

## DELIVERABLE D.T1.3.2

---

Concept report on inputs and ideas come to light during the workshops and roundtable in each city

---

10 2019





## Summary

1. OVERVIEW - WORKSHOP ACTIVITY IN FIVE CITIES .....	2
2. KEY RESULTS .....	2
<i>2.1. Ideas and inputs on the methodology</i> .....	2
2.1.1 Berlin .....	2
2.1.2 Vienna.....	3
2.1.3 Bologna .....	3
2.1.4 Parma .....	5
2.1.5 Ljubljana .....	6
<i>2.2. Discussion points, ideas and inputs on refugee integration: results of the group work</i> .....	7
2.2.1 Berlin .....	7
2.2.2 Vienna.....	8
2.2.3 Bologna .....	8
2.2.4 Parma .....	11
2.2.5 Ljubljana .....	12



## 1. OVERVIEW - WORKSHOP ACTIVITY IN FIVE CITIES

Project Partner	ASP Bologna	ISI-eV Berlin	CdP Parma	KDG Ljubljana	Caritas Vienna
Workshop Date	17.09.2019	23.10.2019	23.10.2019	09.10.2019	03.10.2019
Number of participants (+ facilitators)	10 (+2)	11 (+2)	15 (+4)	16 (+2)	11 (+2)

## 2. KEY RESULTS

### 2.1. Ideas and inputs on the methodology

#### 2.1.1 Berlin

##### Observations from the external facilitators:

- Co-Creation has worked well in the teams
- Participants were inspired by this kind of collaboration, mainly because of the diversity of perspectives of participants from different backgrounds.
- The time frame was too tight
- Participants would like to continue, perhaps with several sessions that don't last a whole day.

Would like to work on more concrete questions

- Participants found it difficult to think outside of the legal barriers, an intensive moderation is required here.
- The perspective of the refugees was important, but this is only possible if they speak and understand German well.
- Employers were underrepresented

Both groups communicated well and offered respect to all group members. There was a genuine curiosity to hear other perspectives. Particular attention was given when members of the refugee community spoke. One representative's language skills were not always strong



enough to follow and contribute to the group. The group and its facilitator supported him when necessary, as did the Arabic speakers in the group.

## 2.1.2 Vienna

### **Important for innovative co-creation (feedback notes):**

- Use language and methods that work for all;
- Warming-up-activity, methods not solely focusing on language (e.g. more sketching than writing/talking);
- More time for a workshop;
- More clarity about the “follow-up” of the workshop;
- An equal playing field: diversity of participants in the group; equal participation in the co-creation (who is involved as a professional, who as a volunteer?);
- Attitude: not developing FOR the target group, but WITH the target group; critical reflection, if the target group is involved in all activities (of the project)<sup>1</sup>;
- Ensure that participation is not an isolated event, but will be part of an ongoing, long-term process; (how) do we follow up on the workshop?
- Needs a strategy on how to involve the “big” decision makers, stakeholders from (e.g.) the public employment office, politicians etc.;
- Build on already existing know-how and networks (e.g. in the neighborhood) and structures, create/support spaces where people with different backgrounds can meet.

The overall climate of the workshop was very good and we had a good working atmosphere; followed by a networking lunch/dinner in the Caritas Vienna integration project “Community Cooking”. The benefit for the participants was the information about the SiforREF project, the experience of co-creation and the methods that were used (capacity building), the meeting of new people and exchange of contacts (SiforREF network in Vienna).

## 2.1.3 Bologna

### **Reflections about the activity and the methodology, guidelines for future co-creation processes:**

- Engagement of all the actors involved in migrant integration from the beginning of the process, from refugees to policy makers, from academicians to practitioners, from educational to social workers to the police;

---

<sup>1</sup> In the context of the workshop we discussed the division of people into “refugees” and “non-refugees”. It generates a difference that corresponds with a logic that reinforces inequality at its core and reproduces mechanisms of exclusion. We should strive to overcome us-them constellations and reflect on our approaches and methodologies.



