

LoGoSO

中德 Germany China

Models of Co-operation
between Local
Governments and Social
Organizations –
Migration: Challenges
and Solutions

LoGoSO Research Papers Nr. 8

Migrant Integration as a Challenge for Local Governments and Social Organizations in China and Germany

– Policy Traditions and Integration Measures in Guangzhou,
Hangzhou, Berlin and Cologne

Anja Ketels, Freie Universität Berlin

March 2019

LoGoSO Research Papers Nr. 8
ISSN: 2570-2351

The Publication Series

LoGoSO Research Papers is the publication series of the LoGoSO Germany China Research Project, edited by Prof. Dr. Katja Levy, Assistant Professor for Chinese Politics and Law at Freie Universität Berlin.

The LoGoSO Research Papers Series serves to disseminate first results of the ongoing research in the LoGoSO Germany China Project (www.logoso-project.com). Inclusion of a paper in the LoGoSO Research Papers should not limit publication in any other venue. Copyright remains with the authors.

Contact

Freie Universität Berlin
Fabeckstr. 23-25, R. 1.1124
14195 Berlin
katja.levy@fu-berlin.de

Authors: <https://logoso-project.com/team/>

www.logoso-project.com

The Research Project

Models of Co-operation between Local Governments and Social Organizations in Germany and China– Migration: Challenges and Solutions (LoGoSO Germany China) is a comparative research project of the Freie Universität Berlin, the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster and the Chinese Academy of Governance, funded by Stiftung Mercator.

This comparative research project looks at the co-operation between state and social organizations (SOs) in China and Germany. It focusses on social service delivery in the area of integration of migrating populations with special attention to the fields of education, employment, vulnerable groups and social assistance (incl. legal aid) as a crosscutting issue to all of the fields. Within this subject area, the project wants to identify different models of state-SO co-operation and analyze which models are successful and why and where this co-operation is problematic. It aims to capture the different models of co-operation in Germany and China, to analyze and compare the underlying structures and to show potentialities for development.

Contents

- 1 Introduction 1
- 2 General data of the four cities 1
 - 2.1 Basic data..... 1
 - 2.2 Economy 2
 - 2.3 Population structure..... 3
 - 2.4 Administration..... 4
- 3 Policy traditions of the four cities 6
 - 3.1 Tradition of philanthropy 6
 - 3.2 Migration trends and policies..... 7
- 4 Integration measures of the four cities 8
 - 4.1 Integration policies..... 8
 - 4.2 Financial expenditure for migrants10
 - 4.3 Implementation of integration measures in the relevant policy fields.....11
 - 4.3.1 Employment11
 - 4.3.2 Education12
 - 4.3.3 Social assistance13
 - 4.3.4 Vulnerable groups.....14
- 5 The role of social organizations in the four cities15
 - 5.1 Overall situation of social organizations15
 - 5.2 Co-operation mechanisms between social organizations and the state16
- 6 Conclusion17
 - 6.1 Comparison17
 - 6.2 Final remarks18
- References19

1 Introduction

The comparative research project “Models of Co-operation between Local Governments and Social Organizations in Germany and China – Migration: Challenges and Solutions (LoGoSO Germany China)” concentrates on two differing cities in each country. Guangzhou (China) and Berlin (Germany) on the one hand are two of the largest cities in China and Germany and are well known for their status as immigrant cities. Hangzhou (China) and Cologne (Germany) on the other hand represent middle-sized cities that function as economic hubs in their region, both being the economic center in their respective province or state. Particular large numbers of migrants and a well-established philanthropic sector characterize all four cities. The research project aims to capture and compare the co-operation models between social organizations (SOs) and local governments in the service provision for migrants in the four cities (LoGoSO-Models). It focuses on the policy fields of employment, education, social assistance (including legal aid) and vulnerable groups. A number of factors shape the LoGoSO-Models, with the characteristics of the sample cities being one decisive factor to be considered.

This comparative report aims at identifying the relevant independent variables for the LoGoSO-Models, as determined by the peculiarities of the sample cities. It will summarize and compare the findings of the four city reports that have been prepared by the research teams (Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018), to shed light on the relevant similarities and differences of the four cities in the area of migrant integration with a special eye on the policy fields of education, employment, social assistance (including legal aid) and vulnerable groups.

In the following, this report will compare the four sample cities along the components that potentially influence the LoGoSO-Models. The main part (section 2-5) introduces the relevant aspects for the four cities, i.e. the general data, such as size, economy, population and administration (section 2), the different traditions of philanthropy and migration (section 3), the actual integration measures with special view to the four relevant policy fields (section 4) and the role and situation of SOs (section 5). Subsequently, section 6 recapitulates the results, compares the findings and draws a conclusion on the challenges for the local governments and the role of SOs in the service provision for migrants.

2 General data of the four cities

This chapter provides an overview of the general situation of the sample cities as determined by their size, population, economy and administration.

2.1 Basic data

The city pairs in Germany and China have been chosen to represent two different cities in each country and to allow comparison across the countries. Berlin, situated in the Northeast of Germany, is the capital and largest city of the country. Cologne, situated in the West of Germany at the river Rhine, is the largest city and economic center of the state of North-Rhine Westphalia (NRW), it accounts for a middle-sized city in Germany. Guangzhou is one of the largest cities in China and capital of Guangdong province. It is

located in the Southeast of China at the Pearl River delta, where it represents the center of the most populous metropolitan area in mainland China. Hangzhou is considered a middle-sized city in China; just like Cologne, it is the largest city and economic center in its province. It is also the capital of Zhejiang province. Table 1 shows the varying sizes of the four cities. In order to identify their status in the country and to be able to compare them, their population must be considered in relation to the overall population of Germany (population: 82.5 million) and China (population: 1.4 billion).

