

GT-ADI-INT(2021)5

Strasbourg, 22 March 2021

WORKING GROUP ON INTERCULTURAL INTEGRATION (GT-ADI-INT)

3rd Meeting Report and List of Decisions

1. Opening of the Meeting

The **Chair**, Pia Buhl-Girolami, opened the meeting and welcomed the members and other participants, in particular Dr Tom De Bruyn, Government of Flanders, Belgium, elected Member of GT-ADI-INT at the second CDADI meeting earlier in February. She further noted with pleasure the participation of other Council of Europe member states, namely Hungary, Germany, Luxembourg, Malta, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom. She thanked also Canada, Japan and Mexico for their participation as Observer States.

The Chair provided the Group with a summary of the conclusions of the second CDADI meeting, which she attended together with the Vice-chair. She then presented the draft agenda, which was adopted without amendments. However, during the meeting, the discussions on the draft Recommendation required a rescheduling of the agenda which was agreed as it finally appears in Appendix I. The list of participants can be found in Appendix II.

2. Synergies with the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

Maria Daniella Marouda, Chair of the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance, presented ECRI's work in the fields of integration and inclusion, with a focus on ECRI's monitoring mechanism. She highlighted that achieving community cohesion, while accepting and valuing diversity is a balancing act leading to greater opportunity within societies, notwithstanding the fact that respecting and protecting migrants and minorities residing on their territories is an obligation for all CoE member States. She also stressed that failing to integrate migrants and minorities not only constitutes a missed opportunity to tackle societal changes but comes at a high additional cost.

She further explained how ECRI's monitoring mechanism works, pointing at education and employment being two important indicators of successful inclusion, and noting that measures in these sectors should ideally be accompanied by means of permanent residence permits or eventually naturalisation. She stressed that integration is a two-way process and made a call to national authorities to provide sufficient budgetary support to the local authorities which are usually better placed to provide essential services and find flexible and tailor-made solutions for integration.

The **Russian Federation** noted that, although the rate of success of citizenship applications mentioned by the ECRI's Chair is a good indicator of integration, these matters fall under the sovereignty of the member states. They further noted that GPR No. 16 is a controversial document whose provisions are not rooted in legal obligations. Firewalls between migration and other authorities within a country, could have detrimental effects on human rights. On hate speech, the Russian Federation noted that this notion does not forbid every kind of criticism.

Finland welcomed the positive feedback given by ECRI's Chair on the Policy Lab and GT-ADI-INT work; they emphasised on the need to join efforts and complement each other, in particular in the field of anti-discrimination and anti-racism, and asked the Chair to share her views on the most practical ways to make sure ECRI's process and indicators are used more widely when monitoring implementation of intercultural integration standards.

In reference to a previous statement by the Russian Federation, **London Lewisham** wished to state that their authorities refer to undocumented migrants or irregular migration, rather than illegal migrants, so as to consider the situation of those people who entered the country irregularly in the lack of legal avenues to consider their specific situation of vulnerability.

In her reply, **ECRI's Chair** clarified that the success rate of citizenship tests has been considered by ECRI in a specific monitoring report concerning a member state where other indicators were lacking.

On GPR No. 16, ECRI's Chair clarified that its aim is to recommend the setting up of a firewall of protection for individuals that find themselves in a position of extreme vulnerability, precisely with a view to secure their human rights. The Recommendation is about temporary protective measures for everyone residing in the territory of a member state, regardless from their status. She commended the example of Portugal in this respect.

On hate speech, she recalled that the right to freedom of expression enshrined in the ECHR does not protect the right to speech that provokes hatred and hate, and declared that for democratic societies it is particularly relevant to find means to address hate speech.

The **Secretariat** recalled that there is a specific subordinate body under CDADI dealing with hate speech and invited the delegates to carry out these discussions in the relevant forum.

On the question about strengthening cooperation, the **Chair of ECRI** mentioned the work of the working group on monitoring indicators for integration, which could look at how best link ECRI's recommendation with the Model Framework and the standard under development by GT-ADI-INT; she also pointed at CoE cooperation programmes as a way to carry out more regular exchanges.

