

Integrating Cities Toolkit

Making participation effective
in diverse neighbourhoods



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EUROCITIES would like to acknowledge the authors of these toolkits Richard Stanton, Sue Lukes, Anna Reisenberger and Simon Güntner from MigrationWork. Their work devising and adapting the methodology of the project, facilitating its process and producing toolkit content has been invaluable.

We would also like to thank the EUROCITIES Working Group Migration & Integration, its former Chair Mr. Ramon Sanahuja i Vèlez (Barcelona) and current Chair Ms Anu Riila (Helsinki) for its guiding role in the production of these publications and its contribution to best practice examples.

Finally, we would like to thank all the city partners involved in the ImpleMentoring project whose experience and feedback contributed to shaping the benchmarks and providing practices to illustrate the key factors:

AARHUS: Anne-Marie Larsen

AMSTERDAM: Engelien Hengeveld, Hettie Politiek

ATHENS: Eleni Tsipoura, Panagiotis Psathas, Maria Kouveli

COPENHAGEN: Trine Dencker Christensen, Thor Ridderhaugen, Jacob Midtgaard

DUBLIN: Declan Hayden (city council) Reginald Oko-Flex Inya (New Community Partnership)

GENOA: Danilo Parodi, Oriano Pianezza

GHENT: Marc Van Acker, Maaïke Buyst, Mohammed El Bakali

LUBLIN: Roman Jaborkhel (city council), Marta Jedrych, Michal Wojcik (Nowy Staw Foundation)

MALMÖ: Sigrid Saveljeff, Fiona Winders

MANCHESTER: Shefali Kapoor, Adam Farricker

MILAN: Caterina Sarfatii, Antonella Colombo, Maura Gambarana

OSLO: Toralv Moe, Tone Skodvin

RIGA: Irina Vasiljeva, Ilona Stalidzane

ROTTERDAM: Marije Pluijm, Evelien Kentje, Ronald Derks

TAMPERE: Marja Nyrhinen, Jaana Halonen, Päivi Sinkkonen

Copyright © 2014 EUROCITIES asbl, Brussels, Belgium. If you would like to cite any part of this publication, please make reference to its title and authoring organisation.

Work to produce the thematic benchmark in this toolkit was led by ImpleMentoring partner Migration Work CIC, a not-for-profit consultancy which works on issues of migration and integration / www.migrationwork.org

Available from EUROCITIES asbl

www.eurocities.eu / www.integratingcities.eu / info@eurocities.eu

About

The **Integrating Cities toolkits** offer practical, tested guidance and inspiration to help cities to reach European standards in key areas of migrant integration –as set out in the **EUROCITIES Integrating Cities Charter**.

Three Integrating Cities toolkits were developed in 2012 through the work of the transnational project **Making integration work in Europe's cities (MIXITIES)**, funded by the European Integration Fund. They covered:

- Introductory and language courses;
- Anti-discrimination policies; and
- Promoting cultural diversity.

Through the work of the new Integrating Cities project ImpleMentoring “City to City support for migrant integration”, four new toolkits were developed in 2014 and cover the themes of:

- Enhancing public perception on migration and diversity
- Managing diversity and promoting equality in cities' administration and service provision
- Making participation effective in diverse neighbourhoods
- Engagement of migrant communities in local policy-making processes and political participation

The toolkits are designed primarily for people working in local authorities in Europe's larger cities. But they may also be useful for smaller local administrations in Europe and beyond, and for the partners of local authorities such as NGOs. Whether your authority already works on these integration themes, or is starting out, the Integrating Cities toolkits can help.

How were the toolkits developed?

In each toolkit you will find an **Integrating Cities benchmark**, together with guidance and examples to help users to apply it.

The benchmark is drawn from a Europe-wide review of cities' experience in working on each of our three themes. In the **ImpleMentoring** project city practitioners, together with independent experts, identified key features of local policy, practice and governance which - for each theme - make the difference in enabling cities to reach the Integrating Cities standard.

Testing itself against the benchmark, a city can see how near it is to the standards of the Integrating Cities Charter. It can see what more it needs to do to meet those standards. And it can find inspiration to match the best, most effective practice among the cities of Europe.

A fuller explanation of benchmarks and ImpleMentoring method is provided by the methodology overview leaflet, separately in this folder.

In addition to these toolkits, monitoring of the implementation of the Charter is also done through the annual Integrating Cities survey of signatory cities.



Foreword

Facilitating engagement from migrant communities and removing barriers to participation for migrants is one of the commitments inscribed in the EUROCIITIES Integrating Cities Charter. Signed by 33 European cities, the Charter identifies the duties and responsibilities of cities to embrace diversity and provide equal opportunities for all residents.