Table 1: Size of the sample cities

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
AREA	892.00 square km	404.89 square km	7,434.4 square km	8,000 square km
TOTAL POPULATION	3,671,000 (end of 2016)	1,061,000 (end of 2016)	14,043,500 (end of 2016)	9,188,000 (end of 2016)
POPULATION IN RELATION TO THE COUNTRY'S POPULATION	4.45%	1.29%	1.00%	0.66%

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018, Statistisches Bundesamt: www.destatis.de

2.2 Economy

Regarding economy, the difference between the German and the Chinese cities are apparent. While Berlin and Cologne are characterized by a strong focus on service industry, Guangzhou and Hangzhou still considerably depend on manufacturing industry. At the same time, the Chinese cities reflect the huge economic growth which is characteristic for the whole country. Table 2 presents the economic situation in the four cities in view of their GDP and the top economic sectors.

Table 2: Economic situation in the sample cities

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
GDP	135.909 billion U.S. dollars in 2016 ¹	66.862 billion U.S. dollars in 2016	294.000 billion U.S. dollars in 2016	166.523 billion U.S. dollars in 2016
GDP PER CAPITA	37,022 U.S. dollars in 2016	63,017 U.S. dollars in 2016	20,935 U.S. dollars in 2016	18,124 U.S. dollars in 2016
ECONOMIC GROWTH (GDP)	2005-2014: Ø 2.0% p.a.	2008-2013: Ø 2.0% p.a.	2012-2016: Ø 9.4% p.a.	2011-2016: Ø 9.2% p.a.
ECONOMIC SECTORS	85.9% services; 13.3% construction and processing trade;	83.7% services; 16.3% manufacturing, construction and production	68% services; 31% mining, manufacturing and construction;	61.2% services; 36% mining, manufacturing and construction;

¹ Converted into U.S. dollars with OANDA Currency Converter (for Berlin and Cologne), dated back to the end of the respective year.

	0.8% others		1% agriculture	2.8% agriculture
--	-------------	--	----------------	------------------

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018, IHK Köln, Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder, Aktuelle Ergebnisse – VGRdL: <https://www.statistik-bw.de/VGRdL/tbls/index.jsp?lang=#tab03>

2.3 Population structure

In China, the household registration (*hukou*) system divides the population of each city into registered and non-registered residents. Social services, such as health care, education and welfare programs, are bound to the registration status, turning those who cannot obtain the local *hukou* into an underprivileged group. Non-registered residents are mostly part of the floating population, which “refers to those who “temporarily” move to a destination with no local residency rights and are only temporarily living and working in the destination” (Ma Xiulian 2017: 1). The floating population in the Chinese cities mainly comprises domestic migrants, most of whom are migrant workers who move from poor rural to affluent urban areas in search of employment and better living conditions for their families. Guangzhou and Hangzhou both attract high numbers of migrant workers without realistic possibility to obtain the local *hukou* (see table 3); they are the target group of this paper's main subject of migrant integration.

Berlin and Cologne also attract high numbers of migrants (see table 3) and face similar challenges in providing them with sufficient social services. This mainly refers to immigrants who come from war-ridden countries such as Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq and others seeking asylum in Germany. In 2015 and 2016, the numbers of asylum seekers in Germany have risen extraordinarily; the applicants for asylum are distributed to the federal states according to a quota system while waiting for the decision. “Positive decisions comprise the recognition as having a right of asylum according to the German constitution, recognition as refugee according to the Geneva Convention, the granting of temporary protection according to European law, and the recognition of impediments to deportation” (Gluns 2017: 7-8). When an asylum seeker is granted one of these categories, he or she is recognized as a refugee and has the right to stay in Germany for a certain amount of time with “full legal access to the labour market and the educational system as well as to the social security systems” (Gluns 2017: 8).

Table 3: Population structure in the sample cities

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
TOTAL POPULATION	3,671,000 (end of 2016)	1,061,000 (end of 2016)	14,043,500 (end of 2016)	9,188,000 (end of 2016)
FOREIGNERS	690,210 (2017)	208,403 (2016)	118,000 (2014)	16,000 (2017)
ASYLUM SEEKERS/ FLOATING POPULATION	Asylum seekers: 79,034 (2015), 16,889 (2016)	Asylum seekers: 10,153 (2015), 13,253 (2016)	Floating population: 5,340,000 (2016)	Floating population: 3,438,100 (2016)

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018, Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, Stadt Köln, Statistisches Bundesamt: www.destatis.de

2.4 Administration

Guangzhou and Hangzhou are both cities at the “sub provincial level” (副省级), which is a special status for selected provincial capitals that function as important economic centers. They are subordinate to the province but are granted special administrative privileges and are more independent from the provincial government than the usual prefectural-level cities. The central government in China exerts varying degrees of control and supervision over its subordinate levels. With the status as powerful cities at sub provincial level, the local administrations of Guangzhou and Hangzhou can both be considered to be relatively independent and to have room for their own specific decision- and policy-making (Heilmann 2017: 85-86).

As a city-state, Berlin is a special case where the municipal level cannot be distinguished from the federal state level. While the city government is formally responsible for all tasks, the districts in Berlin have a particular position because they take the role that is normally attached to autonomous municipalities and fulfil most of the tasks (Gluns 2018: 4). Cologne as an independent municipality is subordinate to the federal state level and executes the regulations of the federal state of North-Rhine Westphalia (NRW) (Grabbe 2018: 1).

In all four sample cities, there is a division of responsibilities between the municipal and the district level, with the main responsibility for migrant issues being attributed to the main municipal administrative agency (see table 4).

