

Support fund for the reception and integration of immigrants and their educational support

Discussion Paper

María Concepción Carrasco
University of Alcalá

Executive Summary

The subject of this report is “the Support Fund for the Reception and Integration of Immigrants and their Educational Support”: A scheme that has been operating in Spain since 2005. The increasing flow of migrants, both internationally and more specifically at a European level, has been the catalyst behind plans to coordinate migration policy at these levels. Financial instruments are one means of support that are vital if the goals set are to be achieved.

The report is divided into three parts. *The first* provides a frame of reference for developing integration policies for immigrants, focusing in particular on the problems they have to overcome, how they tackle them and what resources are available to them. The measures taken vary considerably and are developed at various levels, from national, state or federal government level to regional and local. The difference between the countries’ integration models on the one hand and the possibility of agreeing on a common plan of action on the other, are the two extremes debated at previous Peer Review meetings. *The second part* briefly outlines the objectives, characteristics and financial systems of the Fund for the reception and integration of immigrants and their educational support. *The third part* looks at the main contributions made by the Fund, the possibility of extending it to European level and at systems for evaluating its impact. The Fund has in the main contributed to: the establishment of an inter-territorial and inter-institutional model of cooperation, been the driving force behind an improvement in the planning of activities, increased initiatives and financial resources. Especially relevant for its possible extension are the coordination systems and the involvement of all stakeholders at all levels, in particular the immigrants themselves. Evaluation has placed a priority on establishing new areas of action and planning objectives and indicators that are adapted to specific real needs at regional and local levels.

Lastly, the key points proposed for debate at the October meeting (Peer Review, Spain, 20-21 October, 2008)¹ are the following:

- the coordination of immigration policy (central government) and the management of immigration (normally at regional and local level);
- how to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency of integration activities;
- long term strategies and resource improvements; and
- the need for a culture of evaluation.

¹ It would assist the smooth running of the meeting, if participating countries prepared and shared (as far as possible) the following information: initiatives similar to the Fund, proposed or currently operating strategic plans, systems for social cohesion and the coordination of action at different levels, as well as proposals for improving evaluations.

1. The policy debate at international and EU level

1.1 The policy framework at OECD and European level

Of the 60 million displaced emigrants (2005) 50% went to the United States (mainly from Central America and Mexico), 40% to the European Union (mainly from Eastern Europe), 5% to Canada (mainly from East Asia) and just over 3% to Japan (from East and Southeast Asia)². For 2005, Eurostat estimated the number of non-nationals in European Union states at 28 million. In comparison with previous years, migrations to OECD countries increased in 2005. (The foreign population over 15 years of age in OECD countries is now 75.7 million)³. In the European Union net migration⁴ (the balance between immigration and emigration) for 2007 was 1,910,403 people. Spain occupied the top spot (just over 700,000) followed by Italy and the United Kingdom. Countries with negative net migration are: Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Poland. The largest groups of nationals from third countries in the EU come from Turkey (2.3 million), Morocco (1.7 million), Albania (0.8 million) and Algeria (0.6 million).

An increase in migratory flows does not necessarily mean an increase in integration problems, though in reality it does present enormous challenges. In 2005, in all OECD countries (SOPEMI, 2007), except for Poland, Hungary and the United States, the unemployment rate among immigrant males was higher than for the native population (greater diversity was found for women). In addition 25% of highly qualified immigrants were inactive, on the dole, or employed in positions below their level of training (the lowest rate being in the Czech Republic with 5%) due mainly to the type of work available in the different labour markets.

Illegal immigration presents some important challenges for the international community. It is impossible to provide a figure for irregular immigration. Some estimates for Europe place the figure at over 3.5 million. Let's look at some examples: The Czech Republic: 50,000-300,000 (Jin Vecernik, 2006); Germany: 1,000,000 (Huster Ernst-Ulrich, Benz Benjamín, Boeckh Jürgen, 2006); Greece: 500,000-700,000 (Ziomas, 2006); Italy: 540,000 (Strati, 2006); France: 400,000-500,000 (Guibentif Pierre, 2004); Spain: approximately 500,000 for 2007 (Carrasco, 2008). The Hein de Haas study (2007)⁵ estimates irregular entries to Europe (just from East Africa) at around 25,000 a year. The cost to European Union states (besides the social and human cost) is calculated at 200 million Euros (between 2002-2004, 680.000 return decisions were carried out)⁶.

From an educational point of view, the OECD PISA reports show worse academic results (especially in science subjects, such as maths) for students from immigrant families. However the poor performance of students from immigrant families varies greatly between countries, from slight differences in Australia, Canada and New Zealand, to more than 90 points in Belgium and Germany, even for second generation children⁷. This difference depends on many factors, one of which is the school population structure, in other words, the way the school population is

² More information in the Rickar Sandell article "Immigration: differences on a world wide level", ARI N° 47/2007 http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano/contenido?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/Elcano_in/Zonas_in/ARI%2047-2007

³ <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/247383367577>

⁴ Eurostat: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=1996,39140985&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL&screen=detailref&language=en&product=REF_SD_DE&root=REF_SD_DE/sd_de/sd_de_dem/tsdde230

⁵ <http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/Irregular%20migration%20from%20West%20Africa%20-%20Hein%20de%20Haas.pdf>

⁶ COM(2005) 123 final. http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/2004-2007/doc/sec_2005_435_en.pdf

⁷ See Education at a Glance 2007, OECD.

distributed, according to whether students are considered as first generation (born in a different country to parents also born in that country) or second generation (born in the country in question but to parents from another country). See table 1 in the annex (Percentage of school population with an immigrant background, 2006).

1.2 Integration within the European context⁸

Since the beginning of the XXI century, important advances have been made in efforts to integrate immigrants in Europe. Both at a conceptual level (reports by the European Community commission concerning integration or the establishment of common integration principles, are some examples) and a practical level (legislative instruments, integration and social inclusion plans, measures and actions to fight against social exclusion).

There are legislative instruments concerned with family reunification⁹, long term residents¹⁰ and laws about third country nationals or stateless persons that need international protection¹¹. However, not every country in the European Union has transposed the directives on asylum and immigration.

The European Council adopted the Basic Common Principles as EU immigrant integration policy (PBC)¹² and in September 2005 the Commission presented a Common Integration Programme¹³. The integration manuals for politicians and professionals¹⁴ are used to exchange information and as a guide to good practices. The Integrative Cities or European Integration Forum provide transnational coordination and cooperation systems at a municipal level between public authorities and private companies, social organisations and other social agents involved in integration.

The Commission underlined the importance of integration in social inclusion and social protection policies, based on national reports on social inclusion and protection strategies. The inclusion of immigrants¹⁵ is one of the strategies' main objectives¹⁶.

The financial instruments provided by the EU in support of integration policies have been and remain principally: preparatory activities INTI¹⁷ (since 2003); within the Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows framework 2007-2013¹⁸ The European Fund for the Integration

⁸ Additional information can be obtained from the Council Commission Report, the European Parliament, the European Social and Economic Committee and the Regions Committee. The third annual report on immigration and integration. Brussels, 11/09/1007. COM (2007) 512 final.
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/immigration/docs/com_2007_512_en.pdf

⁹ Council Directive 2003/86 on family regrouping rights .

