



4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the

## Inclusive Integration Policy Lab

Limassol, Cyprus, 13-14 November 2019

### MEETING REPORT

The purpose of the meeting was to further work on the draft “Policy Framework on Intercultural Integration” for the national level (hereinafter “the Draft”). The Draft is underpinned by a review of existing national and local integration strategies and exchanges with policy officials from Council of Europe member States and intercultural cities. It is also based on relevant international standards<sup>1</sup> and draws on the established positive results of intercultural integration approaches at the local level. It is not aimed to be a one-model fits all, rather an inspirational model to foster common understanding, a coherent approach, and shared responsibilities among all levels of governance in relation to migrant integration.

A first skeleton of the Draft had been presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Policy Lab meeting in Strasbourg, on 26 June 2018; this was further discussed at the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in Helsinki, on 28-29 May 2019, and amended as a result of the discussions.

At the moment, the Draft has the following sections:

- An introduction, presenting the main challenges for making migrant integration work and the role of the Council of Europe as honest broker of multilevel dialogue and cooperation in this field.
- Section I, providing the rationale and explaining what intercultural integration is about.
- Section II, presenting the key principles of an inclusive integration strategy, and a matrix providing concrete examples of specific policy measures inspired by those principles.
- Section III, providing a suggested ten-point structure for an inclusive integration strategy.
- Section IV, an explanatory note including key terms.

At the second Policy Lab meeting, agreement was reached on the 10-points structure. In Helsinki, participants endorsed three of the four proposed principles of an Inclusive Integration Strategy, namely Equality, Diversity (former “pluralism”), and Interaction (former Citizenship and active participation). The fourth one, i.e. Multilevel governance, could not be discussed. The comments of the participants also gave interesting inputs to further improve Section I, particularly regarding the rationale of intercultural integration and the presentation of its three core principles, i.e. diversity (advantage), (real) equality, and (positive) interaction. A revised draft was worked out on that basis, reviewed by a few volunteers, and circulated to participants prior to the meeting in Limassol. The revised draft included the additions above, a matrix with a few examples of policy measures, and an amended explanatory note as an attempt to also clarify some key terms.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2015\)1 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on intercultural integration](#)

The meeting in Limassol has therefore aimed at collecting comments on the revised draft as well as examples of cross-institutions cooperation in participating countries, analysing to what extent national authorities can promote intercultural interaction through their policies, and sharing inputs for designing an inspirational model for multilevel governance of integration.

## 1. GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE DRAFT



Participants welcomed the last version of the Draft, which is now clearer and more focused than previously. It has the potential to provide very good guidance for all governance levels, in particular in countries that only recently started dealing with integration issues, or in some others which embraced interculturalism as a policy model not long ago.

The addition of explanations regarding terminology was also welcomed; there was strong support for a proper chapter on Key terms (in the form of a glossary, or thesaurus), to be put at the beginning of the

Draft, so to clarify the use of language for the purposes of the document. Such a glossary would not fix terminology in stone but enlighten the reader on the philosophy behind it and the way in which certain terms should be interpreted so to ensure a common understanding. For instance, a proper glossary could explain how integration and inclusion are interrelated<sup>2</sup>, or clarify the scope of the words “migrant” (only third country nationals or all people with migration background) and “diversity (religious minorities, LGBTi communities, etc.).

Bearing this in mind, the glossary should at least include the following terms: migrant, minorities, diversity, integration, intercultural integration, inclusion, societal cohesion, intersectionality, participation, multilevel governance.

It would be also useful to clarify that - although the model strategy primarily targets migrant integration - the model looks suitable to manage inclusion of all kind of diversities, and governments should feel free to expand its scope.

Also, the Draft should make it clearer – at the beginning of the document - that migrants are not the sole beneficiaries of the model strategy but that this rather targets the society as a whole, enabling it to perceive and live its diversity positively, and make the most of it. An inclusive language that would insist on recognition and reciprocity (eg. by avoiding the word “tolerance”) will certainly help.