3. Intercultural integration – Model Framework for an Intercultural Integration Strategy at the National Level

The **Chair** recalled that she presented the third draft Model Framework for an Intercultural Integration Strategy at the National Level (the Model Framework) at the 2nd CDADI meeting, and that the document was overall well received by the delegates. The present fourth draft has been amended to reflect the comments they made. She also recalled that the Model Framework is not intended to become a legally binding standard, but rather a source of knowledge, inspiration and ideas, including many examples of good practice from all levels of governments.

The **Secretary of GT-ADI-INT** reminded that the Model Framework is the result of extensive work carried out by this Group at the two meetings held last year but also through intense written exchanges and contributions in between meetings. She also recalled that the draft submitted to

CDADI at its second meeting received the unanimous agreement of the Group. She then presented the amendments done following the second CDADI meeting.

Bursa Osmangazi welcomed the fourth draft and, supported by Azerbaijan, requested the deletion of a footnote making reference to a recent research on the economic benefits of Syrian migration in Turkey, on which consensus by academics could not be found yet.

The **Russian Federation** provided general comments to the document questioning the impact of multicultural policies, the reference to specific legal instruments and their scope of application, highlighting the right of states to apply their own integration models, raising the question of applicability of intercultural integration to irregularly present migrants and emphasising the need to correlate integration policies and national security goals.

The **Secretary of GT-ADI-INT** clarified that the Model Framework is intended as a practical tool to guide policy practitioners in their efforts to design and implement intercultural integration policies for inclusive and cohesive societies through multi-level governance, and has no vocation to become a legal standard. Being a “model”, the document also points to examples of good practices from all levels of government and encourages to pursue the highest possible standards relevant to integration offered by Council of Europe and other relevant instruments. She suggested to amend the beginning of the text to make this clearer. The Secretariat further suggested to add footnotes listing the countries having signed or ratified the legal instruments that have not been yet upheld by all CoE member states, a proposal which was welcomed by the Russian Federation.

Lublin supported the document and, in particular, the good practices it compiles and called for additional examples by member states. They praised that the practices collected come from different countries and contexts and were the object of thorough analysis and substantial discussions during an open, flexible and inclusive process. They considered the Model Framework as a good tool for both countries that are leading intercultural integration policy-making, and countries who are in the process of undertaking the journey.

Spain expressed full support to the Model Framework which they considered a useful tool to inform policy makers, and a valuable resource for the state level to identify strategic areas of intervention and plan work ahead. They however agreed that the introduction could be amended by stating more clearly its nature.

Malta considered the Model Framework a very important contribution towards providing practitioners and policy makers alike with knowledge, examples, and experiences relevant to the intercultural integration policy development process. They particularly praised the good-practice approach, the reference to other international standards, including the European Union action plan on integration and inclusion, and the fact that it addresses a whole range of stakeholders.

Bilbao welcomed and fully supported the fourth draft Model Framework, noting it has improved thanks to specific reference to research showing the positive value of well-managed diversity and integration and emphasising on the contribution of migrants to the economic, social and cultural development of the societies in which they live..

The **Chair** recalled that GT-ADI-INT has been instructed by CDADI to finalise the document and forward it to the Steering Committee for discussion and possible adoption at its third meeting. She

noted the agreement of the Group to declare the present draft Model Framework endorsed by GT-ADI-INT with the relevant amendments, and with the reservations of the Russian Federation which will be appended in view of forwarding it to CDADI for discussion and possible endorsement at its third meeting.

4. Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

The **Co-Secretary to GT-ADI-INT** presented the preliminary draft recommendation prepared on the basis of the outline agreed unanimously by the Group. The present draft contains the principles and ideas that inspired the Model Framework. However, she pointed out that while the Model Framework is an operational document especially based on good practice, research and evidence, addressing practitioners with a focus on the “how to”, CM recommendations suggest the general principles member states should follow in policy development. She then presented the structure of the draft recommendation, its rationale and content.

The **Chair** reminded that the Group should send a consolidated draft to CDADI for discussion at its third meeting and invited participants to have a one-hour general discussion before going to the analysis paragraph by paragraph.

