



Urban Agenda - Inclusion of Migrants & Refugees

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Objective of the Public Feedback

In order to realise the full potential of the European Union and deliver on its strategic objectives, the Urban Agenda for the EU strives to involve Urban Authorities in achieving Better Regulation, Better Funding and Better Knowledge.

Established with the 'Pact of Amsterdam' of May 2016, the Urban Agenda for the EU is a new working method to ensure maximum utilisation of the growth potential of cities and to successfully tackle social challenges. It aims to promote cooperation between Member States, Cities, the European Commission and other stakeholders, in order to stimulate growth, liveability and innovation in the cities of Europe.

As stated in the Pact of Amsterdam, Thematic Partnerships are the key delivery vehicle towards realising the goals of the Urban Agenda for the EU. The Pact of Amsterdam lists 12 Priority Themes for the Urban Agenda for the EU. On each Theme a Partnership has been formed.

Four Partnerships were set up in the first half of 2016 and have now developed draft Action Plans. These are: Inclusion of Migrants and refugees (coordinated by the City of Amsterdam and DG HOME); Air Quality (coordinated by The Netherlands); Urban Poverty (coordinated by France and Belgium) and Housing (coordinated by Slovakia and the city of Vienna).

The goal of the **Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees** is for cities to be able to influence European legislation, funding and knowledge sharing. With more influence on these three themes, cities would be able to deal much more efficiently with challenges concerning integration and inclusion of migrants and refugees.

The Partnership focuses on the mid- and long-term view of integration and inclusion of migrants and refugees. It has identified the following topics that need to be addressed in order to ensure successful integration and inclusion: Reception and interaction with the local community, Housing, Work, Education and the cross cutting issue of vulnerable groups.

This Public Feedback is part of a process to evaluate the actions and recommendations developed by the Partnership “Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees”. The Action Plan would greatly benefit from the insights of relevant stakeholders, who have the opportunity to contribute to the improvement of actions and recommendations to be implemented in the future.

The results of the online Public Feedback will be taken into consideration by the members of the Partnership on Urban Poverty for the preparation of the final version of the Action Plan, which will be presented to the DG meeting on urban matters (DGs responsible for urban matters in their Member States, the European Commission, the CoR, CEMR and EUROCITIES) taking place on 26 October 2017.

The individual contributions to this Public Feedback will not be published on the Internet. At the beginning of the questionnaire, you will be able to choose between providing your personal details or submitting your contribution anonymously.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COLLABORATION!

Target group(s)

Contributions are sought from individuals and national authorities, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, social partners and civil society, academic institutions, financial institutions, international organisations, EU Institutions and Agencies, based in EU Member States or third countries.

Period of the online Public Feedback

From 10/07/2017 to 25/08/2017

How to submit your feedback

You can contribute to this Public Feedback by filling out the online questionnaire, available hereafter. You may find it useful to refer to the background documents which are published alongside this consultation.

Individual contributions to this Public Feedback will not be published on the Internet. Answers to the online questionnaire will be taken into account by the Partnership as input to a revised version of the Action Plan, which will be published on Futurium before the end of 2017.

Replies may preferably be submitted in English.

Reference documents and websites

1. [Background Paper to the Public Feedback to the Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees](#)
2. [Pact of Amsterdam](#)
3. [Futurium – section dedicated to the Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees](#)

Disclaimer

The information and views contained in the online Public Feedback are those of the Partnership and do not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the information contained therein. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the content and the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Contact details

Secretariat of the Urban Agenda, Communication team

E-mail: UA.communication@ecorys.com

* 1. Are you responding as an individual:

- Yes
- No

* 2. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation:

- Yes
- No

* 2.a. Are you a public, private or non-governmental organisation?

- Public
- Private
- NGO
- Other

Please specify the level of your public organisation

- Local
- Regional
- National
- EU
- International

* Please specify

Associations representing all the local authorities of Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg and Saxony

* 2.b. In which country is your organisation based?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus

- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

3. Name, surname and position of the respondent (this information will be kept strictly confidential)

Caroline Bogenschütz, Head of the European Office of Local Authorities of Baden-Württemberg

4. Name of the institution (if applicable - this information will be kept strictly confidential)

Joint European Offices of the Local Authorities of Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg and Saxony

5. Email ((this information will be kept strictly confidential)

c.bogenschuetz@europabuero-bw.de

THEME 1 : Better Funding

The Urban Agenda will contribute to identifying, supporting, integrating, and improving traditional, innovative and user-friendly sources of funding for Urban Areas at the relevant institutional level, including from European structural and investment funds (ESIF) in view of achieving effective implementation of interventions in Urban Areas. The Urban Agenda for the EU will not create new or increased EU funding aimed at higher allocations for Urban Authorities. However, it will draw from and convey lessons learned

on how to improve funding opportunities for Urban Authorities across all EU policies and instruments, including Cohesion Policy.

