ევროკავშირი საქართველოსთვის
The European Union for Georgia

ICMPD
International Centre for Migration Policy Development

Roadmap for the Development of a Policy for Migrants' Integration in Georgia

March 2019

ENIGMMA
Putting the pieces together to respond effectively to migration challenges

ICMPD
International Centre for Migration Policy Development

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared in the framework of the "Sustaining Migration Management in Georgia" (ENIGMMA 2) project which is funded under the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) 2016 Technical Cooperation Facility II Programme. The Component 3 of the project generally aims at capacity building and other actions towards fostering migration understanding, expertise and education. In particular, within this Component, the project supports the Government of Georgia in provision of necessary expertise and knowledge for implementation of the selected areas of the Migration Strategy of Georgia for 2016 - 2020. In this regard, the Strategy establishes a goal of improving of immigrant integration policy which is specifically targeted by this report which presents a roadmap for the development of a migrants' integration policy in Georgia.

The roadmap is based on desk research and semi-structured interviews conducted in October 2018 with relevant national and local level stakeholders in Tbilisi and Batumi. The outline of the Roadmap was presented to representatives of the State Commission on Migration Issues as well as representatives of international organisations and NGOs interested in the field of integration of foreigners in January 2019 and includes their initial comments and suggestions voiced out during the presentation.

The team of authors was comprised of researchers from the ICMPD Research Unit. ICMPD ENIGMMA 2 staff members from both Vienna and Tbilisi offices were contributors.

The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable input of the Secretariat of the State Commission on Migration Issues and of its relevant members; therefore, they would like to thank all the partners in Georgia for their support in producing this report.

ICMPD
International Centre for
Migration Policy Development

International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)
Gonzagagasse 1
A-1010 Vienna
www.icmpd.com

International Centre for Migration Policy Development
Vienna, Austria

ICMPD
International Centre for Migration Policy Development

List of Acronyms, Abbreviations and Definitions

CBP	Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU
Commission	European Commission
Council	Council of the European Union
CoE	Council of Europe
ENI	European Neighbourhood Instrument
ENIGMMA 2	Sustaining Migration Management in Georgia project
EU	European Union
GeoStat	National Statistics Office of Georgia
G20	Group of Twenty - an international forum for the governments and central bank governors from 19 countries and the European Union
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
MIPEX	Migrant Integration Policy Index
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
REMINDER	Role of European Mobility and its Impacts in Narratives, Debates and EU Reforms project
SCMI	State Commission on Migration Issues of Georgia
Soviet Union	Former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Union Citizens	Citizens of the European Union
US/USA	United States of America

ICMPD
International Centre for Migration Policy Development

Contents

1. Introduction 2

2. Background 4

2.1. Integration – conceptual considerations 4
2.2. The development of integration policies in Europe 6
2.3. Integration policies at EU level 7
2.4. The role of local authorities 11
2.5. Fitting integration into migration governance 15

3. Migration and integration in Georgia: Status quo and main challenges 19

3.1. Main characteristics of migration to Georgia 19
3.2. Main challenges in the field of integration 21

4. Polity and politics: Institutionalising integration policy 24

4.1. Defining institutional responsibility 24
4.2. Fostering interaction with migrant communities 25
4.3. Monitoring and evaluation 26
4.4. Research and training 27

5. Policy areas of intervention 29

5.1. "Welcome" programs 29
5.2. Language and education 31
5.3. Labour market 32
5.4. Healthcare and social service 33
5.5. Living together: housing and socialising 34
5.6. Culture and Religion 35

6. Conclusions 37

7. References 38

1. Introduction

According to GeoStat, in 2012 there were 69,063 immigrants in Georgia, while in 2017 there were 83,239 which makes up slightly more than 2% of the population of Georgia. While a large proportion represent Georgian citizens, almost a half of these immigrants are foreign citizens (proportions varying in the last 5 years). As Georgia continues to attract labour force from neighbouring countries, the number of foreigners is expected to increase. Against this background, and in order to improve the conditions for current and future migrants to contribute to the Georgian society, integration policies become of utmost importance.

The current report is intended to support Georgian state authorities to develop and implement a policy for migrants' integration as one of the goals of the Migration Strategy of Georgia for 2016 - 2020. The present roadmap was developed in the framework of the "Sustaining Migration Management in Georgia" (ENIGMMA 2) project, in cooperation with relevant Georgian stakeholders, particularly with members of the State Commission on Migration Issues (SCMI).

This report is based on desk research and semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders at national and local level, as well as with relevant civil society organisations. Interviews were conducted in Tbilisi and Batumi in October 2018. The outline of the Roadmap was presented to representatives of the State Commission on Migration Issues as well as representatives of international organisations and NGOs in Georgia in January 2019; therefore, it includes comments and suggestions provided during the presentation. In order to support the development of a sustainable integration policy, the current document is structured along the elements of *polity* (institutional system) – *politics* (procedural aspect of decision-making) – and *policy* (concrete actions) with regard to migrant integration.

The report is structured as following:

The introduction to the report is presented in the first section of the document.

The **second section** lays down relevant background information: conceptual clarifications regarding the term "*integration*" as well as a history of the concept in Europe and its understandings at the EU level. Moreover, this first section underlines two important developments in integration policies – the central role of local authorities and the relationship between integration policies and migration governance.

The **third section** summarises relevant elements of the Georgian context in which an integration policy is being considered. This section sums up the recurrent issues related to integration, as they emerged during the interviews with both national and local level authorities, as well as with representatives of civil society organisations.

The **fourth and fifth sections** present the concrete steps recommended to be followed for the development of an integration policy, and concrete measures suggested to be implemented, respectively. Namely, the fourth section underlines the steps required for institutionalising

integration policies: defining institutional responsibility, fostering interaction with migrant communities and supporting research and training. The fifth section provides examples of policy measures in areas relevant for integration: programmes for those newly arrived in the country, language learning, labour market access, health care and social services, access to housing and means for socialising, as well as the cultural and religious aspect of integration. These areas have all been mentioned by the Georgian stakeholders consulted for the development of this report, with language learning and the cultural and religious aspects being considered of immediate importance for migrants' integration in Georgia.

Finally, the **sixth section** highlights several conclusions of the report.

2. Background

2.1. Integration – conceptual considerations

Although today also used widely in social sciences publications on migration, there is no generally accepted definition on the meaning of the term "integration". In the social sciences, the usage of the term "integration" has undergone major changes. Whereas early sociologists used it to describe the process of cohesion of a whole society, its usage as a concept describing the inclusion of certain groups in the society has been developed only since the 1950s in the US. In migration research, the term "integration" began to be used in the 1980s, in particular, in the German speaking world. The understanding of the term has been strongly influenced by the debate on "assimilation" in American sociology, in particular by the theory of assimilation developed by Milton M. Gordon in 1964. In US sociology, debates on assimilation have been largely overcome in the 1980s by the development of theories of multiculturalism (e.g. Glazer 1998) and diversity, which were spurred by the development of a far-reaching equality legislation (Lowery 1995, Thomas 1990). In contrast to the US, at the same time assimilation theories have been imported into Europe, in particular, as mentioned above – in the German speaking world, laying the ground for the academic debate on integration.

Referring to Lockwood, Esser differentiates between "social integration" and "system integration" (Esser 2001, 3). Whereas a focus on "system integration" is interested in the macro-level of institutions and their effects on integration (e.g. the relationship between the educational system and the labour market), a focus on "social integration" is focused on analysis of the micro-level, e.g. the integration of individuals and the role of their motives, orientations and norms in this process. (Esser 2001, 7).

According to Esser (2006, 23ff.), integration is a concept composed of four dimensions:

- **Cultural integration (Acculturation),** understood as the acquisition of cultural rules for different situations and the acquisition of the dominant language of the country of residence. According to Esser, the acquisition of the dominant language is the most important aspect of integration.
- **Structural Integration (Placement)**, understood as the achievement of a certain position in the society. Placement includes the acquisition of a certain legal status, e.g. naturalisation, the achievement of professional positions and qualifications, but also frequent social contacts to other members of society.
- **Social Integration (Interaction)**, understood as individual orientations, symbolic interaction and private social relations. Interaction is based on contact, and always entails costs (time, energy etc.). For migrants it is thus easier to develop social contacts among their peers, which whom they can communicate in their mother tongue, but this preference might limit the potential to interact with non-migrant members of the society.

- **Identificational Integration (Emotional dimension)**, understood as an emotional and mental relationship to the society, which can be either based on values, a sense of civic responsibility, or benevolent indifference. According to Esser, value-based identification is characteristic for pre-modern societies; in modern societies identification is mostly based on benevolent indifference (in practice the dominant mode), or a sense of civic responsibility.

Esser describes the process of integration as an interaction of these dimensions. For instance, a minimum level of acculturation is necessary for placement, which again supports acculturation. Both processes support interaction, which again might strengthen acculturation and social advancement, altogether leading to a growing level of identification. Based on Esser, Heckmann and Schnapper (2003) have argued that in most cases, people do not show the same degree of integration in all four dimensions, and fragmented integration is rather the norm than an exception. Furthermore, although the dimensions interact, there is no linear relationship between them – a person can be well integrated on the structural level, but have only few contacts beyond his/her community of origin; or vice-versa.

