workers
The stakeholders involved were specifically selected to represent the relevant government authorities (the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance (MLSII), the Ministry of Interior (MoI) and the National Body for the Rights of Women under the Ministry of Justice), independent officials (the Gender Equality Committee and the Equality Authority of the Office of the Ombudsman), trade unions (PEO-Pancyprian Federation of Labour, SEK-Cyprus Workers Confederation and DEOK-Democratic Labour Federation of Cyprus), civil society (KISA - Action for Equality, Support, Anti-racism, ENAR Cyprus, Mediterranean Institute for Gender Studies, PIK - Cyprus Gender Equality Observatory) and migrant communities with the largest concentration of domestic workers (Sri Lanka, Philippines, Vietnam, India, Myanmar and Nepal).

In an initial communication with stakeholders, it was emphasised that the purpose of the peer review was to assess the NEPMW primarily in relation to whether it contributed to the integration of migrant domestic workers, and to what extent.

Interviews were scheduled in order to facilitate the discussion and formed the basis for the drafting of the peer review report on the NEPMW. There was general acknowledgement amongst the stakeholders that integration is a two-way process “whereby migrants keep their cultural identity and at the same time know Cypriot reality”. Views on whether Cyprus was achieving the integration of migrants included pessimistic assessments such as those of the representative of the Gender Equality Committee, who felt there was as yet no integration in Cyprus.

Others preferred to look at government actions which were meant to achieve integration and assess those. The representative of the Ombudsman’s Office was particularly interested in the Long Term Residency Directive. Her Office had investigated complaints of domestic workers, compiled reports and issued recommendations for the implementation of this Directive. To the Filipino migrant respondent integration is a “give and take process and both sides need to respect each other’s rights”, adding that the information and advice services provided by her organisation to Filipino migrants contributed towards integration because knowing and claiming their rights should be part of the integration process.

The following headings list the main measures in the new policy, and the views of the respondent on each of the NEPMW’s points:

**Change of the term ‘domestic worker’ from the previously used ‘domestic helper’**
This was welcomed by a majority of respondents, though they felt it needed to be accompanied by other measures. Representatives of the two Ministries and the PEO trade union respondent thought that “this was not merely a matter of semantics”. The PEO respondent, being familiar with the ILO Domestic Workers Convention process, pointed out that the change would contribute towards the recognition of domestic workers as ‘workers’ and the subsequent recognition of the need for the protection of their labour rights. A female migrant respondent also agreed that it was a positive change and hoped it would bring with it the “necessary respect and protection”. The representative of the Ombudsman’s Office thought it might help employers to understand that domestic workers “are not slaves but working people”. Those who were more positive to this amendment also agreed that it did contribute indirectly to the integration of migrant domestic workers.

**Bank guarantees to cover repatriation costs**
This now has to be provided by both employers and workers (previously only employers had to guarantee the cost of returning the migrant abroad). Views on this included those of the MoI representatives, who claimed that this was a way of helping domestic workers to take on their responsibilities, which is part of integration. Migrant respondents, on the other hand, felt that it was unfair and added greatly to the cost of migration.
for them. The MLSI agreed that it was burdensome from the standpoint of migrants and did not contribute to integration. KISA was of the opinion that the obligation for the migrant domestic worker to pay a guarantee increased the threat of bonded work.

**Basic knowledge of Greek or English**
This new requirement is considered as an incentive for better communication and a step towards - or prerequisite for - integration. Migrant respondents believed language was critical for other aspects of integration, including knowing and claiming rights. Most respondents agreed that language courses should be free of charge and accessible to migrant domestic workers by taking into consideration their hours and places of work.

**A requirement for at least one year’s experience as a domestic worker**
Respondents had mixed feelings about this new addition to the policy. The MoI representatives claimed it was necessary because domestic workers from some countries lacked knowledge of domestic work and were vulnerable to being dismissed and deported if their work was unsatisfactory. The MLSI said it has recently been decided to add 6-month training courses as an alternative to the previous experience requirement.

**Transfer of responsibility for migrant domestic workers from the MoI to the MLSI**
This was welcomed by all respondents as a very positive measure that would contribute directly to the integration of migrant domestic workers. PEO and KISA representatives considered that with the MLSI taking on full responsibility for the employment of domestic workers in conjunction with the ILO Domestic Workers Convention would lead to improvements to the rights of migrant domestic workers. The representative of the Ombudsman’s Office said this transfer was a long standing recommendation of her Office. Other respondents needed assurance that the MLSI’s Inspectorate Department would be effective in checking employment in private homes. The representative of the Ministry said this matter was being discussed at the ILO as other countries face the same situation. He felt that many employers of domestic workers would ‘open’ their houses to labour inspectors or even trade unions.

**The minimum gross wage of domestic workers to be raised by 10% (5% as from 1/1/2011 and 5% as from 1/7/2011)**
Although the percentage of the increase is substantial, the low baseline domestic worker wage reduces its importance as an integration measure. The trade union representative was of the opinion that as a result of no increases for a long number of years, domestic workers had become cheap labour. The representative of the MLSI argued that overtime could be claimed whenever domestic workers worked longer than seven hours per day but migrant respondents were skeptical that this would be universally applied.

**The residence and employment visa to be reduced to 2 years’ duration (from current 4 years)**
Ministry of Interior representatives said this measure aimed at better control and monitoring of the employment of migrant domestic workers, which would benefit both. This was disputed by other respondents, including the representative of KISA, who emphasised the connection between the time period of stay and the security, feeling of belonging and being a member of society by migrant domestic workers.

