TOWARDS A TERRITORIAL APPROACH TO MIGRANT INTEGRATION:
THE ROLE OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES

FACILITATING EVIDENCE-BASED INTEGRATION
POLICIES IN CITIES

BRUSSELS, 22 NOVEMBER 2017

ANNA PICCINNI

LUKAS KLEINE-RUESCHKAMP
OECD/EC Study 2016/2018

Sources Used:

1) Database on migrants in OECD regions (TL2)
   Data analysis of 391 Regions for 35 OECD countries

2) 10 in-depth Case Studies of EU cities

3) 62 Responses from Municipalities (57) and Associations of Cities (5) in Europe to an ad-hoc questionnaire

Target group: Migrants, including native-born children of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers
Towards 12 objectives for public action to migrant integration at the local level

I: Multi-level governance
1. Improved vertical coordination and implementation at the relevant scale
2. Policy coherence in addressing multi-dimensional migrants needs and opportunities
3. Access to and effective use of financial resources adapted to local responsibilities for integration

II: Time and space
4. Design integration policies which take time into account throughout migrant life and status evolution
5. Bring along local civil society to make proximity with migrants a reality

III: Policy formulation and implementation
6. Capacity and diversity of public service, particularly in services for migrants and refugees
7. Cooperation with relevant stakeholders through transparent & effective contracts.
8. Assessment of integration and their use in policy design.
9. Match migrant talents with economic opportunities.
10. Secure access to adequate housing
11. Align social welfare measures with migrant inclusion.
12. Establish education responses that address segregation & provide path to professional growth.
**Migrant integration: « one size fits all » approach is not appropriate**

- **Places matter**, including in terms of perception: *the need for a territorial approach*

- **How?** *Multi-level governance matters* for achieving coherent and effective integration policies

*How can place-based integration policies be more evidence-based?*
Evidence-based local integration cycle: Design, implementation & evaluation

The Checklist supports decision-makers in:
1. Context-analysis: institutional mapping
2. Establishing policy objectives
3. Operationalise the objectives by setting institutional outputs and measures
4. Measuring the achievements
5. Communicate the results
Enabling environment: actors, competences, funding

Gothenburg, Sweden
How cities establish integration objectives, what can the checklist brings?

- A complex political issue: no standard definition
- Multi-stakeholder participation and perception survey
- Integration strategy: from generic to specialized approach, aligned with local development objectives
- Alignment with national and EU integration policies: right incentives
- Multi-sectoral policies: seek coherence by following the person’s needs
How cities operationalize objectives into inputs and outputs and their measurement, what the checklist provides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklist blocks</th>
<th>Example Inputs: formal requirements or Measures designed</th>
<th>Output: implementation of good practice</th>
<th>Intermediate outputs/Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and financial settings</td>
<td>• Set-up of cross-sectoral entity ensuring coherence in integration policy in municipality</td>
<td>• The entity runs a “migration-sensitive” check when policies are proposed across all fields (ex-ante evaluation stage). • Contracts among departments</td>
<td>Right-based access to services (i.e. during changes in status and related administrative system, etc.) has been increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral policies related to migration</td>
<td>• Migration mainstreaming is implemented and monitored in universal service delivery • Database on migrant’s competences at local level</td>
<td>• Language support at early childhood and compulsory school level. • Adult vocational trainings are tailored to the needs of the population arrived in the locality</td>
<td>Reduction in drop-out rate of migrant students since language support in school has been strengthened Tailored training contribute to reduction in the unemployment gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment & Evaluation

Local framework of indicators to assess progresses in implementing migrant integration strategy

City Integration Monitoring system

Issues related to evaluation:
Hard to make the link between policy implementation and outcomes; Make sure outcome measures also include perceptions and benefits of migrants presence to local development; Data comparability: migrant definitions, education systems, etc.
Example on data comparability: PRESENCE

Main Inconsistencies:
- Up-to-date data
- Definition of migrants as: With migration background, foreign born or with foreign nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>% of migrant out of total city population (year)</th>
<th>Definition of migrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altena</td>
<td>11.3 (ND)</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>51.60 (ND)</td>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>23 (2011)</td>
<td>Unclear definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>16.6 (2016)</td>
<td>Unclear definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>29.9 (2016)</td>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>12.24 (2011)</td>
<td>FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>24 (ND) 33.20</td>
<td>FB MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>14.9 (ND)</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>12.74 (2015) 27.40</td>
<td>FB FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>38.30 (2016) 50.00</td>
<td>FB MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MB = Migration Background (foreign-born and native-born children of migrant parents)
FB = Foreign born
FN = Population with foreign nationality
ND = No date available

Source: Data provided by cities participating the case studies.
### Example on data comparability: SECONDARY EDUCATION

#### Main Inconsistencies:
- Categorisation according to nationality or ethnicity
- Different categorisation of secondary school
- Not all cities measure educational attainment - some measures students in education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>% Educational Attainment Secondary Edu Natives</th>
<th>% Educational Attainment Secondary Edu Migrants</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altena</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>64.57 (REF&amp; AS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33 (FB)</td>
<td>Western/ non=western Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Intermediate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>Three different titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>35.9 (white)</td>
<td>38.6 (white other) 46 (mixed or multiple) 55.4 (Asian) 49.0(African) 40 (Other)</td>
<td>% of ppl. in higher education not educational attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>35(upper secondary) 76(post upper secondary)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26.3 (unclear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data provided by cities participating the case studies.*
Integration evaluation: future avenues for research

• Assess the impact of the new actions undertaken since 2015 arrivals: how these lessons can shape future integration policies?

• How to communicate integration-related data?
Way forward:

- “Bench-learning” exercise: compare practices in local evidence-based integration policy. Possibility to use the OECD Checklist for public action to migrant integration at the local level as benchmark.

- Policy evaluation: *From micro (regional/local results) to “nano” experiment to assess the impact of integration policies on specific groups* (i.e. Sarcelles resettled and relocated refugees).

- *Database on migrants in OECD regions*: the database helps identifying place-based factors that might help integration of migrants.
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