With Milan and eight other cities (Amsterdam, Athens, Dublin, Genoa, Ghent, Malmo, Oslo and Rotterdam) as well as experts from MigrationWork and EUROCIITIES, we have embarked on a process to identify ways in which we can involve our migrant populations in all aspects of public life. This commitment arises out of the imperative that involving citizens will advance social cohesion and improve quality of life.

Our focus in the 18 months of the ImpleMentoring project has been to look at our role as local authorities in promoting two separate but interrelated dimensions of migrant participation: civic and political engagement. Although presented as two separate benchmarks, the toolkits on “Engagement in local policy-making processes and political participation of migrant communities” and “Making participation effective in diverse neighbourhoods” can be seen as complementary. Both offer formal and informal paths to promote participation of migrants and facilitate engagement which can elicit a sense of belonging.

We have come to recognize the critical role we can play as cities to encourage migrants to take part in public life and decision-making, even if in some cases these efforts may starkly contradict those of national governments. In Milan we have even sought to address these national barriers by joining forces with the city of Genoa and launching a campaign in favour of more open citizenship laws and local voting rights for migrants.

This benchmark and its counterpart (Engagement in local policy-making processes and political participation of migrant communities) have been developed with our involvement and put under scrutiny in our cities. We hope the resulting toolkits, with illustrative examples from cities across Europe, will serve as a source of inspiration and support to public authorities seeking to enhance engagement from migrant communities and remove barriers for their participation.

In Milan, we are on our way to reaching these benchmarks and thus building meaningful paths for participation of all citizens – irrespective of their origin or status. Nevertheless, to fulfill this goal; institutions at all levels need to play their part. Only then will we be able to advance towards our objective of creating inclusive urban citizenship for all.

Caterina Sarfatti,
city of Milan
Vice-chair, EUROCIITIES Working Group Migration & Integration

Making participation effective in diverse neighbourhoods

Integrating Cities standard

Where a city sets up schemes at neighbourhood level for participation by residents in decisions about the future of their area, it makes sure that these schemes fully include those who are migrants (or of migrant background) and gives them a voice on the same basis as other neighbourhood residents.

The EUROCIITIES Integrating Cities Charter includes the commitment to *Facilitate engagement from migrant communities in our policy-making processes and remove barriers to participation*. This corresponds to the call by the EU's Justice and Home Affairs Council in 2004, as one of its Common Basic Principles for Integration which continues to guide EU policy: The participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies and measures, especially at the local level, supports their integration.

Where diversity is being increased by international migration, cities can make a major contribution to achieving these EU objectives by enabling resident participation at neighbourhood level. Firstly participation at that level will in general be open to all residents - avoiding barriers which may be created for migrants at higher levels of the political system by restrictions on voting rights. Secondly and more fundamentally, participation schemes at this level will deal mainly with issues of everyday life - such as the immediate environment, neighbourhood amenities and services - which is a sphere where integration of ‘host’ and migrant communities can readily happen.

Lastly, residents taking part in such schemes will, across lines of cultural or ethnic difference, be deliberating together and possibly reaching collective decisions on action, in the process finding a common purpose. Their activity helps to create participatory democracy, which can complement and support representative democracy. Prompting more positive perceptions of migration and diversity, this may strengthen social and civic cohesion.

Coverage of this benchmark

The ImpleMentoring project defined its theme C in very broad terms, looking into the factors that enable participation exercises of all types, organised at sub-city or neighbourhood level, to work effectively where the population is 'diverse'. Here 'diversity' is understood to include the range of differences in nationality, ethnicity, culture and residence status that result from international migration to the city, especially in the first generation (those who have themselves migrated) but also where relevant in succeeding generations.

The benchmark for this theme was drafted on the basis of a review of practitioner and official reports, academic analysis, and surveys of practice in the area of neighbourhood participation at national, EU and global levels, plus helpful input from city partners in the ImpleMentoring project.

The following points should be noted about it:

- To be useful to cities across Europe, the benchmark aims to cover the enormous range of participation activities or structures which take place in them - from informal, small-scale actions launched by residents themselves, or short-term city consultation exercises, through to permanent systems of devolved government within a city. The simple term *scheme* is used to allow for all these varieties of 'participation'.
- This is a benchmark for the steps which cities must take if neighbourhood-level participation schemes are to be as truly open and inclusive for migrants and their children's generation, as for every other resident. It identifies, that is, preconditions that ensure their real and equal access to such schemes. In some cases they can only be secured by city-wide policy on participation and equality in general.
- The benchmark's broad remit means that some of its key factors relate directly to theme D which looks at steps taken at city-wide level to promote participation, particularly in processes of public decision-making in the city (Engagement in local policy-making processes and political participation of migrant communities). **Users of this benchmark may find it useful to refer across to the theme D toolkit, if they are interested in the links between neighbourhood participation and these wider policies and processes of the city.**

Note on terms used in the benchmark

- Scheme = participation scheme: at any sub-city level, whether for a specified time period or as a permanent part of city government.
- Migrant = person born outside the country in question, who has moved to live there for at least 12 months (UN definition) or resident of 'migrant background', including person born to migrant parents (according to definitions varying between Member States). Cities may wish to use other definitions, according to their practice, in applying this benchmark.

