



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

## **First Phase Evaluation**

**Prepared for the Network of European Foundations  
by Alison Harker & Steven Burkeman**

## Contents

		<i>Page</i>
	Foreword	2
	Executive Summary	3
<b><i>Part 1</i></b>	<b><i>Background &amp; Methodology</i></b>	
1	The Issue	9
2	The Role of NEF	9
3	The European Programme for Integration & Migration	9
4	Project Evaluation Design & Methodology	13
<b><i>Part 2</i></b>	<b><i>Findings and Recommendations</i></b>	
5	Foundation Cooperation	17
6	The Steering Committee & the Secretariat	19
7	The Grants Programme	23
8	The Consultations	32
9	Interaction between elements of EPIM	35
10	Progress towards EPIM's aims & objectives	37
11	Evaluation	38
12	Options for the Future	39
13	The Evaluation Questions	43
<b><i>Appendices</i></b>		
1	Interviewees	48
2	Questions asked	49
3	Grantees' Policy Recommendations	54

## Foreword

As the European Union grows, and as the movement of peoples into and within the continent becomes greater, the challenges to those arriving and the communities receiving them grow too. But while there are noble ideals and visions which unite the expanding Europe, the strength of these does little to make the practical challenges of partnership any easier to overcome. NEF, through, EPIM, is rising to these challenges, and it has been a fascinating exercise for us to try to reach some (necessarily interim) conclusions about how well it is doing. We have been much helped by our interviewees, who have been generous with their time, honest in their opinions and prepared to share useful insights with us. We are also very grateful for the help we have had at every stage from NEF and EPIM, and would like to mention in this regard especially Alexandre Kirchberger, NEF's Co-ordinator, who has been unfailingly helpful, cheerful, prompt and efficient in responding to our many requests.

There will undoubtedly be judgements in the report with which not everyone will agree, errors of fact which we should have spotted, and tones of expression which cause upset; for all these, we accept full responsibility and apologise in advance.

**Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman**  
**May 2007**

## **Executive Summary**

*This is a necessarily very brief summary of the full report. It has been written so that it could be made available separately from the main report. There is much of significance in the main report which is not included here, however.*

### **Background**

1 Members of the Network of European Foundations, having identified shared concerns and debates about migration and integration, decided in June 2005 to set up the European Programme for Integration and Migration – EPIM - to work on constructive integration policies at the EU level and to promote effective linking of these policies with those of Member States; and to engage the widest possible range of stakeholders in society in this process. In particular, NEF wanted to build on the establishment in 2004 by the EU Member States of the Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBPs) to guide the further development of policies in the areas of integration and migration.

2 EPIM is run by a Steering Committee comprising 11 foundations which have together contributed €640,000 to pay for EPIM's first phase. Of this, €425,000 was set aside for grants which were made to six European-level NGOs, and five others, each working in one country. Strategic grants were for up to €50,000, and advocacy grants were for approx €25,000, in each case over approximately seven months. In addition to the grants programme, EPIM launched a programme of consultations intended to encourage better dialogue on migration and integration issues and to help with the process of breathing life into the CBPs. In the event, four consultations were held – in Portugal, Belgium, the UK, and Germany (the latter as a joint Franco-German enterprise).

3 In February 2007, NEF commissioned consultants Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman to evaluate this first phase of EPIM, with a view to deciding about the shape of any second phase. They interviewed 34 representatives of foundations, NGOs and others in some way associated with EPIM, in order to explore the extent to which the first phase of EPIM has successfully promoted cooperation amongst foundations in Europe working on issues of migration and integration; the effectiveness of consultations organised for EPIM in several countries; and the effectiveness and implementation of the EPIM grants programme.

## Key Findings

4 EPIM is an important and brave initiative with considerable potential. The first phase has been too short to allow considerable progress to have been made though there have been successes. This first phase should be regarded as a solid preparatory phase. A good base has been laid for developing stronger cooperation between the foundations involved in EPIM - there is a growing understanding of how to work and cooperate together. But several of those involved are at the learning stage and not particularly active on migration and integration issues.

5 EPIM's grants have been too few, too small and too short to allow for significant progress towards its aim of creating a clearing house of good practices. But if the learning from this pilot phase is absorbed, then there is good reason to hope that such a clearing house will in due course be established.

6 We are not clear whether EPIM's activities are likely to contribute towards its objectives. The programme seems to have been initiated without independent expert research which would have sought to answer the question: *in what way can foundations most effectively contribute towards the achievement of NEF's objectives in this field?*

7 For understandable reasons, the EPIM process has thus far been very rushed. Time needs to be taken to study more carefully how best to achieve the objectives, to plan the grants programme properly, and if consultations are to be an element in the future, to think them through more thoroughly.

## Wider Findings

8 In common with other efforts at pan-European partnership, there are many practical obstacles to foundation cooperation across national boundaries in Europe. The 22 foundations which became involved in EPIM (half as members of the Steering Committee) have differing policy priorities, staff, cash resources, language skills and they face different travel challenges. As a result, some have found it harder than others to get to, and to participate fully in, day-long meetings held in English in Brussels. Some have had to limit their involvement to helping with the planning of national consultations.

9 Foundations which decided to get involved with EPIM did so for a mixture of reasons. Some wanted to exercise more influence over

European policy on these issues; others simply wanted to learn more – and this is problematic for NEF, as the parent body of EPIM, since it sees itself as being principally about action, with learning as the key *raison d'être* for its sister organisation, the European Foundation Centre.

10 The Steering Committee has needed time to settle down, and for members to get to know one another properly. In the first instance, there was a great deal of pressure to move quickly, and a sense of rush. But the Committee recognised the need to take the time necessary, and as a result relationships are being built. This augurs well for any future phase of EPIM's work.

### **The Grants Programme**

11 The grants have been very well-received by those successful in their applications. But the programme has been very limited. In order not to raise expectations of what was a small grants programme, a closed list was used as the basis of invitations to apply for grants. In the end, 11 grants were awarded. The decisions were made by an independent 4-person jury appointed by the EPIM Steering Committee. The process was seen by interviewees as being very restrictive. Particularly at European level, there was some feeling that it had resulted in grants to 'the usual suspects'. There were a number of criticisms of the jury system. In particular, it was felt that such a small jury was not in a position to have a full understanding of the issues in the major countries of Europe.

12 The grants themselves were widely welcomed for their flexibility, but the programme was felt to be too rushed. In a few cases, despite the stated wish to fund work which would 'breathe life into the CBPs' there was little evidence that the work had very much to do with the CBPs. Grantees were critical of the failure to provide any contribution towards core costs.

13 The workshop organised in Brussels in December 2006 by EPIM for all the foundations and grantees was widely appreciated as a useful opportunity to learn about each other's work, and also about effective use of the media to get messages across. But for some grantees this was the first time in the process when they had understood the wider goals and work of EPIM – as distinct from the grants programme itself.

14 Final reports from grantees were submitted a little over a month before completion of the present study. It is far too soon, therefore, to

evaluate the impact of the grants. But, to date, reports on the work funded are focused on limited audiences.

## The Consultations

15 There were important positive developments resulting from the Portuguese, Belgian and UK consultations. (We were not able to reach an opinion on the Franco-German consultation as no report is available at the time of writing). But there was a lack of clarity about what the consultations were intended to achieve. Steering Committee members were amongst the most critical of the consultations. There were fewer consultations than originally intended, for a variety of reasons.

## Options for the Future

### *General*

16 NEF should allow EPIM to take, say, 9 months to reflect, meet, learn and plan before moving immediately into the next phase. But taking time for reflecting, learning and planning does not mean being inactive. During this period, the Steering Committee should commission an independent expert study to answer the following question – *given EPIM's agreed objectives, in what ways can foundations in Europe most effectively contribute towards the achievement of those objectives?*

17 In time for any next phase, NEF/EPIM should seek to assemble significantly greater resources to increase the managerial capacity, travel budget and grants budget available to EPIM. In terms of managerial capacity, EPIM needs a fulltime project manager. While this will involve a significant increase in costs, willingness to fund this should be taken as an indication of foundations' seriousness about engaging with these issues at European level.

18 The Steering Committee should be reduced in size, with just five foundations in membership; this will make it easier to hold meetings. Other foundations should be kept informed by email etc, and invited to twice-yearly report-back meetings. Foundations principally interested in learning rather than action should be encouraged to join the EFC Diversity, Migration and Integration Interest Group, and liaison between the EFC group and EPIM should be significantly improved.

19 EPIM should sometimes meet outside Brussels and should take the opportunity of such meetings to improve its understanding of work on integration and migration going on in other countries.

## *Grants*

20 In any future grants programme, there should be a two-tier application process, so that an outline proposal can be submitted before a full one is solicited from those judged to be more likely to succeed. Grants should run for a longer period of time and should include a sum towards core costs.

21 The system for soliciting applications and selecting those to whom grants should be awarded should be reviewed. If a jury is to be used, it should be larger and representative of more countries, and better briefed. Options include the following –

- foundations in each country could decide on whether to operate an open or closed list. They could then recommend from amongst the applicants a preliminary list for submission to an EPIM jury in charge of selection; or
- there could be an open list, based on the publication of clear parameters, provided that EPIM has the capacity to handle the response
- each contributing foundation could choose transferable examples of good practice in its own country in relation to EPIM's objectives. These could then be brought together to make presentations at a conference-type event attended by government officials and other interested parties. EPIM could then decide to which organisations grants should be awarded.
- fact-finding visits to grantee NGOs involving EPIM members, EU and national government officials and appropriate experts could be a part of the process.

## *Policy*

22 In order to ensure that useful lessons are extracted and fed into the appropriate EU bodies as well as the member state authorities, we suggest a 'consultative/ advisory' committee of experts etc which meets, say, once a year during the lifetime of the grants in each member state; a programme of regular meetings between the national NGOs and appropriate EU-level NGOs; and ongoing evaluation (see below)



### *Consultations*

23 The role of consultations should be reviewed in any further phase. If they are to be held, then alternative approaches should be considered – one suggested approach would involve each of the partner foundations preparing a 1½ day gathering with grantees, in their headquarters. The first half day would be spent with a visit to one of the funded projects aiming at integration; in the afternoon there would be a closed door round table to discuss particular issues with, besides the partners, national and international stakeholders (40 people max). The next half day would be to draw conclusions. This would also allow foundations to get to know each other better, share best practices and discuss specific issues.