**Scope for varying residence and visa fees charged to employers to take into account low income groups**
The majority of respondents agreed with this change but questioned whether it is an integration measure. KISA’s representative noted that it was also important to ensure that migrant workers are not burdened with any of the new fees which are supposed to be paid by employers. Very often employers ask migrant workers to pay the fees (especially in the case of an extension of more than four years as the fee in this case is much higher) threatening that in case they do not, they will be fired and replaced by a new migrant worker. The representative of KISA also pointed out that it was very important to reduce the application fees for long-term residence status, which is currently very high (€427.15) and thus restrictive.
Conclusion
Some of the individual amendments of the NEPDW (learning the language, training as an alternative to previous experience, transfer of responsibility to the Ministry of Labour, adoption of the term ‘domestic worker’) are considered by the majority of the participating stakeholders to be positive and significant steps in the right direction.

However, with the exception of government representatives, the majority of other respondents are of the opinion that the New Employment Policy for Domestic Workers does not fulfill its objective of effectively protecting the labour rights of migrant domestic workers or contributing substantially to their integration into Cypriot society.

Italy: A migrant district organises for better resources

Initiative Centre for Europe of the Piedmont (Centro d’Iniziativa per l’Europa del Piemonte - CIE Piemonte)

About the partner organisation
CIE Piemonte is a cultural non-profit organisation that aims to build a concrete and widespread culture of Europe through information, cultural exchange and training. It operates with an open structure, articulating a network of citizens, associations, political organisations, trade unions, and local authorities. Its aim is to assist in the development of discussion and proposals around the new challenges of European unification.

Key immigration facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans, Albanians, Latin Americans, Chinese, Ukrainians, and Tunisians</td>
<td>4,235,059</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description
CIE Piemonte has supported the Casa del Quartiere di San Salvario (San Salvario District House) since its inception. For the last eleven years the project has worked in the San Salvario district of Turin, which has traditionally served as the arrival quarter for migrants.

Close to the city centre, the quarter has some of the features of being a poor district, but its central location also brings its residents into close contact with the main social and economic hub of the city’s life. In the 1990s this closeness tended to generate friction and for a while San Salvario acquired a national reputation as the centre of fierce anti-immigrant agitation led by associations formed by Italian residents. Migrants were perceived as
the cause for lowering standards in the area, being responsible for litter, crime, and anti-social behaviour in general.

The neighbourhood movement to establish the Casa del Quartiere was a conscious effort to address the issues at the centre of this discontent. The group supporting the initiative acquired the use of a community building that was converted into a communal space, offering rooms for meetings and recreation to local people as well as a very popular café. The Casa is run by a voluntary management committee that represents the various groups in the local area. Teams of community workers are based on the premises, running projects, which bring them into contact with residents on issues like housing, health, recreation and cultural activities.

The initiative used a very traditional Italian approach to community activity by putting the emphasis on common identity. Common identity grows out of the experience of life in a particular district and offers mutual aid and local solidarity as part of the response to hardship and deprivation. The test for the Casa project was to see whether these principles could still be applied in culturally diverse communities, such as San Salvario, which brought Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans together alongside native Italians.

The project is part of the activity of the San Salvario Local Development Agency, whose objectives are the urban regeneration of the area (including social housing programmes), economic, cultural and social development, communication, and community empowerment. In this framework specific goals of the Casa project are:

- to provide the neighbourhood with public and open spaces for social and cultural activities;
- to promote inter-cultural and inter-age exchange and understanding through the establishment of multistakeholder fora and clubs;
- to provide spaces and technical support to local NGOs organising cultural events, art workshops, multimedia activities, and training;
- to provide facilities for neighbourhood families (kindergarten, low cost canteen) to allow women to increase their participation both in the labour market and the social and cultural life of the community;
- to establish a permanent mechanism of consultation of and among different communities living in the district;
- to increase the self-esteem and sense of belonging of all community members.

The project involves over 20 organisations, which are all members of the Board of the Local Development Agency. Among others:

- ASAI (Association for intercultural activity) and Associazione Teatro Baretti (Theatre group) that organise cultural events and intercultural training;
- Trade and craftsmen associations (Associazione commercianti Borgo 8, Confartigianato, Associazione Commerciale via Madama Cristina e borgo San Salvario) committed to economic development and ‘land marketing’;
- Environmental associations (Legambiente, Ecopolis) involved in urban regeneration programmes;
- Associazione Cittadini per San Salvario, Comitato Spontaneo Quadrilatero San Salvario, Gruppo Abele - Spazi d'Intesa, working on cultural mediation and conflict resolution;
- Religious entities (Oratorio San Luigi, Parrocchia SS.Pietro e Paolo) involved in both children care and religious conflict prevention;
- Women’s associations and “Time Bank” - a body organising volunteering opportunities for people from the community;
- The sections of the trade unions gathering retired people and representing their needs as elderly residents of this area.

The Casa del Quartiere concept resulted from a growing awareness that there were very few places where residents could meet both for organising and enjoying cultural events and social activities and for discussing
the problems and challenges arising from coexistence with different population groups (elderly/youth, Italians/immigrants, Muslims/Christians/Jews/Protestants/Animists, newcomers/long-term residents, Maghreb/Sub-Saharan Africa/East European immigrants, etc.). This awareness led to some principles that were used to guide the organisation of the Casa project. These were:

- Create a ‘community hub’ around which the various population groups could organise and meet each other.
- The hub should include an easily accessible multilingual public library.
- Provide spaces for (multi/inter)cultural activities and events as well as for individual (both Italian and immigrants) associations.
- The Casa should provide for intergenerational exchange and be both elderly- and youth-friendly.
- All activities should be ‘visible’ to each other (open spaces).