In migration studies, it is meanwhile widely acknowledged that most migration decisions are household-based. Households reduce their economic risk-profile if a household member is working in another country and can send back remittances (Stark 1991). Family and friendship networks facilitate migration within certain corridors, as they can provide social capital necessary for settlement in the target country. As Massey (1987) has shown, migration decisions and migration practices are largely shaped not only by migration policies of the sending and the receiving states, but by existing family and regional networks, which provide information on employment and support in the country of residence. These networks do not only support migrants, but also sustain their moral duty to support the family in the country of origin by defining and negotiating belonging to the community. Keeping contacts with the family in the country of origin and sending remittances is a central aspect of the everyday life of migrants and should not be understood as a sign of "lacking integration".

An understanding of integration, which includes the migrants´ persisting contacts and links with the family and the country of origin, can make use of the potential of diaspora organisations for both integration and the development of the country of origin. Supporting their country of origin, these organisations can both contribute to the development at home in economic terms, but also act as facilitators of social change by providing social remittances in the sense of transfer of new ideas and conceptions (Mazzucato 2008, Lacrouix 2013). On the other hand, they can be valuable partners in the development and implementation of integration policies, as they are familiar with both the living conditions in the country of origin and the country of residence and act as bridge builders between migrants and the receiving society.

2.2. The development of integration policies in Europe

In **Europe**, policies aimed at the inclusion of immigrants into the society of the host country reach back to the 1970s and 1980s. Most often they were not framed in terms of integration, but, depending on the country-specific policy trajectory, they could have been found in e.g. "minority-policies" (Netherlands), "race-relations policies" (UK) or "Ausländerpolitik" ("Foreigners policy", Austria, Germany and Switzerland). Only in Sweden the term "integration" was in continuous use since the 1970s. The different policies reflected the existing welfare-state model: While in the UK, a residual welfare state, antidiscrimination policies and multiculturalism stood at the forefront, Nordic states like Sweden based their policies on a combination of equal rights and access to social services and support for labour market integration and language acquisition. Conservative welfare states like Germany or Austria until the 1990s followed a "guest-worker" model excluding immigrants from equal treatment with regard to access to social welfare, and thus were latecomers in the development of integration policies.

In the **United Kingdom**, in the 1980s and 1990s policies aiming at the societal inclusion of immigrants were largely framed in the terms of "race relations", which were rooted in the distinct influence of the colonial tradition of the British Empire on post-war migration policies. In this framing, ethnicity and skin colour, and not migration, were the central analytical focus and the main categories driving concrete policies (Goulbourne 1998), and "race-relations" and antidiscrimination policies were the main political focus in policies regarding migrants´ societal inclusion. Nevertheless, the term "integration" was first used in the immigration debate in Europe. In 1967 the then Home Secretary Roy Jenkins coined the famous definition of integration as "equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance" (Jenkins 1967, 267).

Despite its early usage, the term vanished from the debate in the 1970s and 1980s and was replaced by multiculturalist concepts. It returned in the 1980s in the field of refugee reception, and was linked to the broader migration debates only in the 1990s and 2000s. Since then, a growing number of policy documents, particularly in the field of refugee policies, make use of the term "integration"; which is simultaneously used with the term "social cohesion".

In **the Netherlands**, in the 1980s migrants' policies were reframed as ethnic minority policies focusing on ethnicity as policy guiding paradigm. This frame stressed the permanent position of immigrants as a minority within Dutch society, and appealed to the Dutch legacy of pillarisation – the existence of separate institutional structures in the fields of education and health for the different religious and political communities which characterised Dutch society until the 1990s. In the early 1990s, ethnic minorities' policies made place for an integration policy that focused on the integration of the individual in social and economic spheres such as labour, education and housing. Language acquisition was defined as a main tool for integration. Finally, in 1998 newly arriving migrants were obliged to participate in Dutch language and civic integration courses. This marked the formal beginning of the Dutch integration policy, which became a blueprint for the development of

(voluntary or compulsory) language and civic integration programmes in most European countries in the 2000s (Scholten 2011).

In **Sweden**, since the 1970s integration was basically understood as a combination of legal equality of immigrants and citizens combined with strict immigration control. Since the 1970s, the combination of legal equality and language acquisition characterised Swedish integration policies, and migrants were offered free language tuition at the workplace (Parussel 2009, 8). As in other European countries, the 1990s marked a period of revision of the prevailing paradigms of migration and integration policy. The main thrust of the debate focused on the development of incentives for immigrants to find a job and economic independence and the reduction of their high dependency on social support payments. Nevertheless, the principle of integration based on the equality of the individual and access to the welfare state was still upheld until the new millennium (Lemaitre 2007)

In the three German speaking countries **Austria, Germany and Switzerland** integration policies had been developed at the local level since the early 1980s before integration became a policy issue at the central level already in the 2000s. Sharing a history of "guest worker - policies" at the state level, which largely ignored integration needs of migrants until the end of the 1990s, regional or even municipal governments developed their own measures for immigrant integration in absence of state policies. Thus, municipal and provincial governments pioneered in development of a large variety of integration practices and establishment of institutional responsibilities for integration quite some time before integration policies and institutions were established at the state level. These developments were fostered by their federalist governance structure giving quite some leeway to provincial governments in central policy field, like e.g. education or housing. At the national level, integration as a distinct policy area developed only since the beginning of the new millennium.

2.3. Integration policies at EU level

As migration became an issue of competence for the European Union only since 1998, EU programmes only indirectly influenced national integration policies up to the early 2000s. At the European Council in Tampere in 1999, "integration" entered the EU political arena. Following a suggestion of Germany, France and the UK, the Council called for "vigorous integration policy" towards immigrants from non-EU-countries "based on the idea of approximating the rights of long-resident third country immigrants closer to those of EU citizens"[1]. The Council also mandated the Commission to present a comprehensive proposal for a regulation of labour immigration, family reunification and the position of long-term resident third country nationals. In its "Communication on a Community Immigration Policy"[2] the European Commission suggested a "civic citizenship"

[1] Tampere European Council, 15 and 16 October 1999, Presidency Conclusions, Conclusion 21.
[2] Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Community Immigration Policy, COM (2000) 757 final.

awarded to migrants after a certain length of stay ensuring they would enjoy a comparable level of rights in all member states.

This rights-based understanding of integration characterised the three draft directives – on the entry and residence of third country nationals for employment purposes, on family reunification and on the legal status of long-term residents – submitted to the Council in 2001. While the directive on entry and residence of third country nationals, which aimed at the establishment of a common immigration regulation, failed, the two other draft directives were accepted after some revisions. These revisions allowed Member States to demand the fulfilment of integration conditions, in particular the acquisition of the state language(s) and of knowledge about the society of the country of immigration, as condition for the granting of a long-term residence permit.

The directive on the status of long-term resident third country nationals[3] and the directive on family reunification[4] until today form the legal core of a common European policy on the integration of third country nationals. The directives grant legally residing third country nationals a broad set of rights comparable to Union Citizens after five years of legal residence and the fulfilment of integration conditions, if demanded by a member state. In the following years the directives were complemented by directives on specific immigrant groups - e.g. students[5], researchers[6] or intra-corporate transferees[7], and the so-called "single permit" directive granting newly arrived immigrants limited access to social rights[8].

The June 2003 "Communication on immigration, integration and employment" first outlined the understanding of the concept of "integration" at the EU level[9]. The Communication stressed that integration was a prerequisite for migrants to fully develop their potential for the economic development of Europe, and called for increased efforts to allow migrants to fully participate in the economic, social and cultural life and to fight the discrimination of migrants[10]. Integration was defined as "a reciprocal process based on equal rights and obligations of legally resident third country nationals and the host society, which aims at the full participation of immigrants"[11]. The

[3] Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents.
[4] Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification.
[5] Directive (EU) 2016/801 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of research, studies, training, voluntary service, pupil exchange schemes or educational projects and au pairing.
[6] Directive (EU) 2016/801 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of research, studies, training, voluntary service, pupil exchange schemes or educational projects and au pairing.
[7] Directive 2014/66/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer.
[8] Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State.
[9] COM (2003) 336 final.
[10] COM (2003) 336 final, 18.
[11] COM (2003) 336 final, 24.

Communication defined labour market participation, education and language acquisition, comprehensive urban and regional planning, improved access to health and social services, improved protection against ethnic discrimination and access to naturalization as essential elements of integration. Although attenuated, these considerations were reiterated in the "Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration"[12] accepted by the Council of Ministers on November 19, 2004, which for the first time ascertained a clear commitment to integration by the heads of government.

The "Common Basic Principles (CBPs) for Immigrant Integration"[13], which until today define the understanding of integration at the EU-level, define integration as "a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States' (CBP 1), implying "respect for the basic values of the European Union" (CBP 2). Employment is characterised as a key part of the integration process (CBP 3).

While defining "basic knowledge of the host society's language, history, and institutions" as indispensable to integration", "enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge" was also characterised as essential task of the Member States (CBP4). While CBP 5 highlights the relevance of education as tool to allow more successful and more active participation in society, CBP 6 stresses the need for "access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way". Further principles highlight the relevance of interaction between immigrants and Member State citizens and the need for stimulating exchange (CBP 7); the right of freedom of practice of diverse cultures and religions, unless practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law (CBP 8); and the relevance of participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies and measures, especially at the local level (CBP 9). Finally, CBP 10 defines the mainstreaming of integration policies and measures in all relevant policy portfolios and levels of government and public services as "an important consideration in public policy formation and implementation", while CBP 11 pledges for the development of "clear goals, indicators and evaluation mechanisms".