Intersectionality has also to be further emphasised: so far it appears to be strictly related to gender issues, and to refer exclusively to multiple discrimination. Yet, intersectionality through an intercultural lens also entails breaking a monolithic understanding of identity and accepting that an

---

<sup>2</sup> It has to be reminded that this issue had already been discussed in Helsinki. Participants agreed that “while integration mainly refers to migrants and refugees (i.e. newcomers), inclusion has a wider scope, embracing diversity and equality for all, regardless of cultural, social or other backgrounds. It was suggested that the most appropriate terminology for the purposes of the Draft could be “A framework for integrating diverse societies”. Alternatively, a solution could be to continue speaking about inclusive integration and include in the beginning of the document a thesaurus of key terms”.

individual can have multiple identities that intersect and change over time. If diversity is managed positively, this can become a resource for the whole society.

Another comment concerned the style of the English which, in some parts, appeared too soaring to be fully understood by non-native speakers. Participants advocated for a simplification.

On the proposed principles, participants observed that moving the “citizenship and active participation” principle under “equality” results in a confusion of both. Active citizenship and participation should be either a stand-alone principle (as initially proposed), or integrated rather into the principle of “interaction” when it comes to the participation dimension of citizenship, and into the “equality” principle when it comes to the access to rights dimension of citizenship (and the award of nationality as a key pre-condition for integration). In that case, the whole part should be reformulated to make it consistent with the rest.

Finally, an interesting debate concerned the issue of discrimination, both visible and systemic and the need or not to adopt an individualistic or community (group) approach to it. Labels and categories have been found to be obstacles to mixing and interaction, but also to personal development and multiple identities. Yet, it is very hard for policy makers to get out of dichotomy and categories; the latter are also needed for building solid legal frameworks. The group will have to address this issue from a “how to” point of view in further meetings.

## 2. EXAMPLES of POLICIES, MEASURES and PROJECTS

### ➤ **Limassol: One city the whole world**

The host authorities introduced Limassol context, the “Limassol – One city the whole world” project, and the Intercultural Council and Strategy of Limassol 2018-2020.

Since 2014, the intercultural policies of the city are mainly implemented under the umbrella of “Limassol One city the whole world”, a project funded by the EU.

The project also involves other municipalities of the urban area of Limassol and counts with the additional financial support of a Private company.

It targets and serves people that fall under the refugee or subsidiary protection status, asylum seekers, temporary protection status, resettled or transferred from another EU member state, work and reside permanently or are in the process of acquiring permanent residence.

Among the main activities so far organised the following can be noted:

- Educational trips to cultural and historical places of interest to get acquainted with the culture and history of the host country.
- Children mini football tournament under the slogan “Goal against discrimination”.
- Intercultural events giving opportunities for intercultural interaction among the different ethnic groups living in Limassol.
- “Faces of Limassol” photography contest and exhibition.



- The “World Refugee Day”: celebrated with the Musical footprints festival, to promote intercultural dialogue through music and arts.

Migrant communities have also been granted visibility and participation in the traditional “Flower festival”, a big event which is very important for the local community.

#### ➤ **Limassol Intercultural Council**

Yet the worthiest delivery of the project is the creation of Intercultural Council, established in 2017 - at the time of the Cypriot Presidency of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers - as a result of the city’s participation in the ICC programme, and inspired by a few ICC good practices. This is a consultative body - made up of migrants and non-migrants - which has the role of advising the municipality on the needs of the cities in relation to its nature of diverse city. The Intercultural Council does not discuss only issues of concerns for migrants but addresses matters that are of interest for both Cypriot and non-Cypriot inhabitants of the city. Among its activities, the Council organised - in November 2018 - the first Intercultural Policing training that addressed both local and national police officers.

Building and running such an intercultural council demands to find good stakeholders and people committed to support the process with their time and engagement. It’s important to dig more and more into the social spectrum to detect who are the influencers and thus the people to be involved in the work of the Council who could act as bridge with the respective communities.

#### ➤ **Limassol Intercultural Strategy**

The Intercultural Council also prepared the Intercultural strategy of the city, Limassol being the first municipality in Cyprus to have such an instrument. The drafting work started by naming, mentioning, evoking the problems, in a very informal and democratic way. After several months the Council realised that most of the problems were of common concern for both the locals and the migrants, and that the social challenges identified were the same everywhere, including abroad. These were high housing rents, safety and crimes, health issues, parenting issues, access to employment or to other public services (language barriers, different processes and procedures, etc.), citizenship and voting rights, youth participation, education, access to culture, messaging about interculturalism and diversity advantage. After mapping the problems, the Council started looking for solutions, and planning for solving these issues through the intercultural strategy.