¹⁰ Council Directive 2003/109 with regard to the statute on long term resident nationals of third countries.

¹¹ Council Directive 2004/83 in which minimum norms are established on the requisites for the statute and recognition of third county nationals or stateless persons as refugees or persons that require another type of international protection.

¹² Council Document 14615/04. http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/jha/82745.pdf

¹³ COM(2005) 389. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0389:FIN:EN:PDF>

¹⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/immigration/integration/doc_immigration_integration_en.htm

¹⁵ In the context of social inclusion policies, the definition of migrants is not limited to third country nationals, nor to foreigners. If relevant, the target population also include ethnic minorities and members of the second or third generations.

¹⁶ See: Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (2007). European Commission.

¹⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/2004_2007/inti/funding_inti_en.htm

¹⁸ The negotiations between the Council and the European Parliament on the framework programme on Solidarity and the management of migration flows were successfully completed in December 2006. The framework pro-

of Third-country nationals; ¹⁹ the European Refugee Fund²⁰; within the context of the European Social Fund (FSE) the EQUAL initiative offered an innovative set of good practices to prevent and fight against the discrimination of immigrants in the labour market²¹; finally the URBAN II and URBACT initiatives, have financed measures in the European cities environment.

The European Fund for the Integration of Third-country nationals is especially important in this context as the general objective of the instrument (applicable as of 1 January 2007) is to support the efforts of Member States to enable third country nationals to fulfil the conditions of residence and to facilitate their integration into European societies, in accordance with the Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union. Examples of co-finance measures are: intercultural training and dialogue, courses to acquire basic knowledge about the host society' language, history, institutions, socio-economic features, cultural life, norms and values. The Fund is provided with €825 million for the period 2007-2013 (€65 million for 2007).

1.3 Integration measures: An international comparison

The measures adopted by the different countries on the integration of migrants vary enormously and depend to a large extent on several aspects: the migratory experience, the number of immigrants, the characteristics of the immigration (nationalities, types of immigration), the rules to access citizenship, the wealth of the country or the different integration priorities. Parallel to these measures, the resources provided depend equally on the variables mentioned.

Regarding the types of immigration the inclusion policies must be different according to the aim of migration: economic migration, family reunification, asylum seekers and refugees, returned emigration or education. For example, the measures adopted with reference to *economic migration* often aimed at labour market integration (working permits, rights and obligation, training courses for low skilled workers, unemployment rates, the average of temporary contracts, validate and certify qualifications, measures to combat discriminatory attitudes of employers, and so on). On the other hand, problems of school dropping out or leaving school after the end of compulsory education are addressed in regard to first and second generations and ethnic minorities. Besides the educational problems of children, the access to decent housing and combat the spatial segregation of immigrants combine with *family reunification*. On the contrary, others measures such as integration courses quite often are not compulsory for the asylum seekers and refugees. Finally, the access citizenship and others social services such as the contribute benefit affect returned emigration. Anyway, it seems clear that the measures adopted by the different countries depend on both the types of immigration and the target populations (among others aspects previously mentioned).

Different target populations

The measures adopted are addressed to a wide range target populations. Reception policies such as language courses, civic participation, access to citizenship, working permits, information

gramme consists of four financial instruments: two applicable as from 1st January 2007, the External Borders Fund and the Integration Fund and two applicable as from 1st January 2008, the Return Fund and the European Refugee Fund (the current European Refugee Fund will run till 31st December 2007).

¹⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/integration/funding_integration_en.htm

²⁰ http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/funding/refugee/funding_refugee_en.htm

²¹ http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/index_es.html

campaigns on rights and obligation, etc) tend to be addressed to newly arrived migrants. Among these policies, some need to distinguish between EU citizens and third country nationals who have different rights. This is obviously the case for the information on rights and obligation, civic participation, access to the labour market. Others are addressed to all foreigners who arrive in the country (e.g. language courses). However, integration policies go beyond reception policies, and include measures in the area of education, social inclusion and anti-discrimination that address the situation of all migrants and ethnic minorities, whether or not they have acquired the citizenship of the host country. Finally, the provision of services that are essential to guarantee access to fundamental rights (education, health care) also needs to address the situation of illegal migrants. This is why the target population for integration measures need to be defined in a flexible way and in relation to the objectives of the measures discussed.

On the other hand, in all the countries the measures are developed at different levels, from *national, state or federal government level to regional or local level*. This multi-level intervention creates enormous challenges of coordination and implementation (this aspect will be looked at later). National policy must provide a clear and efficient context for intervention at other levels and vice versa, interventions at regional and local levels must serve for the introduction of more pragmatic national integration policy initiatives. In Canada for example agents involved at a local level expressed their concern with the selection model that was selecting qualified immigrants when the local labour market required less qualified workers. Canada has since adopted agreements with the regions allowing them to participate in the selection of immigrants (provincial nominee agreements). In Spain the new, difficult occupations to fill, register allows regional authorities to intervene in the selection of immigrants for their labour markets.

National measures

In most countries measures taken at national level are concerned with the following areas: the legislative framework (in Europe, this also involves the European legislative framework), that is to say, laws on immigration or anti-discriminatory measures, with the development of national integration plans, with the introduction of analysis, coordination, financing, monitoring and evaluation systems.

Some of the measures developed at this level during the period 2005-2007 (Migrant Integration Policy Index, - INDEX, 2007) in the countries participating in this Peer Review (see table 2 in the annex) are the following:

- Anti-discrimination activities: In 2006, Germany transposed the European directive on the equality law (General Law on Equality or Treatment). In 2005, Greece passed anti-discrimination law n° 3304/2005 (Directive 2000/43 EC and Directive 2000/78EC). Italy adopted the Directive 2000/43/EC on equality of treatment and in 2005 created the National Racial Discrimination Office (UNAR). In 2005, the Latvian Human Rights Office created an organisation responsible for equality. In Spain, the Spanish Racism and Xenophobia Observatory is responsible for implementing measures that promote equality. In Denmark have been established new common complaints committee for equal treatment.
- The transposition of directives: Only Latvia and the Czech Republic have transposed directive 2003/86/CE on family regrouping (other European states that have also transposed the directive are Belgium, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovenia). In

2006, the Czech Republic adapted the European directive on long term residents. In 2007, Italy transposed the long term resident directive. Latvia and Greece did the same in 2006. And finally, in 2007, the Netherlands opted for an inapplicability clause of the transposition.

- Participation in legislative elections: Only the Netherlands and Denmark allow immigrants to vote in legislative elections (Spain allows EU nationals to vote in municipal elections).
- Setting up national integration plans: Germany set up a National Immigration Plan in 2007. Spain has also passed a Strategic Citizen and Integration Plan 2007-2010. In 2005, Latvia began a programme to develop an Integral Immigration and Asylum Management System 2005-2009. Finally Denmark has set up a National Integration Plan: A New Chance for Everyone (2005).
- Other actions: In 2007, Greece set up the National Commission for the integration of immigrants. In the Netherlands, the new Civic Integration Law came into force in January 2007. Since 2005, Spain has had in place a reception, integration and educational support fund. The government of the Czech Republic passed the new "Concept of Immigrant Integration" in 2006. Germany set up the federal initiative "Active for Training Places" with the aim of increasing corporations' social responsibility with regard to sexual equality, in diversity management, in the fight against xenophobia at the workplace, etc.