The **Russian Federation** considered that the document should not only promote intercultural integration but also acknowledge other national approaches. They raised the question of the different legal status that affect regular migration, refugee status, the situation of migrant children and of undocumented migrants, who all seem targeted by the present draft. They expressed criticism on the choice to present diversity as a goal and a value per se, as well as on the reference to hate speech without counterbalancing it through a reference to the right to the freedom of speech. They noted a lack of balance between the protection and consideration of the rights of the migrants and the rights and interests of the majority society’s culture and traditions. The delegate suggested several amendments to the text, in particular in references to CoE standard-setting texts in the preamble as well as an amendment to para 2 of the operational part of the Recommendation to make it applicable, beyond the context of cross-border migration, to the so called “non-citizens”.

The **Secretariat** explained that the issue of clarifying the various categories of migrants from a legal standpoint has been extensively discussed by the Group who decided that legal status fall out of the purposes of this draft Recommendation. The latter does not deal with the conditions of acceding to a status, or accessing services or benefits connected to a given legal status; it is meant to inform about how policies in different areas may be built to support successful intercultural integration and positive diversity management as an advantage for the whole society.

Azerbaijan supported the draft recommendation and expressed satisfaction for a well-prepared text that provides guidance on managing diversity as an opportunity.

Norway wished to emphasise that managing intercultural integration in a successful way is in the interest of the host societies, particularly to avoid conflict and take benefit from the advantages that a well-managed diversity may bring. She therefore disagreed that the document conveys a duality opposing migrants and society interests.

London Lewisham supported the draft recommendation and declared opposed to defining in the text migrants according to their legal status. They further declared proud of the diversity of their

community, which they celebrate including by seeking for cultural exchange that is beneficial to the progress of their society. They finally argued that hate speech falls outside of free speech protected by the European Convention on Human Rights.

Bradford also wished to clarify that the draft recommendation deals with the integration of people of diverse background who are member of the communities in which they live. They reminded that the draft recommendation will mainly guide policy officers and other policy makers and that, for the purposes of integration, what matters is how to involve the individuals and groups present in a community into building a stronger society which respects human rights and fosters positive intercultural interaction. They suggested to clarify in the text that the legal status of migrants is not relevant for the purpose of this draft recommendation.

Lublin shared that in some member states social rights are granted independently from legal status; this is for instance the case of the rights to education and to accessing the health system for migrant children in Poland, which are not connected to the legal status of their parents.

Finland acknowledged that conditioning the recommendation to status defined by law will not serve the general purpose of improving intercultural integration.

Lublin, supported by **Bursa Osmangazi, Bradford, Limassol** and **London Lewisham**, regretted that the present circumstances did not allow the Group for a careful consideration of the amendments before the meeting, something to which the Russian Federation showed understanding.

North Macedonia, supported by **Finland, Portugal** and **Spain** called for considering the spirit of the draft recommendation and the consensus already expressed to its overall approach, and encouraged all members not to focus only on legal parameters and/or definitions. They reminded that a CM recommendation, is not a binding instrument that can contradict national legislation or binding international standards.

Following the discussion paragraph by paragraph the Group reached the following conclusions:

1. On paragraph 5, following a proposal of the Russian Federation and in the spirit of compromise, the Group agreed to delete all references to the goals of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.
2. On paragraph 6, following a proposal of the Russian Federation and in the spirit of compromise, the Group agreed to add a clarification regarding the prohibition of discrimination. The Russian Federation reserved the right to express a further opinion on this paragraph at next CDADI meeting.
3. On paragraph 7, in order to address a proposal of the Russian Federation, the Group reached an interim agreement on a formulation and entrusted the Secretariat to check its exactitude with the Secretariat of the Social Charter.
4. On paragraph 8, following a proposal of the Russian Federation, the Group included the full quote related to the definition of citizen, as it appears in the relevant Recommendation, including the footnote contained in the quoted part, and agreed to add a footnote clarifying the position of the Russian Federation on the relevant Recommendation.
5. On paragraph 9, in order to address a proposal of the Russian Federation and in the spirit of compromise, the Group agreed to quote CM/Recommendation(2011)1 in relation to successful integration rather than to civil, social, cultural and political participation.