Table 4: Administrative structure of the sample cities

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE	Divided into 12 districts	Divided into 9 districts	Divided into 11 districts	Divided into 10 districts
ADMINISTRATION AT THE MUNICIPAL LEVEL	Senate Administration	Municipal Administration	Municipal Government	Municipal Government
ADMINISTRATION AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL	District Offices	District Administrations	District governments	District governments
MAIN RESPONSIBLE BODY FOR MIGRANTS	Senate Administration with a representative for Integration and Migration	Municipal Council with the Integration Council and a Round Table for Refugee Issues	Municipal Government, mainly the Bureau of Migrant Services of Guangzhou Municipality (来穗人员服务管理局)	Municipal Government, mainly the Migrant Service & Management Committee (外来人口服务管理委员会)

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DISTRICTS FOR MIGRANTS ISSUES	The District Offices appoint District Representatives for Integration and Migration and are involved in the implementation of a number of services such as housing, social benefits and child care	The District Assemblies take decisions concerning issues that are relevant for migrant issues in the respective district	Each district has additional service and management agencies	The districts and sub-districts set up migrant service and management centers

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018

The LoGoSO research project focuses on the service provision for migrants in the policy fields of employment, education, social assistance (including legal aid) and vulnerable groups. Table 5 identifies the main responsible actors for the service provision in the relevant policy fields, within the local governments of the sample cities.

Table 5: Main responsible departments for the relevant policy fields

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
EMPLOYMENT	Senate Administration for Integration, Labour and Social Affairs with the employment agencies and local job centres	Employment Agency and local job centres	Human Resources and Social Security Bureau of the Bureau of Migrant Services (人力资源和社会保障局)	Social Security Department (社会保障部门) and administrative department for industry and commerce (工商行政管理部门)
EDUCATION	Senate Administration for Education, Youth and Families with various educational facilities	Administrative Department for Education, Youth and Sports with the Youth Office and the School Authority	Education Bureau of the Bureau of Migrant Services (教育局)	Education Department (教育部门)

	BERLIN	COLOGNE	GUANGZHOU	HANGZHOU
SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	Senate Administration for Integration, Labour and Social Affairs with responsible departments for special issues State Office for Refugee matters (LAF)	Administrative Department for Social Issues, Integration and Environment with specialized authorities for certain issues	Public Security Bureau (公安局) and Housing and Urban-Rural Committee of the Bureau of Migrant Services (卫生和计划生育委员会)	Housing security and real estate management departments (住房保障和房产管理部门) and judicial department (司法部门)
VULNERABLE GROUPS	Various senate administrations, depending on the particular vulnerable group	Various authorities, depending on the particular vulnerable group	Civil Affairs Bureau (民政局) and Health and Family Planning Committee of the Bureau of Migrant Services (卫生和计划生育委员会)	Health Department (卫生部门) and Civil affairs service system (中国民政服务系统)

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018

The administrative structure of the sample cities shows, while in all cities the main municipal administrative agency is responsible for the overall management of migrant issues, several different agencies are involved in the service provision in the different policy fields in each city.

3 Policy traditions of the four cities

This chapter outlines the different traditions of philanthropy as well as the migration trends and policies in the German and Chinese sample cities.

3.1 Tradition of philanthropy

The 19th century was an exceptional prosperous time for charity organizations, both in Germany and in China. In Germany, foundations started to be active and in China, rich merchants began to build up charity organizations. In Germany, this period ended with the Nazi regime (1933-1945) and, in China, with the founding of the People's Republic of China (1949), when all kind of social organizations were dissolved and replaced by organizations established by the Communist Party (Gluns 2018: 9, Ma & Guan 2018: 8). Yet, in the Chinese traditional culture, there is a long history of philanthropy and

Guangzhou is well known for its charity organizations in the Ming and Qing Dynasties (Ma & Guan 2018: 8). After the beginning of the reform and opening policies (1978), this tradition was reanimated, first by government-run charity organizations and gradually also by private organizations. In 2005, the first national registered non-public foundation “HeungKong Charitable Foundation” (香江社会求助基金会) was founded in Guangzhou, which was then quickly followed by many more (Ma & Guan 2018: 8). In Hangzhou, the disastrous Yangtze River Flood in 1998 first resulted in a rapid development of charity organizations that engaged in disaster relief. Nowadays, the status of the city as an internet pioneer city strongly influences the philanthropic sector. Some of the biggest internet groups, such as Taobao or Alibaba are located in Hangzhou and revolutionize the charity sector with their fundraising internet platforms (Ma & Chen 2018: 8).

In West Germany, the battered foundation sector was revived with the help of US American foundations after the Second World War. However, Berlin as a divided and heavily destroyed city with a rather small proportion of affluent citizens was an unattractive location for foundations and lacks behind in this respect until today (Gluns 2018: 10). Cologne, on the contrary, developed one of the densest philanthropic environments in Germany, with many of the largest German foundations² having their headquarters in the city (Grabbe 2018: 9).

3.2 Migration trends and policies

China and Germany have a very diverse history of migration. While in Germany, the immigration of foreigners into the country has a long history and was often intensified by different events over the last centuries, China looks back at a relatively short but intense history of internal migration, starting with the reform and opening policies in the early nineties.

Guangzhou and Hangzhou are exemplary for the rapid urbanization process in China and have early become immigrant cities with a high percentage of floating population. Today, in some areas of Guangzhou, the number of migrants is far higher than the number of local residents and the municipal government gradually developed a system of policies and mechanisms to deal with the difficulties that arise from a lack of integration and social services provision (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 1, 7). Most of the migrants are workers with their origins in different provinces, mainly in central China. Guangzhou is a “National New Type Urbanization Pilot City” and has the title of a “Model City for Service and Management of Floating Population and Ethnic Minorities”. This implies that the Chinese government considers Guangzhou as a pioneer city regarding urbanization and the management of floating population and ethnic minorities in the city (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 6). Migrants are a major labor force in Guangzhou and their integration is not only a primary task of the city administration but also a national goal. Documents like the “Opinions on the Implementation of Urban-Rural Integration Project” (关于推进城乡一体工程的实施意见) specify this attitude and offer some guidelines for its implementation (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 6).