Regional and local measures

Integration policy measures adopted at state level affect the management of immigrants and their integration at regional and local levels. The variety of programmes also increases because of the multifaceted nature of integration. We will now look at some examples of the large scale programmes operating at this level, beginning with an example from outside the European Union, Canada, due to its enormous migratory experience.

Due to its specific national selection system (quotas), the initiatives carried out in Canada (Francesca Froy, 2006), concentrate specifically on highly qualified immigrants. Canada places emphasis on activities designed to improve the employability of foreigners with programmes that involve large investment in high resource activities in some provinces, such as: work experience programmes, recognition of qualifications gained abroad, projects to tackle discrimination in recruitment procedures, higher levels of language training, including occupationally specific language use. The emphasis on other, short term measures requiring less investment (low resource activities) is notable in the province of Ontario (Canada) but also in most European states with more recent migratory experience. In Spain, Italy or the United Kingdom, although there local level initiatives exist that have enabled immigrants to integrate into the labour market, there are few initiatives that allow them to integrate into qualified employment under the same conditions as native workers. Precedence is given to short term initiatives with more visible success.

The different programmes depend on whether they are aimed at recent arrivals or second and third generation immigrants. For the first, these are essentially courses on the host country's language, knowledge of its laws and values (we will look later at the debate over integration

contracts), lodging and information about what resources are available. In the second case, the emphasis is on the education of the youngest with the aim of preventing their exclusion in the future. Germany places great importance on linguistic ability, given that improvement in this area is the key to success in social and labour integration. People with few qualifications are at greater risk of falling into poverty. Since 2005 it has been obligatory for recent arrivals in Germany to enrol in integration courses designed to develop linguistic and social integration skills. In the Netherlands it has also been obligatory since the introduction of the New Integration Act and the Act of Integration Aboard, for immigrants to take an exam in their country of origin (to demonstrate knowledge of the Dutch language and society), and those aged between 16 and 65 already residing in the country are required to take an integration course. In Denmark the New Aliens Act rules that non-UE citizens must pass a high-level test on Danish language and culture. Similar programmes have been developed in France with integration courses for new arrivals. The Greek Ministry Of Employment and Social Protection offer Greek language courses to refugees and immigrants. In total 11 countries have begun contract and integration courses and have created civic duty and citizenship exams: Sweden, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Estonia, Germany and Switzerland (Virginie Guiraudon, 2008)²².

In France, Spain, Denmark and Switzerland local integration policies are aimed more at specific town councils (even neighbourhoods) rather than a particular ethnic group (except for the Roma ethnic minority). For example in Denmark the National Association of Local Authorities and Danish Regions have entered an agreement on "Integration Jobs". On the other hand practically all programmes that are aimed at specific groups (women, the young, certain nationalities or minorities) using specific means, are developed at regional or local level. We now look at some examples:

- In the Czech Republic many programmes are directed at the Roma ethnic minority.
- In Greece programmes are concentrated on the Muslim and Roma minority.
- Special interest motivates programmes in Spain developed in favour of the Roma minority in the Principality of Asturias (Municipal programme of shanty towns eradication in Avilés²³).
- A large number of programmes developed by the German Länder and town councils are aimed specifically at Turkish women (although these services have been reduced due to budget cuts).
- In the Netherlands town councils are required to offer integration courses to asylum seekers and religious leaders. Furthermore, programmes aimed at helping female immigrants to integrate are also common, for example the working group "Migrant Women and Employment" designed to stimulate the employment of immigrant women, set up in March 2006.

²² http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/!ut/p/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QjzKLN4k38vYCSYGYhqEepEoYgbxjmgilFVeCDFj_zcVP0gfW_9AP2C3NDQIHJHROAfKQp6/delta/base64xml/L0IDU0IKQ1RPN29na2tBISEvb0lvUUFBSVFnakZJQUFRaENFSVFqR0EhLzRKRmlDbzBlaDFpY29uUVZHaGQtLzdfNF8zJUDY!?WCM_PORTLET=PC_7_4_3P6_WCM&WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/Elcano_in/Zonas_in/ARI43-2008

²³ <http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.net/peer-reviews/2006/social-integration-of-roma-people-municipal-programme-of-shanty-towns-eradication-in-aviles>

- In Denmark a campaign aimed at female ethnic entrepreneurs has been launched (2007).

At a regional level, it is common for the regions to develop their own integration plans (Spain is an example of this) and even their own integration laws. The Italian region of Tuscany is an illustrative example: After a series of public consultations involving more than 5,000 citizens, Tuscany will enforce a law promoting active citizenship, respecting cultures, faiths, and the life styles of different communities.

Financial resources

Regional and local resources available (coming from European funds, state funds, or from the funds of the regions and towns themselves) for the integration of immigrants vary considerably. It is impossible to summarise all the resources available. Some examples will serve as an illustration.

Canada provides large amounts of resources through its provincial programmes, although they depend on the provinces and the agreements made with the federal government. For example in 2005-2006 the amount per capita assigned to Ontario and Manitoba was approximately 590 Euros and 1,200 Euros, respectively; whilst the previous year Quebec received 3,800 Euros per immigrant. These differences show the negotiating power of the provinces with the federal government. In Spain the regions assigned the largest resources (Catalonia, Madrid, Andalusia, Murcia, Valencia, Canarias) contain the greatest number of immigrants.

It has been calculated that the average amount per participant in integration programmes (introductory courses and basic language tuition) was between €1800-2000 in EU-15 states (2003). Other examples of expenditure by Member States to aid integration (especially the reception of new arrivals) are the following²⁴:

- In the city of Vienna (2003): €38,000 on welcome information packages and €420,000 on language tuition.
- The Flemish Community in Belgium spent €8,800,000 (2003) on introductory activities (excluding language tuition).
- In the Netherlands €50,000,000 was spent on introduction courses.
- In The Czech Republic: €292,707 (2003) on introductory activities for recognised refugees.
- In Germany: The Federal Government allocated a fund of €208,000,000 in 2005 for integration courses (but only €89,000,000 were actually spent). Funds for the amount of €141,000,000 each have been appropriated for 2006 and 2007 (one third of the budget will be devoted to measures to improve the educational success of migrant children²⁵).