6. On paragraph 10, following a proposal of the Russian Federation, the Group inserted a footnote making reference to the Council of Europe Gender Equality Strategy.
7. On paragraph 11, following a proposal of the Russian Federation to delete the whole paragraph, and a proposal of Reykjavik to keep it, supported by Bergen, Bilbao, Bradford, Bursa Osmangazi, Croatia, Finland, Ioannina, London Lewisham, Lublin, Malta, North Macedonia, Portugal, Reggio Emilia and Spain, in the spirit of compromise the Group agreed to keep the paragraph in its initial formulation, and to add – at the request of the Russian Federation - a footnote expressing its disagreement with the content of the relevant Recommendation.
8. On paragraph 14, following a proposal of the Russian Federation, the Group added a reference to the Review report on the implementation of Recommendation CM/Rec(2015)1 (document CDADI(2021)5).
9. On paragraph 15 the Group could not reach agreement on the proposal of the Russian Federation to delete the reference to ECRI GPR 16. Three proposals will be forwarded to CDADI for consideration unless agreement is reached through written consultation:
 - a. Deleting reference to ECRI General Policy Recommendation n° 16: proposed by the Russian Federation.
 - b. Keeping the paragraph as per its original formulation: proposed by Finland, supported by Azerbaijan, Bilbao, Bergen, Croatia, Ioannina, London Lewisham, Lublin, Portugal, Reggio Emilia, and Reykjavik.
 - c. Deleting reference to GPR No. 16 and making a general reference to ECRI’s General Policy Recommendations: proposed by the Secretariat supported by Bursa Osmangazi and Italy.
10. On operative para a), the Group could not reach agreement on the proposal of the Russian Federation to start the paragraph with “Where appropriate” and decided to leave the decision on the opportunity of this amendment to CDADI. On the same para, the Group could not reach agreement on the proposal of the Russian Federation to include reference to non-citizens and decided to forward to CDADI the following three proposals for consideration, unless agreement can be reached through written consultation:
 - d. Proposal of amendment by the Russian Federation: adding to the original paragraph a mention to lawful residents and the so-called “non-citizens”.
 - e. Proposal of Malta, supported by Azerbaijan, Bilbao, Bergen, Bursa Osmangazi, Finland, Ioannina, Italy, Lublin, Portugal, Reggio Emilia, Reykjavik and Spain: shorten the original paragraph by deleting the reference to cross-border migration.
 - f. Compromise solution suggested by the Chair on a proposal of London Lewisham, supported by Bradford, Croatia, London Lewisham and Norway: amend the proposal of the Russian Federation in a way to clarify that it refers to lawful residents who are not able to acquire the nationality of the country of residence, and delete the reference to “non-citizens”.
11. On operative para d), the Group could not reach agreement on the proposal of the Russian Federation to start the paragraph with “Where appropriate” and decided to leave the decision on the opportunity of this amendment to CDADI, unless agreement can be reached through written consultation.

The Group further agreed to amend paragraph 2 of the Appendix with a sentence clarifying that the provisions of this draft Recommendation does not affect the legal status of migrants residing on the territory of a member state or the conditions for legal entry on the territory, in the spirit of compromise and to address a general concern expressed by the Russian Federation.

5. Information on the work of the Gender Equality Commission – Draft Recommendation on Migrant women

Cécile Gréboval, Programme Manager, CoE Gender Equality Division, explained that the protection of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls has only recently been included in the mandate of the Gender Equality Commission (GEC). The Committee of Ministers has set up a new subcommittee (GEC-MIG) to prepare a draft recommendation on this topic, which will update and replace an existing standard dating of 1979. So as for the GT-ADI-INT, the work of the sub-committee has to be completed by the end of this year and the draft recommendation is expected to be adopted by the GEC in November 2021. The gap analysis confirmed that the existing recommendation already identifies some challenges to the gender equality of migrant women, but it also brought forward the need to address a number of important issues – including the situation of asylum-seeking women and the existence of new standards since 1979- which the previous text does not contemplate. The future recommendation will therefore address all migrants, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls, looking at their specific needs through an intersectional approach that will consider also women with disabilities, children, women travelling alone, women belonging to the LGBTI community, etc.