Despite the political emphasis on the importance of integration, the regulatory framework on the EU level in this regard remained limited to non-binding recommendations and communications and to voluntary cooperation between member states and financial support by the European Integration Funds. The Lisbon Treaty[14] confirmed the confined nature of EU influence in the area of integration: Although Art.79 empowered the Council and the European Parliament to adopt measures to promote and support the integration of third country nationals, these measures, however, were meant to "exclude any harmonization of the laws of the Member States." Despite these legal limitations, a gradual Europeanisation of policies of integration vis-à-vis immigrants was

[12] The Council of the European Union: Press Release 2618th Council Meeting, 14615/04 (Presse 321)
[13] Ibid.
[14] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, OJ C 306, 17.12.2007.

strengthened by the Commission in the following years, following the model of the "Open Method of Coordination", whereby member states were encouraged to exchange practices and develop a common policy framing through expert networks, comparative studies, handbooks and exchange of practice (Geddes/Scholten 2014).

In the newest Commission document on integration, the "Action Plan for the Integration of Third Country Nationals" of June 2016[15], the Commission again stressed that "the successful integration of third country nationals is a matter of common interest to all Member States"[16]. The Communication extends the concept of integration to the pre-departure phase and defines five key priority areas[17]:

- **Priority area one** is dedicated to pre-departure and pre-arrival measures, targeting both those arriving from third countries and the receiving society. With regard to pre-departure measures the communication highlights pre-departure language and job-related training in partnership with the countries of origin of migrants, and the need to inform refugees on the country of resettlement in order to help them building realistic expectations. Local and regional authorities receiving (resettled) refugees and migrants should inform their population and prepare curricula informing and empowering refugees.

- **Priority area two** concerns education. In this regard, the Commission highlights the crucial importance of language acquisition of the language(s) spoken in the country of residence and pledges to introduce language integration programmes, adjusted to the individual´s language learning capabilities, at the earliest stage possible after arrival. Language training should be linked to learning of work-related skills and competencies, with a special effort to ensure that courses also reach women. In addition, the relevance of early childhood education and care is mentioned, and measures to promote the up-skilling of low-skilled and low-qualified persons are announced.

- Labour market integration and access to vocational training is highlighted as **priority area three**. In this regard, employment is defined as single most important element of third country nationals´ overall net fiscal contribution. In order to remedy the widespread employment of third country nationals in positions below their level of qualification, the facilitation of skills validation and the recognition of qualifications should be a political priority. Early integration of refugees into vocational training and an improved recognition of academic qualifications are mentioned as further areas of concern.

- **Priority area four** concerns access to basic services. Here, access to housing and health are defined as basic conditions for third country nationals to start their life in a new society. As housing – and in many cases, also health – are main responsibilities of urban governments, the

[15] COM (2016) 377 final.
[16] Ibid., 2.
[17] Ibid., 5 – 14.

Communication makes a clear link to the Urban Agenda of the EU highlighting the important role of urban governments in the management of integration.

- Finally, **priority area five** is devoted to "active participation and social inclusion". Here, the Commission highlights the need to involve third country nationals themselves into the design and implementation of integration policies: "Integration is not just about learning the language, finding a house or getting a job. It is also about playing and active role in one´s local, regional and national community, about developing and sustaining real people-to-people contacts through social, cultural and sports activities and even political engagement"[18]. In addition, access to social orientation programmes, protection against discrimination and the promotion of a positive approach towards diversity are mentioned as central areas for pro-active policies.

2.4. The role of local authorities

Recently, both the European Commission and the OECD have stressed the key role of local authorities in integration policies. This growing interest in the local dimension of integration has also been the driver for a series of joint initiative between the European Union and the OECD, launched in 2016. The initiative "The need for a territorial approach to migrant integration: the role of local authorities"[19] aimed at supporting local authorities' efforts in receiving and integrating migrants and vulnerable migrant groups, including refugees. Highlighting the crucial role of local authorities with their broad remit in education, labour, housing, health, culture for integration, the study identified good practices and lessons learned with regard mainstreaming integration into local development policies as well as co-ordination mechanisms with national or regional authorities.

The initiative consisted of a statistical pillar, comparing the integration outcomes (i.e. labour, housing, education) of foreign-born relative to native-born at regional level in 14 OECD countries and case studies describing migrant integration practices in nine large European cities (Amsterdam, Athens, Berlin, Barcelona, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Paris, Rome and Vienna). It highlighted several major aspects of successful local integration policies:

- **Multi-level, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral policy-making**: Local responsibilities for housing, education and support to job market integration call for information and objective sharing among municipal services, levels of government and with non-public stakeholders with regard to place-based integration strategies. Adjusting to increased local reception and integration needs, some countries (i.e. Netherlands, Sweden) have devolved part of reception, welfare and housing responsibilities for asylum seekers and refugees to the regional and municipal levels. Outsourcing to NGOs and private partners is also widely used to deliver local

[18] Ibid., 12
[19] http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/migrantintegrationincities.htm

public policies for migrant integration, making the contract among them a key dimension for transparent and stable commitment. Municipalities also provide information on employment opportunities, in partnership with the private sector or connect migrant talents with employer needs for apprenticeship and recruitment after the fact.

- The priority objective for local authorities should be **social sustainability**: Creating equal rights and opportunities for all their residents, while ensuring that local communities perceive the benefits of migrant participation in local development. In doing so, cities are aware that effective inclusion models go well beyond reception and need to take into account all areas of life: education, labour, housing, health, culture, participation etc. With this aim, some cities developed comprehensive early integration packages (i.e. Start Wien, Amsterdam Approach, the "establishment programme" in Gothenburg, Integration slots in Berlin) for asylum seekers and refugees. In some cases, cities provide recognised refugees with targeted housing solutions, either through provision of social housing units or through rental cash support (Berlin, Amsterdam, Gothenburg).

- **Local NGOs, business and third-sector enterprises are key partners for integration**: Traditionally such partners have played a crucial role in migrant- and refugee integration. As a result of the recent increased migration inflows, cities turned towards these entities to build on their expertise and to organise a jointly co-ordinated response. At the same time, new citizen initiatives have sprung up, sparking independent mechanisms that the city can then support to respond to needs.

- Show **win-win results**: Cities often lack clear strategies on how to measure and communicate on the positive results of migrant integration. Some efforts have been made to quantify the economic contributions of foreign communities in terms of increased tax revenues, higher levels of risk capital investment, more patents being filed, etc. However, valuing cultural diversity as a positive factor, including in classrooms, is also critical in order to strengthen social links and to help people see migrants and refugees not only as recipients of support, but also as contributors to, the cultural attractiveness and social fabric of the city.

Based on the study mentioned and the results of a survey of 72 other cities, the OECD published a further comprehensive overview on urban integration policy making in 2018. Adding study funded by the European Commission on Local Integration policies in Europe, gathering best practice examples from in-depth studies of nine larger European cities (Amsterdam, Athens, Barcelona, Berlin, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Paris, Rome and Vienna) and the survey results, the report highlights twelve key points for local, regional and national policy-makers and practitioners to consider as they develop and implement local integration programmes[20]:

[20] See http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/OECD-migration-local-factsheet.pdf

1. **Multi-level governance**:
    - Enhance effectiveness through improved vertical coordination and implementation at the relevant scale.
    - Clearly identify roles and responsibilities through institutional mapping, promote dialogue at all levels: Increasing mutual knowledge of integration practices are main tools to reach this goal.
2. **Policy coherence in addressing multi-dimensional migrant needs and opportunities**.
    - Create steering groups focused on the matter at central level; adopt a local cross-sectoral integration strategy; consult and involve local migrant communities; establish public service one-stop-shops. A clear, coherent vision expressing objectives and the benefits of integration should be communicated to the public.
3. Improve **access to and effective use of financial resources adapted to local responsibilities**.
    - Pool resources between cities; attract funding from private actors and foundations.
4. Design integration policies that take into account **time throughout migrants' lifetimes and evolution of their residency status**.
    - It usually takes several years until migrants have a similar employment rate as the native born. Therefore, integration should start on day one, and focus on labour market related qualification and employment. Migrants should be supported in their integration path as soon as they arrive and regardless of the legal status, with an integrated approach combining language and skills training and professional integration.
5. Create spaces where **interaction brings migrants and native-born closer**.
    - Spatial segregation and discrimination constitute two major and mutually reinforcing obstacles for integration. Ensuring equal access to quality public services across all neighbourhoods and investing to create shared public spaces (libraries, cultural centres, squares) and the promotion of civil society action for integration are major remedies are key measures in this regard.
6. Encourage **capacity and diversity of civil service**, mainstream services for migrants and newcomers.
    - Local civil servants are not always equipped with the necessary skills to ensure equal access to the same services for all. Providing training to all municipal departments (including teachers, social workers, police and employment services) about their roles in fostering migrant integration; ensuring equal treatment in recruitment in civil service, to also have public officials with a migrant background, are essential.