### *Evaluation*

24 Like other elements in the first phase, the evaluation has been very rushed. In any future phase, there should be an element of ongoing evaluation, providing continuing feedback.

### **The evaluators**

**Alison Harker** worked in social and community development work in London and the north east of England and later as a grants officer for the City Parochial Foundation and Trust for London, and Atlantic Philanthropies. She is now a freelance consultant working with voluntary organisations and charitable foundations.

**Steven Burkeman**, who is based in York in the UK, has worked in education, welfare rights, local government and the National health Service. From 1982, he was Trust Secretary of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, which he left in 2001 to become a consultant. His clients include leading foundations and human rights organisations.

*The full report follows overleaf.*

## **PART 1 Background & Methodology**

### **1 The issue**

As NEF's 'manifesto' for EPIM puts it, *'Europe, with its diverse and declining population, is undergoing fundamental changes as it positions itself in a globalised and seemingly borderless world. Keeping European societies open and inclusive is a formidable challenge requiring creative responses from engaged citizens. It is against this backdrop that migration and integration debates take place'*<sup>1</sup>. The question of how best to integrate migrants is a central policy challenge throughout Europe and continues to be one of the European Union's priority concerns.

### **2 The Role of NEF**

The Network of European Foundations (NEF) was *'created to act as an operational platform to launch and implement transnational initiatives between foundations and to give a European perspective to them'*. NEF aims *'to act as a catalyst to promote systemic social change, and, where relevant, to influence the developing European policy agenda on issues of common concern'*. Key NEF members and agencies to which they are close shared their concerns and debates about migration and integration, as outlined above, and they recognised the importance of encouraging positive public attitudes towards investment in integration policies at a time when there is so much questioning, fear and insecurity generating difficult conditions in which to achieve effective integration.

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

3.1 Against this background, NEF decided in June 2005, at its General Assembly in Budapest, to develop an initiative to -

*open up debate and encourage broader commitment to the development of constructive integration policies at the EU level and to promote effective linking of these policies with those of Member States at both the national, regional and local levels; and to engage the widest possible range of stakeholders in society in*

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.epim.info/documents/EPIM%20-%20Shaping%20Integration%20Agendas%20in%20Europe.pdf>

*this process with a view also to embedding constructive integration policies and practices in other social and economic programmes.*

3.2 The context in which the initiative – called the European Programme for Integration and Migration (EPIM) - was developed was the establishment in 2004 by the EU Member States of the Common Basic Principles on Integration<sup>2</sup> (Common Basic Principles) to guide the further development of policies in the area of integration and migration. NEF was concerned that these are little known and that, having been established by governments alone, there was little role for civil society in Europe to play in their promotion. NEF asked the questions: how can -

- we breathe life into these principles?
- civil society support the EU, national and local authorities to embed these principles in their policies?
- civil society be mobilised to engage the widest possible range of stakeholders to invest in positive integration policies along the lines of the Common Basic Principles (CBPs)?
- we make sure that the new European Integration Fund proposed by the European Commission is spent well?

3.3 In deciding to focus on the CBPs, NEF was making a strategic choice to focus on promoting non-binding principles, as distinct from monitoring, or promoting, the implementation of enforceable rights under European Treaty law. This is not uncontroversial, and the point was raised in our interviews.

3.4 Noting increasing evidence of xenophobia and racism in European cities, NEF established EPIM with 3 objectives, as follows – to

- open up debate and encourage broader commitment to the development of constructive integration policies at the EU level;
- promote effective linking of these policies with those of Member States at both the national, regional and local levels;

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/en/jha/82745.pdf](http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/jha/82745.pdf)

- engage the widest possible range of stakeholders in society in this process with a view also to embedding constructive integration policies and practices in other social and economic programmes.

3.5 In order to pursue these objectives, EPIM had two aims –

- building stronger cooperation between foundations active in this field so as to secure much greater impact from their work through pooling of ideas and know-how and also greater European-wide visibility of their distinctive contributions;
- creating a clearing-house of good innovative practices and initiatives so as to facilitate the transfer of experience between foundations with a transnational European perspective and with a special concern to illustrate to a wide public practical measures which can make a real difference.

3.6 EPIM is run by a Steering Committee comprising 11 foundations, all of which made contributions to the funding for the project, as follows

–

Atlantic Philanthropies	€150,000
Compagnia di San Paolo	€100,000
King Baudouin Foundation	€100,000
Robert Bosch Stiftung	€100,000
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust	€50,000
Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian	€30,000
Bernard van Leer Foundation	€25,000
European Cultural Foundation	€25,000
Fondation Bernheim	€25,000
Freudenberg Stiftung	€20,000
Mother and Child Education Foundation	€15,000
<b>All</b>	<b>€640,000</b>

3.7 In pursuit of EPIM’s aims, there were two major activities -

A. A programme of consultations, the objectives of which were to -

- create a stronger dialogue engaging the different levels (“up and down”) in exploring the linkage with the European policy agenda on integration (in particular the Common Basic Principles);

- contribute to the development of constructive integration policies and practices which assist in building greater cohesion;
- breathe life into the application of the Common Basic Principles and their further development; and to highlight the contributions of foundations in this field.

In the event, consultations were held in

- *Portugal*, through the Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian - 21 November 2006
- *Belgium*, through the King Baudouin Foundation, the Fondation Bernheim and the Evens Stichting- 6 December 2006
- *Germany*, as a Franco-German enterprise, through the Robert Bosch Stiftung, the Freudenberg Stiftung and the Deutsch-Französische Institut - 15 & 16 March 2007
- *the United Kingdom*, through the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Barrow-Cadbury Trust, the Lloyds TSB Foundation, the City Parochial Foundation and the Paul Hamlyn Foundation – 13 March 2007

B. A programme of grants, with a grants fund of €125,000, to provide financial incentives to support Europe-wide networking and cooperation between NGOs. There were to be two types -

- strategic grants to European NGOs playing an advocacy role in the area of European migration and integration policies - up to €50,000 per grant;
- grants for advocacy activities awarded to NGOs from Member States that wish to join forces with other NGOs within the same Member State and with other Member States on issues linked to migration and integration policies - up to €25,000 per grant.

Grant applications were invited from a closed list, and decisions were made by an independent jury, as follows –

- Mr Roberto Carneiro - former Minister of Education of Portugal
- Ms Dipali Chandra - Programme Adviser to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Ms Litt Woon Long - Co-founder and Director of Long & Olser, former Director of Norway's National Centre for Gender Equality
- Mr Jean-Paul Marthoz - Editorial Director of *Enjeux Internationaux*.

They approved grants to the following organisations –

#### *European-level NGOs*

- December 18
- European Council for Refugees and Exiles
- European Network Against Racism
- European Women's Lobby
- Jesuit Refugee Service - Europe
- Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants

#### *National-level NGOs*

- International and European Forum on Migration Research (Italy)
- Migrant Rights Centre Ireland (Ireland)
- Jesuit Refugee Service - Portugal (Portugal)
- Solidariedad Imigrante (Portugal)
- RAA Berlin - Young European Film Forum for Cultural Diversity (Germany)

## **4 Project Evaluation Design & Methodology**

4.1 EPIM began work in November 2005. What has been labelled as its first phase comes to an end in June 2007. In February 2007, we (Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman) were commissioned to undertake an evaluation of this first phase, in order to enable NEF and the EPIM Steering Committee to inform the planning of the second phase. We were asked to focus on –

- The **cooperation** between foundations with a view to identifying the best ways of building a second phase of the initiative (2007 onwards).
- The effectiveness of the **consultation** process in achieving its stated objectives.

- The effectiveness and implementation of the **grants** programme.

4.2 The questions we were asked to address included the following –

### *Cooperation*

- Has EPIM resulted in greater cooperation between foundations active in this field and an increased visibility of their contribution? What are the critical elements contributing to this? How might this be enhanced in future?
- Which elements of EPIM are individual foundations interested in pursuing/supporting in a possible second phase? Are there sufficient areas of common interest to warrant a second phase?
- What has been learnt about cooperation amongst foundations which should be incorporated into a second phase and/or shared with others considering a similar initiative?

To which we added –

- What are the implications for individual foundations in becoming involved in cooperative initiatives?
- How has cooperation ‘raised the game’ of participating foundations as a result of opportunities to engage with European researchers, stakeholders and decision makers working on integration issues as well as with the national contact points set up in member states?
- To what extent is the learning from such cooperative ventures conveyed to foundation trustees and what are the implications for governance?

### *Consultations*

- Did the series of consultations result in a stronger dialogue on integration and in particular the Common Basic Principles – at the country and EU level?
- Have the series of consultations breathed life into the application of the Common Basic Principles and their further development at the national and EU level? What worked and what did not and why?

To which we added -





- Accepting that integration is a long term phenomenon, what are the views of interviewees on how integration can remain a subject for debate/action?
- Are consultations the most appropriate format? Are there other tools which might be more effective?

### *Grants Programme*

- Is there emerging evidence that the grants programme is enhancing the level of networking amongst key players and enriching action methods and policy analyses?
- Is there evidence that the grants programme has the potential to boost the impact of recipients? What are the key contributing factors? How might this be enhanced in phase two?
- Would the work funded by the grants programme have been undertaken if funding were not available? How central was the availability of funding to the work being undertaken and was it a priority for the recipient organisations?

To which we added -

- To what extent, and in what way, has the work funded through the grants programme enhanced the existing work of the organisation?
- What plans are there to continue the work?
- How has the grants programme helped to ‘breathe life’ into the common basic principles?
- What scope is there for complementary grant making in the future?
- To what extent, and in what way, have the different elements of cooperation, consultation and a grants programme interacted to achieve the objective of breathing life into the common basic principles and starting to improve future integration and migration policies?