The strategy’s main chapters and goals are the following:

#### **1. Culture**

- Support migrant’s cultural activities through microgrants schemes.
- Support for the functioning of migrants’ associations.
- Intercultural library.
- Handbooks for raising migrants’ awareness on and have them participate more actively in the city’s cultural life.

#### **2. Education**

- Promote multilingualism through the development of languages courses in Greek, English, and the most spread foreign languages in the city.
- Intercultural education actions in public and private schools.

- Participation in national and European lifelong learning programmes.
- 3. Youth**
    - Targeted actions to prevent young people fall into crime by creating sense of belonging and proudness of their identity.
    - Activities and actions to develop critical thinking and promote participation.
  - 4. Parenting and family**
    - Providing social support to families.
    - Lobbying for public nurseries to ensure balance between professional and private life.
  - 5. Housing**
    - Discussion sessions aiming at strategic planning of the intercultural landscape and civil engineering for the city of Limassol.
    - Housing for asylum seekers and migrants.
  - 6. Health**
    - Multilingual information website.
    - An emergency line with doctors able to communicate in various languages.
    - Free check-up on certain week-ends.
    - Support for the organisation of funerals. This might be a quite complicated issues for foreigners especially when they don't have a place for burials.
  - 7. Labour affairs**
    - Support to migrants in view of facilitating their access to employment. It worth noticing that two trade unions participate in the Intercultural Council.
  - 8. Policing and safety**
    - Training of police on intercultural policing
  - 9. Access to public services**
    - Multilingualism in delivery of services but also publication of multilingual information brochures.
    - Free legal advice services for migrants and refugees.
    - A watchdog entity or tool will be created to monitor the state of progress regarding migrants.
  - 10. Citizenship and participation**
    - Voting rights are among the crucial indicators of migrants' participation in the society: awareness campaigns are being devised to increase their participation in local elections.

## 11. City branding and media

- Awareness and information meetings, anti-rumours campaigns, and the publication of the guidebook “Limassol for migrants”.
- An intercultural advisor will be soon appointed to further promote the city’s active participation in the ICC programme, including by applying ICC methodologies and compiling the ICC Index.

### ➤ **Limassol Social Services and Welfare**

Besides, although municipalities and local authorities in Cyprus have no competence for social policies, in 2010 and thanks to national and European funds, Limassol started a series of social actions that now fall under the intercultural strategy and are implemented in cooperation with local NGOs. The city has four main social programmes:

- **Street social work programme:** a pool of social workers that makes interventions in neighbourhoods where vulnerable groups are more concentrated (migrant, youth, homeless and Roma people). The programme helps preventing social problems through mobile information desks, support services targeting primary schools, etc. The programme is funded by the Ministry of Labour and Welfare, and the AMIF fund. It targets 200 beneficiaries of which 60% are migrants.
- **School social workers:** intervening in primary schools these social workers are operating since 2015 and aim at promoting successful migrant integration by providing specific opportunities to children with foreign background to socialise with other children of all origins, including locals (educational trips, theatre workshop and other interactive activities to boost feeling of belonging); providing social support to their families; and fostering intercultural competence of the teachers to better understand the challenges of diversity and the need for intercultural interaction. Visits to the families are also organised to make them better understand how the Cypriot school system work. The programme targets 180 participants.
- **Food bank Limassol:** running since 2011 the programme is sustained by charity and volunteer work and provides food packages, once a month, to 300 beneficiaries of which 60% are refugees and asylum seekers.
- **SCHEDIA:** running since July 2019 it targets homeless people and provides psychological and social support, day care service, health care, guidance and housing/employment counselling.

The Intercultural strategy will be evaluated through monthly reports prepared by the Intercultural advisor. As for the drafting stage (co-creation process), the Intercultural Council will be involved in the evaluation, and actually already provides regular feedback to correct and adjust implementation. This has been a key factor of success: by involving the Council in designing the strategy people are now talking about it, working at its implementation, and contributing to publicly brand the city as intercultural.

### **3. EXAMPLES of MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE**

#### **➤ North Macedonia (state level)**

The national coordinator for the development of culture and inter-ministerial cooperation of North Macedonia explained how multilevel governance can represent a challenge in centralised states where the system grants little autonomy to local governments, and central level officials are often dependent on political decisions coming top-down, both at the national and local levels.