CITY-WIDE FRAMEWORK



DEFINING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

In marking out the 'neighbourhood' or area of intervention where a participation scheme will be set up, the city

- takes into account demographic and social processes, and residents' own sense of place, as well as administrative units;
- allows for current administrative units to be sub-divided where necessary, so that residents take part in decisions for an area which feels 'real' to them

Though 'neighbourhood' may have to be defined on administrative lines in some cases, to match delivery of services, a scheme may be most effective if it covers an area with which most residents identify, and where they share common interests

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- **What criteria are used to set the borders of a 'neighbourhood'?**
- **In deciding these borders, does the city refer to social processes like change – past or projected – in housing markets, labour market and migration?**
- **Have residents been asked how they would define their neighbourhood?**
- **Have views on this question been gathered from different groups in the area including migrant and ethnic minority residents?**

EXAMPLES

••• ATHENS

The city is divided into seven districts, each with an elected administration. The 6th District, covering a wide area near the centre, has high population density and diversity as well as much deprivation. Many recent immigrants live there. It is considered an area of high tension, so questions of cohesion and participation are critical. But when the city used ImpleMentoring to find ways to 'overcome hostility to immigration and promote social cohesion', it chose to focus on the neighbourhood around Kypseli Square at the heart of the 6th District.

This area is central to social, economic and administrative activity affecting residents across the District, and is among the oldest and best-known parts of Athens. Kypseli can count on a strong feeling of belonging and pride from permanent residents and both native and migrant residents express a common sense of its identity.

••• BIRMINGHAM

In drafting its city-wide strategy 'Transforming Place', the council designed a toolkit for identifying neighbourhoods. Its aim was 'to achieve broad agreement on neighbourhoods that most residents in an area would recognise'. First, existing district and ward-level committees draw up a draft map of neighbourhoods in their area, referring to past neighbourhood work; key features of local infrastructure; and the knowledge of elected representatives. They add a short description of socio-economic and environmental aspects of each suggested neighbourhood, and then put the map out to consultation including a public meeting for residents, businesses and front-line workers.

In the light of feedback, each of the city's district committees would agree the definition of neighbourhoods in their area. The toolkit emphasises that these should be flexible, open to change over time.

CITY'S PARTICIPATION STRATEGY



The city council adopts a city-wide strategy for participation by residents at neighbourhood level, and gives clear political leadership in carrying it out.

Grass-roots participation in city affairs works in the long term only with support and oversight by the local state. Democratically responsible for development of the whole city, the city council needs an overarching strategy for participation at neighbourhood level that specifies its terms, what support will be offered, and what powers will be devolved. Political leadership is vital to make sure these ground rules are implemented

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- Has the city council an overall strategy for participation, agreed with lower-level municipal authorities, which can guide schemes in neighbourhoods across the city?
- Is it easily accessible for non-specialist residents, including those for whom the local language is not their first?
- Does the strategy set clear guidelines for scheme members on these issues:
 - the relationship between council powers and the tasks of a scheme, showing how its views will feed into city decision-making?
 - proper handling of finance?
 - where to seek resources to support a participation scheme?
 - governance in a scheme, including principles for electing or appointing representatives?
- Does it make clear each scheme's duty to promote equal treatment for all equalities groups and to tackle prejudice against them, regardless of country of origin, nationality and ethnic identity?
- Where does lead responsibility lie, for seeing that this strategy is carried out – at political level or with a manager? If a manager, is s/he at a senior level?

EXAMPLES

• • • **KATOWICE** -----
 From 2008 the city carried out a major ESF-funded project on social and employment activation which included a strategy to promote citizens' participation and capacity-building in neighbourhoods. Key concepts were partnership; community problem-solving; the role of community organiser; and local activity centres where public agencies engage residents in their tasks with the guideline 'Discover the power of community'.