4.3 What we have conducted sits somewhat uncomfortably between notions of formative and summative evaluation. Because the main purpose of the evaluation is to inform a longer next phase, it is founded



on a realistic appreciation by the commissioners that there are limits in terms of outcomes of the first phase, which, in our view, can almost be re-named as ‘preliminary’. In these terms, then this is a formative evaluation of ongoing work. However, it comes at the end of the first phase and is based on the retrospective recollections and insights of stakeholders; in that sense it is summative, in relation to the first phase.

4.4 Our data is entirely qualitative, and is based on responses to questionnaires, and to questions asked in face-to-face and telephone interviews; reports from grantees; minutes of EPIM Steering Committee meetings; and internal EPIM reports. A full list of interviewees and questionnaire respondents is included at Appendix 1, and the written questions used are included at Appendix 2.

4.5 The number of people we could interview on a face-to-face basis was limited by the funding available to pay for travel etc. We sought to get input from the following –

- All the 11 foundations in membership of the EPIM Steering Committee (we interviewed six and received written responses from two more. Three did not respond)
- 11 other foundations which were involved to some degree in the initiative, chosen because we and EPIM felt that their perspective was likely to be useful. Five of these felt they knew too little to be able to contribute
- All 11 recipients of EPIM grants (we interviewed nine but had no response from the remaining two).
- Two of the four members of the Independent Jury
- The Director and Coordinator of NEF
- The Director of the Migration Policy Group (MPG), charged by NEF with managing EPIM
- Five of the 22 NGOs included on the ‘closed list’ invited to apply for grants which chose not to apply
- Other key stakeholders, as advised by NEF

All interviews were conducted on the basis that nothing in our report would be linked to an identifiable interviewee.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Known in the UK as the Chatham House Rule - see <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/index.php?id=14>

## **PART 2: Findings and Recommendations**

### **5 Foundation Cooperation**

5.1 For a foundation based in one country in Europe to decide to commit time and effort, and therefore resources, to an international initiative, albeit one limited to the continent of Europe, is a significant step. For those at the geographic periphery of Europe, or with relatively small resources, or with a principal focus which is national rather than European, it is an even more significant step. To date, some 22 foundations have committed to EPIM to varying degrees. Of these, 11 have been members of the Steering Committee, and 11 have been involved less centrally. Why have they wanted to be part of the initiative?

5.2 In many cases, foundations were acutely aware of migration and integration issues in their own countries, and had some sense that EPIM might enable them, either directly or through grantees, to exercise a benign influence over EU-level policy which would ultimately improve the situation in their own countries. Some were aware of a disconnection between national and Europe-wide policies, and saw EPIM as one way to make progress towards bridging that divide. Many were keen to learn from work in other countries, and from the practices and experience of other foundations and to learn more about the issues through their membership of EPIM. In one or two instances, there was a specific interest in drawing in funding from elsewhere in Europe into international initiatives already supported by the foundations concerned.

5.3 There were, of course, different levels of involvement. Much more was expected of those who joined the Steering Committee than others. (As we show below, even within the Steering Committee, there have been different levels of involvement). A number of foundations which did not become members of the Steering Committee became involved with EPIM mainly through the planning for the national consultations.

5.4 Such foundations did appreciate the opportunity to work alongside other foundations and to cooperate on a common issue (though some were already used to working this way), and to learn more about the Common Basic Principles and migration issues in Europe. UK foundations were uncertain that they could play a fuller role or any role in future because of their foundations' particular foci and priorities and because there is so much happening in the UK which demands their attention. Unfortunately most of the foundations in other member states

which were not Steering Committee members felt they had not been sufficiently involved to be able to have discussions with us about the future and their role in EPIM. Several foundations which did not join the Steering Committee but did speak with us commented that the European agenda feels very far away; that there is a ‘whole new language’ to get to know; and that they were unclear about what EPIM is trying to achieve and its relevance for their work at home.

5.5 Cooperation went beyond foundations. At the outset of the initiative an approach was made to the Migration Policy Group (MPG) to work with EPIM. MPG has a 10-year track record of influencing policy makers at national and European level. It has been instrumental in shifting their thinking towards appreciating the advantages of migration and diversity, and realising that effective responses can be made to the challenges they pose. MPG has a considerable profile in most of the member states from which EPIM’s membership is drawn, and is seen by many in the field as the key organisation in Europe dealing with migration issues. In the light of this, EPIM’s decision to involve it in the initiative seems particularly appropriate.

5.6 Unfortunately, the arrangement has not worked as well as it might. While the EPIM letterhead refers to MPG as the manager of the initiative, there was confusion at the outset about respective roles and a lack of clarity about who would do what. The absence of a written agreement between NEF/EPIM and the MPG increased the potential for misunderstanding and has led to disappointment on both sides. The nature of the relationship between the two bodies needed to be clarified from the outset; MPG has worked with foundations in the past as a grant-seeker - a very different relationship to working as a partner in EPIM.

5.7 MPG has not been given the authority its description as manager would suggest and as the initiative has progressed, the situation has become more confused. MPG has certainly played a part in the first phase, particularly in terms of the information it has provided to EPIM, its contacts and its detailed knowledge of the issues. But the arrangement between the two bodies, if differently handled, could have been more fruitful.

5.8 If EPIM decides to become involved in an arrangement with an outside agency such as MPG in the future, expectations should be clarified on both sides from the outset. Each party needs to be clear about what the other brings to the relationship. Thereafter, it is recommended that a detailed formal agreement is drawn up and regularly reviewed.

## 6 The Steering Committee and the Secretariat

6.1 There are intrinsic difficulties in organising effective cooperation across national boundaries and different cultures - these are not unique to EPIM and its Steering Committee. Simply because organisations in different countries share the description of ‘foundation’, and a concern – in this instance – about migration and integration, does not mean that they share much else. They can be, and often are, different in terms of their statutory basis, the scale and source of their funding, their standing within their countries, their administrative structures, and their organisational cultures. Further, the nature of the issues relating to migration and integration which concern them vary widely from country to country. Some countries have been dealing with these issues for years; others have only relatively recently had to engage with the challenges of large-scale migration.

6.2 There are practical and interrelated problems of travel, language, power, money and time. As we know from discussions with foundations located at the geographic periphery, they have special travel problems – for them, a one day meeting in Brussels can entail the cost and difficulties associated with three days away from their base. The extent to which individual foundations are willing to invest the necessary time and effort may also be affected by varying perceptions of the significance of Europe-wide activity, and by the degree to which there is clarity about the purpose of meetings which they are asked to attend. Foundations represented on the Steering Committee vary widely as to their scale – and thus the marginal impact of spending money on travel, for example, will also vary widely. For some, the decision to come to a meeting in Brussels is a modest commitment; for others, it is more significant.

6.3 In tackling these challenges, there is a body of experience on which to draw. For example, the Balkan Civil Society Development network, in partnership with ECAS, has published ‘*A Practical guide to Partnership – how to make it work*’. There is also a publication by the EQUAL managing authorities of eight EU states on ‘*The principle of Partnership in the new ESF programmes (2007-2013)*’. The EQUAL guide suggests helpful principles for effective partnerships, based on simplicity, flexibility, clarity, consensus, empowerment & equality.

6.4 At the beginning, it was clear to most participants that the Steering Committee was encountering difficulties in communicating, arising in part from the fact that while for some, the use of English as the ‘common language’ was easy, others were using what was to them a second or even

a third language. This is less of a problem if there is plenty of time available. However, because of pressure of time and travel, meetings tended to be short and did not allow sufficient opportunity for participants to really communicate and get to know one another properly.

6.5 There were other problems, too. Lines of accountability were not always clear. The director of NEF has been the moving force in the EPIM initiative, but he does not formally report to the chair of the EPIM Steering Committee. The commitment of some of the bigger foundations has been critical. They have provided significant financial and other resources, but their culture and ways of operating are different from those of the smaller foundations. Accordingly, the ways in which things are done tend to reflect the ways of working of some of the larger foundations which are sometimes alien to others.

6.6 There have been questions of capacity. The work of the NEF secretariat in supporting the Steering Committee has been greatly valued but there is a recognition that the very modestly staffed secretariat has many claims on its time. This is epitomised by the observation that Steering Committee minutes are very good indeed, but lack of capacity means they are often received quite some time after the meeting which they record. There is also some confusion about roles. In order to ‘make things happen’ there has been heavy involvement from the secretariat, MPG, the chair of EPIM and the director of NEF and the split of responsibilities has not always been clear to others.

6.7 There are issues about power. Some of those who sit on the Steering Committee are powerful within their own foundations – sufficiently powerful to make decisions which commit their boards; others do not have this degree of power. It can be challenging for a committee which includes people with such different decision-making responsibilities to work effectively together.

6.8 There are differing perceptions about the proper role for foundations in society. Some of those involved see their role as enabling others to do useful work, albeit towards purposes previously approved by the foundation concerned. They see foundations principally as donors of funding (or grant-makers), and sometimes of other resources. But some foundations see themselves as deciding what needs to be done in a particular field and then either doing it (the operating foundation model) or commissioning it. These differences exist within countries, let alone between them.

6.9 Foundations in the UK tend to focus their efforts specifically on the voluntary sector, or charities, whereas in some other parts of Europe there is a much wider focus encompassing other civil society actors, including trades unions, employers, and cities.

6.10 The work of the Steering Committee depends on the active participation of its members. There are clearly different levels of ‘buy-in’ from members of the Steering Committee. There is a core of foundations with a long track record of work in this field, with a sense of strategy and analysis about working at the European level and how this impacts on their domestic situations. Then there are others which are keen to learn more, and interested enough to contribute some funding to the enterprise, but which find it hard to prioritise the issue to a sufficient extent to allow them to commit a great deal of time to it, or to EPIM. This is, we understand, because of the pressure of other business and because some foundations have a relatively small supporting infrastructure. Some have difficulty in justifying a very significant input of time etc into this initiative when weighed alongside domestic concerns – work at the European level is a significant priority for very few, if any, of the foundations involved in EPIM.