In terms of processes the project aimed for:

- **A participatory process of project building:** The neighbourhood population was widely consulted (questionnaires, public meetings and assemblies, etc) while specific workshops/focus groups involving civil servants, NGOs, architects, community/migrants organisations were organised. No difference was made between immigrants and citizens: all the different groups were involved on equal footing, according to a mainstreaming principle based on the belonging to the neighbourhood community rather than to a particular group.
- **Institutional relations:** Since 2002 the Development Agency and the Project Committee have been meeting with the Municipality Council of Turin, the City Youth Department and other relevant public authorities including law enforcement agencies.

Peer review of the project’s achievements

Assessment of the work of the project has been carried out by a peer group, which included representatives of the San Salvario neighbourhood council, trade unions’ migration services, anti-racist NGOs, and migrants’ associations. The main achievements can be assessed as follows:

- **Improved mutual understanding and reduction of interethnic conflicts:** The presence on the Board of the Casa del Quartiere of the President of the “Comitato Spontaneo (Voluntary Committee) San Salvario”, which was, in the 1990s, the main organisation leading anti-immigration protests in the area, is particularly significant.
- **Urban regeneration:** The Casa, together with the Development Agency, promoted the restoration of derelict houses and the reestablishment of public spaces. This action, supported by both public authorities and private businesses, led to significant achievements. Trends to real estate depreciation and to migration of residents to other areas of the city were halted. Achievements are indirectly confirmed by the side effect of a limited gentrification that has involved low income residents moving to other areas of the town and replaced by people belonging to the middle class.
- **Security improvement:** One of the project’s results has been the increase of cultural and social life in the neighbourhood. Currently San Salvario is a very lively area. Street lighting has been improved as part of the urban regeneration, shops have been allowed longer opening hours, the physical environment is friendlier to the elderly and women with children. As a result street crime rates have been significantly reduced.
Sense of belonging: Residents of the area have started to feel proud of living there. As a consequence the average attention paid to ‘environment maintenance’ has increased. Compared to previous years the streets are now cleaner and degraded buildings are fewer.

Better media image: San Salvario used to be seen as ‘the Turin Bronx’; today it’s currently defined by local and also national media as “one of the more trendy areas in Turin”. This is related to the visible improvements brought about by the hard work of the Casa project. It has been cited in national radio and television programmes and interviews as an example of how to rebuild a degraded area, and it has been presented in the political discourse as a demonstration of the possibility of a not only ‘peaceful’ but also fruitful coexistence of groups belonging to different cultures, nations, religions and ages.

Conclusion
The San Salvario project was motivated by the need to address relations in a community which was divided along ethnic lines as a consequence of years of failure to invest in the district’s infrastructure. However, it was felt that the remedies needed had to be rooted in the real needs of the community, which would themselves only become evident as a part of a democratic process of discussion and negotiation between the different parts of the neighbourhood. The logic of ENAR’s principles addressing anti-discrimination for all (ENAR principle 6) and respecting the links between anti-discrimination, integration and social cohesion (ENAR principle 7) can be seen here.

The project also strove for ‘policy coherence’ (ENAR principle 10), linking the improvements being sought in areas like housing policy, public health and street crime to the success of the community hub being built around the Casa del Quartiere. The hub draws in all the elements of the local community through the partnerships with the 20 organisations that are part of the Board of the Local Development Agency. These groups included bodies that were able to ensure that the viewpoints of the local migrant communities were represented in all the activities of the Casa (ENAR principle 12).
Sweden: African women and employment

Centre Against Racism

About the partner organisation
The Centre Against Racism (CMR) is an umbrella NGO of about 90 member organisations working on anti-discrimination. Member organisations, together with their wide network of contacts, provide for a broad basis of knowledge concerning racism, integration and discrimination in different sectors of Swedish society. The Centre maps and articulates problems and action plans against discrimination and racism, and engages authorities, organisations, the general public, institutions, and political parties through awareness raising campaigns and knowledge dissemination. They also work on integration issues through promoting intercultural dialogue with youth as well as migrants’ rights.

Key immigration facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finns, Iraqis, Poles, Africans (a majority of Somalians), South Americans, Iranians, Lebanese, Syrians, Thais, Chinese, Vietnamese, Indians, Afghans, Filipinos, Koreans (North and South), and Pakistanis</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
<td>Percentage of persons with a foreign background: approx. 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description
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 counterparts in the male Swedish population.

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 longer than six months and who were referred to the Centre by the Swedish Employment Agency. Simba Centre advisors worked with the women to prepare individual work plans based on the woman’s background, education and vocational qualifications, work experience, and also according to her aspirations in the way of employment and future career paths.

The work plan helped identify useful courses persons could attend to upgrade their skills. The Simba Centre provided some of these courses, particularly in IT skills. Discussion groups involving several people looking for work were organised and covered themes such as the norms and expectations of Swedish society, ethics, citizenship, etc.

The Centre has the capacity to work with 80 job seekers at any one time. It has developed strong networks to be able to match jobs with jobseekers by developing a database of 800 companies. It also works closely with the Swedish Employment Agency and the social welfare services in regard to coaching on the needs of long-term unemployed migrants and intercultural dialogue techniques. In addition, the Centre also initiated a partnership with Manpower, a private sector employment agency.
Peer review of the project’s achievements

The reference group that oversaw the project peer review considered the wider context of work done at the level of official policies in the field of employment. It took the view that the recent initiatives taken by the Swedish government, aiming at accelerating the establishment of newly arrived immigrants on the labour market and in social life are not effective concerning integration. They are in fact depriving the newcomers of their capabilities, leaving them vulnerable to social exclusion, racism, discrimination, and poverty.