- No linguistic barriers. Be sure that refugees engaged have a good levels of language proficiency in order to give a real contribution;
- Importance of involvement of public bodies to guide and guarantee the participatory process;
- Role games would be suitable as a methodology, so that a politician can think from the perspective of a social worker or a refugee and vice versa; insert yoga, or theatre, in other words use our body to facilitate the process as well as discussions;
- Sessions should be longer, allow more time to know each other, develop trust and to talk about such challenging topics;
- Learning by doing and be ready to try and fail;
- Transparency. Having clear and declare from the beginning what is the context, the boundaries and the possibilities; avoid to work in abstract, be dependent and contextual;
- Sharing decisions, collaboration and mutual respect, collaborative working and networking
- Sharing good practices. Make all the results of the project actions available for all the other partners around Europe, so that we can learn from the others;
- Ensure that participatory process is not an isolated event but will be part of a long term changing process;
- Multidisciplinary approach: listen to different point of views and learn from different backgrounds;
- Round tables with different levels of interactions, first bilateral and then wider (process by step)
- Importance of involvement of beneficiaries in creating innovative solutions. Bottom-up approach and focus group with refugees. Involve all relevant stakeholders, especially migrants themselves, in the design measures responding their real needs;
- Speed dating and brainstorming as good methods during co-creation sessions;
- More time to express ourselves in focus group sessions;
- Insert theatre, theatre forum, role games to understand different point of views;
- Importance of communication of experiences, good practice and results, data exchange
- Advocacy at a political level. Documents with results of co-creation process proposal of innovative measures shared with public institutions.
- Sharing good practices Make all the results of the project actions available for all the other partners around Europe, so that we can learn from the others;
- Networking and common strategy, local and then transnational

Although every local context is very different and requires specific solutions to address specific challenges, some of the more general findings in the workshop can be precious to share in a common path:

- the idea of having a bottom-up or peer-to-peer or participatory process, especially involving refugees in co-creation and designing integration measures and laws. Successful policies cannot developed without asking to the directly interested people what are their real needs, pains, difficulties that they are experiencing, and what are the skills, knowledge, contributions they can bring;
- engagement of all the actors involved in migrant integration from the very beginning in order to have more dependent, contextual and efficient solutions and to capitalize the diversity;



- foster positive interactions in the local community and promote recognition of migrants' positive contribution to the society
  - go beyond the “emergency” perspective and aim at creating a long-term, sustainable, approach

Workshop is perceived as an opportunity to know each other and create a network at a local level, be part of something important. Participants were very interested in knowing more about future development of the project. They would like it is a beginning of something different.

## 2.1.4 Parma

- As regards the co-creation activity, we observed that the opportunity to meet and exchange experiences/expectations among different subjects has been appreciated by all the participants.
- Above all the presence of stakeholders belonging to the economic arena (local companies, employment agencies) was an added value: while the other participants already knew each other and had already met in different situations (institutional meeting, projects, conferences etc), the economic actors had never been part of a context dedicated to refugee integrations were they were called to express their own point of view. Even if some of them are actively engaged in creating job opportunities for refugees, they appreciated having been invited to discuss on wider political/social issues. The collaboration among the different actors has been very positive and engaged.
- The general climate of the workshop was collaborative, friendly and respectful. The role of the dialogic facilitators has been crucial in order to promote the equal participation of all the stakeholders.
- Particularly important, it was the strict use of time which allowed everyone to give his/her own contribution without anyone to prevail (at the beginning it created some anxiety but then it was something to smile at, but to respect).
- We observed that during the presentation/discussions, and above all during the group activity, nobody has gone „off topic“ even though we had the impression that for some participants it was hard to keep the direction and overcome the „depressive“ mood connected to the normative context.

For future co-creation activities the main “lessons learned” during the workshop held in Parma are

- the importance of inviting a mixed range of participants,
- the key role of facilitators in carrying out the activities and allow the equal participation of all,
- the need to develop a process which goes beyond the single workshop/activity (and this can be done not only creating future occasions for stakeholders to participate and give their contribution but also illustrating very well and openly the goals of the project and the following steps, keeping them informed on the developments etc.).



## 2.1.5 Ljubljana

The second part of the workshop (key learnings on the co-creation- method) did not go as planned by the organizers, as for the majority of the participants it was more important to talk to the institutions which were present at the workshop about specific problems and solutions.



## ***2.2. Discussion points, ideas and inputs on refugee integration: results of the group work***

### **2.2.1 Berlin**

#### **What is positive in Berlin in relation to labour market integration?**

- Employers are open to change
- Demand for skilled workers
- More support and networks available
- Refugee challenges and solutions are becoming clearer (less chaos)
- Statistics
- Initiatives developing - business/NGOs/Govt
- Improved language skills
- Motivation in the community - high motivation of job-seeking refugees
- There are a wide range of programs available
- Language learning is more successful than in the past
- Motivation is in many cases high among new arrivals
- The labour market needs skilled workers at all levels
- Major firms are involved in networks to facilitate labour market integration
- State funding has been more available for programs than previously
- Some new approaches/methods, e.g. mobile coaching
- New forms of cooperation networks have been initiated between business, NGOs and the public authorities. E.g. Chamber of Commerce funding for Self-employment training for new arrivals.
- Some pressure from the business world toward the public administration and occupational, e.g. education training system (adaptation of programs)
- Some gender specific programs for women (Mentoring, Self-employment)