The neighbourhood of Nikiszowiec – where employment in coal mining was lost after 1989 – applied this city strategy to begin regeneration. An activity centre was set up to engage the community in 'independent problem-solving'. It aims to embrace all residents across social and demographic groups; develop leadership; open up discussion of plans for change; build partnership; promote growth of NGOs and cooperatives; and encourage pride in the neighbourhood. Nikiszowiec reports improvement since 2008 in population trends, crime rate, environment and perceptions of the area.

• • • **ROTTERDAM** -----
 The Opzoomeren strategy, pursued by the city since the late 1980s, aims to involve residents in actions within the public domain which they share at street level. Its key principle is self-reliance: with the city as funder and facilitator, it stimulates residents to devise, control and execute their own initiatives themselves. With annual budget of €1.3m, it is coordinated by a team of seven.

On a yearly basis 15% of Rotterdam's population (about 90,000 people) participate via Opzoomeren in around 2500 initiatives. More than 1800 streets took part in 2013, with 70 initiatives that focused on language: in the neighbourhood of Feijenoord for instance, inhabitants help each other with Dutch language skills.

Other examples of Opzoomeren actions: in the district Kralingen-West, elementary school students and senior citizens in a nearby old peoples home organised activities to meet and learn from each other; while Hoogvliet residents organised special 'fundays' to give a break to young people who are informal carers for relatives.

EQUAL VOICES



The city publishes guidance for participatory schemes, on how to ensure that all residents have an equal chance to make their voices heard in scheme events at all levels, including neighbourhood activity.

Participation by residents in this activity only becomes a reality when they feel their contribution is valued as much as everyone else's. The challenge may be especially great for migrants, partly because of cultural difference but also because of public controversy about migration.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- Does the city publish and disseminate guidelines on enabling all residents to contribute on an equal basis to dialogue and decision-making in the activity - whether in formal meetings, open events, or online - and to feel welcome in it
- Do issues covered by this guidance include
 - alternative ways of participating, besides itraditional meetings?
 - Accessibility of events, including timing?
 - How discussions are moderated /chaired, and skills for this role?
 - Use of language that all can understand?
 - Ensuring mutual respect, upholding equalities principles, valuing diversity and challenging prejudice?
 - Ensuring clear feedback from each event, to participants?
- Does the guidance show how to engage migrant residents with varying cultural background, so they can play a full part in scheme discussions?

EXAMPLE

• • • **HELSINKI** -----
 Ruuti (meaning Gunpowder ie. 'explosive') is the city's far-reaching programme to support the civic participation of young people. It aims to broaden youth participation beyond a minority to give a voice to all young residents of Helsinki. Besides offering them access to decision-makers at city level (and informally at national or international level), Ruuti focuses on their role in actions at sub-city level. In two districts of Helsinki it has piloted participatory budgeting that 'gives direct budget and activity planning power to young residents', and one of its core objectives is to strengthen their attachment to their neighbourhood.

An equalities framework for Ruuti is set by the overall *Non-discrimination and equality policy 2014-2017* of the city's Youth Department. Laying down the principle of 'equality in participation', this calls for activities supported by the Department to respect human rights and challenge discrimination on all dimensions of equalities. Besides (for example) gender, sexual orientation and disability, these include ethnicity and cultural difference, and the policy urges respect for cultural identity including different languages. It gives a strong steer to neighbourhood-level work with its call for 'barrier-free meetings and joint activities between different kinds of people'.

WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

COMMUNITY SELF-ORGANISATION



The scheme bases itself so far as possible on existing self-organisation among neighbourhood residents, and embraces diversity (on all equalities dimensions) by engaging the full range of self-organised community groups active in its area, whether formally or informally.

Participation promoted by the city is most likely to succeed where citizens have already independently organised to promote their own aims. By keeping an open door for self-organised groups, this activity can reflect the diversity of its neighbourhood and engage residents who – like some migrants – may hesitate to get involved as individuals.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- What was the level of activism and self-organisation in this neighbourhood (including groups extending into other areas), before the scheme's launch?
- What role have community-led organisations played in the design and running of the scheme?
- Do they include any formed by migrant / ethnic minority residents, and how far have such groups got involved in the scheme?
- Does the scheme encourage independent community-led organisations - including those not formally represented in its structures - to engage with it; and does it maintain regular dialogue with them?

EXAMPLES

••• GHENT

The city has provided for temporary community use a 1.5 hectare site in the Rabot district – formerly the floor of a factory – which is destined eventually to be redeveloped for an urban renewal scheme. The Site, as it is known, has been transformed into a meeting place for the neighbourhood with barbecue equipment, allotment gardens, a soccer field, a children's farm and playground, and a container work centre. A large open space is also used for community celebrations and other events.