7. **Cooperate with non-state stakeholders**, including through transparent and effective contracts.
    - Set up coordination mechanisms with NGOs, migrant organisations and businesses operating in the sector; evaluate services provided to migrants and establish standards aligned with national and regional regulations.
8. **Assess integration results for migrants and host communities** and their use for evidence-based policies.
    - Data on the characteristics of migration at local level are often missing or of low quality. It is thus necessary to develop a data collection strategy and to include monitoring mechanisms in city integration action plans.
9. **Match migrant skills with economic and job opportunities**.
    - Migrants are less likely to be employed and more likely to be over-qualified for their jobs than native-born people. Remedies include the implementation of a locally accessible database of migrants' skills; enforcing anti-discrimination legislations; developing strong networks with the private sector to foster integration; offering support to entrepreneurship (coaching, microfinance and strengthening of business networks).
10. Secure **access to adequate housing**
    - Housing policies should be designed in a way preventing exclusion, in particular, with regard to social housing, and adequate information and (legal) counselling on housing should be provided.
11. Provide **social welfare measures** aligned with **migrant inclusion**
    - Social services should be adapted to better address the barriers that migrants experience (language, but also other dividers caused by internet access, for example); persons with specific needs (unaccompanied children or people with disabilities) should be identified and appropriate referral mechanisms to public social welfare services established. Access to at least basic social welfare services should also be open for those not fulfilling residence criteria.
12. Establish **education responses** that address **segregation** and provide a path for professional growth.
    - Here, the recommendations focus on the improvement of the social mix in schools, as the separation of children from migrant families and from their peers from families of local residents has proven a main hindrance of integration. Mainstream public schools should develop programmes assisting migrants, and access to apprenticeship and the capacity of professional orientation services in secondary schools should be strengthened

and routes to tertiary education for migrants improved, together with awareness of and access to early childhood education and care among migrant families.

2.5. Mainstreaming integration into migration governance

While migration and integration were regarded as separate policy fields in the 1990s, meanwhile a more holistic understanding has developed. Today, the integration process is understood as the interaction of opportunity structures and individual actions, whereby different interventions are relevant in different phases:

- Starting with the migration decision, **pre-departure** measures include the provision of information on the labour and living conditions in the target country and the provisions of tools to acquire its main language(s), e.g. via the internet or mobile-phone apps.
- In the **early settlement phase** following entry (i.e. the first 6 – 12 months) interventions should start as early as possible and focus on language acquisition, civic integration and the recognition of qualifications, including vocational upgrading, if necessary. Support in finding housing and enrolment of school children should accompany these measures. Entering employment at the respective training level should have priority over finding work as fast as possible to minimise the risk of de-qualification.
- During **later stages of settlement**, improvement of language knowledge will still be an important part of the integration process. In addition, migrants may need advice on further education and the education of their children, and their participation in the civil society and neighbourhood communities will become more relevant.

Integration is a concept cross-cutting several policy areas. Participation in the main societal subsystems – the labour market, the education system, housing and spatial distribution, the health and social support system, civil society and family and friendship network are the core areas of integration policy interventions. In these different areas, policies will have a different impact: while the education system is strongly regulated by the state, labour markets are influenced by a variety of economic factors, and friendship networks and social contacts develop beyond regulatory interventions. Legal regulations and policies thus may directly influence some areas, e.g. access to the labour market or education, but will have rather limited impact on other, e.g. social contacts between immigrants and the resident population. In these areas, only “soft interventions”, e.g. the organisation of neighbourhood meetings or outreach activities by local governments, will be possible.

As integration touches on a broad array of policy fields, the need for a joint governance of migration and integration is now widely recognised. In addition, the understanding of integration as a process involving both the migrants and the local population has highlighted the need to develop activities aimed at this population informing its members about migration and supporting their interaction with migrants.

Nevertheless, there is a common understanding that migrants´ duties include the acquisition of the language(s) spoken in the country, the readiness to familiarise themselves with the institutional framework in the country and to obey its legal norms and core values. Governments thus should provide language and civic education classes as early as possible to support migrants´ integration process. On the other hand, they also should implement public campaigns informing the residence population about migration and migrants´ needs and communicate actively about integration.

Integration is a long-time process involving different social actors. While pre-departure information and training offered by the government of the target country can prepare migrants for integration, in the first stage of settlement targeted integration measures will be of high relevance. In order to support settlement, the provision of language training and civic education should start immediately after arrival. In this respect, the development of mechanisms for the evaluation and formal recognition of skills and the provision of skills upgrading, is of crucial importance for successful labour market integration. Migrants also need to get access to advice on issues regarding societal integration, e.g. the functioning of the education or health system, or the unwritten rules/traditions of society, as early as possible. Access to basic services, labour market counselling and housing are crucial for integration in this phase, as is access to legal counselling and protection against discrimination.

Despite the relevance of targeted integration measures supporting migrants in the acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge to contribute to the society, targeted measures are only one part of integration. Participation in the core realms of society – e.g. the labour market, housing, education – is governed by a broad variety of factors. Labour market success often hinges on the general labour market development, the matching of skills, the accessibility of open positions and regional factors. Targeted integration measures will help migrants to find employment, but will be only one factor of many in the labour market integration process. Targeted measures will have their limits in general factors governing societal subsystems. They thus should be evaluated regularly in order to adapt them to changing conditions.

While targeted integration measures are of high relevance in the first phase of settlement, the governance of the core institutions of society – the labour market, housing, education or health – will have a more prominent impact on the positioning and participation of migrants in the later stages. Integration governance thus has to include the analysis of the effects of “mainstream” institutions on integration. For instance, if schools do not provide for support for children of migrant families, who do not speak the state language at home, the school system will run the risk of failing to raise the potential of a part of the young generation. In a society experiencing immigration, hospitals will have to provide translation services to clients not fluent in the state language in order to be able to provide quality health care, and authorities will have to be able to reach out to newly arrived migrants not yet fluent in the state language in their mother tongue by providing interpreters. A thorough analysis of the adaptation needs of core societal institutions is a necessary part of the development of integration policies.

Migration will not always be welcomed by all residents. There might be fears that the growth of diversity could endanger the traditional way of life, increase competition at the labour and housing market, and might lead to the development of ethnically closed districts in the city. Different cultural traditions and religious faith(s) of migrants might be regarded as a threat to own traditions and values and ways of life. In order to overcome these fears, migration governance framework should include integration measures mitigating real or perceived conflicts and should aim at achieving a good balance of social cohesion and diversity. Both the support of migrants' integration through the provision of language and integration classes, as a clear stance on the need for all members or society to obey the legal norms and respect the core values of society are central elements of integration governance.

In addition, integration policies have to address the local population and inform them about the migration and prepare them for growing sociocultural diversity. In this respect, it is advisable to cooperate with civil society organisations as promotors of day-to-day interaction between migrants and residents through common activities at the local level. Moderating conflictual relationships between migrants and residents through trained intercultural mediators can help preventing the development of prejudices and rumours.

Summing up, the following elements of integration policies can be identified:

Pre-departure and pre-entry measures:

- Information on living and working conditions;
- Early language acquisition, e.g. through internet-sites or mobile-phone apps.

Targeted integration measures for migrants:

- Integration counselling including access to suitable language courses in the state language(s);
- Civic orientation and integration courses, including information on access to basic service, education and the labour market;
- Counselling and (legal) advice in the mother tongue;
- Recognition of education and training certificates, tailor-made supplementary (vocational) training;
- Support in access to housing, employment and education.

Sectoral integration policies:

- Adaptation of mainstream-institutions to challenges of immigration (e.g. school system, health system, labour market etc.);
- Training of staff with regard to migration and intercultural communication;
- Screening of procedures and services with regard to accessibility for migrants.

Targeted measures for the settled population:

- Information and outreach campaigns on migration and diversity;
- Organisation of events linking migrants and residents;
- Fostering of social interaction between residents and migrants.

3. Migration and integration in Georgia: Status quo and main challenges

3.1. Main characteristics of migration to Georgia

According to data from GeoStat, in 2017 there were 83,239 immigrant to Georgia and 85,451 emigrants. From the total number of immigrants, 48,343 are Georgian citizens, 9,723 are Russian Federation citizens, 4,365 are from Turkey, 3,501 – from Azerbaijan, 2,686 – from India, and 2,275 – from Ukraine.

Citizenship	Immigrants			Emigrants		
	Both sexes	Males	Females	Both sexes	Males	Females
	2017					
Total	**83,239**	**50,488**	**32,751**	**85,451**	**47,770**	**37,681**
Georgia	48,343	28,989	19,354	67,269	36,713	30,556
Russian Federation	9,723	5,391	4,332	5,105	2,763	2,342
Turkey	4,365	3,396	969	2,136	1,646	490
Ukraine	2,275	1,170	1,105	1,552	960	592
Armenia	2,042	1,097	945	1,523	858	665
Azerbaijan	3,501	2,064	1,437	1,487	798	689
China	904	717	187	849	648	201
USA	1,075	632	443	668	403	265
India	2,686	2,055	631	653	533	120
Greece	569	319	250	445	239	206
Israel	429	268	161	342	188	154
Other	7,246	4,337	2,909	3,370	1,989	1,381
Stateless	81	53	28	52	32	20

Source: GeoStat, http://www.geostat.ge/index.php?action=page&p_id=173&lang=eng (17.02.2019).

According to the 2017 Migration Profile of Georgia, in 2014, out of the approx. 3,714,000 persons residing in Georgia, approx. 3,617,000 were born in Georgia, and some 66,000 were born abroad. For approx. 31,000 persons, birthplace data were missing[21]. Of those born abroad, some 77% (51,098) held Georgian nationality.