6.11 All this can be frustrating for the ‘core’ group, but it is not something over which they can have much influence. Exhortation and pressure may have a temporary effect on the extent to which the group as a whole demonstrates its commitment by turning up to, and remaining for the entirety of, Steering Committee meetings, but people who participate under pressure rather than because they want to participate are unlikely to give of their best. The Steering Committee has spent significant time and effort to ensure that all its members are ‘in the same place’ when it comes to their understanding of the issues with which EPIM is engaged. But there is an in-built dilemma - the purpose of EPIM is to act and therefore the expectation is that members will be actively involved as well as learning about the issues. EPIM needs to be clear about this when attracting new members

6.12 Despite these enormous difficulties, all of which have been identified by interviewees, there does seem to have been significant progress in the way in which the Steering Committee has worked. Several people commented favourably on the ways in which relationships were being built. There is widespread recognition that real cooperation is dependent on people knowing and understanding one another to a far greater degree than they did at the start – and that this cannot be done in a hurry. Increasingly, we have the impression that Steering Committee



members have been making time for this – for example, having meals together in an informal setting where they can really gain a better understanding of each other. As a result, relationships have greatly improved. *In this as in other aspects of the exercise to which we shall return below, we have the sense that if Phase 1 is regarded as a preparatory phase, with realistically trimmed ambitions for what can be achieved in such a phase, then the Steering Committee is very much on a positive track for a ‘proper’ next phase.*

## 6.13 Ways Forward

6.13.1 We suggest one way forward to enhance even greater cooperation in the next phase and to overcome some of the difficulties mentioned above would be to make the division between the core group and the wider group explicit, and build it into the organisation of the project. For example, the Steering Committee – perhaps renamed as the Executive Committee, to emphasise its role – would be limited to a very few foundations; in the first instance, we suggest King Baudouin Foundation, the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, Atlantic Philanthropies, Gulbenkian Foundation and Robert Bosch Stiftung. This would expect to meet more frequently than the larger group to which it would report at meetings held perhaps twice a year, and more frequently by email. Because the Executive Committee would be smaller than the present Steering Committee, it would also be more easily able to confer by telephone between face-to-face meetings. The wider group could be expanded to include those foundations which have not joined the Steering Committee but have indicated a degree of interest in the exercise.

6.13.2 At the same time, the terms of the new memorandum of understanding between NEF and the European Foundations Centre, (EFC) should be widely promulgated, alongside encouragement to foundations generally, but especially those currently involved to some degree with EPIM, to use EFC as a mechanism through which they can learn more about the issues with which EPIM is engaged. EFC provided the data for the mapping report commissioned by the Barrow Cadbury Trust and King Baudouin Foundation, which is *‘a review of the extent to which the work of voluntary and community organisations funded by European foundations supports the EU migrant integration agenda’*<sup>4</sup> - a useful document for an operational body such as EPIM.

---

<sup>4</sup> Spencer, S., and Cooke, S. *The Contribution of the Voluntary Sector to Migrant Integration in Europe* COMPAS, March 2006

6.13.3 The EFC Diversity, Migration and Integration Interest Group (DMIIG), which *'provides a platform for debate, information sharing, exchange of good practice and collaboration to independent foundations and corporate funders active in the fields of migration, migrant integration and diversity'* is an obvious mechanism for cooperation between EPIM and EFC. Perhaps there is room for a 'sub-memorandum of understanding' arising from the NEF/EFC memorandum, between this group and EPIM which would help to ensure that there is effective cooperation on migration and integration issues. In the best of all outcomes, DMIIG and EPIM would work closely together in a complementary fashion. We believe that there have been certain issues which have thus far prevented this and we urge that these be resolved.

6.13.4 We recommend that EPIM should -

- consider holding meetings in a variety of European centres, rather than solely in Brussels (in the first phase, there was an invitation to hold a meeting in Istanbul). The meetings, taking advantage of the geographic spread of Steering Committee members, could incorporate an opportunity to meet local NGOs, particularly those which exhibit good practice, and to hear about the different national contexts in which other foundations operate.
- continue to ensure that member foundations have the opportunity to meet regularly outside the formal meeting setting in order to continue to build relationships.
- have a fulltime manager, appointed by NEF, and tasked with coordinating the initiative, ensuring that communication and information among the foundations is maintained between meetings, managing an enhanced grants programme, and gathering the learning from it. With the Steering Committee, s/he should continue to open up and maintain channels of communication with appropriate EU departments.

## 7 The Grants Programme

### 7.1 The purpose of the programme

7.1.1 EPIM had big ambitions for the grants programme. Grants awarded under the programme were aimed at -



- opening up debate and encouraging broader commitment to the development of constructive integration policies at the EU level and promoting effective linking of these policies with those of Member States at the national, regional and local levels; and at
- stimulating the engagement of the widest possible range of stakeholders in society in this process with a view to embedding constructive integration policies and practices in other social and economic programmes.

7.1.2 The objective was to make NGOs stronger so that they could –

- network with key players, including foundations;
- organise ‘go and see’ activities to enrich their action methods and policy analysis within a European perspective;
- organise training programmes designed to enhance the ability to boost their impact.

7.1.3 To what extent is the grants programme contributing towards achieving these ambitions? Many of those we interviewed were positive about the programme, using words to describe it like ‘*successful*’, ‘*important*’, and ‘*key*’. Others were more critical, mentioning things like the ‘*need to rethink the grants programme*’, and ‘*disappoint[ment at some of the grants]*’. Here, we consider each of the stages in the process, from application through to evaluation.

## 7.2 The process

7.2.1 As indicated above, the total amount of money available for grants was €25,000. These were to be in two categories - up to €25,000 and up to €50,000. These are relatively small sums; key Steering Committee members were worried about raising expectations unduly, and generating a demand for grants which could not be handled by the NEF secretariat. Accordingly, the Committee decided to limit grant applications to those solicited from a closed list. Each Committee member was asked to provide the names of organisations they knew which might form the list. This generated a list of 44 organisations - 10 of these were European-wide organisations, and 34 operated within one country. They were all duly invited to apply. 23 accepted the invitation, and 21 chose not to

apply. Of the 23, nine were European-wide, and 14 operated within one country.

7.2.2 In order to apply, organisations were required to complete a 5-page application form. The criteria were as follows –

- The expected outcomes should be targeted at influencing the European and/or transnational levels.
- The project should be based on the analysis of a specific need of the applicant or on a specific lack in the field.
- The objectives, the means and the methods should be in proportion and well focused.
- The communication and dissemination process of the project should be aimed at breaking new ground with the involvement of a new and wider range of stakeholders.

7.2.3 The form became available in early March 2006, and had to be submitted by 19<sup>th</sup> May. The outcome of the process, with decisions being made by an independent jury drawn from Portugal, Sweden, France and the UK (see above), was to be communicated in early July 2006, and projects had to be completed by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2007, with final reports submitted by 20<sup>th</sup> April 2007.

7.2.4 Eleven organisations received grants, six of which operate at European level and five at a national level. Steering Committee interviewees expressed disappointment at the low level of applications and the poor quality of some of them.

### 7.3 The closed list

7.3.1 While some interviewees were content with the closed list, others (on both sides of the grant-making process) felt that it had been too restrictive and - especially at a European level – had led to applications being invited mainly from ‘the usual suspects’. Even some grantees who felt flattered by the invitation to apply, and by the eventual award of a grant, expressed a preference for an open list. One interviewee, who is very experienced on migration issues, observed that while the applicants included some which are extremely experienced at European level, it was the smaller organisations - which did not have the ‘European language’ -

which were stimulating, fresh, and in touch with what is happening in communities.

7.3.2 Since only half the organisations invited to apply did so, we spoke to several which did not, to find out why. For the most part, at the time they lacked the capacity to plan the work and deliver it to the prescribed deadlines.

7.3.3 Interviewees proposed two alternative proposals for a future application process -

- each country should decide on whether or not to operate an open or closed list. Each foundation should then make a preliminary list to be submitted to a Jury in charge of selection;
- there should be an open list. This should be carefully considered, if the priorities of the grants programme and its parameters are made clear from the outset and if there is the capacity within EPIM to manage the resulting response.

## 7.4 The selection process.

7.4.1 Doubts about the jury system were expressed by Steering Committee members and by jury members themselves. Some felt that, though this was a useful first effort, given limited resources, information, ‘intelligence’ and knowledge of the field, a jury of four people may not be the best way of dealing with the decisions involved in a grants programme.

7.4.2 The following specific issues emerged –

- Applications from different countries for work focusing on those countries can only be effectively assessed by people who understand the national context. For example, several applications were received from Italy but none of the jury members had detailed knowledge of the Italian context.
- The secretariat, and the jury, lacked the capacity to go back to applicants for clarification or more information or to develop ideas.
- The Steering Committee’s priorities were not clear and as a result there was a lack of clarity about the skills and competencies needed

on a jury. The jury was therefore not as well-briefed as it might have been.

## 7.5 The grants: strengths

7.5.1 There was universal acclaim by grantees for aspects of the programme. In most cases the grant enabled them to do work which they felt to be important, and wanted to do but for which they would not have been able to find the funding from other sources. Grantees were –

- enthusiastic about the opening up of a new source of funding, especially at European level;
- very pleased with the way the grants programme operated. They appreciated -
  - the flexibility
  - that the majority of the grant was paid in advance
  - that reporting requirements were not over-burdensome
  - that the application forms were clear and straightforward to complete
  - that if there were unforeseen delays these were accepted by EPIM as an inevitable part of the work
  - that their priorities for the work were accepted and they did not have to make their projects ‘fit’ uncomfortably into a funder’s specific design;
- committed to carrying on the work which had obviously excited them, though in some cases this was dependent on finding alternative funds. The EPIM grant meant more to them, they said than *just* another source of money. They felt that the work they were able to do with the grant ‘moved them on’ as an organisation into new areas and ways of thinking.