Whilst two major NGOs helped to launch the project, residents and organisations of the neighbourhood have got steadily more involved and are now mainly responsible for developing and managing The Site. They give voluntary support to its activities: for example, a group of migrant women took responsibility for the barbecue. Via the city, The Site receives on average regional funding of €100k per annum, of which 60% is for staffing.

••• TURIN

Neighbourhood houses or Case del Quartiere (CdQs) have since the early 2000s become important instruments for participation and cohesion, often in areas with high immigrant population. Some of the nine houses (2014) were initiated by civil society, others by the city authority. But all are spaces of active citizenship and participation, built on self-organisation. Community and neighbourhood associations are involved from the start in setting up 'their' CdQ so that, from its opening, each house is full of residents and associations who share a sense of belonging to it. The CdQ then hosts and supports community associations, local NGOs, migrant organisations and informal groups of citizens in developing educational, cultural and social activities as well as services and help desks.

NEIGHBOURHOOD REVIEW



Design and running of the participation scheme are informed by a review of the neighbourhood, with input from residents, which looks in depth at who lives there; key challenges; and constraints on the action they can take locally.

To help prepare its strategy and inform its work, the scheme needs to start with a clear, balanced and objective picture of its neighbourhood and patterns of change within it. It should be based on residents' knowledge of neighbourhood life, though other expertise may also be needed to help them to build an overall analysis.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- In launching the scheme, what evidence was gathered from residents of the neighbourhood and other sources to get a picture of
 - its population, and how it is changing
 - service gaps, needs and challenges
 - outside constraints on what it can achieve, including national or regional policy and structural factors like economic change?
- What steps were taken to get input from different sections of the population, including migrants?
- How does the scheme update this review of the neighbourhood over time, and what role do its residents play in this process?

EXAMPLE

••• GHENT

In the city's 'Neighbourhood of the Month: Dampoort' initiative in 2013, residents and organisations of this area gave views about it directly to politicians and officers through a range of activities. The keynote of this approach – to be repeated city-wide – is that dialogue with city authorities should follow an agenda set from the bottom up, not from the top down.

Overall thirteen activities were organised, in settings from public spaces to a resident's living room. Each addressed a specific topic - from housing and recreation space, to security - with the relevant Deputy Mayor present.

A key challenge was to involve recent immigrants and others at risk of social exclusion. The 'Dampoort Fair' helped to do this. It included a showing - attended by the Mayor - of a video made by residents where people from diverse backgrounds talked frankly about neighbourhood life; and a popular 'speed dating' session where they expressed views face to face with the Mayor and senior colleagues.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR PARTICIPATION



For each area where residents are developing participation activities, the city prepares with them an action plan which sets out what these activities aim to achieve, how they will work - including who runs them - and how they will feed into decision-making by the city council and other public agencies.

Residents will remain committed to the scheme over the long term only if it begins by setting expectations at a realistic level; recognises its own limits; and guarantees that its own procedures will be transparent and inclusive, treating them all with respect. These requirements can be met by a simple strategic statement, at its start.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- **Has an action plan or strategy been agreed for this activity, taking into account the neighbourhood review (KF5), which makes clear:**
 - **agreed objectives for the activity and steps towards them, with timeline**
 - **what resources (financial or other) will be available to support it**
 - **how this neighbourhood action relates to the city council and other key actors, and their decision-making**
 - **arrangements for steering it, including procedures for electing or appointing residents as local representatives where necessary?**
- **Is this statement in line with City policies on equalities and participation?**
- **Does it make clear how residents of migrant and ethnic minority background will be involved in the scheme?**

EXAMPLES

- **AARHUS** -----
In working with vulnerable residential areas, the city gives priority to residents' participation. It plays a crucial part in planning redevelopment of the deprived and very diverse neighbourhood of Gellerup, helping to build a sense of local ownership over the project.

This includes a new park as a focus for cultural and sports activities, with social and environmental benefits. The city has been keen to involve residents in designing and creating the park.

To bring young residents into this participatory process, the council arranged 'inspirational trips' taking groups of young girls and boys from Gellerup to visit areas in Denmark's capital city Copenhagen where similar urban development projects had been completed. Finding any elements which inspired them, the young people were asked to take photos of these features and to consider how these could help to make their own new park attractive for residents of all ages. Their input has been taken into account in further work to plan this neighbourhood development.-----
- **LEIPZIG** -----
The 'Integrated concept for Leipzig's East' is a 10-year development strategy for neighbourhoods in one of Leipzig's most disadvantaged urban districts with complex social problems. The concept prioritises improvement and networking between educational institutions and the economy at neighbourhood level. It shows how different disciplines and stakeholders can be integrated at neighbourhood level. This integrated strategy was developed during 2011 and 2012 with intensive participation of local actors and residents as well as municipal departments.-----