Reference group discussions centred on the fact that the government’s new strategy for integration for 2008-2010 is not achieving its promise of integration of newcomers. This new strategy focuses on policies to be implemented through general measures. Special measures focusing on immigrants are only targeted at newcomers and at the expense of established migrants and minorities. In short, the Swedish government is doing too little to implement effective policies for the promotion of the well-being of established migrants in Swedish society. This was discussed while having the EU’s Common Basic Principles on Integration in mind. The reference group also came to the conclusion that there is a lack of policy coherence between migration, integration, social inclusion and anti-discrimination. This has caused migrants to be exposed to social exclusion and discrimination.

The question was then how organisations such as the Simba centre and the Centre Against Racism can develop approaches and tools to effectively influence and strengthen the participation of migrants on the employment market. One important factor found was to influence actors such as the Swedish Employment Service and employers to take action in order to become more open and inclusive concerning migrants’ participation and access to the labour market, as well as to influence decision makers to recognise that anti-discrimination and social inclusion are prerequisites for successful integration strategies. The reference group also explored the need for efficient benchmarking mechanisms to measure the integration of migrants on the labour market and the importance of taking a positive approach to migration in order to achieve integration.

Their focused work with individual job seekers improved the success rate in finding jobs for this group, with 30% being 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 in the long-term unemployed category. Also, the work found for clients tended to be in the low-skill sector, which often provided casual or insecure types of 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 staff and board of the Simba Centre, themselves mainly Swedish women of African origin, have learned a lot about how to provide advice, counselling, and training services. They have also become proficient in dealing with staff from the Swedish Employment Agency and employers.

There is concern amongst supporters of the Centre that after over ten years of work they have become a part of the employment management system and have lost some capacity of challenging the way labour markets are organised and prejudice is allowed to operate against vulnerable groups. Success is now generally considered to be the simple fact of placing women in a job, with
little opportunity to follow up and see whether they are truly achieving their potential.

Some indication of the way the Centre has been absorbed into the system comes from the fact that its contract with the Swedish Employment Agency has been changed to require them to receive referrals for more categories of long-term unemployed than the African women they were set up to serve. The Centre has been obliged to accept these terms, being dependent on this contract for funding. This is not necessarily considered a bad thing by the Centre’s staff, since it demonstrates that a community initiated project, led by African women, can play a bigger role in addressing deep-rooted problems of Swedish society. This is a measure of success in the way of migrant integration.

Conclusion

The Simba Project is an example of an integration initiative that had its roots firmly within a migrant community. From its earliest conception it was aimed at building capacity within that community to tackle an important area of disadvantage. It brought positive values, conceptions and principles into this process (ENAR principle 1) by encouraging recognition of the skills that are possessed by this group of workers, which the labour market, when relying on its established structures for measuring worth and value, had overlooked. The themes of integration into the labour market (ENAR principles 8 and 9) are dominant in the Simba Project, along with the role of gender issues (ENAR principle 11).

The Simba Project proved innovative and adaptive with regard to its relations with government and private sector employment agencies in negotiating routes into employment for its client group. However, there is a danger that without a strategy for building alliances between these partners the activities of migrant-based community groups will find their independence being eroded. This is particularly the case if the funding base for the work is narrow; perhaps coming solely from institutional partners.

A few of ENAR’s 15 principles might help reduce the risk of erosion of independence in such circumstances. Principle 5 should be of assistance, with its recommendation that organisations develop the capacity for making use of demographic data to allow assumptions to be challenged at each stage of the development of the project. This entails the existence of research capabilities within the project, and the ability to scrutinise evidence, identify points of conflict, and search for new data, which would overcome inappropriate policies and practices that are rooted in the often bureaucratic outlooks of large government departments and agencies.

Another option might be to build alliances with other bodies that share the project’s concern about labour markets failing to adhere to standards that will be able to deliver social justice outcomes more effectively. ENAR principle 6 - calling for this work to ‘ensure that anti-discrimination applies for all’ offers some guidance here. In the world of employment this should mean dialogue with trade unions, as they are the bodies closest to the mainstream of Swedish society that are concerned with fairness in the workplace. The Simba Project has yet to establish a strategy for bridge-building in this direction and it might well be vital that it succeeds in doing this before long.
United Kingdom: Building a community base of integration

**UK Race and Europe Network (UKREN)**

About the partner organisation

UKREN was established in 1996 by a group of six leading UK anti-racist organisations to raise awareness of the importance of European Union legislation and policy for UK-based organisations working on race equality and discrimination issues. Today, UKREN is a UK-wide network of more than 200 organisations - predominately non-governmental and community-based in nature - involved in race relations and combating racism at a local, national or European level.

Key immigration facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main migrant communities</th>
<th>Size of migrant community</th>
<th>Percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indians, Poles, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Germans, South Africans, Americans, Nigerians, Jamaicans and Irish</td>
<td>7,139,000 (2010 estimated)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The diverse, multicultural environment that exists in large UK cities have long provided the engine force that has driven real progress towards a democratic form of integration. The early years of resistance to overt racism on the part of black immigrant communities created organisational forms that have continued to exist until the present day. This tradition has combined the elements of community organisation, political involvement, communication (through the work of a lively network of ethnic newspapers and journals and community radio stations), legal activism (particularly making use of anti-discrimination and latterly human rights laws), and leadership training.

The best of this work is situated in geographical areas in which immigrant and black and minority communities form a sufficient critical mass to facilitate the establishment of structures and support mechanisms that are capable of existing for extended periods. For the purpose of evaluating an integration project in the UK, UKREN therefore approached the Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF) to request their participation in this exercise.