²⁴ Véase COM(2005) 123 final. http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/2004-2007/doc/sec_2005_435_en.pdf

²⁵ http://www.bundesregierung.de/nn_6516/Content/EN/StatischeSeiten/Schwerpunkte/Integration/kasten1-der-nationale-integrationsplan.html

- In Italy (2007) a €50,000,000 Social Inclusion fund was set up for immigrants, but the Corte Constitucional declared the fund unconstitutional because it should have been placed under the control of the regions and not the central government. The amount made available for scholastic integration however, is estimated at around €53,000,000, which is distributed among the regional school offices.
- Greece: implementation of 332 training programmes with a budget €21,900,000 (in which 6,709 immigrants, repatriates and refugees have participated).
- France: for 2004 the Office for International Migration, OMI dedicated €3,546,200 to immigrant reception programmes, especially for personnel expenses and in addition the action and support fund for integration and the fight against discrimination, FASILD) dedicated a total of €27,200,000 to language courses²⁶.
- The United Kingdom: The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant has risen from €205 million in 2004-2005 to €227 million in 2007-2008 and will continue to rise to €263 million by 2010-2011 (aimed at raising the educational achievement of pupils from ethnic minorities).
- Denmark spent €108,600,000 (2003) on introduction courses (civic orientation, language tuition and labour market training) for newly arrived immigrants and refugees. Additionally the Government in Denmark has set aside €81 million for the Integration Plan "A new chance for everyone". At the local level €40 million has been set aside to hire new consultants in 10 municipalities with many ethnic minorities.

²⁶ See Synthesis Report of the Peer Review Meeting, Paris 8-9 November 2004. http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.net/peer-reviews/2004/the-reception-platforms-to-promote-the-integration-of-immigrants/04_FR_synth_en_050509.pdf

1.4 Reference to previous Peer Reviews and the reports by the independent social inclusion network experts

In this section we would like to look at some of the debates currently underway in Europe and dealt with in previous Peer Reviews, which demonstrate both the possibilities of transferring immigrant integration initiatives, and the obstacles to achieving this end.

The differences between the integration models²⁷ adopted by Member States have an enormous affect on which integration measures are developed. Said models vary from the search for a common national identity (melting-pot) to an acceptance of cultural diversity (multiculturalism or inter-culturality). The French case is an example of the first, and the United Kingdom and the Netherlands of the second. An intermediate model, such as the topic of this report, the Reception Fund, can be seen in practice, where emphasis is placed on both integration into the host society under principles of equality and non-discrimination, and in inter-culturality as a system of interaction between people of different origins and cultures, appreciating and respecting cultural diversity and guaranteeing social cohesion.

The debate over integration contracts belongs within the context described and was analysed in the Peer Review: "Reception and integration of newly arrived immigrants²⁸" (Synthesis Report, Paris 8-9 November 2004). Integration contracts have their origins in the reception programmes, which have been in place in France since mid 2003. The State commits itself to facilitating integration and in turn the immigrant makes the commitment to respect the basic values of French society. This commitment is set out explicitly in the integration contract. One of the more positive features dealt with was national cover, implying equal access to resources, and an inter-ministerial plan. However, greater reservation was found when it came to actually implementing the contract and the reception programmes as they were found to be systems that were excessively different in both time and space.

The likelihood of agreeing on common courses of action (not only some Basic Common Principles) poses a challenge to Member countries. Experts in earlier reports have revealed a series of common factors:

- Efforts to prevent discrimination in the labour market, as well as discrimination in other areas;
- Educational support, especially for first generation and women;
- Social and political participation;
- Housing;
- Cultural identity.

The core activities of the Reception Fund are working in this direction (as we will see in the following point) with emphasis on groups requiring special attention (target groups): children and young people, as well as women.

²⁷ See the report by Iain Begg and Eric Marlier (LSE, CEPS/INSTEAD): <http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.net/policy-assessment-activities/reports/second-semester-2006/synthesis-report-2006-2/>

²⁸ http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.net/peer-reviews/2004/the-reception-platforms-to-promote-the-integration-of-immigrants/04_FR_synth_en_050509.pdf

One particularly important organisational question²⁹ is the debate over whether the integration measures should be managed at national, even European, level or at local or regional level. Many Member States have given priority to the local level (in general all countries with a largely decentralised administration) on the basis of greater closeness to the citizens and as such being in possession of greater and better knowledge of their needs. The debate is centred around equality of treatment (France) versus the difficulty of managing and coordinating different regional and local conditions. The Reception Fund could be an intermediary way of taking into account the coordination and management systems developed at a central level, but flexible enough to allow regional and local level integration policies that are adapted to the needs of their citizens to be developed.

Finally, the participation of all stakeholders, especially the immigrants themselves, is a question that has been dealt with in all the reports. An example of good practice cited is the measures adopted in Finland³⁰ concerning unemployed (and registered) immigrants. The integration of these immigrants includes an agreement between the local authority, the local employment office and the immigrant themselves. The plan obliges the public authority to process and finance the measures agreed in it. The plan is scheduled to last three years, but can be increased to five under certain circumstances (illiteracy or to complete basic education).

2. Description of the support fund for the reception and integration of immigrants and their educational support³¹

2.1 Main aims and characteristics

The Spanish national social inclusion plan (in response to the introduction of the Lisbon Objectives and in harmony with the Common Basic Principles on Integration and the Common Agenda for Integration) established as priority objectives for 2006-2008 (of the five contemplated) support for the social integration of immigrants. This objective is approached through the support fund for the reception and integration of immigrants and their educational support (from hereon in referred to as the Fund) set up in 2005 by the Labour and Social Affairs Ministry (the Secretary of State for Immigration and Emigration) and maintained to date. A new frame of reference will be created with the development of the Strategic Citizenship and Integration 2007-2010 (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, 2007)³².

The main objective is to promote the work done on integration by the General State Administration, the Autonomous Communities and Town Councils, giving direction to the actions taken by the public authorities and energising all those involved in the integration process.

²⁹ This predicament has been dealt with in the report on "Integration of Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities" by Pierre Gyibentif. <http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.net/peer-reviews/guibentif.pdf>

³⁰ See the report by Sampo Ruoppila: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/docs/social_inclusion/experts_reports/finland_2_2006.pdf

³¹ For more detailed information about the FUND see the report by the representatives of the host country (Spain) prepared for the Peer Review meeting of 20-21 October 2008. In addition consult: <http://www.mtas.es/migraciones/Integracion/Integralmigrantes/FondoAcogida.htm>

³² <http://www.mtas.es/migraciones/Integracion/PlanEstrategico/Docs/PEClingles.pdf>

There are twelve core activities:

- reception;
- education;
- employment;
- housing;
- social services;
- health;
- childhood and youth;
- equal treatment;
- women;
- participation;
- sensitisation;
- co-development.

The priorities (that will constitute the amount of resources assigned) are specified at the reception and integration, education and local level.

2.2 Assignment and resources criteria

The Fund was originally divided into two parts with particular consideration given to each of them: **reception and integration** (60% in 2005, 50% in 2006 and 49% in 2007) and **educational support** (40% in 2005, 50% in 2006 and 45% in 2007). At the same time a minimum limit was established for activities promoted or developed by **Local Authorities** (50% in 2005, 40% in 2006 and 40% in 2007). In 2007 a special activity was included **the care of unaccompanied foreign minors** (5%).

The assignment criteria for reception and integration are the following:

- A basic assignment of 10% for each Autonomous Region under the criteria of inter-territorial solidarity;
- Foreign population registered in each Autonomous Region with a weighting of 35%;
- Number of extra-community workers affiliated to the Social Security with a weighting of 25%;
- Number of extra-community workers in the special agricultural scheme with 10%;
- A part for exceptional circumstances (20%) which is assigned after consideration between those Autonomous Regions with greatest migratory pressure (Andalusia, Canaries, Catalonia, Madrid, Murcia, Valencia and the cities of Ceuta and Melilla).