The actions presented below have been prepared by the Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees and aim to address the Better funding theme.

DRAFT ACTION 1 - Establishment of Financial Blending Facilities for cities and SMEs

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 1 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the lack of easy direct access for cities/SMEs/social impact funds to EU funding targeting refugee integration, in particular the AMIF (Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund).

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
*To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please briefly justify your score

Especially local authorities that find themselves in financial difficulties need external funding in the form of grants in order to master and financially shoulder their integration tasks. These require bigger investments in fields like language learning, education, social culture and labour market.

The funding landscape for integration projects is divers and concerning the effort for some even daunting. The familiarization with the funding programmes as well as the application process is - at least in part - associated with a substantial expenditure of time. Therefore, the bundling of the offers as well as an easier access to the funding formats would be extremely welcome. But it is still a controversial issue whether financial blending facilities (mixed financing) are suited to meet the local challenges.

Furthermore it shall be noted that the required own contribution from the applicants represents especially in the case of smaller players from the civil society - and that includes migrant organisations as well - often an insurmountable obstacle. Financial assistance might also play a role for SMEs. But the removal of restrictions to the resident status - especially concerning the employment of refugees - is more important for them.

Presentation of ACTION 1

The **objective** of this action is to establish one or several blending facilities, which combine the delivery of grants from EU funding with loan financing provided by the EIB. A potential implementation could be the

creation of a blending facility between the AMIF grant resources and the EIB loan resources.

Foreseen **activities** include:

- The preparation of draft concept papers for one or several blending facilities;
- Interviews with cities, MS and financial institutions;
- The elaboration of proposals for the necessary regulatory changes to EU regulations;
- The negotiation of the facility related documentation.

The implementation of this action is expected to lead to the provision to cities/social impact funds of a direct access to additional funding for migration/integration-related investments. It will also lead to an increase in the possibilities for SMEs to receive a loan from financial institutions for migration/refugee-related investments.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly Yes
- Partially Yes
- No
- I don't know

2.a. Please justify briefly your choice

We welcome the bundling of different funding opportunities (grants) with a simultaneous facilitation of access requirements, conditions and project handling. At the same time the bundling might promote networking between project managers and support the exchange of experiences. The Local Authorities of Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg and Saxony however prefer a financial assistance without loan financing. Mixed financing does not imply automatically an easier access. Borrowing increases the administrative burden of the local authorities as various departments have to be involved and complicated processes in cooperation with the EIB have to be undergone. Moreover, borrowing increases the financial risk. In the past, several local authorities shied away from applying for other facilities.

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

The proposals include:

- Minimisation of the co-payment of partners of integration projects, maybe with additional support from the state in order to reach full financing.
- an easier and more flexible arrangement of existing funding programmes (ESIF, AMIF, FEAD) without having to undergo complicated processes in cooperation with the EIB
- support for national funding programmes by funds from the EU (if certain criteria are fulfilled)
- a proportionate pre-financing of projects (especially to avoid troubles for smaller project partners)

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

Positions papers for the simplification of the existing funding programmes, e.g.

- Position paper of the German managing authority for the ESF (federal level) concerning the organisation of ESF post 2021 - Towards a new "Lean Fund Management" (LFM)
- Notes from the German "Freie Wohlfahrtspflege" (non-statutory welfare sector) concerning the implementation and further development of FEAD

[DRAFT ACTION 2 - Establishment of Financial Blending Facilities for microfinance](#)

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 2 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the barriers which newly arrived or settled migrants face when they attempt to start a business in their host locality (e.g. hurdles in access to funding, lack of familiarity with administrative and legal requirements, legal restrictions).

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A

* To what extent you find this issue crucial?