² Large foundations in Cologne include Fritz Thyssen Foundation, Caritas Foundation Germany and Imhoff Foundation.

In Hangzhou, migrant workers account for about 30% of the total population. The municipal government acknowledged the challenges behind this development and made the integration of the floating population one of its core political goals (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 4, 6-7). The “Regulations on the Management of Floating Population Services” (杭州市流动人口服务管理条例) were introduced in 2012 and offer guidelines for this (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 9). The city also introduced a number of measures in order to develop a new model for the management of migrant workers, with the goal of integrating them on par with the local residents (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 23).

Berlin and Cologne also attracted many migrants, albeit from foreign countries, and continuously developed into diverse and multicultural cities. Reconstruction after the Second World War and the recovering industries in the 1950s required huge numbers of workers that were not available in Germany. Thus, “guest workers” were recruited and – after the building of the wall – came primarily from Turkey – to Cologne and West-Berlin. During that time, no programs or long-term plans for settlement in Germany promoted integration and when many of the “guest workers” decided to reunite with their families and settle permanently, large Turkish communities with little contact to the (original) German population emerged (Gluns 2018: 3, Grabbe 2018: 4).

In Berlin, the current incoming of large numbers of refugees from war-ridden countries first gained attention through several public demonstrations since 2012 to raise awareness for the problematic situation of the refugees during their flight and their reception in Germany. In 2015, the increasingly large numbers of asylum seekers made refugee integration and policy one of the main topics in the public debate (Gluns 2018: 3-4). In Cologne, a number of civil society groups, formed in reaction to racist right-wing groups, were at the forefront of raising awareness for the need of good integration in a multicultural society (Grabbe 2018: 4). Both cities are strongly shaped by their long history of migration. As “cities of diversity”, they attach high value to the fundamental and human rights of every individual and to being free of discrimination (Gluns 2018: 10, Grabbe 2018: 21). It is expected that most of the refugees will remain for a long time. Therefore, integration is a long-term political goal and should start as early as possible (Gluns 2018: 20, Grabbe 2018: 20).

4 Integration measures of the four cities

In the following, the general integration policies as well as the financial expenditure for migrants of the sample cities are outlined first. A closer look at the implementation of integration measures in the relevant policy fields, i.e. employment, education, social assistance, vulnerable groups, completes this section.

4.1 Integration policies

Integration of migrants is a responsibility of the municipalities, both in China and in Germany. Hence, in addition to the overall national guidelines, the sample cities all depend on their own concepts and policies (see Table 6).

Guangzhou started early to manage the service provision for migrants and to implement a series of local policies to specify its integration guidelines. The city was among the

first cities in China to implement the point-based residence permit system, a system that should help migrants to apply for a household registration based on certain standards of qualification, such as age, education, professional qualifications (Ma & Guan 2018: 13-16).

Following the “Regulations for the Registration of Floating Populations in Zhejiang Province” (浙江省流动人口居住登记条例), Hangzhou set up its own regulations for the management of floating populations in 2011. After the point-based residence permit was promoted to the national level since 2014, the city began to adapt its implementation in 2016. In 2017, with the revision of the “Provisions on the Services and Management of Floating Populations in Hangzhou” (杭州市人民政府办公厅关于推行新型居住证制度的通知), the local government eventually established the point-based system for service provision to a full extent. Now the migrants can cumulate points based on certain qualifications, which are specified in the “Points-Based Residence Permit Index” (see Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Table 4: 14-17) (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 13-14).

The integration concept of Berlin understands diversity as a positive feature and pursues the goal of an equal participation of migrants in all matters of life, particularly in education and employment. It also calls for the participation of civil society. Given the increasing numbers of migrants in 2015, Berlin was confronted with new challenges leading up to the development of the “Master Plan for Integration and Security” (Masterplan Integration und Sicherheit) which also includes the urban society into the circle of responsible actors for integration (Gluns 2018: 10).

In Cologne, the “Concept to Strengthen the Integrative Urban Society” (Konzept zur Stärkung der Integrativen Stadtgesellschaft) constitutes the foundation of all integration programs. It was developed by actors from politics and civil society and emphasizes the cultural diversity and integrity of Cologne. The concept stresses the necessity of involving various departments of the municipal administration as well as civil society actors (Grabbe 2018: 9).

Table 6: Integration policies in the sample cities

CITY	POLICIES
BERLIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration concept "Promoting Diversity – Strengthening Cohesion" (Vielfalt fördern – Zusammenhalt stärken) (2007) • "Law Regulating Participation and Integration in Berlin" (Gesetz zur Regelung von Partizipation und Integration, PartIntG) (2010) • "Master Plan for Integration and Security" (Masterplan Integration und Sicherheit) (2016)
COLOGNE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration concept "Concept to Strengthen the Integrative Urban Society" (Konzept zur Stärkung der Integrativen Stadtgesellschaft) (2012) • "Intercultural Action Program" (Interkulturelles Maßnahmenprogramm) (2014)

GUANGZHOU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Regulations of Migrant Workers in Guangzhou” (广州市流动人口管理规定) • “Implementation Rules for Migrant Workers to Rent Public Rental Housing in Guangzhou” (来穗务工人员申请承租公共租赁住房实施细则) • “Guangzhou Medical Relief Measures” (广州市医疗救助办法); “Implementation Methods of Point-based Residence Permit in Guangzhou” (广州市积分入户管理办法实施细则) • “Opinions on Strengthening Population Control and Service Management in Guangzhou” (加强本市人口调控和服务管理工作的意见)(2014)
HANGZHOU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Measures for the Residence Administration of the Floating Population in Hangzhou” (杭州市流动人口居住管理办法) (2011) • “Notice of Hangzhou Municipal People’s Government on Implementing a New Residence Permit System” (杭州市人民政府关于进一步推进户籍制度改革的实施意见) (2016) • “Methods of Point-based Household Registration System in Hangzhou (for Trial Implementation)” (杭州市外来人口积分落户办法(试行)) (2017) • “Provisions on the Services and Management of Floating Population in Hangzhou (Revised Draft)” (杭州市流动人口服务管理规定(修订草案)) (2017)

Sources: Gluns 2018, Grabbe 2018, Ma & Chen et al. 2018, Ma & Guan et al. 2018

4.2 Financial expenditure for migrants

The financial expenditure for migrants is difficult to measure and to compare because it encompasses various sources and fields. Thus, the available data are not necessarily comparable, but still give an impression of the financial burden for the municipalities.