#### **What is problematic in Berlin in relation to labour market integration?**

- Bureaucracy. This issue was noted 6 times in a group of 6.
- Qualification recognition
- Technical language skills
- Information flow. Who knows what?
- Childcare - women
- Few Employers have capacity to manage complex processes
- Employers fearful to invest resources into staff who will lose right to work
- Not enough employment opportunities for refugees (risk)
- The insecurity of permission to stay, legal status limited
- Too much bureaucracy - difficult to understand for newcomers
- Lack of childcare for women seeking work or further education
- There exists a variety of programs but many individuals are still not reached





- For those who find jobs or apprenticeships there is a need for technical language training
- Despite language courses little chance to practice German, no contact to German speakers
- There are few further training courses available for persons over 30 years of age
- Biggest problem is the matching of persons on the job learned skills to be recognized for same or similar jobs available here
- Mismatch between German occupational system and the occupational systems of countries of origin; persons with higher qualification receive poor counseling, discouragement
- Assessment skills and tools not widely known or practiced in job centers
- Some employment offices can make investment money for small business available, but the advisor refuses the business idea of the refugee
- Rents and infrastructure costs are too high for the self-employed

## 2.2.2 Vienna

### What are the crucial points in refugee integration in Vienna (Austria)?

- Importance of public integration support from the very beginning, covering the fields of language learning, trauma treatment (if necessary), housing, public transport;
- Additional support from civil society is crucial, private networks and mentoring for the integration process (ideas „donate your network“, „become a buddy“...);
- The biggest impact can be achieved by (better) coaching in job centers;
- Traineeships and volunteer work is important to foster the labor market orientation and integration;
- Vienna is a „good practice“ within Austria, has a dense network of supporting structures; offers public support from the very beginning with “StartWien”, a project as part of primary care (Grundversorgung);
- The current needs in Vienna are innovative long-term integration activities, as the phase of quick and short term aid has passed;
- Difference in target group - proactive, networking refugees vs. refugees who need more support, how can we support those with limited resources?
- Sustainable financing of (best practice) integration projects is an ongoing issue.

## 2.2.3 Bologna

### Table 1: Social inclusion

**Target group:** First premise: the participants wanted to add a first note, saying that in Bologna Metropolitan Area and in general in Italy, it would be useful and fair to include not only refugees but even asylum seekers and people with humanitarian protection status, in order to take in consideration experiences of all participants. The reason for this request is



that, according to the Decree Law n. 113 of October 4th 2018, commonly known as “Security Decree” (Salvini-Di Maio government) they have less possibilities than refugees.

Second premise: the high level of social, political, bureaucratic, financial, legislative difficulties of all those working in this sector in Italy, made it very difficult not to be negative and reach out for possible positive and efficient solutions. Most of the discussion was about what you should and would do, but you cannot or may not do in Italy.

*Needs perceived, difficulties experienced, critical issues and challenges (yellow post-it)*

What does it mean for you integration? Starting from the real situation and difficulties experienced to highlight most important problems to face.

- Labeling (fake news and negative narration concerning refugees)
- Few relationships in the local community
- Housing
- Work

*Focus question: How can they have better interactions with the other residents in local communities?*

*Ideas and possible solutions, (blue and pink post-it with explanations in green)*

Analysis of methods and practices that worked to identify objectives and possible solutions, keep in mind that people, individually, make the difference

- Give correct and useful information, info bombing to fight fake news and negative narration concerning refugees;
- Train the labour consultants about refugees’ condition and legislation;
- Italian language courses;
- Sport, theatre, dance, music and all other cultural and social activities as moments to know each other and build positive interactions;
- Have a cultural mediator in condominiums where refugees live along with natives to facilitate mutual understanding;
- Projects not only for/with refugees, but also for/with the residents, all involved since the very beginning in co-creation processes;
- Agreements with real estate agencies to face housing problems, urban regeneration as a solution to the housing problem and an opportunity to find a job;
- Projects for working inclusion;
  - Metro PON (Multi-fund National Operational Programme Metropolitan Cities dedicated to sustainable urban development) to recover agricultural heritage, train refugees and encourage start-ups;
  - Project “Scuola-Cantiere” of Ass. Terraverde to train young refugees from 18 to 25, innovative training course, in the fields of construction and gardening, structured as a real construction site and in direct contact with expert craftsmen and companies in the green and construction sectors.