1.a. Please briefly justify your score

Persons with a migrant background do not only encounter the usual challenges other company founders face. Moreover, they face challenges due to a lack of knowledge of the economic system of the host country as well as of questions concerning the right of residence and the recognition of acquired qualifications. Furthermore, studies show that migrants compared to company founders without a migrant background less often use financial funding opportunities. Becoming self-employed can open the way to social advancement. But it should not be forgotten that company founders without the necessary language skills face higher risks.

Presentation of ACTION 2

The **objective** of this action is to strengthen the accessibility and provision of business development services, as part of microloan packages. To do so, this action aims to promote and make better use of the EIF microfinancing possibilities.

Foreseen **activities** include the potential implementation of a pilot programme which could introduce embedded grants into the EaSI (European Commission's Programme for Employment and Social innovation) guarantee product. Grants of EUR 400 per micro-borrower would be paid to financial intermediaries who lend to migrants and refugees and combine the microloan with business development services.

The implementation of this action is expected to help micro-enterprises of refugees and migrants in accessing business development services.

* 2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I don't know

2.a. Please justify briefly your choice

We welcome the linking of microcredits of a usual amount to an easier access to information concerning the administrative and legal requirements, the limitations and the intercultural circumstances. It is important that the advice centres open themselves to intercultural aspects, offer personal and low-threshold counselling and are familiar with questions from persons with migrant background (right of residence, recognition of acquired qualifications, trainer licences and the like). It could be problematic that the existence of such centres is often not sufficiently well-known to use them. The services of financial intermediaries could provide an opportunity, but the success still depends on the person in question and his or her commitment.

Culture-sensitive counselling, easier recognition of qualifications acquired abroad as well as faster and financed adaptation qualification measures (reskilling) coupled with profession-specific language skills should be put together in an overall package. This "package" should be so well known that it indeed reaches the target group. Studies on company foundations of migrants as support would be supportive and recommendable.

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

- In Germany the network IQ (integration by qualification) exists since the early 2000s, formerly funded by EIF. In various locations models for culture-sensitive counselling of founders with migrant background have been tested. The ASM (Workgroup of self-employed Migrants) from Hamburg belongs to its members.
- In the city of Mainz the network InBez focuses on the promotion of migrant economy
- Programme "Gründungszuschuss" (foundation grants) of the Bundesagentur für Arbeit (Federal Agency of Employment)
- Institut für Mittelstandsforschung (Institute for SME Research) Mannheim
- Website "starting your own business": <http://www.existenzgruender.de/EN/Home/inhalt.html>

DRAFT ACTION 3 - Reduce regulatory and practical barriers for cities and local authorities and promote tools to guarantee a better access to EU integration funding

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 3 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the issue of the problematic access for cities to ESIF or AMIF funding. Cities in general do not have direct or sufficient access to integration funding as this funding is channelled through regional managing authorities or central governments.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please justify briefly your scoring

There are not sufficient funds available on the local level to master successfully the challenge of integration; the existing EU funding programmes provide very important impulses. However, concerning those programmes during the current funding period optimization potential was identified. The familiarization with the different funding formats as well as the application procedure and the project handling go with a huge effort. The obstacles for a successful application discourage some local authorities, especially those with limited staff capacity, from realising very good ideas with the help of EU funds. The participation of the local authorities in the elaboration of the general framework is crucial for achieving a demand-oriented funding.

Presentation of ACTION 3

The **objective** of this action is to provide guaranteed city access to EU integration funding, namely by reflecting on the regulatory and by developing solutions for the post 2020 Multiannual Financial Framework.

Foreseen **activities** include:

- Issuing a practical guide on the use of EU funds in supporting cities' effort for inclusion of migrants and refugees;
- Analysing obstacles/barriers towards EU funding and best practices; Meeting with relevant stakeholders;
- Drafting recommendation for the post 2020 EU funding regulation;

- Steering towards a new post 2020 regulation for a single fund for EU Migrant Integration Measures;
- Drafting a communication strategy.

The implementation of this action is expected to lead to the elaboration of a recommendation paper to be put forward by April 2018.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I don't know

2.a. Please justify briefly your choice

The national and the operational programmes differ from region to region in order to do justice to the local circumstances. A guideline developed by the thematic partnership should be altered by the respective local administrative bodies in order to avoid rising false expectations. The aim should be to have a simply understandable integration guideline for each region. An appropriate communication of funding opportunities is extremely important.