7.5.2 Several mentioned that the grant enabled them to work strategically. Many organisations exist on project grants, sometimes for as little as 6 months at a time. In such circumstances, strategic work is almost impossible. For one organisation it was their first real grant. Another said the grant enabled them to do something ‘big’ and which could make an impact. For others, the grant had provided an opportunity to think differently about the way they work and had led them to change some of their practice. Perhaps inevitably, grantees wanted the EPIM grants programme to be continued.

## 7.6 The grants: weaknesses

7.6.1 All grantees we interviewed felt that the grants programme had been too rushed. The invitation to apply for a grant required a response by 19 May 2006. Then, EPIM notified the successful applicants during the first week in July. Grantees had to finish the funded work by 1 March 2007. In most cases, this was too short a period to enable the work funded to happen in a proper planned way. It takes time to recruit staff. It takes time to negotiate with other stakeholders – for example, educational institutions. It takes time to plan the work properly.

7.6.2 Grants made for specific pieces of short-term work, the parameters of which are - albeit lightly - proscribed by the funder, have a number of likely effects. *First*, hard-pressed non-profit organisations may be tempted away from their main mission in order to grab the chance of additional funding. This was to some extent avoided by EPIM because it used the closed list process – so that it at least judged that all invitees were already working in the specific area for which EPIM wished to award funding.

7.6.3 *Second*, applicants may decide to ‘dress up’ existing work in order to get funding needed for their continuing operation. We think this was a ‘grey area’ in a number of instances where EPIM grants were approved. For example, one successful applicant went to great lengths in the application to link the work for which they were seeking funds to the Common Basic Principles. It was known that EPIM wanted to ‘*breathe life into the Common Basic Principles*’. Yet when we interviewed the contact person it was clear that he felt their work had little to do with the Common Basic Principles.

7.6.4 A *third* possibility is that the organisation genuinely wants to do the work for which funding is on offer and does indeed prepare a project which meets the funder’s stated criteria. But in those circumstances, the core operation will need to be sustained; in our view, it is unreasonable to expect that new work can be grafted on to an existing operation without it impacting on core costs. It is because of the impact on core costs that, in the UK at least, it is customary for universities, for example, to add a figure of approximately 40% (and sometimes more) of the budget to pay for overheads.

7.6.5 In the application form EPIM did not encourage applicants to think about the impact of the project on the organisation’s overheads. One organisation told us that they were so keen to get the grant from EPIM in

order to carry out work they desperately wanted to do that they cut their costs drastically and then had to draw heavily on the ‘voluntary’ input of other staff and the organisation’s resources. They were delighted to receive the EPIM grant and completed the planned work – but they could not have done so to the standard they and EPIM required without a recent large grant from a foundation not associated with EPIM.

## **7.7 The December workshop**

7.7.1 On December 8<sup>th</sup> 2006, EPIM convened a meeting in Brussels for all the foundations and grantees associated with the project. The meeting had two main purposes; to –

- evaluate the implementation of the projects by the grantees midway through the process and draw some conclusions on problems and perspectives;
- share perspectives on communications and media work with a view to increasing the grantees’ awareness of the need to proactively develop outreach and advocacy policies.

7.7.2 There was universal enthusiasm for the December workshop. Grantees valued the opportunity to network with other NGOs and with foundations, though there had been little follow-up with the foundations on the part of the NGOs. They were glad to hear about each other’s work and several found the session on the media very useful. Foundations also found the workshop useful.

7.7.3 However, for some grantees, the workshop was the first time in the whole process of applying and receiving funding from EPIM when they really understood that the EPIM initiative was more than just a grants programme. This was the occasion when they actually understood the significance of the Common Basic Principles within the EPIM initiative. Some felt that it would have been good to have understood all this at the outset and to have known more at an earlier stage about what others were doing. There seems to have been confusion amongst some grantees about the true nature of the EPIM initiative. It was suggested to us that a clear explanation at the outset, perhaps by bringing together the grantees, would have benefited the whole programme.

7.7.4 EPIM’s own evaluation of the day proposed that a longer debriefing session should be organised on the model of the December

meeting and that this should focus on lessons learned. That is due on June 12<sup>th</sup> 2007.

## 7.8 Evaluating the grants

7.8.1 We were asked to –

- establish whether there is evidence that the grants programme has the potential to boost the impact of recipients
- identify the key contributing factors and how these might be enhanced in future phases of the EPIM initiative.

7.8.2 The tight timescale has meant that evaluation of the work funded has been limited, as has any assessment of impact. Four organisations told us that it was too early to evaluate the work. Others had evaluated specific events and others had carried out internal evaluations as part of their routine activities. One European-level organisation had carried out an evaluation using a board of experts. Two others had carried out ongoing evaluations.

7.8.3 Grantees' reports and the interviews we conducted show that any influence at European or transnational levels at this stage has been very limited. Most of the grantees are focused on their own work and internal organisation, and on debate within existing networks. There have been very limited audiences for reports published as a result of EPIM grants.

7.8.4 What emerges from grantee reports is a picture of a fragmented NGO sector working in the field of migration, despite some efforts at cooperation and networking. Grantees have expressed their frustrations, experiences and concerns - but they have only to a limited degree articulated politically realistic recommendations based on clear policy analysis. We have summarised policy points made by grantees in [Appendix 3](#).

7.8.5 There are some signs that a few of the grantees might make an impact in the future – where they have an imaginative and outward looking approach, an appreciation of the 'big picture', a clear wide vision, and consistently disseminate a central message by a variety of means, including the media.



## 7.9 Ways Forward

7.9.1 For the future, grantees would like the next grants programme to address their three main concerns about the programme in the first phase

- the short period for which grants were made;
- the lack of any contribution to core costs; and
- the need for better opportunities for national and European-wide organisations to work together.

7.9.2 Grantees would like -

- a two tier application process with the opportunity to submit an outline proposal for preliminary discussion before making a firm application
- longer term grants which enable them to make a real impact. Short-term grant funding limits its potential impact. The need to find alternative funding to continue the work (which not all our interviewees had yet managed to do) interrupted the momentum. More time would have allowed the work to be usefully refined. One interviewee has produced a final report which, had time allowed, they would have shortened, thereby improving it and potentially making more of an impact with it.
- grants which include a realistic contribution to organisational core costs.
- more opportunities to work together, and for there to be a means of national and European level organisations genuinely working together. It is natural for national organisations to network within their own countries, but it is more difficult to identify appropriate networking opportunities outside country boundaries. Despite this, several grantees had identified and made links with organisations throughout Europe doing work relevant to their own and which were not part of the EPIM programme. EPIM grants ‘legitimised’ cooperative working with others – something which normal pressures tend to make difficult, and which takes time, and money. As one grantee put it, *‘the national situations should be informing the European level’*. This needs money, and longer-term grants.



7.9.3 There are different challenges in networking with Europe-wide organisations. There are already established Europe-wide networks. Staff tend to move between Europe-wide organisations anyway, making networking between them somewhat easier.

7.9.4 If analysing and influencing policy is to remain central to EPIM's grants programme, then EPIM needs to seek greater clarity and realism from grant-seekers at application stage about how they propose to do this. EPIM then needs to support and encourage grantees in this work through the lifetime of the grants.

## 7.10 More than Money

7.10.1 EPIM's objectives need more than money if they are to be fulfilled. As EPIM has already recognised through the media workshop element in the December 8<sup>th</sup> gathering, grantees also need capacity building in using the media and in effective dissemination of messages. In addition, EPIM should consider bringing its grantees together on a regular basis to ensure that the wider dimension in which they all operate remains uppermost in their minds and that they build a unified rather than fragmented picture of integration and the situation of migrants. It is from such a perspective that policy analysis and subsequent recommendations can realistically be developed.

## 8 The Consultations

8.1 There were a number of clear positives emerging from the EPIM consultations, attendance at which was for the most part high.

8.2 *The Portuguese consultation* was the first one. It was part of a bigger event organised by the Gulbenkian Foundation. The Foundation brought together high ranking representatives from government and civil society and the event raised the profile of work in the area of migration and integration. It included a signing ceremony of the 'Platform on Policies about the integration and reception of immigrants' which is a commitment to put integration principles into practice. High ranking representatives from employers' organisations, trade unions, and churches, as well as representatives of city governments, signed the Platform as did a range of Portuguese foundations. This event ensured that a long term perspective on the issues associated with migration and integration was recognised and follow-up activities were planned.

8.3 *The Belgian consultation* was the second EPIM consultation. It was organised by the King Baudouin Foundation, the Bernheim Foundation and Evens Stichting. The theme was '*Pathways to success in education for young migrants - the identification of factors critical to success within a European context*'. This consultation and the report on it made an impact in Belgium, highlighting the marked differences between the two biggest communities, the French- and Dutch-speaking communities, in terms of immigrant children's performance. The event was judged to be very successful, well prepared, with a clear focus and drawing upon other countries' experience whilst focusing on the Belgian situation. The European context and the Common Basic Principles were highlighted and senior policy makers were challenged to share their thinking on how to help change the situation of young immigrants.

8.4 *The UK consultation* included amongst its speakers Sarah Spencer, a respected 'expert' in this field. Her contribution was heard by a member of the UK Government's Commission on Integration and Cohesion - a year-long enquiry into cohesion issues in Britain. As a direct result, she was asked to provide a copy of her address, and then to meet the Commissioner concerned, who leads for the Commission on migration issues. As a result, Sarah was asked to prepare concrete proposals for a strategy for migration. This was considered very recently by the Commission at an away-day, the outcome of which is not yet known.

8.5 But there was dissatisfaction expressed with the attendance and who attended the UK consultation. Disappointment was expressed at the quality of the workshops; the lack of what some might have seen as basic information (such as what is happening at EU level) but which was nevertheless important for people trying to understand European issues; and the lack of discussion about how the initiative fitted into a long term strategy on integration as developed under the EPIM agenda. There was concern about what follow-up there might be and that there was no discussion about irregular migrants in the EU member states. (Because we were only able to attend the London consultation, we picked up particular views about it; we cannot say to what extent there would have been similar views expressed immediately following the other consultations).