MRCF was established in 1993 in response to the needs of migrant and refugee communities in northwest London. Settled economic migrants as well as newly arrived refugees struggled in their attempts to access health and welfare services, employment and education, legal advice, and housing. They formed community organisations to share their knowledge and skills and to support each other, but this presented them with the additional challenges of meeting the requirements of charitable law and working within a competitive voluntary sector. In the true spirit of partnership and self-help, diverse communities overcame their differences and joined forces in order to empower themselves.

MRCF has a membership structure with 40 organisations currently enrolled. Of these 30 are groups, which primarily service particular ethnic groups, such as Somalis, Bosnians, Ukrainians, Chinese, Ethiopians, Moroccans, Vietnamese, Sudanese and Eritreans. Seven describe themselves as 'women' or 'mothers' groups. Two are constructed around the needs and contributions of elders, and three are youth organisations. One organis-
tion working with people with disabilities and four with specific groups of workers (dentists, doctors and domestic workers) are involved in the Forum. Some groups are focused on health issues and others on culture (poetry, dance, music). In addition, three groups provide supplementary educational support for children, combining English and maths support with mother tongue classes.

MRCF is based in North Kensington, a multicultural district, which is the home territory of the world famous Notting Hill Carnival. It is also the wealthiest and the most densely populated area in England. MRCF runs a resource centre that provides space for training, meetings and cultural activities, and office space and support services for community groups. Its resource centre premises allow it to have daily contact with individuals and the main communities in the area. Its meeting rooms are in constant use by different groups and the people and advice services and mentoring support is available to hundreds of vulnerable individuals.

MRCF has established a user-led infrastructure that aids in capacity building for local community-led alliances. It supports the rights of migrants and refugees by assisting in the development and strengthening of their community organisations. In addition, MRCF develops and runs programmes that provide support to individual migrants and refugees. These programmes are issue-based and usually address needs that cannot be addressed by community organisations such as the Overseas Health Professionals training programme, which provides support for migrant doctors and dentists in the process of verification of their qualifications in the UK. To date, the project has provided support to more than 3,500 individuals from 98 countries across the UK.

MRCF also provides training. Currently it is running a free course in ‘digital activism’, which helps migrant communities establish a presence on the web and use social networking to convey their messages to wider audiences and utilise digital resources for participation and learning.

One focus for its work is improving migrants’ access to the services and opportunities that exist across London. These include the health service, school and education, family welfare, housing, and employment opportunities. It also works to promote civic engagement in democratic processes.

MRCF aims to address the social exclusion of migrants and refugees and strengthen their voice and civic participation with the overall aim of achieving equality of participation of disadvantaged individuals and communities, thus making their integration more productive and meaningful. It operates with a ‘holistic’ approach to its work, understanding how each part of its programme relates to the overall goal of community empowerment.

The key operational principle for MRCF is to listen to its users, make sense of wider context, and suggest and facilitate responses. In many cases responses are related to immediate resettlement needs but in others, MRCF helped address issues of more settled migrant communities. This was the case with the Moroccan Oral History Project, which built a picture of Moroccan migration in the UK.24

The Forum’s approach clearly directs migrant organisations outwards from the concerns expressed within their communities to a fuller engagement with other groups within local civil society and towards policy makers and politicians making key decisions. In planning programmes of work it makes use of ‘power analysis’ techniques, which map the chains of authority and interest in a particular policy domain, looking for the points where advocacy will be most persuasive and effective.

24 See http://www.morocconmemories.org.uk/
Peer review of the project’s achievements
The Forum constantly reviews its work against an agreed set of benchmarks. These are:

- the extent to which it has contributed to the enhancement of the skills and knowledge of people in the community;
- the quality of the networks and partnerships it has aided the groups in developing;
- the level of participation of refugees and migrants in equality and social inclusion partnerships across the wider region and the UK nationally;
- the extent to which the voice of genuine migrant experience is reported throughout its work, including in its published reports and newsletters;
- the effectiveness of these publications in persuading people in the audiences they are targeted at;
- its capacity to respond to media and public enquiries;
- the outcomes achieved for individuals who have used its advice and referral services;
- the outcome for its work with key target groups, which with recent projects have included young people and dental and healthcare professionals of migrant background.

Progress against these benchmarks is carefully evaluated in a process that involves obtaining feedback from the groups involved in Forum projects - both from the standpoint of the benefits gained and also the quality of the experience for the individual who has been involved in this work. Analysis of this feedback allows the Forum to obtain a stronger sense of what is working positively in its work and the reasons for this, but also to consider what has been less successful and what lessons need to be learned.

In 2010, MRCF involved 92 people in its work on a volunteer basis. Between them, they spoke 42 languages and dialects, illustrating the diversity of the communities in their catchment area. The Forum’s mentoring scheme supported 75 vulnerable migrants throughout the year. Its three day per week capacity building project delivered 141 individual advice sessions of fundraising, project development, delivery and governance to 32 community organisations.

The Forum worked in partnership with 168 organisations in the UK and EU across a number of policy areas (immigration and integration, health and welfare, education, employment, equality and advice). In its three day per week advice project, it provided advice to 264 individuals on 356 different occasions. 55 of the users supported were disabled and 7 were over the age of 65. Advice areas included: immigration (204); welfare (71); housing (22); and benefits (21). 904 events and meetings were organised by community organisations, which amounts to 2,634 hours of community activities and 17,208 visits to the Centre. 16 organisations shared this office space.