There are two assignment criteria for educational support, the number of extra-community foreign students enrolled in obligatory schooling (60%) and the number of students that do not speak Castilian Spanish (40%).

The financial resources assigned to the Fund were the following: €120,000,000 in 2005, €182,400,000 in 2006 and €198,000,000 in 2007. Co-financing by the Autonomous Regions must be at least 30%.

We must make it clear that this fund is not intended to finance all public immigrant integration policies. It only represents that part of the costs which correspond to the State General

Administration, under no circumstances does it represent the total cost of integration on the part of the Autonomous Regions.

2.3 Management and evaluation systems

Once the amount of the Fund has been approved in the General State Budget, the Higher Immigration Policy Council meeting is held, in which all the Autonomous Regions and the Federation of Municipalities and Provinces are represented. At this meeting the Secretary of State for Immigration-Directorate General for Integration, proposes a cooperation framework; once this has been approved, the Autonomous Regions have to come up with a plan of action, which must then be approved by the State General Administration. The agreement is regulated through a Collaboration Treaty that contains the obligations of all parties involved and includes as an annex the Plan of Action. The treaty is renewed in successive years by means of the Treaty Extension Protocol.

The Autonomous Regions enjoy flexibility when it comes to assigning credit at a local level: public announcement, assignation criteria similar to those of the State General Administration, or agreements with the Regional Municipalities Federation are the systems normally used.

At the end of each year the Autonomous Regions must present an Implementation Record in which they give an account of each of the quantitative and qualitative indicators for the core activities, (the process, the result and the impact)³³ set out in the Plan of Action.

The independent external evaluation of the Fund was carried out for 2007 (for which 1% was put aside), with reference mainly to the year 2006 and the following objectives:

- Evaluate the relevance, validity and efficacy of the measures and activities contemplated in the Cooperation Framework for the management of the Fund.
- Evaluate the affect of the Fund on the process of immigrant integration with special attention paid to the local sphere and the sectors affected most by the selected activities.
- Obtain conclusions and recommendations for the continued efficacy of the Fund.

³³ We resubmit the report prepared by the Ministry of Labour and Immigration (Spain).

3. Evaluation of contributions, transferability and impact evaluation systems

3.1 An assessment of the contribution to the EU good practice policy debate

The Fund is an efficient tool that has contributed to the establishment of a cooperation model between administrations. Inter-territorial cooperation, that is to say, between the State General Administration, the Autonomous Regions and the Local Authorities; as well as, inter-institutional cooperation with the different departments of the political sectors responsible.

The Fund has been the driving force behind an improvement in the planning of integration activities using the knowledge obtained by those closest to the reality on the ground, the Autonomous Regions, local authorities and non profit organisations (with whom it is common to negotiate).

The Fund has brought about an increase in immigrant integration activities uniting and increasing financial efforts. The contribution of the Autonomous Regions has increased more proportionally than the Fund itself, allowing us to talk of mutual feedback.

The Fund has contributed to the generation of systems for disseminating good practices. An example of this is the Fairea Digital Bulletin, created by the Autonomous Region of Andalusia as a means of transferring knowledge and good practices. Since its inception 21 bulletins have been published³⁴.

3.2 An assessment of its transferability and learning value for other Member States

National circumstances are so diverse that only parts of the policy under consideration are transferable.

The concept of social cohesion takes on special importance through improved coordination and the involvement of all stakeholders at all levels. This is not an easy task given the different social and economic situations of the different countries. For example in the Czech Republic the number of immigrants is small, but they have huge problems with housing and very limited knowledge of the language. The first of these is dealt with by central government, the second however, is carried out by NGOs, creating disparities between the different regions. The German model however, through the implementation of the National Integration Plan, is much closer to the proposals of the Spanish Fund.

In addition, the proximity of regional and local activities to life on the ground (where the organised civil society normally operates) is key to potential transferability. Regional Plans of Action, which have been approved by the State, (through collaboration treaties signed by all parties) are a useful tool that unites the regions (they can establish their own priorities in the action plan) to state level coordination and monitoring of a plan of action that is both broader and unique to them (cooperation framework). Adapting to new circumstances is more agile as the Plans of Action are

³⁴ Available in Spanish:
http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/gobernacion/opencms/portal/PoliticasyMigratorias/Publicaciones/boletines_fairea?entrada=tematica&tematica=63

not rigid tools nor are they designed to be long term (the incorporation of the activity with unaccompanied foreign minors for 2007 is an example of this).

On the other hand, the Fund expresses among its operating principles the need for all stakeholders, especially the immigrants themselves, to participate in the design and execution of the different activities. This is a recurrent topic in European debates, but essential if we want to increase the efficacy of the different integration measures.

3.3 An assessment of possible ways of measuring results or the impact of the policy under review

- From the perspective of the European Union and its Member states, the Immigrant Integration Policy Index (INDEX)³⁵, could be an efficient evaluation system. The INDEX embraces six policy areas: *access to the labour market, family regrouping, long term residence, political participation, access to nationality and anti-discrimination.*
- At a more specific execution level the EU Basic Common Principles are key to a unified evaluation of the measures that aid the integration of immigrants in the host country. See table 3 in the annex, in which the following areas of the main measures adopted by European countries are highlighted (coinciding with said Principles): *Two-way process, respect EU values, employment, basic knowledge of the host society, efforts in education, equal access to institutions, interaction, the practice of diverse cultures and religions, participation of immigrants, mainstreaming integration policies and evaluation.*
- Additionally, knowledge of the social reality of each country is a necessary prerequisite for establishing the general, specific and functional objectives. In Spain the Social Barometer³⁶ (Colectivo IOE, 2008) can be adapted to knowledge of the social circumstances of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Some of the following areas and indicators are of particular importance: POVERTY (foreign population in situation of extreme poverty, population at risk of falling into poverty); EMPLOYMENT (unemployment rate, long term unemployed, homes with all those of working age unemployed, temporary contract rate, purchasing power of wage earners), HEALTH (access to health services, state of health), EDUCATION (early abandonment of education, number of students with special educational needs), HOUSING (access to housing), SOCIAL PROTECTION (contributory welfare and unemployment benefit, users of social services), CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (participation in elections, registered associations), GENDER EQUALITY (employment, unemployment and temporary contract rates, average wage, study abandonment rates, unemployment benefits, all measured as the average distance for both sexes) and the NUMBER OF FOREIGNERS IN IRREGULAR CIRCUMSTANCES.
- Finally, the migratory policy measures adopted under the previously mentioned circumstances can be evaluated using the following indicators: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, usefulness, transferability and durability. For this it is absolutely necessary that resource indicators, execution indicators (functional objectives), result indicators

³⁵ <http://www.integrationindex.eu>

³⁶ <http://www.barometrosocial.es/index-eng.html>

(specific objectives) and impact indicators (general or global objectives) are established³⁷.

4. Key questions (to be addressed during the meeting)

- Governance. In the sphere of governance there are two questions that repeatedly worry all those countries concerned with the integration of immigrants: 1) immigration management (normally at regional and local level) is rarely accompanied by an integration policy (central government). Central government needs to trust local organisations but at the same time it is advisable that it sets up a guide and creates the capacity to monitor the results of policies. 2) Coordination. On many occasions public policy is fragmented into a multitude of activities at different levels and carried out by a wide variety of agents (basic public services, organised civil society, amongst others).