RESOURCES: RUNNING THE SCHEME



The city authority and partners invest enough resources in the scheme to ensure that they can engage fully with it, and that it can reach out to all neighbourhood residents including recent migrants and others at risk of exclusion from local civic life

Though voluntary effort by residents is at the heart of the scheme, its success also depends on input from the city council and possibly other agencies. As well as dedicated officer support in the neighbourhood, this includes costs like internal staff capacity and training, for which resources need to be identified.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- **What resources (apart from residents' own time) are available to support the operation of the scheme?**
- **Have the city council and other institutional partners in the scheme allocated enough staff capacity to work consistently within it?**
- **Are training and briefings offered to political representatives and officers in partner agencies, to prepare them for collaborative roles in the scheme?**
- **Has the scheme got a dedicated front-line officer (or officers) who can engage regularly with people in all sections of the neighbourhood's population and across equalities categories, including migrants; promote the work of the scheme; and encourage them to take part in it?**

EXAMPLES

- **ZURICH** -----
Each neighbourhood in Zurich has a community centre whose activities are planned by - and for - the local population. Coordination teams within the city administration observe developments across different areas of the city, and support local initiatives by civil society. Security is addressed by the SIP service (security, intervention, prevention) which is present in public spaces to anticipate and prevent conflicts. Small local projects relevant for integration at the neighbourhood level are supported financially by the city with a budget of around €150k per annum.-----
- **BIRMINGHAM** -----
The 'Our Place' programme (developed in 2013) aims to create a neighbourhood-level community budget that is co-designed with residents. The community plays a leading role, working with the council and other statutory bodies to shape local services so they work from a resident's perspective.

The first step is to set up a network of all local social service providers, in order for them to shape an integrated approach to service delivery and understand each other's needs. The next step is to draft a budget aligned to agreed initiatives carried out by providers, where also residents can have a greater influence over service design and delivery. A pilot has been launched in the Shard End neighbourhood of the city.-----

SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS



Adequate support is available to ensure that residents who get involved in the scheme can make their voices heard, including migrants, and that the diverse communities and interests of the neighbourhood can be represented in a stable, transparent and sustainable way over time.

If they are to contribute effectively to the scheme on an equal basis, residents may need a range of support services, plus training and briefings for those who take representative roles. Whichever procedure for filling these roles is agreed in its founding strategy (KF6), the scheme will also need help to carry it through efficiently and transparently.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- **What support is offered to residents of the neighbourhood to ensure that its activity is equally accessible to all of them? Does it include for instance**
 - childcare
 - help for those with disabilities
 - interpreting?
- **When residents take on roles as representatives within the scheme, what training is available to enable them to work effectively and to deal as equals with officials from partner agencies?**
- **How does this training take into account the experience and needs of residents of migrant and ethnic minority background, equalities issues and intercultural awareness?**
- **When the scheme needs to elect or appoint residents to representative positions**
 - is support given by the city or other outside partners, to ensure that the procedure is open to all?
 - is there external oversight, to guarantee that it is fair and transparent?

EXAMPLES

- **MALMÖ** -----
The All Activities Centre (AAC, Allaktivitetshuset) is a civic participation project in Malmö's South district. Using the concept of free activities in an out-of-hours programme in local schools, pupils and neighbourhood residents decide which activities the centre should have. They then plan, lead and run them. The centres are very well-used by all sections of the community.

To the first AAC in the Lindängen neighbourhood, the city recently added a similar centre in Hermodsdal. Between them they receive approximately 6,000 visits every month. Participation by target-group women and girls in diverse neighbourhoods is particularly high. City resources to support the centre – apart from the school premises – include an annual budget of around €170k (with one-third from ERDF).

Experience to date shows how this award-winning AAC model, giving local people responsibility for their own initiatives and for the public facilities that support them, can not only build community participation but also improve school results and the behaviour of young people in and around school. School leaders suggest that this reflects the confidence, well-being and sense of responsibility which pupils have gained from participating in their AAC.
- **DUBLIN** -----
The 'Practical Guide to Integration' drawn up for local authorities in the Dublin area, though aimed primarily at city and other councils, also relates to good practice for participation at other levels. It notes the importance of preparing participants from the city's 'new communities' for roles in civic participation, by offering them training in effective committee organisation, consensus decision-making, leadership and representing community interests through council structures. The Guide also points out the need to address practical barriers to participation, for example by providing officer support and covering costs of attendance at meetings.

STAKEHOLDERS



In promoting participation within the neighbourhood, the City

- engages a broad range of actors with a stake in its future - including public agencies, businesses including local traders, and NGOs representing groups not self-organised within the neighbourhood;
- draws on their links and expertise to involve local communities including migrants.