The calculations in China mainly include costs for the direct service provision by the municipalities as well as government purchase of the services of SOs. They show that the per-person financial expenditure for migrants is still much lower than the one for registered permanent residents in Chinese cities. However, the further implementation of the point-based residence permit system will grant access to social services for more migrants and increase the financial expenditure for migrants considerably. According to a cost calculation for granting urban residency to 1.5 million migrant workers in Guangzhou until 2020, which includes public services such as education, health insurance, housing security etc., the city must spend about an additional 23.93 billion U.S. dollars between 2015 and 2020 (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 12). The costs for welfare expenditures are mainly borne by the provinces and local governments in China. Guangzhou and Hangzhou, as provincial capitals and highly developed cities, must bear most of the expenses on the municipal level, which is a heavy financial burden. Studies show, that by spending about an additional 15 million U.S. dollars, Hangzhou municipality can increase the urbanization rate by 0.28 percent. The residence status for

migrant workers, connected with the social service provision is thus highly dependent on the financial capacities of the municipalities (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 11-12).

In Berlin, expenses for refugee integration, including costs for accommodation, education, health care, labor market integrations etc., amount to three percent of the total budget of the Senate Administration for Finance. This is a heavy financial burden for the municipality, albeit the federal state reimburses some of the expenses. However, Berlin is committed to actively promoting integration and provides funding for some additional projects. For example, the municipality and the districts cooperate in funding social and cultural projects in accordance with the Master Plan for Integration with about 70 million U.S. dollars³ per year (Gluns 2018: 6).

In 2017, the city of Cologne officially spent 229.18 million U.S. dollars on services for migrants. These include accommodation, financial assistance and to a smaller extend labour market integration. Additional financial expenditure for purchasing social services from other providers is not included in this calculation. Like Berlin, the city receives some reimbursement by the federal government. However, this support is far from being sufficient and the city still suffers from the financial burden. Nonetheless, Cologne provided an integration budget of about 1.11 million U.S. dollars in 2018 and goes to great lengths for the financial support of integration (Grabbe 2018: 6).

4.3 Implementation of integration measures in the relevant policy fields

4.3.1 Employment

The professional quality and capacity of migrant workers are important factors for Guangzhou, thus the city recently increased its support for migrants in the fields of employment services, vocational training and social insurance. The “Action Plan for the Integration of Migrant Workers in Guangzhou (2016-2020)” (广州市来穗人员融合行动计划 (2016—2020)) regulated that a preliminary employment training and education system covering urban and rural areas shall be established by 2020 (Ma & Guan 2018: 17).

Hangzhou also emphasizes the relevance of the integration of migrants in employment and has set up several support initiatives. These include non-profit and district run employment agencies, the Hangzhou Human Resources Information Network that supports the networking between all the different actors, the “New Hangzhouer’s Job Application Certificate” (新杭州人求职登记证) as a starter package for new migrants, as well as further training programs (Ma & Chen 2018: 19-20).

The Senate of Berlin considers employment as one of the keys to integration. Various actors are involved in this policy field; thus, a steering group was set up, that involves all relevant actors, including the employment agencies and SOs. For the municipal administration, important tasks in this policy field are the assessment of skills, counseling, the enhancement of employment opportunities and the support for self-employment. Various initiatives like “Welcome in Work” offices, “Mobile Education

³ All expenses for Berlin and Cologne are converted into U.S. dollars with OANDA Currency Converter, dated back to July 2017.

Counseling” (Mobile Bildungsberatung), or policies like the so-called “charitable additional work opportunities” (Gemeinnützige zusätzliche Arbeitsgelegenheiten, GzA) serve to fulfil these tasks (Gluns 2018: 11-12). Additionally, SOs are intensely involved in training, qualification, counselling and placement. Government-funded networks like the “IQ Network” or the “bridge network” as well as the ARRIVO program, which was established by the senate, assist refugees in all aspects of entering the labor market (Gluns 2018: 18).

Cologne, in accordance with its integration concept, strives for long-term integration of migrants with equal participation in the labor market. The “Integration Point” is the first contact of all refugees in Cologne and is responsible for an assessment of skills and an early integration into the labor market or in training programs. Several federally funded programs, such as the project “KompAS” and the job centers provide qualification opportunities and counseling (Grabbe 2018: 10). SOs supplement these programs with projects such as the publicly funded “Chance+ Network for Refugees” (Chance+, Netzwerk für Flüchtlinge und Arbeit), which focuses on the general integration of refugees into the labor market, or the establishment of integration pilots that focus on vocational training and the contact to enterprises (Grabbe 2018: 17-18).

4.3.2 Education

The education of migrants’ children is one of the key issues in China’s integration measures. Thus, the policy field of education primarily focus on migrants’ children in the Chinese sample cities. In Guangzhou, this problem has received growing attention since 2010. The responsibility for the education of migrants’ children lies with the local government and the schools that are bound to fulfill the integration policies. Eligible children of migrants should have the same education opportunities as local residents; yet, the eligibility of the children depends on a point-based school enrollment policy, which is determined by the districts. In other words, the education opportunities of migrants’ children are linked with the qualification of their parents, such as their registration status, their employment and income situation and their duration of residency in the city (Ma & Guan 2018: 17-18).