→ *Coordinating this multilevel governance is a complex task in which many bilateral systems operate. The challenge of improving coordination without duplicating activities such as equal access to services and resources is obvious.*

- How can the efficiency and effectiveness of the activities designed to integrate immigrants in the host society be improved? For any activity to be effective it must be based on knowledge of real needs at a local level. Experts in Germany (Ernst-Ulrich Huster, Benjamin Benz, Jürgen Boeckh, 2006) show that only 42% of the fund assigned for integration courses was spent in 2005. The Bavarian Prime Minister stated that little more than half the 60,000 foreigners required to attend integration courses actually did so. The non-profit organisations put emphasise on the excessive amount of bureaucracy to attend the courses. Experts in Greece (Ziomas 2006) highlight the inefficiency of the Integrated Action Programme with regard to Roma, which continue to suffer from exclusion. In France only 57.4% of those that signed an integration contract attended language courses in 2003 although this increased to 75% in 2004 (Pierre Guibentif, 2004). Not wishing to overstate the issue, an improvement in efficiency can be obtained by:

→ *Improving the information transferred between the different levels of activity, as well as improving the quality of statistics and registration, still a challenge for the different host countries who want to know the reality on the ground.*

→ *The active participation of the actual beneficiaries of the integration policies is key to the effectiveness of the measures.*

→ *Establishing protocols and reception systems for new arrivals (be it the country in question or in the school environment). On the other hand the concept of "reception" must be clarified.*

- Integration requires long term strategies and large investment in resources. Experts (Jiri Vecernik) in the Czech Republic show one of the main problems with integration policies is a shortage of funds: in 2004, €815,000, was reduced to €489,000 in 2005 and increased to €1,018,000 for 2006. The fact that these funds are approved annually favours short term projects, generally carried out by NGOs. The European Union has

³⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/working/doc/indic_en.pdf

proposed as an objective (until 2013) reaching 30% of new arrivals with its initial reception activities (language courses as well as courses on the norms and values of the host country). Given that it is estimated that more than 1 million new immigrants arrive each year and the average amount spent on language and social skills courses is € 1800-2000 per person in EU-15, the amount of additional funding required is calculated at approximately € 300,000,000. If the Member States contribute 50% (co-payment) to the European fund, for this item alone, would have to be € 150,000,000. Additionally cultural and social integration activities have cost the EU around €14,000,000, but according to EU estimates an annual expenditure of € 100,000,000 is forecast. The total forecast for the Fund for the integration of immigrants in the EU is € 400,000,000. To this amount the expenditure of the asylum fund must be added. In Germany alone annual expenditure estimates exceed € 1.5 billion. The EU will contribute around €170 million per year. On the other hand, the European Social Funds (2007-2013) give special mention of immigrants, under the general objective of enhancing access to employment of job seekers and inactive people, preventing unemployment, prolonging working lives and increasing participation in the labour market of women and migrants.

→ *The general shortage of resources continues to be a challenge for European countries together with an improvement in the assignation of those resources that do exist.*

- *A culture of evaluation is needed.* Despite the fact that some of the initiatives mentioned in the report are evaluated (e.g. In Germany a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the integration courses has been carried out, in France the OMI (Office for International Migration) has done the same thing, and in Spain the Fund has been the object of evaluation since 2006) it is necessary to look in greater depth at, at least two aspects: a) evaluation does not mean auditing, in other words, it should not be interpreted as an exam of efficacy or efficiency but as an opportunity to improve the activities carried out as well as contributing to transparency; b) it is essential that clear and functional objectives are established, as well as indicators for evaluating the process, results and later long term monitoring of them.

→ *A plan of action, some clear and precise objectives and indicators constitute a good tool for coordinating activities at different levels of activity and improving evaluation.*

References

Begg, Iain; Marlier Eric (2007): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities*. Synthesis Report.

COLECTIVO IOE, (2008): *Barómetro Social de España. Análisis del período 1994-2006*. CIP-Ecosocial y Traficantes de Sueños. Madrid.

COM (2005) 123 final: *General Programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows. Extended impact assessment*. Brussels, SEC (2005) 435.

COM (2005) 389 final: *A Common Agenda for Integration. Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union*. Brussels.

COM (2007) 512 final: *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration*. Brussels.

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (14615/04): Press Release, Justice and Home Affairs. Brussels, 2004.

Carrasco, C. (en prensa): *Mercado de Trabajo e Inmigración*. FOESSA. España.

European Commission (1999): *The New Programming period 2000-2006: methodological working papers. Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation: An indicative methodology*, Working Papers, nº 3. Directorate-General XVI, REGIONAL POLICY AND COHESION, Co-ordination and evaluation of operations.

European Commission (2007): *Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion*. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

Eurostat, (2006): *Statistics in Focus. Population and social Conditions*, Brussels.

Froy, Francesca (2006): "From Immigration to Integration: Comparing Local Practises" in *From Immigration to Integration: Local Solutions to a Global Challenge*, pg. 31-98, OECD.

Guibentif, Pierre (2004): *Reception and Integration of newly arrived immigrants*. Synthesis Report, Peer Review in the Field of Social Inclusion Policies, France.

Guiraudon, Virginiae (2008): *Integration Contracts for Immigrants: Common Trends and Differences in European Experience*. ARI 43/2008, Real Instituto Elcano. Spain.

Guy, Will (2006): *Municipal programme of shanty towns eradication in Avilés (Principality of Asturias)*. Spain.

Haas, Hein de (2007): *The myth of invasion. Irregular migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union*. IMI research report, University of Oxford.

Huster Ernst-Ulrich; Benz, Benjamin; Boeckh, Jürgen (2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Germany*.

Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, (2007): *Strategic Plan for Citizenship and Integration. Executive Summary*. Secretaría de Estado de Inmigración y Emigración. Spain.

Mølgaard, Anne; Børner, Tobias, (2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Denmark*.

Niessen, J., Huddleston, T., Citron, L. (2007): *Migrant Integration Policy Index*. British Council and Migration Policy Group, United Kingdom.

OECD (2007): *Education at a Glance*. Paris.

OECD (2007): *PISA 2006*. Paris.

Ruoppila, Sampo (2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Finland*.

Sandell, Rickar (2007): *World Differences*, ARI N° 47/2007. Real Instituto Elcano. Spain.

SOPEMI, (2007): *International Migration Outlook*, OECD publishing.

Statistics in Focus (Population and social conditions): "Non-national populations in the EU Member States", n° 8/2006, Eurostat.

Strati, Filippo (2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Italy*.

Vecernik, Jiri (2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Czech Republic*.

Ziomas (coor., 2006): *Feeding in and feeding out and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. A Study of National Policies: Greece*.