8.6 At the time of writing there was no report available on *the Franco-German consultation*.

8.7 Grants given to the European Network against Racism (ENAR) and the European Women's Lobby were in essence to pay for consultations, and while not part of the original EPIM programme of consultations, the ENAR gathering in particular was seen as having been very successful.

8.8 There were a number of critical comments made about the consultations generally. There was a lack of clarity about what they were supposed to achieve; clarity on this would suggest that the consultations be organised in such a way as to maximise the chances of the achievement. There is a great deal of consultation fatigue and this is especially the case where people are required to travel considerable distances to attend. People need to know why they are participating; how the consultation is likely to contribute to a stated goal; and to feel – at the end of the consultation – that progress has been made towards that goal; participants in three of the four consultations organised as part of the EPIM programme did not generally feel this.

8.9 Steering Committee members were amongst the most critical of the consultations. They variously commented that they '*were of little use*'; '*were too ambitious*'; '*were not as originally expected*'; and that there was a lack of coherence, and clarity of message, between them. Some felt that there had been too few consultations. Some of those to whom we spoke felt that consultations should be abandoned in any further phase of EPIM.

8.10 Others felt that the consultations were too academic, and that they need to be opened up to wider groups - that they were not really consultations as such.

8.11 There were fewer consultations than had originally been intended. We think that there are several reasons for this, and that they are all of significance. *First*, the EPIM Steering Committee with the best will in the world is not in a position to ensure that its decisions will be implemented. Things look different 'on the ground' – there are issues, practical constraints, and problems to be confronted of which the Steering Committee cannot be fully aware. It is a continuing theme of this report that much in phase 1 of the programme, including elements which are regarded as very positive, have been organised quickly, with too little time for the job to be done properly – a sense that everything has been made subject to the constraints of a timetable designed to meet what are felt to be the needs of EPIM. This is particularly the case with the consultations. As with other elements in the programme, there is a strong

feeling that more time is needed to reflect and learn, to think, rather than to rush towards ‘doing’.

8.12 *Second*, it may be the case that in individual countries the foundations charged with organising consultations did not have the time to do the job, and that they delegated the work to voluntary organisations which do not have the standing and leverage to engage the necessary partners to produce what was originally envisaged.

8.13 *Third*, in specific countries it may be that the issues at any point in time are so contentious and so political, that creating a consultation seems just too difficult and controversial.

8.14 *Fourth* – and we think perhaps most significantly – the motivation to organise depends on a clear understanding of the part that consultations play in the wider EPIM strategy – how they link to the grants programme, how they are supposed to link to each other, and how they will contribute to the ultimate EPIM goal of influencing European policy on integration and migration. It is not surprising that those consultations that were organised were initiated by the Steering Committee members with perhaps the most understanding and longest track record of work on the issues.

## 8.15 Ways Forward

8.15.1 If consultations are to be an element in the next phase – and, as indicated, some feel that they should not be – then it is important to link them more clearly with the grants programme. One interviewee suggested an alternative model in which each of the partner foundations would prepare a 1½ day gathering with grantees, in their headquarters. The first half day would be spent with a visit to one of the funded projects aiming at integration; in the afternoon there would be a closed-door round table to discuss particular issues with, besides the partners, national and international stakeholders (maximum 40 people). The next half day would be to draw conclusions. This would also allow foundations to start getting to know each other better, share best practices and discuss specific issues.

## 9 Interaction between elements of EPIM

9.1 The three elements of the EPIM initiative - cooperation amongst foundations; consultations; and a grants programme - have worked in



parallel. Whether or not this was intended, there appears to have been little or no interaction between them. To outsiders, the absence of a clear connection between all three elements seemed strange. One interviewee expressed the view that there was something odd about allocating resources for integration and migration and collecting information through consultation on the same areas. Few of the grantees were aware that there was a consultation programme, or that they were invited. Some of the Steering Committee members told us they felt they did not know very much about the grants.

9.2 One interviewee expressed the view that the interaction between the three elements is only happening now; maybe it is appropriate that this is the case. But in any next phase, a closer connection between the three elements could be significant.

9.3 The parallel nature of the three elements perhaps limited the understanding amongst some of the grantees that in receiving a grant they were part of a wider initiative, that their work could contribute to a wider audience and that EPIM has a vision which is broader than simply running a grants programme.

9.4 Some did say that they were aware of being part of something bigger but one interviewee commented that, intellectually, people may have thought they were part of a wider process - but this was not integrated into their grant applications or their ways of working. Her concern was that there was a lack of awareness of the wider European dimension and organisations and issues were segmented. She felt that the grants programme would have been enhanced if EPIM had explained more clearly the 'whole' of the initiative at the outset and if it had kept repeating this. This would no doubt also have influenced the grantees' approach to policy analysis and the nature of the policy recommendations which emerged from the grants.

9.5 This view was reflected by some grantees who felt that although certain organisations worked cooperatively, these tended to be ones which operate at a European level and have traditionally worked this way. They felt that linkages between the NGOs which operate at a European level and those which operate at national level were not made. Moreover, some grantees did not become aware of the true nature of the initiative until the December workshop.

9.6 One interviewee concluded that EPIM's encouragement to adopt a broader vision of the work and to incorporate this into the messages they

communicated might have ‘lost out’ to consideration of micro level issues in the process of grant making. As a result, the opportunity to convey a broader vision and findings from a range of countries and organisations may be limited. It was felt that the experience of the grantees could be effectively used alongside the outcome of a (differently organised) consultation process - if the two elements are more closely integrated in the next phase.

## 10 Progress towards EPIM’s aims & objectives

10.1 This is clearly the right moment to check on the extent to which progress has been made towards the original aims, and therefore, to judge to what extent either the aims themselves or the programmes of action need to be changed so that the latter will lead to the former. But this may also be the moment to ask a tougher question: *to what extent are the aims, even if fully achieved, realistically likely to lead to EPIM’s objectives?* - which were to open up debate and encourage broader commitment to the development of constructive integration policies at the EU level; to promote effective linking of these policies with those of member states at the national regional and local levels; and to engage the widest possible range of stakeholders in society in this process with a view also to embedding constructive integration policies and practices in other social and economic programmes.

10.2 It is unrealistic to expect that EPIM would have made significant progress towards achieving its aims by the end of a first experimental phase. As for the *first aim*, a good base has been laid for developing stronger cooperation between the foundations which have chosen to become involved in EPIM. This is not, however, necessarily the same as cooperation between foundations active in the field of migration and integration; several of those involved are really only at the learning stage and are not themselves yet particularly active in the field.

10.3 Has EPIM reached all the foundations working in Europe in this field, including all those identified in the COMPAS report (see para 6.13.2 above)? To the extent that some of the foundations that have joined EPIM have done so in order to learn rather than act (see above), there may need to be some restructuring to ensure that the stronger cooperation is being built between the right organisations.

10.4 But whatever the membership of EPIM – both within and beyond the Steering Committee – we see signs that there has been a growing



understanding of how to work and cooperate together and that this will be transferable to the next phase.

10.5 The *second aim* – to create a clearing house of good practices etc – is (inevitably) a long way from being achieved. As indicated above, the grants have been too few, too small and too short to allow for significant progress in this direction. But if the learning from this pilot phase is absorbed, then there is good reason to hope that such a clearing house will in due course be established. At this point, of course, the interface with EFC becomes important because EPIM will in effect have established a learning resource - and learning, as distinct from action, is the major focus for the EFC group.

10.6 But the second question – about the extent to which these aims can realistically be expected to contribute to the achievement of EPIM's objectives – is much tougher. We sense that the programme was initiated without the kind of independent expert research which would have answered, with a greater degree of certainty, the key question: *in what way can foundations most effectively contribute towards the achievement of NEF's objectives in this field?* This is the kind of approach, as we understand it, which was taken before NEF embarked on work in the field of religion and tolerance. We risk moving beyond our remit in raising – still less, addressing – this issue, which it would in any case have been impossible to cover in the limited time available for this exercise. But we do think it needs to be asked, and answered. Are the aims – even when fulfilled – the most likely to lead to achieving the objectives? Perhaps this is the moment to take the time to investigate whether there are better ways for foundations to work on these, so that the next phase of the work can be based on the results of such an investigation.

## 11 Evaluation

11.1 We have referred elsewhere to the sense of rush which has pervaded this initiative. This extends also to the present evaluation. The evaluation began before the consultations were completed; most of the interviewing etc had to be completed before final grants reports were received; and the report had to be submitted in advance of the planned 2-day June 12/13 2007 meeting. This caused some problems for grantees who could not understand why we were evaluating a programme which for them was not finished. Arranging discussions with very busy people within foundations was not straightforward. After an in-principle agreement had been reached on the terms of the evaluation, the time

allowed for it was cut. We did not anticipate the scale of the problems this would cause in trying to arrange appointments with interviewees, many of whom travel extensively. The fee agreed for the evaluation was inclusive of expenses, which made it practically impossible for us to interview as many key actors as we would have liked on a face-to-face basis.

11.2 We feel that in this instance, an ongoing evaluation process might have been more valuable, with feedback as the exercise developed. The role of external evaluators is often to enable people to say things via the evaluators which they cannot (yet) say directly to each other. This would, for example, have enabled the Steering Committee to pick up much sooner a sense that things were being (unnecessarily) rushed, and to respond accordingly.

## 12 Options for the future

12.1 In setting out options for the future, we are aware that, at the January 2007 Steering Committee meeting, plans were discussed for the next phase. There was evidently some debate about whether it was important to review the outcome of this evaluation process before proceeding. Predictably, perhaps, as evaluators we would urge that the Steering Committee should take the necessary time to reflect on the results of this evaluation; on what EPIM can realistically achieve within its resources in the future; on what it is appropriate for foundations to undertake; and to ensure common understanding of issues and concepts including integration *We recommend that EPIM does not rush into a next phase but that it takes, say, 9 months, to reflect, meet, learn and plan as a necessary prerequisite to putting in place the next phase.* But taking time to reflect, learn and plan does not mean being inactive.