The recommendation will also consider horizontal issues such as gender stereotyping, the specific situation of girls, access to justice including legal aid, and artificial intelligence, to quote only some. The provisional content includes a large section on protection and support, especially for victims of violence against women and victims of trafficking in human beings. The text also considers all the steps of women's journey, from arrival (including transit, reception facilities and training of staff), residence and integration (including healthcare, employment, residence permits, etc.), and returns (including provisions regarding the principle of *non-refoulement*). Discussions within the drafting Committee have not yet reached consensus on all the matters. Comments and contributions from GT-ADI-INT will be welcome.

Canada informed that the country has carried out interesting work on this topic, with the support of the European Commission and the European External Action Service, which resulted in a series of workshops, ministerial level panels, papers and podcast that can be consulted online¹.

6. Exchange of views with Triantafillos Loukarelis (Italy), Chair of the CD-ADI

The **Chair of CDADI**, Triantafillos Loukarelis (Italy), thanked the Group for the invitation to share his views, and congratulated members for their work. He said that the discussions held in CDADI last February were of particular interest, especially on the Model framework and the need to build capacity, develop tools, and indicators to measure the efficacy of the integration model proposed. He shared that the quality of the debate within GT-ADI-INT and the expertise of the working group could open the possibility to consider convert it in future into a subordinate body.

¹ See : <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/news/fourth-edition-of-the-canada-eu-migration-platform-launches>

The Chair further encouraged GT-ADI-INT members to build solid relations with their CDADI delegates, and ensure they are properly informed of the work of the Group. He stressed that intercultural integration is a very important field of action for CDADI and yet, a very specific one, requiring the involvement of a whole range of actors of which GT-ADI-INT should be the advocate. The Chair concluded by congratulating Lublin for its recent appointment as the 2023 European Youth Capital.

GT-ADI-INT Chair stressed that intercultural integration touches upon many different fields and requires action from many levels; she asked whether this is something that CDADI is ready to consider and commit to.

Spain noted that discrimination, inequalities, poverty and intolerance are growing in Europe; they wished to stress that GT-ADI-INT work comes at a very strategic moment and has the potential to unlock a strong response from all levels of governments, bringing together the states and the local level. They further informed that Spain is currently working on a strategy for the integration of migrants, building on the former citizenship plan and on the strategy against racism and xenophobia. The Model Framework will feed into this work.

Lublin expressed gratitude for being part of GT-ADI-INT work: being a city with a serious commitment towards intercultural integration they feel proud to be involved in a process that will benefit many European states, and grateful to be given the possibility of sharing their good practices and learning from others. They also stressed that local governments have an increasing role in supporting state policies for integration; they count with broad networks of partner cities and can help towards positive change.

The **Russian Federation** wished to recall its position that intercultural integration is not the only valid integration approach and that the experience of states with other models should be taken into account. They also stressed considerations should be framed by the rule of law and human rights. They affirmed that intercultural integration may lead to very serious discrimination, in particular towards lawful residents.

Reykjavik shared their delegate's personal experience as a migrant, being welcomed in her community, having worked for the city of Reykjavik on intercultural integration, and working at present with the state, within the Ministry of Social Affairs. Her experience made her understand how important the cooperation between the state and the municipalities is, and how a horizontal approach to integration matters is crucial for the well-being of societies.

Bilbao shared their appreciation for the work of GT-ADI-INT which gives local authorities space for sharing their experience, challenges, lessons learned and success.

Limassol stressed that cooperation among all levels of governments is crucial: there is scope for bridging national and local interests, bringing together those who take decisions at the state level and the local authorities who are the closest to the population.

The **Chair of CDADI** welcomed the comments. He considered the broad approach of GT-ADI-INT as a strength. He recognised the negative impact of the pandemic, so as of other major crisis, which bring even more evidence of the relevance of GT-ADI-INT, in particular regarding the collection of good practices from the field, and the development of tools and guidance on intercultural integration.