Annex

% of 15 year old pupils	Native ¹	Second-generation ²	First-generation ³
Austria	86,8	5,3	7,9
Belgium	86,7	7,0	6,3
Bulgaria	99,8	0,1	0,1
Croatia	88,0	4,8	7,2
Czech Rep	98,1	0,7	1,2
Denmark	92,4	4,2	3,4
Estonia	88,4	10,5	1,1
Finland	98,5	0,2	1,3
France	87,0	9,6	3,4
Germany	85,8	7,7	6,6
Greece	92,4	1,2	6,4
Hungary	98,3	0,4	1,3
Ireland	94,4	1,1	4,5
Italy	96,2	0,7	3,1
Latvia	92,9	6,6	0,5
Lithuania	97,9	1,7	0,4
Luxembourg	63,9	19,5	16,6
Netherlands	88,7	7,8	3,5
Poland	99,8	0,1	0,1
Portugal	94,1	2,4	3,5
Romania	99,9	0	0,1
Slovenia	89,7	8,5	1,8
Slovakia	99,5	0,3	0,1
Spain	93,1	0,8	6,1
Sweden	89,2	6,2	4,7
United Kingdom	91,4	5,0	3,7
Iceland	98,2	0,4	1,4
Liechtenstein	63,2	13,1	23,6
Norway	93,9	3,0	3,1
Turkey	98,5	0,8	0,6
Australia	78,1	12,8	9,0
Canada	78,9	11,2	9,9
China	56,2	24,6	19,2
New Zealand	78,7	6,9	14,3
USA	84,8	9,4	5,8
OECD average	90,7	4,6	4,8

Source: OECD PISA (2006)

¹ Born in the country of assessment with at least one parent born in the same country.

² Born in the country of assessment but whose parents were born in another country.

³ Born in another country and whose parents were born in another country.

Table 2: Migrant Integration Policy: mains measures 2005-2007 Countries Peer Review 2008	
Czech Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) November 2005: Amendment No.428/2005 Coll. to Act on the Residency of Aliens transposed EC Directive on family reunion. 2) May 2006: Parliament failed to override veto on Anti-Discrimination Act by Senate, which found its definitions vague and difficult to implement. 3) April 2006: Amendment No. 161/2006 to Alien Act on long-term residence transposed EC Directive on long-term residents. 4) October 2006: "Active Selection of Qualified Foreign Workers" pilot programme launched.
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Year 2005: Integration Plan "A new chance for everyone". 6) March 2006: The campaign "Show racism the red card". 7) "Initial help" was introduced in July 2002 and is aimed at newly arrived refugees and immigrants. 8) April 2006: New Aliens Act rules that non-EU citizens must pass a high-level test on Danish language and culture. 9) October 2006: New common complaints committee for equal treatment established (to start to work in 2008).
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10) May 2006: Conference of Interior ministers agreed Länder can determine the content of their own naturalisation tests. 11) July 2006: Equality Act transposed EC Directives on anti-discrimination. 12) July 2006: First Integration Summit prepared national integration plan, focus on integration courses, language training, labour market integration, cultural pluralism, media, and gender. 13) July 2006: Family reunion waiting period extended, and German nationals receiving welfare prohibited from sponsoring spouse. 14) January 2007: Federal Constitutional Court affirmed ban on dual nationality. 15) 2007: National Immigration Plan
Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16) October 2005: Greek ombudsman recommended prohibiting the expulsion of third-country national minors, most of whom are unaccompanied or born in Greece. 17) 2005: Anti-discrimination 3304/2005 law was approved, nevertheless Greek Ombudsman's first report as Equality Body identified anti-discrimination shortcomings as mainly linked to lack of independence and operational capacity. 18) July 2006: Late transposition of EC Directive on long-term residents. 19) February 2007: Law n.3536/2007 established National Commission for Immigrants' Integration, but without immigrant representatives.
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20) December 2005: Creation of National Office against Racial Discrimination (UNAR). 21) August 2006: Bill on naturalisation proposed. 22) October 2006: New immigration bill proposed facilitated access for professionals and unskilled workers. 23) November 2006: Social Solidarity Minister proposed that migrants could apply for a new temporary residence permit against proof of having €2,000 to maintain them while looking for work, rather than migrants paying that amount to be smuggled illegally into Italy. 24) January 2007: Transposition of EC Directive on long-term residents by Law n° 3, January 8th, 2007.

Table 2: Migrant Integration Policy: mains measures 2005-2007 Countries Peer Review 2008	
	25) August 2005: Programme for Development of Comprehensive Migration and Asylum

Latvia	<p>Management System 2005-9 launched.</p> <p>26) November 2005: Amendments to the immigration law established criteria for detention and right to appeal.</p> <p>27) December 2005: Latvian National Human Rights office designated equality body.</p> <p>28) June 2006: Transposition of EU Directive on long-term residents raised debate on status of non-nationals.</p> <p>29) 2006 The Government approved the National Programme "The Roma (Gipsies) in Latvia 2007-2009".</p>
The Netherlands	<p>30) March 2006: Civic Integration Abroad entered into force, introducing obligatory integration test in country of origin for family reunion applicants (not valid for persons coming from Australia, Canada, U.S.A., European Economic Area, Japan, Monaco, New Zealand, South Korea, Switzerland and Vatican City).</p> <p>31) November 2006: Voters of immigrant origin turn out for legislative elections at 70%, up from 58% in March local elections.</p> <p>32) January 2007: New Civic Integration Act entered into force.</p> <p>33) January 2007: The Netherlands has opted for a derogation clause in the transposition of the Directive for long-term residents, making simple sickness insurance a condition for long-term residence.</p>
Spain	<p>34) March 2006: Spanish Monitoring Centre against Racism and Xenophobia tasked to propose action and promote equality.</p> <p>35) March 2005: Creation of the "Support Fund for the reception and integration of immigrants and their educational support".</p> <p>36) February 2007: First Strategic Plan on Immigration and Citizenship proposed 2 billion Euros for three-year integration measures.</p>

Source: Migrant Integration Policy Index. British Council and Migration Policy Group, 2007. www.integrationindex.eu; and our own work.

Table 3. Summary report on Integration Policies in the EU- Common Basic Principles		
Two-way process	Country	Actions and tools
	Czech Republic	Updated Concept of Immigrant Integration
	Greece	Integration Action Plan
	Slovenia	Unit for cultural rights of minorities and for the development of cultural diversity
	Belgium	Actions French and Flemish Communities
	Denmark	A fund supports local projects 'Copenhagen Day of Dialogue'
	Germany	German Islam Conference
	Swedish	Swedish Year of Multiculturalism (2006)
	Luxembourg	"Neighbours Festival", "Festival of migrations, cultures and citizenship"
	Finland	Theme day of nationality (Turku)
	Netherlands	Primary and secondary schools
	Irish	National Action Plan against Racism-Planning for diversity
	Slovak Republic	Action Plan to Prevent All Forms of Discrimination, Racism, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance
	Latvia	International Tolerance Day
	Lithuania	A new version of the Code of Ethics of Journalists and Publishers
	Portugal	Week of Culture Diversity
	United Kingdom	Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society
Respect values EU		
	Belgium	Committee of Seven Wise Men
	France	High Council of Integration
	Lithuania	Civic orientation and integration courses
	Luxembourg	Civic education courses
	Bulgaria	Civic education-road to Europe
	Sweden	Integration Board National Action for Human Rights
	The Netherlands	Declaration of Solidarity with the Netherlands (naturalisation ceremonies)
	Germany	Integration courses and naturalisation courses
Employment		
	Czech Republic	Reside legally while looking for a job
	Spain	Catalogue of Labour Shortages in Specific Occupations
	Portugal	Offices of Employment and Entrepreneurial Support for Immigrants
	Poland	Intercultural Centre for Vocational Adaptation. Work Club of the Polish Humanitarian Organisation
	Slovak Republic	Specific web site to advertise vacancies
	Danish	Political agreement "A new change for everyone"
	Germany	Active for Training Places
	Ireland	Employment Rights Information Booklet
	France	Diversity Charter
	Finland	Working group (Ministry of Trade and Industry)
	The Netherlands	Action plan for developing immigrant entrepreneurship. Working group "Migrant Women and Employment".
	Belgian	Diversity Unit (to fight against discrimination at work)
	Greece	Interventions in favour of unemployed women
	Sweden	Special team to provide support (employment office)
	Austria	Employment immigrants in the public sector
	United Kingdom	Industry sectors
	Denmark	Agreement: "A new change for everyone"
Basic Knowledge of the host society		