Almost half of foreigners living in Georgia (47%) were born in Georgia, this particularly concerns citizens of Russia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Ukraine, while in the case of other countries, the number of foreign-born persons exceeds the number of those who were born in Georgia. Among migrants from the countries not belonging to the former Soviet Union, persons born in Turkey are the largest group (1,245).

[21] State Commission on Migration Issues (SCMI) 2017: 2017 Migration Profile of Georgia. Tbilisi (State Commission on Migration Issues), p. 36.

Labour migration has grown significantly in recent years. While in 2012, approx. 5,100 residence permits on work ground were granted, the figure rose to approx. 9,660 in 2016. The majority of such residence permit holders in Georgia are citizens of Turkey, China, India or Iran. Out of the 32,783 residence permits on work ground issued during the period 2012-2016, 7,739 (24%) were issued to citizens of Turkey, 7,173 (22%) – to citizens of China, 4,357 (13%) – to citizens of India, 2,896 (9%) – to citizens of Iran, and 1,943 (6%) – to citizens of Ukraine. In recent years, Georgia experienced a continuous growth of migrants from Asian countries with a dominantly non-Christian population[22].

According to the 2017 Migration Profile, in the period of 2012-2016, there were 34,024 cases of foreign citizens registering ownership of either agricultural/non-agricultural land, or an apartment/house in Georgia. Also in this group, citizens of the neighbouring countries stand out, many of them presumably of Georgian origin[23].

Further to labour and investment migration, educational migration is the third large source for migrants entering Georgia. According to 2016 data, the total number of foreign students enrolled in Georgian higher education institutions in the previous 11 years was 13,527, the majority of them originating from Azerbaijan, India, Turkey, Nigeria, Russia and Iraq[24].

According to the Migration Profile, labour migration mainly targets Tbilisi (57%) and the Adjara region (31%), and positions in construction, the automotive sector and management. Labour migrants usually hold a secondary education or some vocational qualifications. Migration to Georgia is also characterised by sizeable numbers of migrant entrepreneurs. During the five-year period of 2012-2016, foreign citizens registered total of 35,533 limited liability companies, branches of foreign company, joint stock companies or individual entrepreneurships, although probably not all of them active[25].

From an economic point of view, labour and investment migration are a highly relevant and welcome element of the continuous growth of Georgia´s economy. Confronted with sizeable emigration, immigration is a necessary strategy to compensate for loss of workforce through emigration and lacking vocational training among the resident population. Labour migration to Georgia is dominated by males in the younger (20 – 40) age group, reflecting typical characteristics of the early phase of the transition towards a country of immigration, which, like all established countries of immigration, in future will have to prepare to a growth of migration related to family formation and family reunification.

[22] Ibid., p. 4.2
[23] Ibid., p. 43.
[24] Ibid., p. 41.
[25] Ibid., p. 46 f.

3.2. Main challenges in the field of integration and potential solutions[26]

As most of the immigrants originate from neighbouring countries which, like Georgia, formed a part of the former Soviet Union, these migrants partially share a common history and a common socio-cultural (and sometimes also religious) orientation with the Georgian society. As many Georgians are still fluent in Russian, also a common lingua franca exists. In future, language fluency in Russian will diminish, but could be replaced by language fluency in English, which now is widely taught both at schools in Georgia as in the neighbouring countries.

These communalities do not exist with regard to migrants from Asia, who most often lack fluency in Russian and are not familiar with the common cultural traditions of the region. Georgia being a predominantly Orthodox country, migration from predominantly non-Christian countries will increase religious diversity and the visibility of migration in public. Like in many European countries facing growth of visible sociocultural diversity, specific integration challenges have to be expected. Migrants from these countries may be confronted with prejudices and rejection, and may develop closed communities in reaction. Information on their situation, the development of sustainable communication channels with them, and public communication fostering the acceptance of diversity will be crucial. Interviews with experts, policy makers and practitioners conducted in October 2018 highlighted below listed integration challenges. During the discussions, several suggestions were formulated. The recurrent ones are summarised below:

- The **lack of fluency in Georgian** and the **development of ethnic concentration in urban areas** were most often mentioned as the most prominent challenges for integration. A growing number of migrants would lack the necessary knowledge of Georgian for communication, and thus, on the one hand, could easily become victims of labour exploitation, while on the other hand, ethnic concentration in certain urban districts would lead to the development of previously unknown in Georgia spatial segregation. The local Georgian population would react critically towards these developments and demand measures increasing language fluency among migrants.
- In addition, there would be the need for **one-stop counselling and civic integration centres reaching out to migrants** in order to a) counsel them with regard to residence/foreigners law and procedures, labour regulations and housing rules and b) inform them about the functioning and basic rules of Georgian society. In this context, several interview-partners highlighted the need to better inform migrants about the core values and cultural norms prevalent in the Georgian society.

[26] It should be noted that holders of the international protection status and other foreigners share some common challenges but the situation is not completely the same, as the status holders have better access to some of the rights, such as the right to education and the right to free medical care, etc.

- Several interview-partners argued in favour of **compulsory language classes in Georgian** in order to a) reach out to migrants and b) prevent the growth of ethnic segregation in cities. In this respect, one option would be to introduce certain incentives in case successful attendance of language and civic integration classes is proven. Some interview partners also highlighted the need to professionalise teaching of Georgian through the development of teaching methods for "Georgian as a Second Language" and a system of quality control of existing language schools.

- Several interview-partners also highlighted the risk of **exploitation of migrants through irregular employment**. In particular, migrants not fluent in Georgian would easily become victims of labour exploitation. Both pre-departure information by Georgian consulates and embassies and counselling centres staffed with experts fluent in the mother tongue of migrants were seen as a remedy.

- According to the interview-partners, **academic and vocational qualifications obtained abroad are often not easily recognised**. For this reason, clear and transparent procedures for the recognition of qualifications obtained abroad are considered relevant. In addition, informing migrants about these procedures, either at the border and/or through advice-centres in the major cities, is another important point.

- As several interview-partners highlighted that **migrant children sometimes face challenges when entering school**, as there are no provisions for the early acquisition of Georgian. As the Georgian educational system is characterised by a coexistence of public and private schools, some private schools teaching in foreign language, e.g. in Russian, have been established serving children from Russian speaking migrant families. Most interview-partners were critical towards the developments of schools teaching in another language than Georgian. They suggested compulsory kindergarten-attendance and programmes for the acquisition of Georgian at kindergartens in order to allow children from migrant families to pursue a successful education path in public schools in Georgia.

- **Equal access to health services** is limited to those holding a permanent residence permit, except of access to basic services. As several interview partners highlighted, this situation forces migrants to either conclude expensive private health insurance contracts and reduces their readiness to contact medical support if necessary. According to them, access to health insurance should be made accessible before the acquisition of a permanent residence permit in order to prevent negative effects on the health of migrants.

- Almost all interview partners mentioned **negative attitudes towards migrants from certain countries and visible minorities** as major challenges for integration. Information campaigns on migration targeting the general public, the organisation of events bringing together residents and migrants, and the provisions of intercultural mediators focusing their work on districts with a high proportion of migrants were suggested as remedial action.

- As highlighted by many interview partners, **institutional responsibilities** would be missing at the local level. Local administrations would lack data and information on the living conditions of immigrants, and have no mandate for integration. In particular, in cities and municipalities with a high share of immigrants, the local administration should be given the duty and the mandate to develop local integration measures in cooperation with the civil society.

4. Polity and politics: Institutionalising integration policy

While in the 1980s and 1990s only few EU Member States had established an institutional framework to deal with the integration of immigrants, now dedicated institutions and integration programmes can be found in most of them. In many EU countries, policy makers have formed a consensus, that the governance of integration is a task of both the state government and governments at the local level to be reflected in the administrative and institutional structure of the country. Like e.g. the fields of education, health, or spatial planning, integration is currently becoming a regular task for public management.

Institutionalised public integration policies in EU Member States can be characterised by three specificities:

a) **Institutionalisation of responsibilities**: In many EU Member States, state-secretariats or ministries have been tasked with the development and implementation of integration policies. Similar institutions are often found at the level of provincial governments and at the urban level. Specialised administrative departments for integration are tasked with the implementation of concrete activities.

b) **Dialogue platforms** with experts and the civil society, including migrant representatives: In several EU countries (e.g. Austria, Germany, the Netherlands), platforms for the dialogue with experts and civil society have been implemented. Normally, these platforms organise regular or ad-hoc meetings as a venue for discussion of specific topics.

c) **Institutionalisation of monitoring and evaluation**: Regular evaluation of integration measures and monitoring of impacts is a new trend in integration policies. First developed at urban level in established cities of migration like e.g. Amsterdam, Berlin and Vienna, several EU countries (e.g. Austria, the Netherlands, the UK) meanwhile regularly publish reports on the state of integration based on data analysis and scientific studies.

4.1. Defining institutional responsibility

Sustainable policy making hinges on clearly defined political and administrative responsibilities. In multilevel governance settings, as e.g. federal countries or countries including areas holding a certain degree of autonomy, these responsibilities have to be defined at all levels of government, and a coordination mechanism shared by all parties should be developed.

As concrete integration measures most often are implemented at the local government level, it is essential to include local governments into the development of integration policies and programmes and to foster the establishment of political and administrative responsibilities for integration. In this respect, the devolution of tasks to the local level should be accompanied by access to necessary resources in order to allow local governments to implement integration programmes and projects adapted to their needs.