12.2 Because the situation of migrants and the communities to which they have come is such an urgent and dynamic one, and given the changing scale of migration, EPIM has been understandably and rightly driven by its own sense of urgency. But the down-side of this is that there has been no opportunity to reflect on how the kinds of activities which EPIM promotes can best contribute towards the achievement of the objectives.

12.3 Thus, during EPIM's coming months, the Steering Committee should commission from an independent expert a study which should answer the following question – *given EPIM's agreed objectives, in what*



*ways can foundations in Europe most effectively contribute towards the achievement of those objectives?*

12.4 This is emphatically not a repeat of the COMPAS study referred to above which was in essence a mapping exercise describing the current pattern of foundation activities in this field, and identifying gaps for grant making. Rather, the proposed study would seek, at a profound, informed and practical level, to identify how the kinds of changes in policy and practice on migration and integration in Europe along the lines sought by EPIM can be achieved through the input of foundations - which may be monetary, or related to other foundation assets (for example, access, or networks). It is important to emphasise that in this field as in others, changes in policy and changes in practice are distinct. The latter is what matters to people and communities, and is much harder to achieve than the former. Changes in policy may be necessary, but are not sufficient, to guarantee changes in practice.

12.5 The Steering Committee should also use this time to reflect on its own structure, with specific regard to the points made in 6.13 above. The restructuring recommended there, with a much smaller Executive Committee, and a larger group of supporting foundations which would be kept informed but actively involved less frequently, will make EPIM's structures 'fitter for purpose' as and when the next phase proceeds.

12.6 In our view, an effective next phase needs significantly more resources than have been available so far, both for grant-making and for EPIM's own infrastructure – to facilitate meetings beyond Brussels, and to allow for the strengthening of the secretariat so the programme has the full-time attention of a staff person. This interim period should be used to gather additional resources from existing and new partners.

12.7 Beyond this, it is clear that future development should depend on consideration of this evaluation and of the study described in 12.3 above. *The following options, mainly affecting the grants programme, are not an 'all or nothing' list – they are presented for the Steering Committee to consider and to make choices as they think fit.* They are geared to greater integration of the key elements which have featured in EPIM's work so far – especially learning and grant making with a focus on changing policy and practice.

## 12.8 Options

12.8.1 EPIM could, with an enhanced secretariat, and changes to the system by which grant selection is made, run an entirely *open grants programme* inviting applications in response to its stated objectives. In order to ensure that useful lessons are extracted and fed into the appropriate EU bodies as well as the member state authorities, we suggest that there might be -

- a ‘consultative/advisory’ committee of experts etc which meets with grantees and EPIM, say, once a year during the lifetime of the grants in each member state
- a programme of regular meetings between the national NGO grantees and appropriate EU level grantees
- on going evaluation
- that EPIM gathers the lessons from the above for dissemination to the EU and beyond

12.8.2 If, however, EPIM chooses to continue grant making, but on the basis of *a closed list*, we suggest that each contributing foundation should select what it considers to be transferable examples of good practice in its own country in relation to EPIM’s objectives. These, or a selection of them (with the selection being made by independent experts), along with recommended European level NGOs should then be brought together to make presentations to EPIM at a conference-type event attended by government officials and other interested parties. Only following this would EPIM decide to which organisations grants should be awarded on a multi-year basis. Grants might be accompanied by expert input on, for example, use of the media. In this way, EPIM will combine grant making with learning about good practice. Keeping the government authorities etc ‘on board’ thereafter could lead to an influence on policy. The European level and national grantees should meet early in the ‘life’ of the grants and regularly thereafter with the encouragement of EPIM. An event involving policy makers could be organised towards the end of the grants and EPIM could take on responsibility or disseminating the lessons from the whole programme.

12.8.3 Steering (or, as we hope it will by then be, Executive) Committee members should visit some of the selected NGOs and should

meet with EPIM members, EU and national government officials and appropriate experts as part of (say) a week's fact-finding visit in specific member states. There would need to be proper follow-up in order to progress the work, maintain relationships and eventually begin to develop policies. Such study visits should include foundation staff and others who are not of director level, in order to internalise the learning and inform future foundation work in this field.

12.8.4 Whichever system is adopted – open or closed - we do not think the jury system as it has worked so far is appropriate. The points made in 7.4 above should be reviewed.

12.8.5 If EPIM wants to do more than simply make grants, it could decide to enhance any grants with -

- input on use of the media/how to influence policy etc.
- regular meetings between EPIM, grantees, and relevant others to ensure that the work remains on track, and
- professional assistance with dissemination.

12.8.6 EPIM could disseminate the lessons learned from the grants programme as a whole. This approach could effectively contribute to the development of constructive integration policies and highlight practical measures which can make a difference.

### **Other options**

12.8.7 EPIM could review which European networks are most effective, and could reserve parts of its grant making budget to support these networks.

12.8.8 Part of the grants budget might be used on a rolling programme focussing on different member states over, say a five year period which the European NGOs prioritise for collaborative work. The grant-making could be accompanied with a programme of learning through regular meetings of the grantees and EPIM.

12.8.9 Beyond grant-making, foundations in each member state could meet with NGOs, government officials etc and/or commission small pieces of research to establish what are the key issues in relation to migration/integration there. The results could be examined to see where

there are common themes. This would then guide the nature of the grants programme in future years.

12.8.10 Finally, EPIM could abandon any consultation and formal programme of cooperation among foundations, beyond cooperation on grant-making.

## 13 The Evaluation Questions

*While we believe that most of the questions listed in section 4 above have been answered in the main body of the Report, for ease of reference we have sought here to provide summary responses to all of them.*

### Cooperation

13.1 *Has EPIM resulted in greater cooperation between foundations active in this field and an increased visibility of their contribution? What are the critical elements contributing to this? How might this be enhanced in future? What has been learnt about cooperation amongst foundations which should be incorporated into a second phase and/or shared with others considering a similar initiative?*

13.1.1 There has been more cooperation. It has been based on improved personal relationships, a focus on a single issue, financial investment, information exchange and the fact that EPIM began to communicate with the outside world with one voice. As a result, NGOs are more aware of the foundations' contribution - mainly EPIM's grants.

13.1.2 The EU and national government officials have not had much of a chance to be aware of the foundations' contribution. (It is different in specific countries where there are significant foundations - but governments would have been aware of them already, not particularly through EPIM).

13.1.3 Cooperation, especially across borders, takes time. Especially in the early stages of an initiative, it is important to devote time to ensuring common understanding of issues and concepts, and of what is to be done - to devote time to really communicating, to learning about the contexts in which others operate and their ways of working, to reflecting and planning. Ways need to be found to help foundations to learn more about the situation in other countries – including, for example, an effort to disseminate good practice on migration and integration in

those countries. Cooperation will be enhanced in future through better understanding of each other, by visiting each other's countries, by having a clear focus in the next phase and clear objectives, through discussion and dissemination of good practice, a strengthened secretariat and clarity over the roles of key people.

13.2 *What are the implications for individual foundations in becoming involved in cooperative initiatives?*

13.2.1 *Positives:* foundations are able to increase their understanding of what others are doing, gain access to new ways of thinking, and get information which informs their own strategic thinking. NGOs they support are strengthened by EPIM grants.

13.2.2 *Negatives:* depending on their level of involvement, the workload of foundations can be heavy. There is a greater time commitment involved especially in the early stages of any cooperative initiative when people have to really communicate and appreciate each other's understanding of issues.

13.3 *How has cooperation 'raised the game' of participating foundations as a result of opportunities to engage with European researchers, stakeholders and decision makers working on integration issues as well as with the national contact points set up in member states?*

13.3.1 It is too soon to judge, but it is likely that progress on this is limited so far.

13.4 *To what extent is the learning from such cooperative ventures conveyed to foundation trustees and what are the implications for governance?*

13.4.1 Foundations work very differently. Some trustees are fully informed -others are not.

## **Consultations**

13.5 *Did the series of consultations result in a stronger dialogue on integration and in particular the Common Basic Principles – at the country and EU level? Have the series of consultations breathed life into the application of the Common Basic Principles and their further development at the national and EU level? What worked and what did*

*not and why? Are consultations the most appropriate format? Are there other tools which might be more effective?*

13.5.1 The programme of consultations, which was smaller than expected, did not fulfil the original hopes for it. There was a widespread feeling that though individual consultations achieved some successes, the consultations did not produce a coherent message; examination of national issues does not easily translate into recommendations to the EU.

13.5.2 Consultations as they have existed in the first phase are not considered to be the most appropriate format for the future or to be a crucial part of the EPIM initiative. An alternative suggestion is included in section 8 of the report.

## **Grants**

13.6 *Is there emerging evidence that the grants programme is enhancing the level of networking amongst key players and enriching action methods and policy analyses? Is there evidence that the grants programme has the potential to boost the impact of recipients? What are the key contributing factors? How might this be enhanced in phase two?*

13.6.1 The grantees have all embraced networking with enthusiasm. They have long recognised the value of it but EPIM ‘legitimised’ it and encouraged new networking opportunities, not least with foundations. Individual organisations have drawn lessons from the work of others including those outside the EPIM initiative.

13.6.2 It is not yet clear that all the grantees are engaging in policy analysis outside their own immediate context to any appreciable extent - there are signs that this could be developed further in the future.

13.6.3 Longer term grants would really help to boost the impact made by grant recipients. There are small signs that a few organisations might be able to make an impact in the future but the time has been too short. The key contributing factors are to do with an imaginative and outward looking approach, a clear wide vision, a policy orientation, and consistent dissemination of a central message by a variety of means including the media.

13.7 *Could the work funded by the grants programme have been undertaken if funding were not available? How central was the*



*availability of funding to the work being undertaken and was it a priority for the recipient organisations?*

13.7.1 The EPIM grants enabled organisations to do work they would not have been able to embark upon otherwise. In some cases the grant was timely and fitted in with planned work. In other cases it allowed work to be undertaken that organisations desperately wanted to do but for which – until EPIM - they felt it would be impossible to obtain funding.

