

**Richard Williams**

**Bill Seary**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

# **Year-end Report 2010**

**Prepared as part of an evaluation of the  
second phase of the**

## **European Programme for Integration and Migration**



**March 2011**

## **Executive Summary**

This is the second annual report of the second phase of the European Programme for Integration and Migration, which began in September 2008. This report and its annexes make an assessment of the progress of the 15 projects since our report for 2009, of the selection and induction of a second round of grantees and of the development and overall impact of the programme to date. It is written at a time when partner foundations have agreed to work together to formulate a proposal for a further programme – “EPIM III”. As a result, many of our recommendations this time are directed to EPIM III rather than to the remainder of EPIM II.

The external context of EPIM’s work continued to deteriorate in 2010. Governments across Europe are using migrants (and, in the case of France and Italy, Roma migrants in particular) as a scapegoat for economic problems. Islamophobia is increasing, notably in Germany. The Commission, particularly the Home Affairs Directorate-General, and the Council continued to view undocumented migrants in terms of controlling entry and enforcing return. This is in spite of the findings of the EU-funded *Clandestino* study which at the end of 2009 had estimated the undocumented migration population in the EU 27 at between 1.9 million and 3.8 million, far fewer than the 8 million figure widely used.

## **Progress**

In 2010, its second full year, the EPIM Programme recorded some significant successes. At the end of the year, the grantees were all broadly on course and had formed a number of informal partnerships for specific activities. Voices of migrants are being increasingly heard at the EU level, particularly those of migrant women, thanks to the new network fostered by the European Women’s Lobby. The issue of undocumented migrants is being pushed on to the government/institutional agenda, both at EU and national level, particularly with regard to the right to health care. Projects have attracted media coverage of migrant integration issues in a wide range of European countries.

This was achieved with the support of the small secretariat which, among other activities, provided two capacity building workshops, quarterly briefings on relevant European developments (courtesy of the European Policy Centre) and regular telephone advice.

The Steering Committee has developed into an effective body and found ways of accommodating considerable differences in approach with a new communications strategy and an agreement to plan a third phase of the Programme, an EPIM III.

## Strategic Grant Making

The **project selection** procedure for the second call for proposals was widely felt to be an improvement on the first round. Decisions were made by a small group of foundations, supported by written input from external experts. Nevertheless some foundations would have welcomed the Secretariat taking a stronger lead.

The quality of **internal communication** has improved this year. The policy updates, DMIIG newsletter and Secretariat's summaries of grantees' progress are particularly welcomed, while a substantial minority of grantees would like to have more contact with other organisations involved in EPIM in order to better understand the different contexts in EU countries and act as a resource for interested journalists, or to identify partners for future work. Some foundations are concerned about the volume of information and would welcome the Secretariat making recommendations based on its own analysis and providing less raw information.

The **key learning** in this area is that effective internal communication (whether by e-mail, websites or some other means) depends upon the sort of understanding and trust that comes only after considerable face-to-face contact, which EPIM has achieved through workshops and joint activities, such as JLIIs.

While it can be said that EPIM has achieved extensive **media coverage** of migration and integration issues in a wide range of European countries, grantees vary greatly in the way they report impact, ranging from simply claiming positive media coverage of the general issue to listing titles of newspaper articles. Consequently, the quality of coverage and whether it has increased cannot readily be assessed.

A survey of projects' **evaluation** arrangements showed them to be diverse and often weak. Their monitoring arrangements are not always aligned with the questionnaires they fill in or with the indicators in the Programme's logical framework. A thorough discussion of evaluation and monitoring arrangements at an early workshop in a future Programme would help prompt grantees to implement their plans, establish consistent benchmarks and measures and ensure coherence with Programme evaluation.

The **database** of project reports is nearing the point where it will become a useful tool for programme management, as well as evaluation, but considerable staff time has gone into its development during the life of the programme and to ensuring the quality of data. More information is being asked of grantees than appears to be used. If, after careful consideration, it is decided to use a similar database in a future programme, indicators, forms and software should all be developed and tested in advance of the implementation of grantees' projects.

## Networking and Capacity Building

EPIM-funded organisations have **grown** stronger in a range of ways:

- Joint learning initiative (JLI) training and information collected through EPIM projects have increased confidence and success in fundraising;
- techniques learned at the Communications workshop in Lisbon have resulted in more effective advocacy and media work;
- new partnerships with other grantees have produced successes, such as a European Parliament hearing on undocumented women and children's access to health care.