We welcome the analysis of the obstacles for EU funding and of good practices; this builds an important basis for the organization of the future multiannual financial framework, maybe with a bundling opportunity of various programmes for integration. It is important to gather the experiences from a multitude of integration project partners. A close exchange of the thematic partnership with those local authorities which do not participate in the partnership is desirable.

The drafting of recommendations for the new funding period and the preparation of a new regulation for the simplification and combination of present EU funding opportunities for integration are welcome. As far as possible facilitations should already be introduced during the current funding period. Important points are the reduction of administrative burdens, more flexibility in regards to the funding purpose and an overarching funding of target groups (EU citizens, third-state nationals, persons with migrant background independently of their nationality).

The benefit of the programmes "Rights, Equality and Citizenship" as well as of the "Europe for Citizens" should not be underestimated in regards to the reduction of fears, prejudices and racism and therefore for the increase of integration chances. Also the question should be raised for example, how it can be prevented that conflicts, stemming from the countries of origin, divide migrant groups from those countries.

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

Eckpunkte für eine Vereinfachung der ESIF-Verordnung in der Förderperiode 2021+ (Key points for a facilitation of the ESIF-Regulation for the funding period post 2021), developed by representatives of the Coordination Unit of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (EA3 - coordination of EU cohesion and structural policy) and by representatives of the EFRE-administration and certifying authorities of the Länder

Position paper of the federal managing authority of the ESF concerning the organisation of ESF post 2021 - Towards a new "Lean Fund Management" (LFM)

Various position papers of local authorities on the future of cohesion policy, including as well a position paper from our Joint European Offices of Local Authorities of Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg and Saxony, and the know-how of the persons in charge of integration and refugees in the local authorities

Various regional EU funding handbooks for the local authorities

An event organized by the European Offices of the Local Authorities of Baden-Württemberg, the German Association of Towns and Municipalities and the Federal Association of Non-statutory Welfare (BAGFW) concerning the EU funding opportunities of integration projects on 9th October 2017 in Brussels

Could you identify other bottlenecks to be tackled with more urgency than the abovementioned ones?
Please elaborate

Would you like to be kept informed on the developments of this theme and on the activities of the Partnership?

- Yes

No

If yes, please indicate your email address

info@ebbk.de

THEME 2 : Better Regulation

Drawing on the general principles of better regulation, EU legislation should be designed so that it achieves the objectives at minimum cost without imposing unnecessary legislative burdens. In this sense the Urban Agenda for the EU will contribute to the Better Regulation theme. The Urban Agenda for the EU will not initiate new regulation, but will be regarded as an informal contribution to the design of future and revision of existing EU regulation, in order for it to better reflect urban needs, practices and responsibilities.

The action presented below has been prepared by the Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees and aims to address the Better regulation theme.

[DRAFT ACTION 4 - Protection and reinforcement of the rights of children with a migrant background from a multilevel perspective](#)

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 4 to be addressed

This action aims at ensuring the reinforcement of the rights of migrant children, namely tackling the issues of:

- Lack of appropriate protection of the unaccompanied minors (UAM);
- School segregation, in the form of concentration of migrant children in schools

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please briefly justify your score

Integration only succeeds in contact with pupils from the host country; moreover an adequate protection of minor refugees is seen as an essential requirement for their positive development. The current practice to limit services for the youth to 18 years of age is challenged by some sides. Furthermore, not only unaccompanied minor refugees are in huge need of protection during and after their escape but also children accompanied by their families. It is a huge challenge to cushion interrupted education biographies. Also a consolidation of therapeutic treatment should be taken into consideration.

Presentation of ACTION 4

The **objective** of this action is to focus on:

- Generating better regulation with respect to UAMs;
- Achieving inclusive education for children with migrant background.

Foreseen **activities** include:

- The elaboration of recommendations on the reform of the Common EU Asylum System with regards to the impacts on UAMs from the perspective of EU cities;
- The implementation of a pilot action in two cities and the development of methodological guidance on addressing educational segregation, potentially leading to local level policy recommendations and the adoption of legal amendments at the local level.

The implementation of this action is expected to lead to a better protection of UAM rights and to improve the level of inclusion of migrant children in the education system at the local level.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I don't know

2.a. Please justify briefly your choice

We welcome the proposed measures to make recommendations (concerning the reform of the common European asylum system and for the local authorities) and to develop of methodical guidelines. All relevant factors and actors should be included in this process - also beyond the circle of participants in the thematic partnership.