7. Next steps, venue and dates of the next meeting

The **Chair** noted that time would not allow for a brainstorming discussion on priorities for a potential future mandate and suggested to postpone this conversation to the next meeting. She gave the floor to the representative of Valencia regional government (Spain) to inform about the hosting plans.

Daríá Terradez Salom, General director for the relations with the EU and the State, Valencia regional government, regretted the lack of real improvements in countering the Covid pandemic but wished to renew the invitation of her government to host the 4th GT-ADI-INT meeting in Valencia. She stressed that Valencia regional government is deeply committed to the intercultural integration of migrants and will be happy to take the opportunity of the 4th meeting to present their Strategy for migrant integration, largely based on CoE standards. She also offered the possibility of an exchange of views with the Vice-president of the Regional government, and a field visit to the centre in charge of migrant integration.

The **Secretary of GT-ADI-INT** recalled the agreed roadmap. The 4th meeting will take place on 28-30 September 2021. Participants will be asked to report on the developments in their countries/municipalities in relation with intercultural integration, as well as on the promotion of GT-ADI-INT work with their authorities and counterparts. The Group will also have to finalise the work on the draft recommendation, following the feedback that will be given by CDADI, and discuss how to promote awareness on it once adopted. The Group shall also have a conversation on the next potential mandate, with a particular eye on elements already highlighted by CDADI, i.e. means for efficient sharing of good practices and peer learning, review of progress, indicators, and pilot projects to test the proposed model. In the past, the Group also expressed the wish to have an exchange of views with the Chair of MSI/DIS.

The **Co-Secretary of GT-ADI-INT** further informed of the possibility to organise a consultation meeting on the draft recommendation, to take into account the views of those stakeholders who are not participating in GT-ADI-INT, including migrant communities. This is something that can be forwarded to CDADI for decision, if the Group so agrees.

8. List of decisions

The Working Group:

1. Welcomed the exchanges of views with the Chair of the ECRI, the Secretariat of the Gender Equality Commission, and the Chair of CDADI, and thanked the guest speakers for their participation.
2. Discussed the Model Framework for an Intercultural Integration Strategy at the National Level, agreed to a few amendments proposed, noted the reservations of the Russian Federation and requested the latter to submit them in writing within one week, with a view to be attached to the draft Model Framework that will be sent to CDADI for discussion and possible endorsement.
3. Discussed the draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration, agreed on a number of amendments where consensus could be found, noted disagreement on a few elements, and decided to collect further views in

writing within one week on the paragraphs where consensus could not be found, after which the draft Recommendation will be sent to CDADI with any potential unresolved issues for discussion at its third meeting.

4. Agreed to propose to CDADI that a consultation meeting on the draft Recommendation with relevant stakeholders is organised.
5. Discussed and agreed on its updated Roadmap, including the date and venue for the next meetings as follows:
 - a. 4th meeting: 28-30 September (3 days), in Valencia.

Appendix I

AGENDA

16 March, 9.30 – 12.30 a.m. CET – 2.00 – 5.00 p.m. CET

9.00-9.30 - Welcome and connectivity test in the Bluejeans videoconferencing system (participants and all speakers)

9.30 – 9.50

Chair: Pia Buhl Girolami, Norway

1. Opening, Information on CD-ADI latest decisions, and Agenda

Working documents:

GT-ADI-INT(2020)8 - Report of the Second Meeting

GT-ADI-INT(2021)2 – Information on GT-ADI-INT Members

CDADI(2021)5 - Report on the Review of the implementation of CM/Rec(2015)1 on intercultural integration

GT-ADI-INT(2021)1 – Draft Agenda

Welcoming remarks, information on the outcomes of the 2nd CD-ADI meeting with regards to intercultural integration, revision and adoption of the Agenda.

9.50 – 10.30

2. Synergies with the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

Exchange of views with the Chair of European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), Maria Marouda, on the work of ECRI in the fields of integration and inclusion policies: information on ECRI's work, its monitoring mechanism and follow-up process, and possible synergies with GT-ADI-INT.