Most grantees found that establishing European **networks** took longer and needed more resources than they expected; one found it easier than anticipated. This area warrants further study. Grantees' networks have been extended to other EPIM-funded organisations and various joint initiatives have been undertaken.

More than 160 NGOs have been involved with EPIM to varying degrees since the first phase, the great majority in northern and western Europe. The extent to which partners other than the lead NGO feel engaged with EPIM and the whether their advocacy potential is fully realised unclear.

Some organisations have secured new **funding**, such as PICUM's substantial grant from the European commission for core activities (an implicit recognition of the importance of the issue of undocumented migrants). But the wider picture is bleaker, with expected cuts to EU funding in this area after 2013 and the closure of Atlantic Philanthropies' programmes in 2016.

The three **JLIs** not only improved skills and introduced new approaches to the organisations involved, but the need to work in partnership with other grantees also fostered mutual understanding and facilitated networking. One was less cost-effective than the others. Some grantees took steps to cascade learning within their organisations, while one lost all the learning when their EPIM contact person moved on.

The key learning is that the **optimum JLI** involves a small number of participants with common interests and specialised learning needs that would not be met by off-the-shelf training programmes. A subject of interest and potential benefit to a larger group of grantees, such as peer review, would be better suited to a full workshop programme.

If JLIs are run again, particular attention should be paid to procedures for setting them up, to guidance, particularly on the need for all participating organisations to agree on the plan, and to the method of allocating money to each one. Grantees should be encouraged to maximise value for money, by, for example, combining training sessions with exchange visits. A requirement to create learning materials for the benefit of other grantees is likely to necessitate more

effort than it merits, but participants should be encouraged to share learning within their organisation.

Most grantees see **workshops** as a valuable networking opportunity. They also welcome the site visits, a new innovation in 2010. Some reported modest amounts of learning from workshops, in specific areas, but programmes remain too crowded with too little time for new ideas to be discussed and digested. The practice of setting up different working groups to run each workshop may have got in the way of putting into practice lessons learned at previous workshops.

The **invisible impacts** of being funded by EPIM, such as internal capacity building, the ability to think about strategy, relationship with members) are often as important to organisations as the direct results of the project EPIM is supporting. Clearly, the effect on organisations receiving longer, three year, grants is likely to be more durable than on those receiving a short grant.

### **Advocacy and Policy**

The engagement of an external consultancy early in the year enabled EPIM to adopt a **communication strategy** and to produce some potentially useful tools, including a series of **case studies**. The extent to which either the strategy or the case studies are being used, however, has yet to be seen. Negotiations on the EU's budget post-2013 may present a suitable target for coordinated advocacy, given the expected cuts to funding in the area of migration and integration. .

Work on the communication strategy has forced foundations to consider their own positions on broad migration issues, the role they and/or EPIM should play and their expectations of the programme. **A clear role has emerged**, namely to encourage new funders to the area, to support grantees in their advocacy efforts and to share strategic learning.

The development of the strategy has also exposed a lack of confidence on the part of some foundations in the ability of grantees to engage in meaningful debate with a range of policymakers. Some grantees themselves are concerned about the sector's capacity for effective analysis and strategic response to national and EU policies.

Foundations considering future funding for advocacy in this area need to take a view on whether they want to see concrete outcomes in terms of policy and legislative change, which would imply focussing on existing European and national policies, or whether they will accept fewer concrete outcomes as NGOs support the most vulnerable who fall into the policy gaps and try, in their advocacy, to change the terms of the debate. While these two approaches support each other in the long term, any one programme needs to be clear about which of the two most needs to be moved forward so that it can define clear measures of success.

## Foundations' Partnership

As the programme develops, the **benefits of collaborative funding** for European work are emerging. Broadly, foundations are finding that their activities at the national level are complemented by working in partnership with others to influence relevant EU law and policy. They can leverage more funding and greater impact while gaining valuable learning about the issue, about the EU dimension and about other funders' working methods. Partnership working, however, takes time for its value to be realised, requires compromise, overheads are inevitably higher than for direct funding and more staff time is needed than is usual for the size of the investment.

**External consultants** helped foundations move forward on the communication strategy and discuss a third phase of EPIM. They helped foundations to join in the discussion more freely, uninhibited by any formal role they had within EPIM or perceptions of differences in status or experience. External consultants and facilitators may represent an effective means of resolving tensions and impasses that may arise within a partnership of foundations with greatly differing cultures, investment power and approaches to grant giving.

Many foundations are in favour of reducing the operational role of the **Steering Committee** in a future programme, so that it acts more like a board. We support this. However careful consideration will need to be given to this prior to any EPIM III, as it may require an expanded Secretariat staff, with enhanced skills. It is likely to have budget implications and may reduce foundations' opportunities for mutual learning, which they see as an important benefit of EPIM.