In addition it makes sense to set up accommodation and care facilities for young people after reaching majority.

It is e.g. advisable to introduce opportunities for catch-up schooling for migrants over and under 18 years of age. Furthermore therapeutic treatment for minor refugees has to be enhanced. Also the participation of young migrants in leisure programmes which are linked to their schools and the inclusion of their families should be encouraged. It is recommended to develop regional strategies in order to avoid segregation in schools and to support further training of the teaching staff and voluntaries. Attempts to link the right to general schooling to the status of residence should be opposed resolutely.

The pilot project in two cities will represent an interesting sample. Yet, it will not have any representative character. The pilot project should be extended to a larger level.

There are special challenges in the case of lacking or uncertain prospects of permanent residence: The educational integration is made more difficult and there is unequal treatment, as young people with a bad prospect of residence are excluded from some measures.

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

NGOS like Pro Asyl, Flüchtlingsrat (Refugee Council) as well as the Bundesfachverband Unbegleitete minderjährige Flüchtlinge e.V. (Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees) have published several recommendations for a general legal framework.

Model projects of the Saxon Ministry of State for Culture, Street School Dresden (of the Treberhilfe e.V. for Refugees in planning), SCHLAU-Schule (Bavaria), "Angekommen" (Having arrived) in Dortmund

A European study in that field: <http://www.themenpool-migration.eu/dtraum05.htm>

Could you identify other bottlenecks to be tackled with more urgency than the abovementioned ones?
Please elaborate

Would you like to be kept informed on the developments of this theme and on the activities of the Partnership?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please indicate your email address

THEME 3 : Better Knowledge

The Urban Agenda for the EU will contribute to enhancing the knowledge base on urban issues and the exchange of best practices and knowledge. Reliable data is important for evidence-based urban policy making as well as for providing tailor-made solutions to major challenges. Initiatives taken in this context will be in accordance with the relevant EU legislation on data protection, the better use of public sector information and the promotion of big, linked and open data.

The actions presented below have been prepared by the Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees and aim to address the Better knowledge theme.

[DRAFT ACTION 5 - Establish a peer to peer academy on migrant and refugee integration for policy makers](#)

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 5 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the lack of the necessary expertise and capacity of local authorities to address quickly and effectively integration related challenges.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
*To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please briefly justify your score

The exchange of experiences and good practices is regarded generally as very important - be it on a local, regional, national, European or international level. There are already different offers for education, training and further training for qualified staff. It has also to be taken into account that the conditions in regards to the legal framework and the funding possibilities differ between the member states and therefore there is not always a transferability.

Presentation of ACTION 5

The **objective** of this action is to systematically share experience and best practice on integration across Europe, in order to enhance the capacity of local authorities to develop successful integration policies.

Foreseen **activities** include:

- The assessment of the needs and feasibility in setting up the academy, via the consultation of relevant stakeholders.
- The implementation and evaluation of a pilot action, consisting of 2-3 training modules, with around 10 participants per module.

The implementation of this action is expected to lead to the establishment of an academy for policy makers at the local level, which would serve as a platform for trainings and sharing of successful experience as well as a network of peers.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I don't know

2.a. Please justify briefly your choice

A seminar offer would generally be welcomed. But the question must be raised whether the existing structures should not be used - e.g. the webinars of the Council of the Regions and congresses. The contents of the seminars have to be designed in a manner that they are transferable independently from national specifications. The improvement of the clarity and structure of the Futurium-website could contribute as well to a better exchange of experiences on the European level and could encourage the use of the platform.

Additional information campaigns with films and online and print brochures are recommended.

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

At the European level there is inter alia the network Intercultural City. This network of the European Council demonstrates that it is possible - also in the diversity within Europe - to benefit of the knowledge of your counterparts.

The networking activities of the associations of the local authorities have to be pointed out. In Germany, the Bundesintegrationsbeauftragte (Federal Commissioner for Integration) uses to meet once or twice a year the integration commissioners of the Länder and local level.

DRAFT ACTION 6 - European Migrant Advisory Board

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 6 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the failure in including migrant and refugees in the design and implementation of integration and inclusion policies. Policy is made for migrant and refugees but not with them.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
*To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please briefly justify your score

The incorporation of the migrants' experiences into the work of the thematic partnership is important for the integration process as well as an element of an active democracy and a sign of appreciation. In practice there are sometimes difficulties to motivate migrants as their inclusion often does not have a meaning influence on decision making. The incorporation of migrants who are living in the different EU member states is of importance. It should be made sure that women and young people are involved.