Yet, multilateral cooperation can still work when the top politicians (Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, the Mayor, etc.) are part of mixed bodies created under their aegis for addressing specific issues.

A successful example in North Macedonia is the multilevel body put in place a couple of years ago to redress Ohrid's management as a World Heritage site. The Prime minister took the issue on board and the Government appointed a minister to lead a body made up of seventeen different institutions (at all levels) whose task was to implement the twenty recommendations made by UNESCO to save the site. Media and social media – who enjoy a very good degree of freedom from power - also helped speeding up things through mediatic pressure. Thanks to the clear guidance from the Prime minister Office and the Government the body implements regular monitoring and works quite efficiently, including by managing shared financial resources in an effective way.

Another example of multilevel governance, more related to integration, culminated in the recent adoption by North Macedonia of its first National Intercultural Strategy. Work was coordinated by a body representing several institutions, and made up seven clusters, each counting with a coordinator referring to an overall coordinator. The preparation of the strategy lasted for one year. Participating institutions (including the Ministry of culture, the Agency for minority rights, the Ministry of education, Roma experts, media representatives, representatives of the NGOs, the Union of local municipalities, etc.) were selected according to their competence and placed under the lead of the Office of the Prime Minister, so that the Strategy drafters were those who had the responsibility for its eventual implementation. Because of the history of the country and its very diverse population, the strategy is not about minority rights but about community rights and a whole society approach. The rationale for the strategy was to have an instrument that would consolidate a climate of permanent peace and coexistence in a diverse community, breaking silos and creating bridges. Because the evaluation of the Ohrid agreement by the OSCE concluded that the society was still divided, interculturalism was chosen as the policy paradigm that would help addressing this.

#### **➤ Bradford (local level)**

Back in 2016 the UK produced a national review of integration policies which spotted a series of shortcomings that the government decided to address through the adoption of the Integrated Communities D+Strategies Green paper, which is intercultural in spirit in March 2018. Five local authorities were chosen to pilot the plan set under the Green paper, among which Bradford. 2.7 million Pounds were allocated to test a series of measures through projects' implementation. An evaluation process is also foreseen to help the implementers understand what worked and what didn't. This was a very good point made by the government which insisted on the need to draw lessons from the experience, enabling the local authorities to test without fear of failure.

Bradford population is half million, with a high percentage of people with foreign roots. The city became a Sanctuary city in 2010. Among other things, it has a large Syrian resettlement programme,



and refugee integration programmes too. More recently, Bradford has seen the arrival of a discrete Roma population from the Slovak Republic.

The [Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government](#) (state level) is overseeing the implementation of the Green paper. It's fair to say that without the government strategy the local authorities would not have been able to move from multiculturalism to interculturalism. The state level also brought in the process a certain win-win narrative, and helped gathering together all

stakeholders, including the "white working class", in the implementation of the programme.

One of the key issues that the government wanted to address was how to move from the superficial interaction activities such as festivals and celebrations, to more consistent and sustained positive interaction that would entail stronger and long-term relationships. Funding has therefore targeted pilot projects aimed at real mixing. Some examples:

- Projects to connect students of very diverse background (eg. from white middle class communities and migrant communities) around leisure and educational activities lasting over weeks and months, and implemented with the support and involvement of the teachers and the parents.
- Projects aimed at migrant integration within the workforce through inclusive recruitment, carried out in partnership with the business sector.

In terms of advantages brought by this model of cooperation, Bradford considers that the state framework for the implementation of the Green paper allowed the city to develop an evidence base system. For long time Bradford has been carrying out intercultural policies but did not have the means to bring evidence of the long-term impact of the measures aimed at promoting interaction. Today, the evaluation process put in place by the government will allow proving the effectiveness and positive impact of their investments. Also, the government strategy brought ownership for the key actors, has strong foundations, and was centred on building on strengths and not just focussing on problems. There is also an implicit recognition of the fact that social mixing starts when people lift-up from poverty and move to higher income areas, thus allowing to address a very important challenge for both the locals and the migrants.

Regarding the limits of this model, Bradford noted that while an entire chapter of the strategy is about people of diverse origin getting along, working together and interacting, government departments and policy makers do not carry out enough intersectoral work. There is still a lack of real connections, cooperation and co-creation within government departments, even though integration is still a matter of interest for many. As in the case of North-Macedonia above, the top-down approach may be the reason for that.