MRCF delivered training and employment support to 3,500 overseas doctors and dentists, trained 90 digital activists for 6 weeks, and delivered English classes, training on self-advocacy, job search skills, welfare rights, and health awareness for hundreds of newly arrived migrants. The Forum organised eight public events, bringing together community leaders and policy makers to enhance the debate and instigate change. It published two reports reflecting concerns raised in these meetings and ran successful lobbying campaigns to ensure the voices of its members were heard and considered in the debate (regular e-newsletters are distributed to 5,000 subscribers).

Other measurable impacts of the Forum would include:

- numbers of visits to its website;
- number of bookings for events, training and meetings in its Resource Centre;
- number of individuals seeking legal advice;
- number of capacity building support sessions;
- number of individuals attending training and regis-
tering for programmes such as Overseas Health Professionals or Mentoring Programme;
- number of policy changes addressed through campaigning, media and partnership work;
- numbers of blogs associated with specific Forum initiatives such as the Census video blog or the Welcome Committee blog series;
- number of actions associated with its ‘Take Action’ project, a web-tool that encourages people to identify with various public campaigns and take such actions as signing petitions or writing to MPs;
- number of publications put out each year in its programme of reports and briefings;
- measurable improvements in migrant access to health services in line with the work done as part of the Forum’s ‘Good Practice Guide to Accessing Health’;
- number of special meetings and trainings organised with policy makers as a part of the ‘Engage to Change’ programme, an initiative which encourages migrants to engage directly with politicians and policy-makers at Forum organised meetings and events.

Conclusion

MRCF has been able to build on a long tradition of migrant community leadership in integration activities in the UK. This has provided the model for their work and it follows ENAR principles 3 and 4 in making human rights a central theme in all its activities. Knowledge of local demography (ENAR principle 5) and advocacy in support of anti-discrimination for all (ENAR principle 6) are also present in its work.

Perhaps the core principle that can be identified throughout the Forum’s work is ENAR principle 12 - ensuring participation and the migrants’ voice. It is a project that has built up extensive support in the local community and strong relationships have been built with other groups of residents from outside migrant networks, including public authorities such as local government and the health service. MRCF provides a strong model of a project that operates across all the ENAR 15 principles.
SECTION 3

PLANNING INTEGRATION PROJECTS
What is a ‘good’ integration project?

The key element to keep in mind when considering community-level integration work is that the idea of integration - what it is, what its goals are, what an integrated society even looks like - is hotly contested at almost all levels. The benefits of an integration policy can indeed look very different from the vantage points of national governments, regional and local authorities, agencies and public services, civil society organisations, and migrant and host communities.

Because there is so much room for tension and dispute about what the purpose of integration policy actually is, it is important for projects starting their work in local communities to have a strong take on what they are trying to achieve from the onset.

**Address inequalities:** Integration should aim at achieving equality across the main areas of social and economic life. The starting point for conceptualising migrant integration policies generally focuses on the position of the migrant. Yet, a good strategy would adopt a wider approach, tackling a whole range of inequalities that affect the migrant as well as the host communities.

**Know the stakeholders:** Strategies for integration require collaboration with many different groups who have a stake in the issue at different levels, whether local, national, or Europe-wide. These include politicians, civil servants working in government departments and agencies, professional bodies (social workers, doctors, nurses, teachers, police officers, housing officials, etc), employers and trade unions, representatives of the local media, and prominent people actively involved in the local community, in addition to the migrants themselves.

**Consider what issues can be advanced using the framework of integration policies:** It is not possible to take up everything to do with migrant inequalities all at once. A good project starts by knowing what can feasibly be achieved at the present point in time. Its activities are organised in ways that ensure that definite progress will be made during the course of its work. It also aims to be in the position of going on to tackle fresh issues once it has concluded its current work.

**Interculturalism:** A good project recognises and respects the fact that migrants will view the world from standpoints that reflect their experiences and cultural values. An interculturalist approach encourages dialogue across these different perspectives with the expectation that this will be enriching for all. In this way, we can hope to move beyond the presumption that all people have rigid identities that are immune to modification and that may change in the light of discussion and experience.

**Empowerment:** Integration projects that empower both migrants and host society nationals to join in mutual dialogue and to participate fully in society have made important strides forward. Positive integration outcomes are evident by increased awareness and self-confidence, greater participation and involvement of all members in society, and a deeper understanding and respect for the diversity in society.

**A good migrant integration project will have these issues at the heart of its work:**

**Participation, action, research:** A good project is designed in a way which brings everyone who has a stake in its success around the table from the outset. It involves all groups in the basic thinking, planning and identifying of actions to be taken and the knowledge gaps to be filled. It takes research seriously, working to strengthen the evidence base and to set out convincing, fact-based arguments that win more people to its aims and objectives.
Six ways to plan integration projects for outcomes that support the rights of migrants

Step One: Remember that there are areas of policy that are absolutely critical to respect for successful integration policy

These are:

- Full and equal participation in the labour market
- Respect for family life and the right of family reunion
- Education - both of children and adults
- Political participation - the right to take part in the processes that make the exercise of power accountable in our societies
- Long-term residence - access by a definite point in time (5 years in EU law) at which point long-term residence becomes permanent settlement
- A clear path to citizenship
- Protection in law from discrimination

Think about these issues when considering the work you want to undertake in respect to migrant integration. Which of these make clear impacts in the areas of community life with which you are concerned? If it is more than one of these items (or even all of them), how do they relate to each other in promoting integration?

In practice

North Kensington is an area of west London which has a large and very diverse community of migrant people. Though surrounded by some of the most opulent neighbourhoods in London, it has a high proportion of poor quality housing, extracting high rents from tenants who themselves are likely to receive relatively low earnings. These difficulties are often compounded by insecurities of residence status, with many people in the refugee communities being refused the papers they need by the authorities to allow them to work, receive services, or bring members of their family to join them.