Hangzhou implements similar measures since 2012, determining that the children of qualified migrant workers should have access to a school in their district. Quickly, many migrant children were enrolled in the public schools, accounting for over 40% percent of all school children. In reaction to the new situation and the large numbers of students, the local government provided training for school principals and distributed funds worth 2.64 million U.S. dollars for the construction of new schools. In 2017, the “Measures for the Administration of Preschool Education and Compulsory Education for Migrants’ Children in Hangzhou Urban District (for Trial Implementation)” (外来人口随迁子女在杭州市区接受学前教育 and 义务教育管理办法 (试行)) were a further step to committing the responsible departments to provide the necessary services and equal opportunities for migrants’ children (Ma & Chen 2018: 20-21).

In Germany, education programs for refugees usually address adults. Education for everybody is a public responsibility and, in the case of refugees, focuses chiefly on

language training before integrating the refugees into the regular education system. Berlin has implemented various educational reforms in the early 2000s, to grant everybody practicable access to the school system. With the help of different programs for language tuition and counseling, the refugees are supposed to be integrated into the regular system as early as possible, including schooling, vocational training, universities or further training for adults (Gluns 2018: 12-13).

Cologne adopts the system of NRW, which either provides separate preparatory training for refugee children or directly integrates them into regular classes with additional language training. With the goal of integrating the refugees as early as possible into the regular education system, Cologne also provides several further training programs. SOs only play a supplementary role in the German education system, primarily providing child care and services for special groups. In order to coordinate all educational programs, including the services of SOs, Cologne has implemented the program “Local Coordination of Educational Services for Newly Immigrated Individuals” (Kommunale Koordinierung der Bildungsangebote für Neuzugewanderte) (Grabbe 2018: 11-12, 18).

4.3.3 Social assistance

Guangzhou provides social assistance for migrants in terms of housing and legal aid. In order to solve the issues with the accommodation of migrants the “Implementation Rules for Migrant Workers to Rent Public Rental Housing in Guangzhou (for Trial Implementation)” (来穗务工人员申请承租公共租赁住房实施细则(试行)) were implemented in 2016. The regulations allow qualified migrants to rent houses in the city and provide cheap housing space (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 22). Regarding legal aid, the “Legal Aid Implementation Measures of Guangzhou” (广州市法律援助实施办法) were implemented in 2009 to regulate the provision of free legal services for everybody with financial difficulties and for certain vulnerable groups within the migrant group. Additionally, the Guangzhou Legal Aid Foundation (GLAF) was founded in 2016 and, until today, set up legal aid workstations in all prisons and courts in the city. The free legal services are directed at everybody in need but are largely used by migrants (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 22-24).

In Hangzhou, the “Notice on Strengthening the Construction and Management of Temporary Housing” (关于加强临时租赁住房建设和管理若干问题的通知) of 2017 regulates and demands the construction of special housing opportunities for migrant workers (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 23). The stated goal is to build 40,000 flats for temporal renting for migrant workers until 2020. In terms of legal advice, the revision of the “Trial Measures for the Provision of Reliefs to Migrants Workers with Special Difficulties in Hangzhou City” (杭州市外来务工人员特殊困难救助试行办法) in 2011 added a paragraph to provide free legal advice and legal aid to the floating population. However, this service is only available for those that have lived in Hangzhou for more than one year and is executed by the state authorities. An additional volunteer service by the Hangzhou Federation of Trade Unions for advice and support in legal questions when the rights of migrant workers are concerned, struggles to stand up to the state authorities (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 23-24).

Berlin renewed its social assistance concept after it failed to handle the large numbers of incoming refugees in 2015. In new arrival centers, the refugees undergo the first process of registration and receive basic assistance for housing, health care and other necessities. Public actors, such as the State Office for Refugee matters (LAF) and the Federal Agency for Migration and Refugees are responsible for this process. While the goal is to distribute the refugees to decentral private accommodations, reality shows that group accommodations still make up the large share. Counseling on various matters and for different target groups is provided by public and private actors and a Welcome Center, which guides refugees through the arrival process and helps to find the relevant contacts, was established in 2016 (Gluns 2018: 13-14). SOs provide many services in the field of social assistance for refugees that are mainly concentrated on counselling, housing and language training. They are often supported and funded by public actors, i.e. when employing “integration pilots” (Integrationslotsen) or “neighborhood mothers” (Stadtteilmütter) that offer direct contact and orientation for migrants, or in arranging housing options in co-operation with the LAF (Gluns 2018: 19).

The first reception of refugees lies within the responsibilities of the state; thus, the refugees stay in reception centers of NRW for at least three months before being distributed to the municipalities. For the refugees that are distributed to Cologne, the city developed a similar system as Berlin. Due to limited housing options in the city, most refugees still live in group accommodations and receive assistance in form of counseling and financial support (Grabbe 2018: 12-14). In Cologne, SOs are also important actors for counseling services and for the management of accommodation. They are often under contract with the government and the responsible government departments continuously develop new programs in co-operation with SOs (Grabbe 2018: 18-19).

4.3.4 Vulnerable groups

Guangzhou has a social relief program that is managed by its civil affairs department and provides services like medical care, emergency assistance, assistance for vagrants and beggars and charitable assistance. These services are not for migrants in particular, but for everybody who finds himself or herself in a critical situation. Vulnerable groups within the migrant group are often in need and thus account for an important recipient of these services. However, apart from assistance for vagrants and beggars, all services are bound to preconditions such as the residence permit in Guangzhou or at least two years of living and working record in the city (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 24-27).