In several countries, local governments have embarked on the development of "integration strategies" defining the major targets and activities in the field of integration for the next four to six years. Further to defining priorities and areas of action, the development process of these strategic documents safeguards the inclusion of a broad variety of stakeholders and helps to develop a common understanding of the concept of integration. A regular revision of these strategies helps to adapt policies to changing conditions.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- In Georgia, at the central level, there already exists a well-established institutional framework for integration policy making with clearly defined responsibilities at the ministerial level and the State Commission on Migration Issues as a platform for dialogue and policy development. At the local level, no comparable structures exist, and local governments often do not have the mandate for integration. In particular, in cities and municipalities with a larger share of migrants, political and administrative responsibilities for integration should be devolved to local governments, and departments for integration should be established.

- In addition, the development of (local) multiannual integration strategies, jointly with NGOs and migrants' representatives, defining concrete priorities and tasks with an attached timeline can help to coordinate integration policy making.

4.2. Fostering interaction with migrant communities

For several reasons, administrations often do not relate to migrants as well as to their own citizens. Further to a lack of knowledge of the state language and the governance structure, migrants often do not experience good relations with the administration of their country of origin and thus shy away from contacts with public authorities. As in many countries migrants do not hold voting rights, they also often do not forge good contacts with political representatives.

In this way, the two main channels of day-to-day communication of the political-administrative system with the residents are blocked. Administrations thus often are not well informed about the specific needs of migrant communities living on their territory, and also lack access toward the community, and thus may face serious obstacles when required to solve concrete problems.

The establishment of one-stop advice centres at local level, staffed (where possible) with personnel fluent in the language of the main migrant groups, is an important tool for the improvement of contacts with the migrant communities.

In the 1990s, several European cities have established elected or appointed "migrants' boards" to overcome these deficiencies. The experiences with these boards were mixed. While on the one hand allowing to establish contacts to representatives of migrants' associations, these associations often only represented a part of the migrant communities, and were not accepted as representatives by

migrants from different areas of the country, or those of a different religion or political opinion. In addition, migrants sitting on these boards were asked to give their expertise in all policy areas relevant for integration – a task a single person cannot seriously fulfil.

In reaction, some countries, e.g. the Netherlands and the UK, established "citizens councils" advising the local government on certain policy issues (e.g. education, health), which also included experts from migrant groups. In addition, several countries granted settled migrants voting rights at the local level to overcome their representation deficit.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- The SCMI Working Group on integration could be extended to include independent experts on various aspects of integration.
- In cities with a high proportion of immigrants, consultative bodies on specific policy areas including experts from migrant communities could be established.
- In cities with a high proportion of immigrants, public service halls and community centres under the Ministry of Justice could employ staff fluent in English and, if possible, the language(s) of the main migrant groups.

4.3. Monitoring and evaluation

The integration process of migrants is influenced by a broad range of factors. Depending on the policy area, integration policy measures will have different impacts. It is thus necessary to continuously monitor and evaluate them in order to adapt them in changing conditions. In addition, regular monitoring reports are an important tool to inform the public and help preventing the spread of rumours.

In the European Union, the quest for monitoring of integration has led to the development of a number of indicators for integration policies and integration outcomes. At the EU level, the "Zaragoza Integration Indicators"[27] aim at measuring migrants´ integration with a set of indicators reflecting structural, social and identificational integration. Eurostat annually publishes these indicators covering the labour market, employment conditions, education, housing and living conditions, risk of poverty and social exclusion, and active citizenship[28].

[27] https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/librarydoc/eu-zaragoza-integration-indicators-italy?lang=de
[28] Eurostat: Migrant Integration. 2017 edition, Luxembourg (Publications Office of the European Union), available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/8787947/KS-05-17-100-EN-N.pdf/f6c45af2-6c4f-4ca0-b547-d25e6ef9c359

The OECD - study "Indicators of Immigrant Integration – Settling in 2015" and the 2018 update present a detailed international comparison of the outcomes of immigrants and their children and their evolution over time, for all European Union and OECD countries as well as selected G20 countries[29].

While the studies mentioned above focus on integration outcomes, the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX[30]) compares policies to integrate migrants in all EU Member States, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and the USA making use of 167 policy indicators.

At the urban level, the City of Vienna has established a regular integration and diversity monitoring, which both analysis integration outcomes and the measures implemented by the City of Vienna to adapt to the growth of diversity within the urban population. The monitoring reports are published every three years making use of a common set of indicators[31].

Concrete actions for Georgia:

- Implementation of a stock-taking study on the situation and living conditions of migrants in Georgia.
- Establishment of coordinated and regular data collections on the situation and living conditions of immigrants along the model of the Zaragoza Integration Indicators.
- Consider possibility of Georgia´s participation in the next round of the MIPEX evaluation.

4.4. Research and training

In parallel with the development of integration policy as a regular policy field, research on migrants' integration has grown rapidly in recent years in the EU. A growing number of universities offer M.A. or Ph.D. course in migration, which also devote a sizeable part of their programme to integration issues, and all EU-funded framework programmes for research in recent years included specific calls targeting migrant integration. In addition, national research funds have supported a growing number of integration related research projects.

[29] OECD/EU 2015: Indicators of Immigrant Integration – Settling in. Paris (OECD); OECD/EU 2018: Settling In 2018 – Indicators of Immigrant Integration. Paris (OECD).
[30] http://www.mipex.eu/
[31] Stadt Wien: Monitoring Integration – Diversität 2013 – 2016, available at: http://www.urbaninnovation.at/tools/uploads/4.WienerIntegrationsDiversitaetsmonitor.pdf

Academic training and research is a key element of the development of integration policies. As a cross-cutting issue, integration policy making needs expertise in diverse areas, ranging from sociology to health, pedagogics, political sciences and urban planning. This expertise has to be developed within academia to guarantee quality and international cooperation.

While monitoring and evaluation will enhance the knowledge on the general development in the field of integration, specific issues will need to be studied with targeted studies. A targeted research programme on integration allows preparing the base for continuous monitoring of integration and enhances the understanding of challenges and opportunities of migration.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Establishment of a dedicated research budget on integration issues to be managed by the State Commission on Migration Issues (e.g. WG).
- Establishment of a training curriculum for integration experts at university level.

5. Policy areas of intervention

When it comes to migrant integration, state policy is of utmost importance, not only policy at the national level, but also that at the regional and local level. Moreover, recent research has highlighted the need to examine different policy domains (the legal-political, the socio-economic, the cultural-religious) together and take into account other policies, beyond those specifically targeting immigrants and including those that address broader societal institutions. What seem to matter is not only policy frames and policy measures, but also how these policies are organised and implemented by the different actors involved (Penninx and Garcés-Mascareñas 2016, 21-22).

This section includes examples of measures in selected areas of integration policies, areas which were mentioned by stakeholders consulted during the mission on October 2018 in Tbilisi and Batumi.

5.1. "Welcome" programs

Three major trends can be observed in integration policies in European countries (OECD 2018, 99-100). **First**, countries are introducing programmes to structure early integration activities. Austria, Belgium and Lithuania are some of the countries that have been creating such programs in the last two years. **Second**, countries with existing integration programmes are now restructuring their integration services. Finally, a **third** observable trend is that foreigners' participation in introduction measures is becoming obligatory. In addition to civic integration and language classes – which is a policy area in itself in the field of integration – these early integration programmes include some very practical information on legally settling in the new country.

Finland, for instance, has a portal on integration which was set to guide newly arrived migrants through the administrative process of settling in Finland[32]. Specific information is being provided in 12 languages. Newcomers to Finland can request an initial assessment by the Employment and Economic Office or by the Local Social Office (at the municipal level). If, after an initial assessment, support with integration is needed, an integration plan is being prepared. Integration training sessions, part of this plan, are organised by municipalities, the Employment and Economic Development Offices or various education institutes. This training usually includes Finnish or Swedish language studies[33] as well as introductions to the Finnish society, culture and working life. Immigrant associations are involved to support migrants and migrant children maintain and develop their native culture. The "Welcome to Finland Guide" (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland 2018) contains, in addition to administrative requirements to register with the local level authorities,

[32] https://www.infofinland.fi/en/frontpage (18.02.2019).
[33] "The two official languages in Finland are Finnish and Swedish. 90% of the population are Finnish-speaking and 5.4% are Swedish-speaking. People with some other mother tongue than Finnish or Swedish comprise 4.5% of the total population" (Ministry of Justice Finland. https://oikeusministerio.fi/en/linguistic-rights).

information on starting a business, taxation, Finish working culture, information on Finnish and Swedish, as well as information on leisure activities in Finland.