- Networking between public and private sectors, involving civil society, people and organizations of different sectors and disciplines, cooperation with associations working with refugees.

### Table 2: Labour market integration

**Target group:** Male refugees aged 20-30, coming from West Africa, illiterate, not in employment and with poor skills to find a job in the new Country (the picture of the man represents the chosen target)

*Needs perceived, difficulties experienced, critical issues and challenges (blue post-it)*

- Overcome language barriers
- Lack of skills: many people arriving in our country lose their skills, and are obliged to learn a new job (picture of two people sitting in front of a wall means this vision of the future with few opportunities)
- Not only find a place in the labour market but even support positive interaction between people from different background and cultures in the work environment
- No possibility of mobility in the Country, that could be for them a good way to find a job more easily (the picture of the man in prison)

*Focus question: How can they build an economic (access to employment) and social identity?*

*Ideas and possible solutions (green post-it)*

(Picture of Italian champion road cyclist Gino Bartali, recognised as a "Righteous Among the Nations" for his efforts to aid Jews during World War II as example of strength and justice)

- Italian language courses;
- Professional training with focus on hard skills as well as soft skills;
- Promote migrants' professional and entrepreneurial skills;
- Specific education to connect the skills of job seekers with the needs of employers;
- "Welcome" Project promoted by UNHCR. Recognition to companies that most distinguish themselves in promoting the labour placement of refugees and in supporting their integration process in Italy. The "Welcome. Working for Refugee Integration" Logo can be used by companies for communication purposes;
- Tax cut for the companies;
- Capitalizing the diversity in the companies, social mix as an added value;
- Corporate social responsibility and attention for migrant integration;
- Training courses and internships for migrants. Regional Law n.14/2014 Promotion of Investments in Emilia-Romagna supports work integration and social inclusion of people in fragile and vulnerable conditions, through the integration of public employment services, social and health services, and foster migrants integration in the labour market
- Close cooperation between public and private sectors



## 2.2.4 Parma

Findings of the group discussion: What can be done to improve the situation (refugee integration)? Through 3 different steps: Priority - Process - Guidelines

### Group 1

Current situation: “there is no refugees” (due to the new Law). We lack a “map” to orient refugees and a good “protocol” between this sector and private companies. We lack policies, not practices.

- Priorities. “A laboratory for the future”
- With a good mix between social and economic (work) aspects. We need a new wave of consultation among social parties. Innovation does not deny what has been already done but it should systemize best practices.
- Social networking is a priority, in the context of subsidiarity between public and private sector.

### Group 2

- Priority: to create social cohesion and enhance mutual contact/knowledge
- Where? At the level of neighborhood
- Process: Institution of a neighborhood mediator, with three goals:
  - humanistic mediation of conflicts
  - peer to peer training
  - conciliation of life times
  - He/she is involved in training, information, creating situations for understanding, orientation (services, opportunities), conflict management.

### Group 3

- Priority: Training and work placement of migrants
- Process:
  - training of the trainers of the professionals involved in the training process
  - definition and formation of coordination roles
  - provision of basic courses (Italian, work orientation, soft skills, reception)
  - provision of vocational courses + basic school education
  - accompaniment to professional integration
- Guidelines:
  - definition of structured / organized paths (with a pivot that acts as “integrator” between the third sector, companies, public administration, employment agencies)
  - need to introduce assessment / feedback systems by the people involved in the process
  - need to intervene in public administrations in order to have a certain timeframe for activating the process of integrating / obtaining documents
  - mechanisms for spreading the model for scalability



## 2.2.5 Ljubljana

- The workshop turned out as a tactical and practical tool for dialogue among different stakeholders, especially the conversation between the representatives of institutions and users, i.e. refugees, migrants, and small NGOs.
- The idea of creating a daily center (space, place) that prevent isolation and help people with the basic steps of integration (much-needed socialization) and further planning of a more autonomous economic well being was the core point of the second phase.
- Considering the local context, the state regulation of migration, including integration and education, which is too centralized, one of the innovative approaches in refugee policy could be the establishment of social daily centers that would enhance the quality of life for migrants by migrants themselves, taking into consideration different means of integration.
- A common social innovative approach in refugee policy, thus, creation of possibilities that would improve the employment of refugees through semi-formal, informal and horizontal institutions where a common space of communication and sharing is crucial for further steps. Actually, in this case, the social innovative point is not so new and coming from the side of many grassroots experiences, from small NGOs, activists, and refugees themselves.