13.8 *To what extent, and in what way, has the work funded through the grants programme enhanced the existing work of the organisation?*

13.8.1 The organisations were all clear that the EPIM grant was important to the development of their organisation. In some case it had moved them into strategic thinking/working. All the grantees had been helped to increase their networking, and some had been helped to make new contacts.

13.9 *What plans are there to continue the work?*

13.9.1 Grantees are generally committed to continue the work started with the EPIM grants. Some have secured further funding to enable this to happen; others will find it difficult to attract the funding, but have devised ways of progressing without it.

13.10 *How has the grants programme helped to ‘breathe life’ into the common basic principles?*

13.10.1 EPIM has made the Common Basic Principles more significant to organisations which were not previously particularly aware of them. The CBPs provide a useful framework - a tool which organisations often use in discussions with bodies which might not be aware of the CBPs. They are fundamental for organisations concerned with integration, but less so for others.

13.11 *What scope is there for complementary grant making in the future?*

13.11.1 More work is needed to establish the scope for future complementary grant-making. It has been suggested that grants -



- should focus on capacity building and empowerment of immigrants, rather than the concrete issues favoured by other grant-makers, or that they -
- could build on the potential of the Structural Funds or that they -
- could be made in order to facilitate on- going exchange of experience between different actors involved in integration policy and practice.

13.11.2 Grants focused on such issues are more likely to provide complementarity.

### **Progress on the Issues**

13.12 *To what extent, and in what way, have the different elements of cooperation, consultation and a grants programme interacted to achieve the objective of breathing life into the common basic principles and starting to improve future integration and migration policies?*

13.12.1 There has been little interaction between the different elements in the EPIM programme - the three elements have existed in parallel. Of the three, the grants programme is thought to have been the most successful to date.

13.13 *Accepting that integration is a long term phenomenon, what are the views of interviewees on how integration can remain a subject for debate/action?*

13.13.1 There was no clear response to this question, mainly because there is confusion about what different people/foundations mean by 'integration'.

### **The Future**

13.14 *Which elements of EPIM are individual foundations interested in pursuing/supporting in a possible second phase? Are there sufficient areas of common interest to warrant a second phase?*

13.14.1 Foundations increasingly value the opportunity to work together. They generally want a next phase, but they want to see the kinds of changes set out above. There is also enthusiasm for a grants programme.

## Appendix 1: Interviewees

Atlantic Philanthropies	Brian Kearney-Grieve
Barrow-Cadbury Trust	Areti Sianni
City Parochial Foundation	Mubin Haq
Compagnia Di San Paolo	Nicólo Russo Perez
December 18	René Plaetevoet
Enjeux Internationaux (member of grants jury)	Jean-Paul Marthoz
Esmée Fairbairn Foundation	Nicola Pollock
European Council for Refugees and Exiles	Berend Jonker
European Network Against Racism	Pauline Geoghegan
European Women's Lobby	Clarisse Delorme
Evens Stichting	Maud Aguirre*
Fondation Bernheim	Micheline Mardulyn
Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian	Luisa Sanches do Valle
Immigrant Council of Ireland	Sister Stan Kennedy*
Integrating Ireland	Aki Stavros*
International and European Forum on Migration Research	Roberta Ricucci
Jesuit Refugee Service - Europe	Fr Jan Stuyt
Jesuit Refugee Service - Portugal	Rosário Farmhouse
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust	Stephen Pittam & Juliet Prager
Joseph Rowntree Foundation	Emma Stone
Joseph Rowntree Foundation (member of grants jury)	Dipali Chandra
King Baudouin Foundation	Françoise Pissart
Lloyds TSB Foundation for England & Wales	Rose Challies*
Migrant Rights Centre Ireland	Helen Lowry
Migration Policy Group	Jan Niessen
Mother And Child Education Foundation	Derya Akalin*
Network Of European Foundations	Hywel Ceri Jones
Network Of European Foundations	Alex Kirchberger
Platform of European Social NGOs	Kathleen Spencer Chapman*
Robert Bosch Stiftung	Dr Olaf Hahn*
Runnymede Trust	Michelynn Lafleche
UK Race in Europe Network	Sarah Isal
Young European Film Forum for Cultural Diversity	Britta Kollberg

**\*by email questionnaire only**

## Appendix 2: Questions asked

*The questions below were used for emailed responses and as trigger questions in face-to-face and telephone interviews. Inevitably, they represent a compromise – a trade-off between the number of questions to which a response is solicited, and the likelihood that all questions will be answered in a timely and comprehensive fashion.*

### 2.1 Steering Committee members

#### General

1. Why did your foundation become involved in EPIM? In what ways have you been involved?
2. What has been your experience of the EPIM meetings? How easy/difficult has it been to attend? To what extent have you felt involved? What has helped/hindered your participation and/or that of your foundation?

#### Cooperation between foundations

3. In what ways do you think EPIM has, or has not, contributed to greater cooperation between foundations? Which areas of cooperation have been of most benefit? What has hindered further cooperation?
4. How do you think cooperation might be improved and in which areas?
5. How has involvement in EPIM added value to-or enhanced your foundation's existing work programmes? Has involvement in EPIM added to the work of your grantees, and if so how? Has involvement in EPIM increased your foundation's work load (or not) and if so in what way?

#### Consultations

6. What do you consider to have been the achievements/weaknesses of the consultations?
7. What did you learn from taking part in/organising your consultation?

8. What has happened as a result of your consultation? What difference has it made at 1) national and 2) European levels?
9. If there are consultations in any second stage what changes would you want to make? Do you think there might be more effective ways of encouraging debate/dialogue on integration?

### Grants programme

10. What do you consider to have been the achievements/weaknesses of the grants programme?
11. If there is a grants programme in any second stage what changes would you want to make?

### Next steps

12. What is your opinion on the interaction between the three elements of the EPIM project - co-operation between foundations; national consultations in member states; the grants programme?
13. What is your vision for any second stage of EPIM?
14. Are there specific barriers limiting your future involvement? Are there any key elements which need to be present to allow you to contribute to the EPIM initiative? Please explain.

## **2.2 Foundations not in membership of the Steering Committee**

### General

1. Why did your foundation become involved in EPIM? In what ways have you been involved?
2. If you have had experience of the EPIM meetings what has been your experience of them? How easy/difficult has it been to attend? To what extent have you felt involved? What has helped/hindered your participation and/or that of your foundation?

## Cooperation between foundations

3. In what ways do you think EPIM has, or has not, contributed to greater cooperation between foundations? Which areas of cooperation have been of most benefit? What has hindered further cooperation?
4. How do you think cooperation might be improved and in which areas?
5. How has involvement in EPIM added value to-or enhanced-your foundation's existing work programmes? Has involvement in EPIM added to the work of your grantees and if so how? Has involvement in EPIM increased your foundation's workload (or not) and if so in what way?

## Consultations

6. What do you consider to have been the achievements/ weaknesses of the consultations?
7. If you took part in one of the EPIM consultations, what did you learn from taking part in/organising the consultation?
8. Please describe the results of your consultation and what difference it made at 1) national and 2) European levels.
9. If there are consultations in any second stage what changes would you want to make? Do you think there might be more effective ways of encouraging debate/dialogue on integration?

## Grants Programme

10. What is your understanding/knowledge of the grants programme run by EPIM?
11. What do you consider to have been the achievements/weaknesses of the grants programme?
12. If there is a grants programme in any second stage what would you want to see included/improved

## Next steps

13. What is your opinion on the interaction between the three elements of the EPIM project ...co-operation between foundations/national consultations in member states/the grants programme?

14. Is your foundation likely to be involved in the EPIM initiative in any second phase? If so, do you expect to be involved to the same extent as you were in the first phase, or to a greater or lesser extent?

15. Are there specific barriers limiting your future involvement? Are there any key elements which need to be present to allow you to contribute to the EPIM initiative? Please explain

16. What is your vision for any second stage of EPIM?

### **2.3 Grantees**

1. In getting a grant from EPIM, to what extent, if any, did you feel you were part of a larger initiative? Please explain.

2. To what extent, if any, did the grant from EPIM make your organisation or any group of organisations with which you worked stronger by enabling networking? Please explain and provide examples

3. Did receiving a grant link you in any way with other European organisations/national organisations/foundations? If it did, is the contact still active? What benefits did you gain from the contact(s)?

4. To what extent, if any, did the award of the grant enable you to work in a collaborative way? With whom did you work and what were the benefits/ disadvantages? Please explain.

5. Were you able to draw on existing good practice in using the grant? Has this made good practice from elsewhere more accessible? Please explain

6. Are there ways in which the grant could have been put to more effective use if it had been made available differently? Please explain.

7. What was the value of the December workshop for your organisation?

8. Did your organisation take part in any of the national consultations organised by EPIM? If so, what was the value of this?

9. In what way, if at all, have you been aware of the interaction of the three elements of the EPIM programme, cooperation between foundations, national consultations in member states and a grants programme? Please explain.



### Appendix 3: Grantees' key policy recommendations

*The grantees made a number of recommendations but the following were recurring themes.*

- The ratification of the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of Migrant Workers and members of their families.
- Extending EU policies and EU protection to undocumented migrants to ensure respect for basic rights and to avoid exploitation.
- Addressing the issue of stranded/destitute migrants e.g. asylum seekers whose applications have failed or those who cannot be returned
- Advocating for coherent admission policies which include language acquisition, education, employment and other aspects of social integration.
- Harmonisation of citizenship conditions across EU member states
- Mainstreaming gender rights into EU migration policies, and particularly the protection of women and the status of domestic workers.
- Fostering ethnic and national diversity in the media.
- Promotion of a 'bottom up' approach to integration policies which involves capacity building of civil society organisations and strengthening their role.
- Promotion of the coordination of EU policy making in respect of anti- discrimination and integration policies.