In the city of Vienna, the Municipality Department 17 – Integration and Diversity – provides specific integration services for all newcomers to the city who receive their confirmation of registration (as EU citizens) or their residence card (as third country nationals and family members of EU citizens). At the first coaching meeting[34], employees of the department fluent in the most relevant languages of migrant communities advise newly arrived migrants on the first steps of settlement. Migrants receive a "welcome map" containing information on the most relevant Viennese institutions and services for the different areas of life, e.g. kindergartens, schools or hospitals, the labour market services, language and integration course providers. The welcome map also includes the "Vienna education booklet", where all integration related activities of the migrant will be entered, and the Vienna language vouchers (currently, € 300.-) for usage with all language and integration course providers in the city[35]. The entries in the "Vienna education booklet" serve as a proof of attending the classes. At the meeting, the advisor discusses the planned integration trajectory with each migrant individually, helps to find a place in a suitable German language and integration course to allow the fulfilment of the integration contract, and advises on the information modules on e.g. recognition of qualifications or finding a job offered by the labour market services. Jointly with the migrant, an integration plan for the attendance of the necessary courses and information sessions is developed. In addition, the migrant may be advised on different issues of daily life, e.g. pre-school-education offers, registration for schools, or possibilities to upgrade his/her vocational training or other relevant topics. If necessary, additional meetings with the advisor may be arranged.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Transforming existing information on settling in/legal migration to Georgia[36] into a step-by-step guide for settling in Georgia.
- Initiating a duty to attend civic integration and counselling sessions within the first three months after arrival.
- Assigning "One stop" counselling centres for newly arrived migrants focusing on early settlement process. Depending on the number of migrants in a respective region, this can be implemented by involving civil society organisations that can provide staff for such an office, staff financed through targeted projects.
- Provision of orientation measures on living in Georgia in countries of origin of migrants before departure. This can be implemented through Georgian consulates abroad.

[34] Start Wien. http://www.startwien.at/de-eu/startcoaching (18.02.2019).
[35] Attendance of a German language and integration course is mandatory for newly arrived migrants in Austria, the costs for the courses are subsidised by the government, and the Euro150 voucher is an additional subsidy only available in Vienna.
[36] State Commission on Migration Issues, Guidebook on Legal Immigration, http://migration.commission.ge/files/immigration_en_2017.pdf

5.2. Language and education

In all European countries, acquiring the official language of the country of residence is considered key to integration. Being part of early integration programmes, language learning is also linked with certain residency and work permit decision. In a 2014 Council of Europe report, 23 out of 36 countries demand from migrants a certain level of proficiency in the official language of the country as a condition for granting residency. In almost half of these countries (12 out of the 23) migrants were asked to take a test at a state-run test centre, while in the rest of the countries a certificate from an accredited language school was required (CoE 2014).

Relevant for the development of such courses are:

- The **course duration** (how long is it needed to reach A2 or B1 level in a language, considering the specificities of a language?).
- The **teaching method tailored to a specific group** (is the teaching method adequate for people coming from different cultures, are there adequate methods for teaching a foreign language to illiterate adults, for instance?).
- **Accessibility for the target group** (can people reach the class with public transport, does the course offer child care, are classes scheduled in the evening so people can attend classes after work?).

An example of addressing language learning in an integrative manner is the "Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters" programme (the HIPPY programme)[37], present in Vienna. One of the main activities of the programme is that HIPPY home visitors come once a week to migrant families – in practice, these are mostly mothers taking care of young children – and bring them play and learning material for each of the coming weeks, and show them how they can independently work through the material with their children, in a playful manner.

There are also group meetings and excursions for mothers and children. The idea is to teach young children and in doing so, to involve parents as active promoters of education. The programme requires networking and close cooperation with kindergartens, schools, migrant associations and relevant political actors at local level.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Improving access to education for migrant children (also through preparatory classes to learn Georgian).

[37] http://www.hippy.at/ (18.02.2019).

- Training teachers to teach Georgian as a foreign language (This can be achieved, for instance, by making use of the methodology already developed by a teacher working with Open House).
- Using incentives for language acquisition. Involvement in implementing some of the suggested action of migrant organisations or those organisations already working with migrants and that are already promoters of language acquisition.

5.3. Labour market

While language training remains the key building block of integration, there is a growing focus on the integration of migrants into the labour market at the level adequate to their skills.

In the context of participation in the labour market, the assessment and recognition of qualifications obtained abroad and the validation of skills of migrants are the most important challenges. Employment of migrants beyond their skill level will lead to a waste of human potential and limit migrants' contribution to the economic development of the host society. For this reason, the development of tools for transparent skills recognition – which help employers to overcome uncertainty about the qualification of potential employees – is of core concern. Several EU countries have started to develop systems allowing the recognition of foreign qualifications with a view to foster employment at an adequate training level. While in many countries the recognition of academic qualifications was the first area to develop a systematic approach towards skills assessment, meanwhile the recognition of vocational qualifications has gained growing relevance. In some countries, such as Germany or Sweden, recognition of qualifications and skills validation is linked to training modules upgrading qualifications obtained abroad, or offering specific trainings for skills not acquired in the country of origin.

Labour markets in Europe are heavily regulated and often demand the proof of formal training as a condition for employment. In many third countries, vocational skills are acquired informally in a master – student relationship, or within company-based training programmes. The assessment and recognition of informally acquired skills is a specific challenge to be addressed in procedures for skills recognition.

"MYSKILLS" programme[38], developed by the German labour market authorities in 2016, aims to identify the competencies and work-relevant skills of refugees and migrants through technology-based testing, and to use the results of the test for placement, training and apprenticeships.

[38] Bundesagentur für Arbeit. For people coming from other countries. https://www.arbeitsagentur.de/en/welcome (18.02.2019).

MYSKILLS is a vocational competence test that is completed by the client following a counselling interview, if the client claims that he or she has work experience in an occupation but has no recognised formal qualification or way to prove it. Individuals are tested in one or more professions in a test centre. The test takes about four hours. Tests are available for 30 professions (professions such as sales person or cook). The tests are supported by pictures and videos and are available in six languages (German, English, Modern Standard Arabic, New Persian, Turkish and Russian). For each profession the test has five to eight different action or competence areas (for instance, for the test 'salesperson' these include actions such as 'providing customer service' and 'ringing up customers'). The competence areas are clearly separable, represent occupational areas/assignments in firms, are oriented towards existing partial qualification models, and generally represent the full vocational proficiency. The individual is evaluated for each area – whether they have high skills, moderate skills, or low/no skills. Depending on the outcome of the assessment, a decision is made on whether deployment to a particular placement is possible or not, whether extra training is needed, or what occupation placement may be most suitable.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Consider the applicability of mechanisms for recognition of professional training undertaken in other countries, including informal education.
- Develop training programmes in the areas needed on the labour market (by involving employers).

5.4. Healthcare and social service

Equal access to health for all residents is regarded a precondition for sustainable public health policies in most European countries. In this respect, lack of access of migrants to health insurance and health care is regarded as a main challenge. But even if migrants can access the health system on the same legal base as citizens, lack of knowledge of local language and of the health system, different health literacy and discrimination may still impede the take up of health care by migrants, with negative effects not only on their health, but also the public health situation in general.

One example of a measure aimed at improving migrants' access to healthcare comes from Malta. Cultural Mediators in Health Care project[39] aims at facilitating communication between migrants coming from different countries and health service providers, and raises awareness about challenges brought by cultural and linguistic barriers encountered by both sides. Particular attention has been given to the training of cultural mediators and health professionals in how to work and collaborate in

[39] European Website on Integration. Malta: Cultural mediators in health care. https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/intpract/malta-cultural-mediators-in-health-care (18.2.2019).

this relatively new way of working within a triadic context. The training was developed by the Migrant Health Liaison Office within the Primary Health Care Department and trained 12 groups of migrants over 6 years who become then cultural mediators. The cultural mediator's role goes beyond that of an interpreter; it seeks to convey the world of the migrant patient to the health professional through an explanation of cultural behaviours related to health and social care. Furthermore, the trained cultural mediator's role serves a tool for the facilitation of integration and inclusion both for the cultural mediator and also for the migrant patients who are being assisted. Migrant patients are being guided on how to access the available health care services appropriately.

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Providing information about access to basic health services to newly arrived migrants in Georgia.
- Granting access to health care irrespectively of the residence permit.

5.5. Living together: housing and socialising

Living together is the most direct translation of social integration which influences how people experience their neighbourhoods, schools and communities. Impact of immigration is usually localised, as cities are home to more migrants than small towns or villages. Furthermore, as newly arrived draw on networks of compatriots, one result is the formation of so-called "ethnic enclaves" where people from the same country (or same language group) tend to live next to each other. One major challenge to social integration is segregation, be it in housing, access to services, social spheres and institutions.

Gebietsbetreuung[40] is a public service of the city of Vienna which brings together experts from the fields of architecture, urban and landscape planning, law and mediation. Their tasks are, among others, to

- inform homeowners about renovations measures,
- provide advice for the development of new housing,
- support initiatives and projects in public spaces – for a liveable environment.

For instance, when a public park is to be reconstructed, residents living in the area are asked to get involved and actively participate to the reconstruction of the park. The idea is that the public space belongs to everyone and all should feel connected to it, have access to it and use the public space for forming and maintaining communities.

[40] https://www.gbstern.at/ (18.02.2019).

Proposals for concrete actions in Georgia:

- Improving access to housing for migrants outside of "migrant neighbourhoods/ migrant areas".
- Involving residents in planning selected areas of the public space.
- Introducing intercultural mediators in urban settlements with relatively high immigrant population.

5.6. Culture and Religion

A recent research on perception of migration in various EU countries[41] shows that whether migrants come from within the EU or from countries outside the EU is of less importance, but what differs with regards to perception of migration, is the nationals' education, income and health.