While Foundations appear content with the current **governance** structure, working groups have had varying success, there are wide disparities in foundations' participation, and significant decisions are left to a very small Executive Committee. Governance questions should be integral to discussions on EPIM III.

## **Findings and Strategic Learning**

### *Finding 1*

**The design of EPIM II has facilitated communication among grantees and among foundations. Grantees have made direct use of some of this information to strengthen their organisations**

#### *Strategic Learning for Finding 1*

The quality of internal exchange has improved this year. We draw the conclusion that this results from better mutual knowledge among the grantees and the foundations separately and - to a lesser extent – together. Effective internal communication (whether by e-mail, websites or some other means) depends upon the sort of understanding that comes only after considerable contact, including workshops, joint activities, such as JLI, and other opportunities to meet face-to-face.

### *Finding 2*

**Joint Learning Initiatives effectively met NGOs' learning needs, while strengthening relations between participant organisations**

#### *Strategic Learning for Finding 2*

Grantee-organised joint learning initiatives have strengthened the organisations involved – especially the organisations that planned and implemented the JLI, while the need to work in partnership with other grantees fostered mutual understanding and facilitated networking

The optimum JLI appears to involve a small number of participants with common interests and specialised learning needs that would not be met by off-the-shelf training programmes. Attention should be given to maximising value for money, for example by combining training sessions with exchange visits.

Where a subject is of interest and benefit to a larger group of grantees, such as peer review, consideration should be made to including it in the full workshop programme.

This experience of the use of the JLI approach should inform similar work in the future. In particular, attention should be paid to the setting up procedures and guidance, particularly on the need for all participating organisations to agree on the plan, and to the method of allocating money to each JLI.

JLI of this nature will mainly increase the skills of individual participants. Nevertheless, they should be encouraged to share learning within their organisation.

A requirement to create learning materials for the benefit of other grantees is likely to necessitate more effort than it merits – after all,

those individuals will have not have been sufficiently interested in the subject to participate in the JLI.

### *Finding 3*

#### **EPIM has enabled the grantees to strengthen their organisations in a number of ways**

##### *Strategic Learning for Finding 3*

The strengthening of the grantees has been much more evident this year than in last year. We draw the conclusion that longer-term grants are more likely to have lasting impact on the organisations than are relatively short term ones. Short term projects may have a role in some areas, but the applications required do not need and do not encourage a strategic approach. This may seem rather obvious (and NGOs often criticise the EU for preferring to fund short term projects), however short term projects have featured in EPIM II and many funders still limit projects to one year or eighteen months.

Invisible impacts (for example; internal capacity building, ability to think about strategy, relationship with members) are often as important to organisations as the direct results of the project EPIM is supporting.

### *Finding 4*

#### **The engagement of an external consultancy enabled EPIM to break through an impasse on communications and advocacy and led to the production of some useful tools**

##### *Strategic Learning for Finding 4*

The development of a communication strategy has been useful in that it has forced foundations to consider their own positions on broad migration issues and the role they and/or EPIM should play and their expectations of the programme. This led to their acknowledging that their role was limited to encouraging new funders to the area, to supporting grantees in their advocacy efforts and to sharing strategic learning.

Foundations considering future funding for advocacy in this area need to take a view on whether they want to see concrete outcomes in terms of policy and legislative change, which would imply focussing on existing European and national policies, or whether they will accept fewer concrete outcomes as NGOs support the most vulnerable who fall into the policy gaps and try, in their advocacy, to change the terms of the debate. While these two approaches support each other in the long term, any one programme needs to be clear about which of the two most needs to be moved forward so that it can define clear measures of success.

The development of the strategy has also exposed a lack of confidence on the part of some foundations in the ability of grantees to engage in

meaningful debate with a range of policymakers. Grantees themselves are concerned about their own capacity to research and respond to national and EU policies in the context of a broad, coherent and persuasive narrative.

#### *Finding 5*

#### **Foundations benefit by working together through EPIM**

##### *Strategic Learning for Finding 5*

It takes an extended period of working together before the full value of collaboration can be realised.

Working together to resolve real difficulties speeds this process.

The supporters of a partner foundation need to be able to see the advantages of their foundations involvement in collaborative work.

Foundations that are engaged in an individual EU Member State on national or local issues can benefit by collaborating with others to influence relevant EU law and policy. Lessons from EPIM may be applicable to areas other than migration where the EU has competence.