	Austria	Integration Agreement and German Language training (to receive a residence permit)
	Denmark	Examination on Danish society (to obtain Danish citizenship)
	United Kingdom	"Life in the United Kingdom: A Journey to Citizenship"
	Portugal	National Reception and Integration Centre "Portugal Welcomes You" (new-arrived third country nationals)
	France	Integration Agreement
	Germany	Language classes and integration courses
	Lithuania, Slovenia, Romania, United Kingdom	Personal integration plan (refugees)
	Czech Republic, Greece, Latvia, Sweden, Italy, Spain, Poland	Information material and welcome packages and web sites (new-arrived)
	The Netherlands	Compulsory pre-departure examinations (exclusion refugees and asylum seekers)
	Ireland	Citizens' information centres
	Luxembourg	"Cours Inlux" (Project for Language classes in French)
Efforts in education		
	Austria	Federal law (intercultural teaching and learning)
	Finland	Municipalities (mother tongue)
	Spain	Half of the State Fund for Reception, Integration and Education is used by schools.
	Belgium	French Community (courses): bridge classes, mother tongue tuition.
	Bulgaria	The national programme for the development of education
	Estonia	Resources for training teachers bilingual education
	Romania	Free courses of Romanian
	Finland	Courses for integration immigrant children into the general education system
	Hungary	Courses for integration immigrant children into the general education system
	Greece	Reception and tutorial classes and bilingual (Greek-Turkish) schools (135 in the prefecture of Eastern Macedonia and Thrace)
	Luxembourg	Reception Unit-intercultural mediators
	Portugal	"Choices Program" (to prevent school-leaving)
	United Kingdom	Ethnic Minority Achievement Services. "Aiming High" strategy (funding and guidance materials are provided to local authorities)
	The Netherlands	Meetings (schools and local authorities) Samenspel (for migrant children and their mothers)
	Poland	Children of the World (Kindergarten project)
	Ireland	Department of Education and Science: system of language support for non-English speakers
	Sweden	Specific curriculum for learning Swedish
	France	Language tuition and introductory courses
	Germany	"Active for Training Places"
	Denmark	Campaign "Need For All Youngsters" (2002-2009).

Equality access to institutions		
	Italy	Access to social services: mediation services
	Lithuania	Access to public offices: interpretation
	Austria	Special multi-language information desks
	Denmark	User Panel of the Danish Immigration Service
	Poland	Information within public institutions
	Sweden	Action plans to take into account cultural diversity (government agencies)
	The Netherlands	Structures of the government (anti-discrimination project)
	Finland	"Handbook on equality data" (Ministry of Labour, containing good anti-discrimination practises)
	Czech Republic	Multicultural education and language skills (public administration staff)
	Bulgaria	Multicultural education (social assistants)
	Romania	Employ interpreters and cultural mediators (public services)
	Slovak Republic	Multicultural education (staff of labour, social and family affairs offices)
	Hungary	Training on integration issues (desk officers of family)
	Latvia	Centre of trust (contact point with institutions)
	Ireland	Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service (one-stop-shop)
	Portugal	SOS Service for Immigrants
	United Kingdom	Strategic Upgrade of National Refugee Integration Services (Sunrise)
Interaction		
	Greece	Cultural mediators and volunteering. Hellenic Migration Policy Institute
	Italy	Cultural mediators and volunteering
	Spain	Cultural mediators and volunteering
	Austria	Department for integration and diversity matters
	Ireland	Local community groups
	Bulgaria	"Sports Vacation Programme"
	Estonia	An employment exchange programme (between different regions)
	Denmark	Participation of immigrants in volunteering organisations
	Lithuania	Web-site
	Luxembourg	Entertainment workshops
	The Netherlands	Broad Initiative for Social Cohesion (many projects)
	United Kingdom	Action plan on intercultural dialogue. A government "Respect Task Force". "Leading Cohesive Communities-a guide for leaders and chief executives"
	Germany	The Local Aliens Registration Offices

The practice of diverse cultures and religions		
	Denmark	Initiatives fostering intercultural dialogue
	Germany	Federal level conference with representatives of Muslim communities
	Finland	Working group on intercultural and inter-religious dialogue (Advisory Board for Ethnic Relations)
	Italy	Council for Italian Islam (created by the Ministry of the Interior in 2005)
	Latvia	Information campaign against Islamophobia
	Luxembourg	Inter religious group (public conferences)
	Sweden	Meetings (Minister responsible for religious affairs and religious communities)
	The Netherlands	Training for spiritual leaders (Muslims' organisations, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the Ministry for Immigration and Integration)
Participation of immigrants		
	Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, the Netherlands, Denmark	Entitled to vote in local elections
	Spain	Entitled to vote in local elections (EU foreigners). Forum for the Integration of Immigrants.
	Luxembourg	Commissions communales consultatives
	Belgium	Forum for Ethnic minorities
	Portugal	Consultation Council for Immigration Affairs (COCAI)
	Denmark	Councils for Ethnic Minorities (many municipalities)
	France	National Council for the Integration of Immigrant Population
	Ireland	Local Level Forums
	Italy	"Council dealing with third-country nationals and their families" (national level) and "Immigration Territorial Councils" (local level)
	Sweden	Network of elected representatives from municipalities and Country Councils
	United Kingdom	Commission on Integration and Cohesion
Mainstreaming integration policies		
	Czech Republic	All relevant Ministers
	Belgium	All relevant Ministers
	Finland	The Integration Act
	Greece	An inter-ministerial committee (Minister of Interior, Public Administration and Decentralisation)
	Romania	Inter-institutional cooperation
	Ireland	Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service

Evaluation		
	Denmark	Minister of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs published every year an study on integration indicators
	Sweden	The Swedish Integration Board
	Portugal	Immigration Observatory
	Spain	Permanent Observatory of Immigration
	Germany	External contractors
	Estonia	External contactors and a public opinion survey
	Ireland	Indicators of State funding initiatives on integration
	Czech Republic	Commission for the Integration of foreigners

Source: Based on *the Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration*, COM (2007) 512 final; and our own work.