Whilst the scheme aims above all to give a voice to residents, it will be more effective if it also draws in other stakeholders from across sectors. Improving the neighbourhood usually calls for sustained collaboration between agencies and with the private sector, while civil society bodies can represent residents who lack advocacy at that level. The scheme gains authority from this engagement by a range of actors.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- **Which external stakeholders are involved in the scheme; from which sectors; how were they chosen, and by whom?**
- **Do they include migrant service suppliers including shops, other small or medium enterprises, and non-profit community providers?**
- **What roles do these stakeholders play, and do they respond to opinions or decisions of others taking part in the neighbourhood activity?**
- **How far are they committed to sustaining these roles, for the long term?**
- **Has stakeholders' engagement with the scheme made it easier for them to work together in the neighbourhood, in providing services or undertaking economic or social activity?**

EXAMPLES

- **ATHENS** -----
To promote the message of cohesion and co-existence, city authorities have focused especially on the Kypseli area (see above) where a range of participative activities is developing. Within neighbourhoods of Kypseli, many self-organized residents' groups are active (such as shopkeepers' unions, migrant associations, initiatives of social solidarity) together with NGOs working on issues like homelessness, public health, and migrants' rights.

But the coordination of these actors and stakeholders cannot be taken for granted. As from 2014, the city is drawing up a 'social map' or register of socially-oriented organizations and initiatives that are active in Kypseli, working to address residents' everyday problems. The aim is partly to enhance the neighbourhood's profile, but also to make communication easier between all these actors.
- **TURIN** -----
The 'neighbourhood houses' (CdQ – see also key factor 4) emerged in some cases from initiatives by citizens and NGOs while others were initiated by the city. But in every case the CdQ relies on partnership in its neighbourhood, working with a broad mix of stakeholders.

Firstly these houses collaborate with municipal departments and other service providers who can help their users, including hospitals, schools and libraries. Private charitable foundations, secondly, are important partners – especially as they largely fund the houses. Finally and crucially, activities and projects taking place in each CdQ will typically engage a wide range of civil society groups from cultural associations or trade unions to migrant associations, informal groups of citizens and professionals.

COORDINATION AT NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL



The City helps those supporting participatory activity by residents in neighbourhoods - whether public agencies or civil society actors - to coordinate their roles at that level, so that they can work consistently and effectively with residents to carry out their neighbourhood action plan.

As participatory action develops at neighbourhood level, it often calls for a response by several city agencies and other service providers. A mechanism for regular liaison at that level will help agencies to respond effectively and efficiently to residents' ideas, building confidence in the participation process. Similarly when the neighbourhood action is informal and bottom-up - with input from civil society groups rather than public service providers - the city may be able to help by facilitating coordination between them.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- In the neighbourhood where the participation scheme takes place, what arrangement has the city made to bring together its own departments and other service providers, so they can coordinate work at that level?
- How does this inter-agency group engage with representatives of residents and other stakeholders?
- Does it meet regularly, and at what interval?
- Have the agencies taking part in it, enough delegated authority to make things happen at this neighbourhood level in response to residents' views?
- Where action has developed 'bottom up' on residents' own initiative, does the city facilitate coordination between NGOs or other non-state actors involved in supporting it?

EXAMPLE

••• MALMÖ

Agencies in the two neighbourhoods of Lindängen and Hermodsdal in Malmö meet over breakfast every second week to coordinate their activities. Representatives from council departments such as schools, libraries, youth clubs, older peoples services, social services and the areas' activities centres (see KF 8 above) meet informally with landlords, police and other local stakeholders such as NGOs. The purpose of these meetings is an exchange of information and knowledge, joint planning and discovering opportunities for practical partnership.

The meetings and resulting relationships have created 'Area Teams' who find ways of complementing each other's work for the benefit of the neighbourhoods. The concept has resulted in - and builds upon - improved communication and knowledge of different perspectives on the same neighborhood, plus close collaboration in both planning and implementation. The focus for Area Teams' work is always what residents say that they want, and how their participation in implementation can best be promoted and supported.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION



The scheme incorporates systems for

- monitoring progress against its strategic aims, so it can learn and adapt over time;
- evaluating its processes, its results and outcomes of its work beyond its own lifespan.

Using methods adapted to a diverse population, monitoring and evaluation can help to make the neighbourhood scheme a system for learning-by-doing, able to respond to rapid change in such areas. Monitoring - openly reporting both success and setbacks - will enhance the scheme's credibility in the eyes of residents. Well-planned evaluation can capture key long-run outcomes, and may help to make the case for mainstreaming the scheme.

