

Richard Williams
Bill Seary

Year-end Report 2009

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

European Programme for Integration and Migration



March 2010

Executive Summary

This is the first annual report of the second phase of the European Programme for Integration and Migration, which began in September 2008. This report makes an assessment of the progress of the 15 projects since our baseline report of December 2008, as well as the development and overall impact of the programme to date. It aims to identify lessons that are emerging, in order to improve the delivery of this programme and to extract strategic learning that will inform other collaborative funding initiatives and a possible third phase of EPIM.

The end of 2009 saw two major developments in EPIM's external environment. Firstly, following a 'yes' vote in the Irish referendum, the Lisbon treaty came into force on 1 December. Legislation relating to the entry and movement of migrants is now decided by the "ordinary community procedure", which means that a Member State is no longer able to veto proposals. The European Parliament now has an equal voice with the Council in this area, so MEPs have become a much more important target for those seeking to influence legislation on immigration and integration. Finally, the Treaty provides a clearer legislative framework for migrant integration in the form of a legal basis for "measures to provide incentives and support".

Also in December, the EU adopted the Stockholm Programme, the second major development of the year. Migration is a priority for EU policy in the area of justice, freedom and security in this programme for the next five years. Medium term objectives, however, are likely to be overshadowed in the short term at least by the security agenda, and specifically the perceived need to stem the arrival of undocumented migrants in Europe across the Mediterranean.

Progress

At the end of 2009 the grantees were all more or less on course. There had been some minor delays caused by delays in other funding and by – in some projects – underestimates of the time needed to establish a Europe-wide network. However, all grantees have supplied stories of success and suggested policy lessons.

This was achieved with the support of the following programme activities; -

- holding two capacity building workshops on advocacy;
- publishing a sheet of strategic learning;
- commissioning - and sharing with partner foundations and grantees - quarterly issues of a Policy Briefing prepared by the European Policy Centre; and
- setting up an innovative scheme of joint learning initiatives (JLIs):

Grantees have told us that the EPIM programme has provided them with new opportunities to make contacts and form networks. They have come to appreciate the capacity building work of EPIM. This has also attracted the interest of other foundations.

As evaluators, we have profited from new software that collates the progress reports completed by grantees.

Partner foundations have made considerable progress during the year on extending their membership and financial resources and in building trust within the Steering Committee.

Strategic Learning

Grant making

Grantees are reporting that they find the programme an unusual and helpful form of grant-giving.

We have had positive feedback from all sides on the advantages of having a dedicated Programme Manager and on the helpfulness of the holder of that post.

The requirement for the first grantee progress reports to be submitted after six months was too early for the longer-term projects.

The decision not to prioritise current short-term grantees in the second round appears to overlook the need for continuity of support.

The role within EPIM of grantees' partner organisations was not clear. Given that they extend EPIM's reach far beyond the lead organisations, more emphasis could have been placed on including them in networking and capacity-building. They should be included in any advocacy and communications strategies.

Migrant- and minority-led organisations are poorly represented in EPIM II, though the success of EPIM II projects working with migrant-led organisations - such as the European Network of Migrant Women - testify to the demand for migrant voices to engage in national and EU-level policy debates. We recommend that foundations discuss with grantees and migrant-led organisations outside of EPIM whether migrant-led organisations have a special role in migrant representation and how best to tackle the barriers that prevent them from accessing funding.

The logical framework needs attention. At present the links between the various columns are not clear and the Programme Manager's suggestions for adding indicators of success have not been considered by the Steering Committee.

It is now time to make a decision on whether to proceed to an EPIM III. Not knowing whether the programme will be renewed has consequences for advocacy or communications work and some partner foundations in planning their work beyond 2011 will need to know whether there will be a further EPIM programme.

Capacity building

The workshops have been appreciated (with some reservations about the first) by the grantees. They were, particularly pleased by the way in which workshops facilitated exchanges between grantees. Also some of

the formal input has been valued and one participant welcomed the opportunity for some thinking time.

The establishment of joint learning initiatives was a worthwhile experiment and there are lessons to be learnt if similar provisions are to be made in future funding programmes. The joint learning initiative model was well suited to the needs of EPIM in that it increased the effectiveness of the grantees and supported networking among them. It will be useful in other funding programmes with a similar structure. To be most effective, the grantees should have the chance to get to know each other well before they are asked to form a training consortium.

Policy lessons

Two overarching messages are emerging. The first is that there is a biased use by Member States of the Common Basic Principles and, in particular, a marked absence of the idea of integration being a “dynamic two-way process of mutual accommodation”. The second is that, in the pursuit of “security” and “controlling immigration” the human rights of migrants are being violated and that this is a development that creates risks for all members of society.

Advocacy and Communications

The idea of foundations engaging in advocacy has proven highly contentious, revealing cultural differences between foundations from different countries as well as between individual foundations. A debate about whether or not EPIM should develop a collective strategy to influence EU and national integration policy delayed the Steering Committee’s consideration of the broader spectrum of communications issues, aside from EPIM advocacy.

Elements of a Communications strategy might have included: -

- supporting EPIM’s objectives by improving communications between foundations, grantees, Secretariat and external consultants;
- further encouragement to other funders to invest in migration and integration work at European, national and local level;
- sharing learning about the EPIM model not only with other private foundations, but also with institutional funders, such as the European Commission;
- ensuring that the Secretariat and other individuals who might promote EPIM have the resources, tools and support to do so effectively;
- gathering the best stories and examples from the grantees that illustrate the need for and benefits of EPIM.

Aside from any initiative by foundations to engage in advocacy on the issues, or by EPIM to carry out joint advocacy, EPIM can add value to grantees’ advocacy activities, by providing a forum for reflection, tools for mutual learning and an opportunity to develop a coherent narrative.

Without taking a view on whether the Foundations should themselves engage in advocacy, we recommend that the Steering Committee continue to develop an advocacy strategy in partnership with the grantees and their networks. The strategy should ensure that advocacy by grantees, as well as EPIM's own promotional and advocacy activities derives full benefit from the collective knowledge of the EPIM network.

Future Programmes

Lessons are emerging from EPIM II that may be useful in the design of future collaborative funding programmes.

There are considerable benefits to collaborative funding. These include: -

- to bring additional foundations into funding an area that had been poorly served by private philanthropy;
- to expand the amount of funding available for this work;
- to enable Foundations to support projects across national or other boundaries, when they would normally be restricted to funding within a particular region;
- to facilitate working with and/or learning from other foundations;
- to reach grantees whom that would not normally be encountered.

Collaborative funding programmes have particular difficulties in framing clear purposes and measures of success. Much thinking went in the shaping of EPIM II and agreement was reached on the three main areas of funding to be offered. However this work left considerable vagueness about how the advocacy goal was to be achieved, while the logical framework is not always clear on the relationships between activities and expected outputs for each goal.

The programme management function is critical to the success of a collaborative funding programme. EPIM II offers a good model.

Collaborative funding programmes are most relevant when grant making is combined with capacity building work. Collaborative funding programmes are a learning experience for the funders and the learning will be maximised if they are also a learning experience for the grantees. The EPIM II work with Joint Learning Initiatives provides a good model here.

Collaborative funding programmes at the European level are particularly important because the role of the European Union decision making in many of the fields of interest to non-governmental organisations has become larger in recent years. Advocacy needs to be organised at the EU level but foundation funding remains primarily at the local, national or regional level. However transnational European partnerships, whether EPIM funders, NGO networks or, indeed Member States of the European Council face common challenges of language, cultural differences, distance etc.