- How would you identify priorities for an integration project in these circumstances?
- How would you factor in the need to have proper regard for the particular position of women, or young people, in these communities? What do you know about the incidence of disability or poor health in this local area?
Step Two: Identify which of ENAR’s 15 principles for a positive approach to migration are going to help you plot a course for your integration project

If you want to make use of these principles, remember that you are looking for opportunities around which to structure your project:
- Positive values and terminology
- Human rights
- Anti-discrimination
- The rights of people in employment
- Equality in education
- The opportunity for pro-active, rather than reactive, responses

The ENAR principles also suggest that you look for the links between areas like anti-discrimination and social inclusion. Making the case for integration often has as much to do with the overall coherence of policy as it does with a particular set of measures in any one area of policy.

See page 13 for the full 15 Principles.

In practice

Young people in the Marolles district of Brussels often achieve less than their full potential in school. Your project is working with teachers to try and see what can be done to achieve better educational outcomes, and you find out a significant factor is the fact that the housing situation of their families is frequently overcrowded and affords no quiet places where children can read and do their homework.

With this understanding, your advocacy might require you to take up two separate areas of policy - housing and homework clubs in schools and community centres. The case for improvements in the stock of social housing and the regulation of private sector tenancies is closely bound up with what you are trying to achieve for young people in the school system.

Step Three: Make the case for the need for your integration project

The need for the activity you are planning will be obvious to you, but will others understand it? What evidence do you have which confirms the existence of the problem you have identified? Do other people support you in this point of view?

You will need to consider who you have to persuade to get this work underway. You will also have to assemble all the data and evidence, and identify the sources of this data as well in order to convince others and to foster understanding of the ‘true’ situation. Finally, you will need to ensure that the people who have given you these insights are going to back you up as you set out your arguments.
In practice

You know from your conversations with the women who use your Centre Against Racism that African women in Stockholm have a harder time than their peers attaining the type of work for which they are qualified in the host population. You feel that it would be relatively simple to set up a project that works on the issues both with the women and with employers to get better results. But there are plenty of people who are sceptical about the case you are trying to make. Some of these are influential in the government employment services and the employer federations. You need a strategy to set out the facts regarding the problems you are addressing and also what can be achieved.

Consider using a participatory action research approach to obtaining the evidence and presenting it to the people who need to hear it. Participatory means drawing in all the people who have facts on this data and getting their agreement on the best way to present it.

Focus groups are a good way to get this discussion going. They get the conversation started in which people record their knowledge of the relevant issues, and can also help you to identify the information gaps. If there is agreement on these issues, focus group participants can point you in the direction you need to go to obtain the additional information you need.

Participatory approaches to action research allow you to build up a partnership around your project right from the outset. They build commitment amongst the people who are feeding in their knowledge and viewpoints. With commitment comes a willingness to play a role in communicating what you have agreed needs to be said to wider groups of people.

Step Four: Undertake a ’power analysis’ of all the groups and institutions you will have to confront and deal with as you build up this project

Institutions are made up of people and they often take the positions they have from an understanding of the interests of that institution more than on an appraisal of the available evidence. But if this leads them to take positions that are in contradiction to the evidence, then think through what you need to do to nudge them away from the institutional position and move a little closer towards your own.

However, this is made even more complicated when we realise that the institution from which the person takes his/her cue on how to think about a situation is itself located within an array of other institutions, each of which is made up of people taking their standpoints from their perceptions of how institutional interests need to be protected.

Power analysis is a technique that allows you to think your way into all these layers of complexity and pinpoint where you can obtain some leverage for your ideas and plans. It starts by identifying key stakeholders and how they stand in relation to one another, and then looks for ways in which strategic activities can bring about gradual or sometimes rapid realignments. When this happens, new opportunities open up and it becomes possible to move quickly.
In practice

On the scale it has been taking place, immigration is a new phenomenon in Bulgaria, and the Sofia-based newspapers and media have only recently started reporting it to their readerships and audiences. The way this has been done is structured by the expectations of the market for mass news consumptions, and following the models of the western European popular press, some papers and media groups have assumed that this means carrying ‘bad news’ stories about immigrants, which confirm the readers’ negative stereotypes.

A power analysis allows the interlocking components of this institutional response to be identified and deconstructed. This, in turn, sets an agenda for discussion with the reporters and editors, whereby it can be suggested to them that other responses to the presence of immigrants are possible.

It is also possible to give them concrete examples of positive experiences, for instance, attitudes people have regarding foreign cuisine. Bulgarian citizens have an increasing appetite for the food that the new immigrants are cooking. The emergence of places in Bulgarian cities where foreign food is cooked and served is considered by natives as evidence that their country is once again taking its place in the European mainstream.

This constellation of facts, combined with a sense of the interests and motivations of mass media organisations, can provide a good map as to the sorts of projects that might be possible to bring about cultural changes in the news industry, so that it does more to promote positive images and optimistic ways of viewing migration.

Step Five: Build partnerships and alliances

Integration strategies might start with migrant communities, but soon they have to deal with building partnerships and alliances to advance their cause.

The steps outlined above will help prepare for the time when firm agreements need to be made with external bodies. Participatory action research will have helped you identify the key players and interests that have something to contribute to the work you want to do. Power analysis will give you the capacity to anticipate issues in advance and know how to handle them.

The most important thing is that your project knows the value that will come of embarking on this sort of activity. Knowing in advance and anticipating likely outcomes enable the option to get out of an arrangement. Be wary about entering into something when the main factors motivating people who want to work with you are not properly known. If you are drawn into a partnership with stakeholders who are more powerful than you, make sure they understand your bottom line and give yourself options to move away if the relationship becomes problematic.