GUIDE QUESTIONS

- Has the scheme agreed on a set of indicators or tests - quantitative or qualitative - to show its progress towards goals set by its own strategy?
- Were these indicators chosen by residents of the neighbourhood and if not, how has the scheme checked that they are meaningful to a large majority of residents, including those of varying cultural backgrounds?
- Has the scheme a system for regularly monitoring its progress against these indicators, and reporting results to its board (or other governing body)?
- Will this monitoring specifically cover progress towards equalities goals, including levels of participation by migrant and ethnic minority residents and its outcomes for them?
- What arrangement has been made to evaluate the scheme - its processes, impact at the end of its life, and longer-term outcomes after it has closed?
- When, and how, can residents feed their opinions into monitoring and evaluation of the scheme, and are findings reported back to them?
- Can the scheme change course, in response to messages from its monitoring or evaluation?

EXAMPLE

••• AMSTERDAM

The city's programma Wijkaanpak or district programme 2008-13 devolved a substantial budget to 19 neighbourhoods where citizens could themselves decide how to use it on social or environmental actions.

Results have been extensively monitored and evaluated throughout this period, using both quantitative and qualitative information, with a focus on three basic indicators: residents' feelings of safety; satisfaction with the neighbourhood and how it is changing; and who participates in the actions, including 'new' migrant groups. These were supplemented with data for instance on crime and graffiti. Methods used for monitoring and evaluation have included street interviews, postal surveys, and research studies by local academics (especially on levels of participation).

Findings have been published regularly online, alongside information on the activities across all neighbourhoods so they could compare and learn from one another. The city has also held a series of large meetings open to all participating citizens - 'day (or night) of the district' - where monitoring and evaluation reports could be fed back to them and discussed.

CONTEXT FACTORS

The following are a list of factors that can affect the ability of your city to meet the benchmark. You can refer to these when using the toolkit to explain a particular context in which the city operates in reaching the European standard.

CONTEXT FACTOR	EXAMPLES OF WHAT THIS FACTOR MAY INVOLVE
• National legislation and policy	Division of competences between central and city administrations; rules limiting city's power to provide services to migrants, or ways of delivering them.
• Data availability	Limits on sources of quantitative data - or qualitative information where relevant.
• Migrant population	History of migration including recent changes; make-up of current migrant population (eg. language requirements, diversity, links with previous settlement).
• Labour market and other economic conditions	Rates of unemployment and skills requirements of local employers, opportunities for self-employment.
• City resources	Availability of financial resources for integration actions; changes in budget.
• City's political situation	Political control within city administration; its policies on migration and integration; electoral outlook.
• Civil society in the city	Degree of development of civil society in the city – both migrant-run organisations and others; extent of engagement in municipal decision-making.

About the ImpleMentoring project

ImpleMentoring was a city-to-city support project running from November 2012 to May 2014, introducing to the field of mutual learning between cities the concept of mentoring.

Led by EUROCITIES, the ImpleMentoring project promoted mutual learning between cities in four thematic areas of integration, to enable them to improve their practice. In this way it helped them to get closer to European standards of best practice and - in particular - to realise the principles of EUROCITIES' Integrating Cities Charter. It built on the experience and success of EUROCITIES projects (MIXITIES, DIVE and INTI-Cities) by shifting the focus from peer reviews and standard-setting towards policy implementation guided by standards and evaluation.

ImpleMentoring was realised by a consortium coordinated by EUROCITIES, 15 local authorities from 11 member states and Migration Work CIC as a facilitator and expert leader.

How do the Integrating Cities Toolkits relate to the broader EU context?

ImpleMentoring introduces an innovative learning method. Its strength lies in the interaction between two levels:

● ● ● **Specific and local:** It supports partner cities in carrying out concrete changes to local practice - where goals and standards are set by a benchmark based on EU-wide experience, and each city undertaking these actions is mentored through the process of change by a mentor city.

● ● ● **General and EU-wide:** By applying its thematic benchmarks in these 'real-life' city actions, ImpleMentoring develops, tests and validates them so they can be delivered to Europe's cities and the European Commission as tools for improving practice EU-wide in future years.

These four toolkits and benchmarks on migrant integration follow the three toolkits already published in the framework of the MIXITIES project in 2012 and are still available on www.integratingcities.eu. They show the ongoing commitment of many public authorities and NGOs to learn from each other, assessing and improving policies for the integration of migrants in Europe.



Square de Meeûs 1
B-1000 Brussels
Tel. +32 2 552 08 88
info@eurocities.eu
www.eurocities.eu
www.integratingcities.eu



@eurocitiestweet
@integratingCTs



www.migrationwork.org
info@migrationwork.org
+44 (0)1273 328059