### ➤ **Montreal (local level)**

In Canada there are three levels of governance: the municipal level, the provincial level and the federal level.

There is a specific context in immigration management in Canada and Quebec: Canada is responsible for the whole immigration programme for the rest of Canada and for border controls, refugees and asylum seekers; Quebec fix and chose its own economic immigrants and fix the quotas independently from the state policy. In terms of governance there are two visions of society and immigration in Canada and Quebec: the first one promotes multiculturalism as a policy approach while the second one has promoted interculturalism for a long time. Both approaches are pro-diversity and open to migration but the models of society they aspire to are different.

Montreal has been working on managing diversity for the past 30 years; yet, since the recent setting up of the BINAM, the Montreal office for newcomers within the Social inclusion and Diversity Department, the policies of the city started focussing more intensively on migration management. BINAM's inspirational model was the Geneva migration office.

For issues related to immigration, Montreal only deals with the provincial government and it has an agreement with the Ministry of immigration of Quebec. On the contrary, it refers to the federal government only on issues related to the asylum seekers and the refugees.

The last agreement with the Ministry of Immigration of Quebec was negotiated for three years and it released twelve million dollars to finance projects to be implemented by the city, including internships for diversity, welcoming programmes, work with public libraries, etc. A big part of the funds is reallocated by the city to NGOs and the local communities who run their own projects in line with the policy guidance of the city.

The current agreement was negotiated in 2017 by the BINAM. Compared to before, BINAM has tried to focus the agreement on addressing local issues affecting the neighbourhoods.

While the support of the Regional level is fundamental to expand the scope of the action of the city and provide additional resources, the challenge of the system is that the system of powers is still influencing the negotiations. For instance, Montreal has recently got the status of Metropolis, involving the areas around the city and giving it specific competence on housing and immigration issues. Yet, when applying the agreement, the city still has to follow the formal guidelines of the Provincial government, including in the matters that would follow under its own competence.

In conclusion, the status of Metropolis recently obtained by the City of Montreal should allow it getting the necessary autonomy to develop actions and programmes that better meet the needs and challenging affecting immigrants on its territory.

### ➤ **Finland (state level)**

Finland has a quite clear structure for dealing with migrant integration. First of all they have a legal framework comprising – since 2010 – the revised [Act on the promotion of immigrant integration](#). With such a legal instrument government feel they can act in a coherent manner. The 2010 Act addresses not only integration issues and service provisions, but also equality and non-discrimination, positive interaction, active participation of migrants in the society.

In order to enact the law, the state level adopted a [Government integration programme for 2016 and 2019](#), giving clear indication on where resources have to be allocated and on which kind of actions. The plan establishes several focus areas, some of which have a clear intercultural definition and scope. For instance, policy area 2.1 is about promoting immigrants' strengths to enhance Finnish innovation capacity. Area 2.2 is the longest one of the chapters on integration and it indicates areas where cross-sectoral measures can be adopted. Area 2.3 relates to increasing cooperation between the state and the municipalities, setting a clear frame of each other's responsibilities.

The involvement of the local level in the integration policies is also framed by law and defined by Chapter 3 of the Act with which the state set up the duties of the municipalities and the measures they shall implement. However, despite a top-down approach, it has to be noted that local authorities have complete freedom on how to organise their work on the matter and on the choice of the tools. For instance, the municipalities get benefits for organising the reception of asylum seekers but they decide alone how to organise themselves and how many people they can receive.



From the perspective of the government this model is efficient and works well. The challenges are mainly related to effectively reaching out to the newcomers so that they are aware of their rights and able to realise opportunities. For instance, all the information is available online and in English, Finnish or Swedish. People who do not have social media literacy or do not speak any of the three languages mentioned before are left in a vacuum and there is no way for them to access information which is crucial for their integration.

Regarding the regional level, projects involving multilevel governance are mainly carried out through external funds. One of the most successful ones is a European funded project called "Home in Finland" which has been very efficient in carrying out interrelated actions going on in several regions while being at the same time integrated with the national level. A key factor for the project's success has been the creation of local and regional coordinators who have strong knowledge of the territory and of its challenges and have a job description exclusively focussing on the implementation the project. Therefore, they can devote time to build ties with the target group but also to pressure the national level for regular contacts and exchanges. In addition, there is an overall national level coordinator, who is the head of the project and liaise with the local and regional coordinators. Through this project, all actors have filled in the missing link between the local, regional and national level. The other element of success is reciprocity because all the coordinators are peers and can negotiate and interact as equals. This has promoted, among other things, greater trust among all levels.