Hangzhou implemented the “Trial Measures for the Provision of Relief to Migrant Workers with Special Difficulties in Hangzhou City” (杭州市外来务工人员特殊困难救助试行办法) in 2008 and revised it in 2011. Funds worth 9.11 million U.S. dollars were allocated to relief programs for qualified migrant workers with special difficulties. After the revision in 2011, migrant workers who have lived and worked in Hangzhou for more than one year and their children were qualified for the relief program and could receive support in case of serious illness, accidents or other special difficulties. Relief policies were further developed in 2017 with the “Measures for Temporary Relief in Hangzhou” (杭州市临时救助办法) that encompass all migrants and provide assistance for people that

suffer urgent and temporary difficulties (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 23). SOs in Hangzhou support vulnerable groups with smaller programs, e.g. the Hangzhou Women's Federation has developed a program to offer free screening for "women's 'two cancer's'" (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 24).

As initial point for services directed at vulnerable groups, Berlin, in co-operation with the Berlin Network for Particular Vulnerable Persons, has developed a system of supporting the (self)-identification of vulnerabilities. The main groups to receive special integration measures include (unaccompanied) minors, female and LGBTI refugees, traumatized persons, persons with disabilities and senior refugees (Gluns 2018: 14-15). For these groups, special services like the integration into the youth welfare system for unaccompanied minors, a plan for the protection of single women and LGBTI refugees, e.g. in the form of separate accommodation, counseling and psychotherapy for traumatized persons, as well as special health care options for persons with disabilities and senior refugees, have been implemented by the local government (Gluns 2018: 15-17). SOs receive financial support from the city to supplement these measures with counseling and assistance for particular groups, including additional psychological support and the engagement of legal guardians for unaccompanied minors (Gluns 2018: 19-20).

In 2016, an expert group in Cologne presented detailed recommendations for the relief of vulnerable groups, mainly resulting in better identification and accommodation measures as well as better training for public employees and volunteers. The measures for certain vulnerable groups resemble the ones in Berlin and are supported by SOs (Grabbe 2018: 14-17). The needs in this field are significant, thus the city offers funding and support for new initiatives that are still necessary in many areas (Grabbe 2018: 19-20).

5 The role of social organizations in the four cities

This chapter outlines the overall situation of SOs in the sample cities and addresses the co-operation mechanisms between SOs and the local governments.

5.1 Overall situation of social organizations

In China, social organizations operate in a highly regulated environment and depend on a good relationship with the government. Guangzhou and Hangzhou are both cities that are particularly known for a strong philanthropic sector where SOs get a lot of support from the government. Guangzhou portrays itself as a "Charity City" and states high goals for its philanthropic environment, including the anticipated number of setting up a minimum of 8.5 social organizations in every 10,000 inhabitants and the goal of registering a minimum of 15% of all urban residents as volunteers. Various policies manage and support the charitable activities in the city and, since 2016, many activities under the headline "Charity for all in Guangzhou" (羊城慈善为民) promote the work and the development of SOs (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 9-10). The number of SOs in Guangzhou has been growing steadily and in 2017, 7594 SOs were officially registered in the city, including 42 private foundations (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 9, 28).

Hangzhou also belongs to the Chinese cities with a strong philanthropic sector and the development of SOs in the city is supported by various policies. In 2016, Hangzhou counted a total of approximately 20,000 SOs, 6,490 of which were officially registered, including 27 private foundations. They are active in various fields and play an important role for the social service provision in the city (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 25). The influential internet companies in Hangzhou are a strong force for fundraising activities. Since the implementation of the “Charity Law of the Peoples Republic of China” (中华人民共和国慈善法) in September 2016, they raised tremendous amounts of donations; Ant Financial alone raised 54.2 billion U.S. dollars in cooperation with nearly 80 SOs (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 8).

Even though the philanthropic sector in Berlin does not have a strong tradition, the support for foundations is catching up and the number of foundations increases constantly. Today, there are already 900 registered foundations in Berlin (Gluns 2018: 10). Cologne inhabits some of the biggest German foundations and continues its strong tradition of philanthropy. School foundations in particular are an important part of this tradition with 239 school foundations under the supervision of the Ministry of Education of NRW continuing their work today. With 389 foundations in sum, Cologne has a high density of foundations per inhabitant and ranks first in NRW (Grabbe 2018: 8-9).

5.2 Co-operation mechanisms between social organizations and the state

In their efforts to deal with the challenges arising from the service provision for the large numbers of migrants, all four sample cities acknowledge the importance of SOs and seek to utilize their expertise and manpower. The implementation of integration measures is often supported, or even mainly conducted by SOs. In order to strengthen the role and the utility of SOs, the municipal governments provide funds and rely on co-operation mechanisms.

The local government in Guangzhou began its co-operation with SOs as early as 2008 and has since then invested funds worth over 266.5 million U.S. dollars to help SOs carry out social services. The government purchase of services is based on a “Catalogue of Social Organizations with Qualifications for the Government Function Transfer and Purchase of Services in Guangzhou” (广州市市本级具备承接政府职能转移和购买服务资质的社会组织目录) that is updated on a regular basis (Ma & Guan et al. 2018: 22).

Hangzhou municipal government also supports the development of SOs, with a financial budget worth 7.53 million U.S. dollars per year (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 24). In 2014, the government purchase of services became the bottom-line of all co-operation mechanisms and of the service provision for migrants in Hangzhou. All services that can be distributed to the responsibility of SOs are no longer carried out by the government but purchased from SOs (Ma & Chen et al. 2018: 27-28).

The German cities also support SOs with funds, qualification measures and networking activities, in order to gain strong partners in the service provision for migrants. Every kind of initiative, no matter how small, is welcome to assist the service provision, however, when it comes to receiving government funds, the welfare associations with a large infrastructure are at an advantage (Gluns 2018: 18, Grabbe 2018: 17).