In the above mentioned Horizon 2020 research project REMINDER conducted in partnership with ICMPD, researchers at the University of Oxford found that "the probability of supporting immigration of at least some unskilled workers from EU countries is lowest among people in low-skilled occupations, those in poor health, and those who find it difficult to cope on their income. The chances are also low among those who think that EU unification has gone too far and those who value being Christian as an important condition for immigration"[42]. In other words, perception of migration depends on the position one has or identifies him/herself with in society. In public debates, often only the challenges associated with immigration are highlighted, while the potential gains stay underreported. As a consequence, integration may be misunderstood as a concept benefiting only migrants, and not the entire population. Targeted media and communication campaigns on the gains and challenges of migration, have been developed in several European countries in recent years.

In Spain, a comprehensive communication, awareness raising, and advocacy strategy to improve the treatment of immigration in the Spanish media has been developed by the NGO-network "Red Acoge"[43]. The network acts as an intermediary between journalists and immigrants and refugees with the aim to impact on the media and society in general on the use of language. It trains journalists to avoid sensational reporting, characterised by a lack of rigor in investigation and reporting, which is sometimes present in news items relating to the migrant and refugee population as well as to the migration process in general, and generates harmful stereotypes for social cohesion and integration.

[41] https://www.reminder-project.eu/ (16.02.209).
[42] Ibid.
[43] https://www.redacoge.org/es/quienessomos/presentacion.html (16.02.2019).

The fight against this *immigracionalism* (which comes from immigration + sensationalism) aims to make it more visible, and correct it. The methodology of the project is based on the critical analysis of the information, the empowerment of immigrants as spokespersons of their own experience and the direct and individualized intervention with reporters. The project is implemented in 6 regions (La Rioja, Madrid, Murcia, Salamanca, Valencia and Valladolid), where it maintains contact with local and regional media (European Website on Integration 2017)[44].

Proposals for concrete actions for Georgia:

- Awareness raising campaigns targeting both, nationals and foreigners, such as the campaign "Stand together" where nationals and foreigners come together and play sports, or implement art projects, for instance.
- Information campaigns informing migrants about their rights and duties, by directly involving migrant organisations or organisations working with migrants.

[44] https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/intpract/inmigracionalism-project-on-the-medias-treatment-of-immigration-and-asylum-in-spain (5.11.2018).

6. Conclusions

With the establishment of the State Commission on Migration Issues, the development of the Migration Strategies for Georgia, its Action Plan and the regular publication of Migration Profiles detailing the migration situation in the country, Georgia has already started to develop an evidence-based migration policy for the future. Integration issues have already been discussed within the framework of a working group of the State Commission on Migration Issues, and also form a relevant part of the Migration Profiles published by the SCMI.

While these activities have laid the ground for the further development of integration policies, this document aimed at outlining paths for further development and the establishment of sustainable institutional structures based on examples from other European countries. While the analysis shows communalities in recent developments – the establishment of specialised institutional structures, the growing involvement of local governments and the civil society, and the focus on language acquisition and civic integration in the first phase of settlement – the concrete examples are shaped by the different historical conditions of the countries and embedded into the existing institutional framework.

Incremental policy making is based on needs analysis, capacity building and institutional reform and the implementation of targeted measures. Regular policy evaluation and the continuous monitoring of outputs and outcomes accompany the process of evidence-based policy making. In this sense, the analysis and ideas presented in this report aim at fostering discussions and policy developments adapted to the situation on the ground. In this sense, the authors envisaged this report as a contribution to the further development and implementation of integration policies in Georgia.

7. References

CoE 2014: Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants. Policy and practice Final Report on the 3rd Council of Europe Survey. https://languageforwork.ecml.at/Portals/48/ICT_REV_LFW/LIAM-SurveyReport2014_EN.pdf.pdf (18.02.2019).

Eurostat 2017: Migrant Integration. 2017 edition. Luxembourg (Publications Office of the European Union), available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/8787947/KS-05-17-100-EN-N.pdf/f6c45af2-6c4f-4ca0-b547-d25e6ef9c359. (18.02.2019)

Esser, Hartmut 2001: Integration und ethnische Schichtung. Arbeitspapier 40. Mannheim 106 http://www.mzes.uni-mannheim.de/publications/wp/wp-40.pdf (15.10.2011).

Esser, Hartmut 2006: Sprache und Integration. Die sozialen Bedingungen und Folgen des Spracherwerbs von Migranten. Frankfurt und New York (Campus).

GeoStat. Number of immigrants and emigrants by sex and citizenship. http://www.geostat.ge/index.php?action=page&p_id=173&lang=eng (17.02.2019).

Glazer, Nathan 1998: We Are All Multiculturalists Now. Boston (Harvard University Press).
Lacrouix, Thomas 2013: Collective remittances and integration. In: Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 39/6, 1019 – 1035.

Lowery, Michael 1995: The War on Equal Employment, in: Black Enterprises, Vol 27, Nr.7, 150 – 167.
Massey, Douglas 1987: Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States. In: American Journal of Sociology 92/6, 1372 – 1402.

Mazzacuto, Valentina 2008: The Double Engagement: Transnationalism and Integration. Ghanian Migrants´ Lives between Ghana and the Netherlands. In: Journal of Migration and Ethnic Studies 34/2, 199 – 216.

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland (2018), Welcome to Finland Guide, http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/161193/MEAEguide_18_2018_TervetuloaSuomeen_Eng_PDFUA.pdf (15.02.2019).

OECD (2018), International Migration Outlook 2018, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2018-en (15.02.2019).

OECD/EU 2015: Indicators of Immigrant Integration – Settling in. Paris (OECD); OECD/EU 2018c: Settling In 2018 – Indicators of Immigrant Integration. Paris (OECD).

Penninx, Rinus and Garcés-Mascareñas, Blanca 2016: The Concept of Integration as an Analytical Tool and as a Policy Concept, 11-30. In Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas and Rinus Penninx (Eds.) *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe. Context, Levels and Actors*. IMISCOE Research Series: Springer Open

Stark, Oded 1991: The Migration of Labour. Oxford (Basil Blackwell).

State Commission on Migration Issues (SCMI) 2017: 2017 Migration Profile of Georgia. Tbilisi (State Commission on Migration Issues), p. 36.

Thomas, Roosevelt R. 1990: From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity. Harvard Business Review, Vol. 68 (2), p. 197 – 117.

European Union documents:

EC and OECD 2018: Commission and OECD Present Report on the Local Integration of Migrants. http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/OECD-migration-local-factsheet.pdf (18.02.2019).

COM (2000) 757 final. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Community Immigration Policy. https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ddccd7a4.html (18.02.2019).

COM (2003) 336 final. Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on immigration, integration and employment. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0336:FIN:EN:PDF (18.02.2019).

COM (2016) 377 final. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_action_plan_integration_third-country_nationals_en.pdf (18.02.2019).

Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents. https://www.easo.europa.eu/sites/default/files/public/Longtermresidency-EN.pdf (18.02.2019).

Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification. https://www.easo.europa.eu/sites/default/files/public/Family-Reunification-EN.pdf. (18.02.2019).

Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:343:0001:0009:EN:PDF (18.02.2019).

Directive 2014/66/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L0066&from=EN (18.02.2019).

Directive (EU) 2016/801 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of research, studies, training, voluntary service, pupil exchange schemes or educational projects and au pairing. https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/65b80366-1ede-11e6-86d0-01aa75ed71a1 (18.02.2019).

European Parliament. Tampere European Council, 15 and 16 October 1999, Presidency Conclusions, Conclusion 21. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm. (18.02.2019).

The Council of the European Union: Press Release 2618th Council Meeting, 14615/04 (Presse 321). http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-04-321_en.htm?locale=en (18.02.2019).

Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, OJ C 306, 17.12.2007. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12007L%2FTXT (18.02.2019).

Websites:

Bundesagentur für Arbeit. For people comiong from other countries. https://www.arbeitsagentur.de/en/welcome (18.02.2019).

European Website on Integration. Malta: Cultural mediators in health care. https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/intpract/malta-cultural-mediators-in-health-care (18.2.2019).

European Website on Integration (2017), Inmigracionalism Project on the media's treatment of immigration and asylum in Spain (Unofficial translation), https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/intpract/inmigracionalism-project-on-the-medias-treatment-of-immigration-and-asylum-in-spain (15.02.2019).

European Website on Integration. Introduction of EU 'Zaragoza' Integration Indicators. https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/librarydoc/eu-zaragoza-integration-indicators-italy (18.02.2019).

Gebietsbetreuung Stadterneuerung. https://www.gbstern.at/ (18.02.2019).
Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters. http://www.hippy.at/ (18.02.2019)
Ministry of Justice Finland. Linguistic rights. https://oikeusministerio.fi/en/linguistic-rights (18.02.2019).

Moving to Finland. https://www.infofinland.fi/en/frontpage (18.02.2019).
OECD 2017: Territorial Approach to Migrant Integration. http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/migrantintegrationincities.htm (18.02.2019).

Red Acoge. https://www.redacoge.org/es/quienessomos/presentacion.html (16.02.2019).

REMINDER ("Role of European Mobility and Its Impacts in Narratives, Debates and EU Reforms") project. https://www.reminder-project.eu/ (16.02.209).

Start Wien. http://www.startwien.at/de-eu/startcoaching (18.02.2019).

Stadt Wien: Monitoring Integration – Diversität 2013 – 2016. http://www.urbaninnovation.at/tools/uploads/4.WienerIntegrationsDiversitaetsmonitor.pdf (18.02.2019).