#### **4. EFFECTIVE MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE: DESIGNING THE IDEAL MODEL**

During a systemic design session, participants analysed the strengths and weaknesses of the models above, as well as their factors for success. Based on that, they started shaping their ideal model.

Integration should be a mutual venture between states and cities on both processes and mechanisms. The fact that cities also work horizontally with other municipalities should be recognised and valued. To ensure multilevel governance, it is proposed to create a coordinating **hub** as the place where cooperation takes place, decisions are made, and information is shared. The hub would involve not only the three levels of governance but also the citizens and other key entities, groups or institutions that may promote positive change. Representatives of cities and states in the hub would act and behave as peers.

The hub would carry out a needs assessment and analyse how the shared objectives can be pursued innovatively. Data would be independently sourced, objectively reliable and available to all levels. A grassroots level approach would help identifying what works and relaying this information to the state.

The hub would also provide opportunities for the local authorities to participate in the strategy decision making process: they would not just provide feedback to the central level, but their knowhow and experience would be recognised and allow them contributing to making decisions.

Regarding the strategies, if reciprocity and co-creation are in place, the hub could deliver a national framework strategy setting the tone for the regional and local ones. They would all be complementary, enabling factors for each other, and pursue the same ultimate goals. In this respect, the Portuguese model of the High Commissioner for Migration (ACM) can be of inspiration for what concerns the methodology, not necessarily through the creation of a dedicated agency, but through the setting up of participatory mechanisms for framing the priorities through a general guidance.

Funding would mainly come from the state level, with contributions from the regional and local levels for the matters falling more directly under their immediate competence. Specific and unrestricted funds for pilot projects would also be available, to stimulate innovation in future strategic iterations—including through micro-projects on the ground feeding up into macro-policy via the role of municipalities in co-designing the national strategy.

Such a hub would change the dynamic that makes the cities recipients of instructions from the state level, and move policy making forward from a top-down approach to a more horizontal way of working.

Finally, it was proposed to consider the possibility of staff secondments among all levels of governance to ensure a temporarily mobility between levels that would allow public officers to better understand the respective contexts and constraints, as well as to share knowledge and good practices.

## **5. NEXT STEPS**

A general discussion took place once more regarding the structure of the document. Some find it too long, some others too short; some believe the introduction has to be shortened, some other believe that the rationale has to be stronger and explain in deep details how the intercultural policy model works. There is however agreement on the fact that the Draft has to provide both a “skeleton” of a model strategy and the “muscles”. The latter are almost there even though more examples of successful policies and measures from all levels have to be collected and integrated in the text. Yet, the skeleton is still missing.

It was agreed to continue work on the Draft with a view to:

- Integrate the comments and proposals included in the present report.

- Add at the beginning of the Draft a thesaurus of key terms that would allow for a common understanding on terminology and namely clarify the relation between intercultural integration and inclusion, the scope of intersectionality, and the whole society approach (the citizenry as beneficiary of the strategy).
- Make it more explicit - at the beginning of the document – which are the challenges that the Draft would help states to face.
- Define better the concept of multilevel governance and its implications.
- Rethink the principle of active citizenship and participation, by having it either as a stand-alone or integrated in the principle of interaction.
- Simplify the language.
- Boost the matrix with more examples from all levels of governance.
- Focus on the “how to”, to provide inspirational practices for governments.
- Add inputs on how inclusive integration policies can help meeting the equality and non-discrimination challenges, and how they can adopt an intersectional perspective.

In addition, there is a need to separate – before bridging again – the vision of the practitioners to the one of the politicians and decision makers. The ICC team will therefore survey the members from the state level (i.e. those who will have to endorse the model strategy) to enquire about the form in which they would like the Strategy document to be presented (eg. one single but concise document; a document with appendices; a matrix with appendices including the rationale and the guidance, etc.).

The team will also prepare a very simple template that participants can use to provide examples of good policies/measures/tools and mechanisms, to further feed the matrix.

The next meeting of the Policy Lab will take place in Spring 2020.



Report prepared by Ivana d’Alessandro