6 Conclusion

This chapter recapitulates and compares the findings on the general situation, policy traditions, integration measures and roles of SOs in the four sample cities. It concludes with some final remarks and a summary of the findings.

6.1 Comparison

Despite the differences in size, population and economic situation, the administrations of all four cities can be observed to be heavily influenced by migration and bear a considerable financial burden. In all cities, the main municipal administrative agency and a well-developed administrative structure are responsible for dealing with migrant issues.

Regarding **policy traditions**, the obvious difference lies in the differing experience with migration in Germany and China. The German cities have a long tradition of migration and, drawing from their experience, aim at starting integration as early as possible and with the plan of long-term settlement in mind. The Chinese cities cannot draw from such experiences and only in recent years began to acknowledge the necessity for integration measures for the floating population.

Many of the **integration measures** in China have the character of trial versions on the way to developing a solid integration concept. Rather than promoting early integration, they usually address migrants that have already settled and worked in the city for some time. When looking at the development of integration measures, it can be observed that Berlin and Guangzhou are relatively independent in terms of policy development and implementation. This can be ascribed to the status of Berlin as a city-state and Guangzhou as one of the richest and largest Chinese cities, provincial capital and “Model City for Service and Management of the Floating Population and Ethnic Minorities”. Cologne and Hangzhou are more dependent and closer interconnected with their respective state or province administration. It is also noticeable, that in China integration measures depend largely on the introduction and implementation by the state, whereas in Germany, independent actors are more likely to be involved. For example, legal aid is executed by independent actors in Germany, while China does not render state control over such issues.

In all four cities, **the important roles of SOs** for the service provision for migrants are apparent and all local governments attempt to involve SOs in their integration measures. However, given the different traditions and situations in the cities, the co-operation mechanisms and concrete measures take various forms. In Guangzhou, SOs have developed numerous integration projects and have provided valuable advice for the local government. The local government in Hangzhou started later to cooperate closely with SOs, but then quickly made SOs the main service providers for integration services in the city. In China, the cooperation between the local governments and SOs is very close and follows a top-down system where the government provides the guidelines and the funds, while the SOs are responsible for carrying out the specific services. SOs that want to follow their own ideas and interests can influence the government by giving advice and stirring a win-win situation in which their services support the objectives of

the city administration. In Germany, SOs are important partners for the government in policy development as well as implementation. Mainly the large welfare associations receive funds from the governments in order to carry out certain social services. However, smaller SOs that implement their own measures and work in a rather free and self-supported environment are also an important factor for the service provision for migrants.

6.2 Final remarks

The reports on the four sample cities show the peculiarities of the cities concerning their overall situation, their policy traditions and their integration measures. While, naturally, the different systems and traditions in China and Germany have a strong influence on the characteristics of the respective cities, it is important to note that each city still has its distinct features and implements its own measures.

It can be concluded that the main challenges for the local governments are similar in all four cities: A solid integration concept and functioning policies have to be developed, the implementation of the integration measures including financing and setting up a suitable administrative structure have to be further improved and the cooperation with other actors such as SOs has to be developed to cover all needs and services. While the focus in the Chinese cities lies on the development of the integration concept and its implementation, the German cities rather struggle with setting up the right infrastructure for the necessary service provision. SOs are an important factor for developing new ideas and structures. In China, the easiest way for SOs to apply these ideas is to cooperate with the government and take part in the government purchase service, while in Germany, SOs are important partners for the government but mostly work relatively independent and implement their ideas in their own way.

Further insights into the concrete models of cooperation between the local governments and SOs will be given in the research results of the comparative research project LoGoSO Germany China.

References

- Amt für Statistik Berlin-Brandenburg, *Statistischer Bericht, Einwohnerinnen und Einwohner im Land Berlin am 30. Juni 2017*, https://www.statistik-berlin-brandenburg.de/publikationen/stat_berichte/2017/SB_A01-05-00_2017h01_BE.pdf, last accessed March 6, 2018.
- Gluns, Danielle (2017), "Current Migration Trends in Germany", Report 4 of LoGoSO project.
- Gluns, Danielle (2018), "Refugee Integration Policy and Public Administration in Berlin", *LoGoSO Research Papers Nr. 6*.
- Grabbe, Christina (2018), "Refugee Integration Policy and Public Administration in Berlin", *LoGoSO Research Papers Nr. 7*.
- Heilmann, Sebastian (2017), *China's Political System*, Rowman & Littlefield: London.
- IHK Köln, *Wirtschaftsregion Köln 2017, Statistischer Überblick*, https://www.ihk-koeln.de/upload/WEB_1406_IHK_Wirtschaftsregion_Koeln_2017_DE_Doppelseiten_9161.pdf, last accessed March 6, 2018.
- MA Qingyu, CHEN Xufeng, SHAN, Miaomiao (2018), "Report on Migrant Integration Policy of Hangzhou", Report 16 of LoGoSO project (February 2018).
- MA Qingyu, GUAN Dongsheng, WANG Jing, MAO Peijin (2018), "Report on Migrant Integration Policy in Guangzhou", Report 15 of LoGoSO project (July 2018).
- MA Xiulian (2017), "Migration Trends and Challenges in China", Report 3 of LoGoSO project.
- Stadt Köln, *Neue Kölner Statistik. 1/2017*, http://www.stadt-koeln.de/mediaasset/content/pdf15/statistik-einwohner-und-haushalte/1081701_k%C3%B6lnerinnen_und_k%C3%B6lner_in_2016_ew_nks_1_2017.pdf, last accessed March 6, 2018.
- Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder, *Bruttoinlandsprodukt von Berlin von 1970 bis 2016 (in Millionen Euro)*, <https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/5010/umfrage/entwicklung-des-bruttoinlandsprodukts-von-berlin-seit-1970/>, last accessed March 6, 2018.