It is desirable to involve migrants generally in the local integration policy. The involvement of well integrated persons with migrant background in the support of the new arrivals is highly promising. From time to time the question was raised whether a right to vote in local elections for migrants with permanent residence would be possible.

Presentation of ACTION 6

The **objective** of this action is to include migrants and refugees in the process of finding solutions to the obstacles to integration and inclusion. The implementation of this action is expected to lead to the launch of the European Migrant Advisory Board, to be officially installed in October 2017. The Board will comprise migrants and former refugees and will offer advice to the Partnership for their involvement in the development and launch of inclusion policies.

Foreseen **activities** include:

- The selection of the members of the Advisory Board and the elaboration of its organisational structure;
- The design of the program for the Advisory Board;
- The design of a monitoring and evaluation system;
- The collection of cases on which advice can be provided;
- The elaboration of a communication and marketing strategy.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I don't know

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

- There are integration councils in many German local authorities. Those have joined together on the Länder and national level (e.g. LAKA-BW - Landesverband der kommunalen Migrantenvertretungen Baden-Württemberg)
 - European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE)
 - The Asylum Information Database (AIDA)
 - The European Legal Network on Asylum (ELENA)
 - Rat für Migration e.V./Council for Migration
 - Flüchtlingsdialog in Überlingen, based on "design thinking" a methodology to develop creative ideas (contact: e.dachauer@ueberlingen.de)

Could you identify other bottlenecks to be tackled with more urgency than the abovementioned ones? Please elaborate

Presentation of BOTTLENECK 7 to be addressed

This action aims at tackling the issue of the uneven availability of statistics on integration at a local level as well as the lack of a well-established transfer of knowledge among cities on evidence-based policy making on integration.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent you find this issue crucial and why?

	1 - Weakest	2 - Weak	3 - Regular	4 - Strong	5 - Strongest	N /A
* To what extent you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.a. Please briefly justify your score

It is important to improve the statistical foundation of the integration topic and the knowledge transfer because a fact-based work is the pre-requisite for an efficient, strategic integration policy with a visible/measurable success. The existing data is incomplete, somewhat unclear and in part not comparable due to different definitions used. But the data gathering should not cause too much bureaucratic effort. It is desirable to provide the data in every EU language.

Presentation of ACTION 7

The **objective** of this action is to improve the statistical base regarding integration- on urban/regional level and to enhance the transfer of knowledge among European cities on evidence-based integration policy making .

Foreseen **activities** include:

- A review process within a Working Group bringing together cities and EU-level stakeholders.
- A state of play-analysis of current activities leading to an assessment of needs and gaps.
- The implementation of a feasibility test by Eurostat to depict immigrant integration indicators on infra-state level, based on the Labour Force Survey tables.

- The elaboration of a report on the exploitation of various cross-country sample surveys for integration data on urban level.
- The mapping of good practices of evidence-based integration policy-making in European cities.
- The publication of an options report, containing Working Group recommendations on the way forward.

The implementation of this action is expected to lead to:

- The broadening of the European wide knowledge base on migrant integration at urban/regional level.
- The elaboration of a European toolbox for evidence-based local integration policies.

*2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
 Partially yes
 No
 I don't know

*3. According to your experience, do you believe that the bottleneck presented above could be better tackled through other action(s)?

- Yes
 No
 I don't know

3.a. If yes, which other actions would you propose? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation

*4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
 No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

In Germany, there have already been various attempts to measure integration. There are over 100 indicators of the National Integration Plan and the indicators of the "Kommunale Gemeinschaftsstelle für Verwaltungsmanagement

(KGSt)" (Municipal Joint Office for Administrative Management). In the past couple of years a lot of cities have additionally built up a reporting system on integration.

Worth mentioning are moreover:

- <http://www.integrationsmonitoring-laender.de/startseite>
- municipal quality circle on integration policy <http://www.stuttgart.de/item/show/385012>

See also the data material of existing European networks such as the Intercultural Cities.

Could you identify other bottlenecks to be tackled with more urgency than the abovementioned ones?
Please elaborate

Would you like to be kept informed on the developments of this theme and on the activities of the Partnership?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please indicate your email address

Contact

UA.communication@ecorys.com