Handling a project partnership in a way that keeps you on course to meet your objectives can be challenging, but if your project is equipped with the skills and the ability to anticipate, it will add to your capacity to make an impact on the policy agendas of the authorities you are trying to influence.
In practice

The district of San Salvario has had a troubled history of community agitation directed against migrants. An influential community group has come into existence, which is operating from the viewpoint that the newcomers are ‘trouble’ and not wanted in the community. Your research has made it clear that this position is based on a high degree of frustration that the host community has experienced because it believes that the city authorities are not concerned with the problems of the area. The community feels that it is being ignored and the backwash has come back to flow over the immigrants who have arrived recently.

The issue here is the way the city council is dealing with the area, and not directly the viewpoint of the older inhabitants. To make progress it will be necessary to detach the local community group from their current position and build a relationship with them that focuses attitudes outwards.

Moving things in this direction will probably mean getting support from other entities in the local area, like the local church, a trade union branch, or social and youth workers. It will also mean picking issues that help illustrate your point, namely, that it is not immigrants who are causing the problems, but landlords who have allowed housing stock to become derelict, or the failure of council services to keep the streets clean.

Arguing the issues in this way will make clear the community bridge-building that needs to be undertaken and the partnerships you will want to engage.

Step Six: Contend with setbacks

Working on the issue of integration and the rights of migrants often involves setbacks. Even if you have evidence supporting the case you want to make and have backing from influential partners, you can find yourself dealing with entrenched hostility from authorities and sections of the public who are not prepared to accept that immigrants have a right to equal treatment.

Even in these circumstances you can undertake activities to advance migrant integration. One of the most important is considering the legal dimension of the case you are trying to make.

You should ask whether the issue in contention deals with a fundamental human right, which applies to all persons residing within the jurisdiction of a state, which is signatory to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as the European Convention on Human Rights. The Convention provides redress on issues concerning the right to life, the use of torture and cruel and degrading treatment, forced labour, right to liberty, right to a fair trial, no punishment without law, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to respect for family life, and the right to free expression, amongst others. Even when domestic law appears not to offer any remedy to the people you are working with, it is worthwhile to think about rights guaranteed by the laws of both the Council of Europe and the European Union.
When planning your project, you should therefore consider whether you will need some capacity for legal support and advice. The opportunity to work with lawyers who are prepared to help develop the human rights dimension to the issues you are dealing with can be valuable and should be taken up.

In general, even when the tone of public opinion and government policy is hostile to the work you are trying to do, you will still find groups and sections of society who can see what you are trying to achieve and will be more inclined to be sympathetic. You might expect to find people committed to anti-racist and cosmopolitan outlooks amongst this group, and possibly trade unionists and people of religious persuasion as well. In some aspects of your work you can hope to appeal for support from groups concerned with gender equality, the rights of young people, elderly people, or the disabled. Allies might be found amongst groups of experts and professionals, who are able to confirm the basic facts of the case you are trying to make from their own work and experience.

In short, there are always allies - either already present or potentially in the making - and your plans and strategies should consider how best to reach out to them and include them.

**In practice**

Government policy in Cyprus is proving itself to be exceptionally hostile to the rights of migrant workers. One group bearing the brunt of these attitudes are domestic workers, who are the biggest single group of migrants in the country. The absence of any special provision to assist this group has left them exposed to gross exploitation and even slavery conditions in the households in which they work.

Through assiduous work with researchers, lawyers, trades unionists, and activists from amongst the migrant domestic worker communities, you are working to assemble a basic coalition, which will challenge the attitudes of the authorities and provide support to the people affected by their policies.

Part of what you have to think about concerns the viewpoint that EU law and policy takes on these issues, so you can join up with a Europe-wide network of groups supporting the rights of migrants to explore opportunities for collaboration and mutual assistance. You have embarked on a long-term strategy, but with good planning, you may well succeed with your goals.
It was intended with this toolkit to provide insight into current challenges relating to migrant integration, policies, and the realities of implementation. Hoping to support organisations working with migrant communities and to support their integration activities at local and regional levels, this toolkit provides guidance, especially relating to ENAR’s 15 principles. The overall aim was to provide good practice on a range of different activities and actions related to migrant integration, to aid in devising strategies for those pursuing integration projects and to improve communication strategies in order to reach wide audiences to promote a positive understanding of migrant integration.

We wish you all good luck and courage in ongoing efforts!
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TOOLKIT: WORKING ON INTEGRATION AT LOCAL LEVEL

This toolkit has been designed to help groups working with migrant communities in local and regional contexts in the field of integration. It provides guidance on the principles which should underpin projects that aim to achieve integration as “a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of EU countries”.

It showcases promising practices in migrant integration to inform organisations that are looking for examples of good practice in this area of work. In so doing, the toolkit explains the ways in which migrant integration fits into the bigger picture of social policy and politics operating at the level of the European Union, the Member States, and the concerns of regional and local authorities. It also aims to influence other countries’ approaches and, crucially, the EU approach, impacting on constructive integration policies nationally and locally.

This toolkit should help to answer questions about:
- The objectives that migrant integration projects should be pursuing;
- The range of activities and actions that will move towards fulfilling these objectives;
- How the work of the project can be kept under review to ensure objectives are met;
- How to communicate the outcomes of the project’s work to wider audiences.

The European Network Against Racism (ENAR) consists of over 700 organisations working to combat racism in all EU Member States and acts as the voice of the anti-racist movement in Europe. ENAR aims to fight racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, to promote equality of treatment between European Union citizens and third country nationals, and to link local/regional/national and EU initiatives.