10.30 – 11.15

3. Intercultural integration – Final Draft Model Framework for an Intercultural Integration Strategy at the National Level

Working document:

GT-ADI-INT(2021)4 - Final Draft Model Framework for an Intercultural Integration Strategy at the National Level

Discussion on the Final Draft model framework for an intercultural integration strategy at the national level, as amended after the feedback provided by the CD-ADI at its second meeting.

11.15 – 11.30 *Coffee break*

11.30 – 12.30

4. Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

Working document:

GT-ADI-INT(2021)3 - Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

Discussion on the (second) Draft Recommendation, as amended after the feedback provided by the CD-ADI at its second meeting.

12.30 – 2.00 *Lunch break*

2.00 – 4.30

(Cont.) Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

4.30 – 5.00

5. Information on the work of the Gender Equality Commission – Draft Recommendation on Migrant women

Exchange of views with Cécile Gréboval, Programme Manager, Gender Equality Division, on current work of the GEC drafting Committee.

17 March, 9.30 – 1.00 p.m. CET

9.30 – 10.45

(Cont.) Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

10.45 – 11.30

6. Exchange of views with Triantafillos Loukarelis (Italy), Chair of the CD-ADI

Discussion of the GT-ADI-INT documents by CDADI – preparing the next meeting.

11.30 – 12.30

(Cont.) Draft Recommendation on multi-level policies and governance for intercultural integration

12.30 – 1.00 p.m.

7. Next steps and updated Roadmap

GT-ADI-INT are invited to hold a discussion on:

- Possible CD-ADI priorities for the next mandate
- A public consultation meeting for feedback on the draft Recommendation

- Hosting of the 4th GT-ADI-INT meeting
- Updated Roadmap

Appendix II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ELECTED MEMBERS

AZERBAIJAN

Agil SHIRINOV

Confirmed

Professor,
Rector of the Azerbaijan Institute of theology,
Assistant professor at the Department of religious studies,
Azerbaijan Institute of theology,
Baku, Azerbaijan.

BELGIUM

Tom De BRUYN

Confirmed

Deputy to the director at the Agency for Home Affairs,
Department of Equal Opportunities, Integration and Civic Integration of the Government of Flanders
Belgium.

BERGEN (NORWAY)

Sølve SÆTRE

Confirmed

Special advisor for diversity,
Advisor on political issues concerning refugees, Roma inclusion,
LGBTI, prevention of radicalisation, gender equality and faith issues,
Department for culture, diversity and equality,
Bergen, Norway.

BILBAO (SPAIN)

Itziar URTASUN

Apologised

Councillor,
International cooperation and coexistence department,
Bilbao, Spain.

Claudia EMMANUEL LAREDO (Vice-chair)

Confirmed

Official,
International cooperation and coexistence department,
Bilbao, Spain.

BRADFORD (UNITED KINGDOM)

Ian DAY

Confirmed

Assistant director,
Neighbourhood and customer services,
Bradford Council,
Bradford, United Kingdom.

BURSA-OSMANGAZI (TURKEY)

Şenol DÜLGER

External relations coordinator,
Bursa-Osmangazi, Turkey.

Confirmed

CROATIA

Alen TAHIRI

Director,
Government office for human rights and the rights of national minorities,
Zagreb, Croatia.

Apologised

Mirela ŠAVRLJUGA

Advisor at Government and Government Office,
Office for Human Rights and Rights of National Minorities,
Zagreb, Croatia.

Confirmed

FINLAND

Peter KARIUKI

Senior specialist,
Secretary general,
Advisory Board for Ethnic Relations (ETNO),
Ministry of justice,
Department of democracy and public law,
Helsinki, Finland.

Confirmed

IOANNINA (GREECE)

Dionysia AMPATZIDI

Senior advisor to the Mayor of Ioannina on social and migration policy,
Ioannina, Greece.

Confirmed

ITALY

Nadan PETROVIC

Professor,
Coordinator of the Centre for migration and refugee studies,
Rome, Italy.

Confirmed

(THE LONDON BOROUGH OF) LEWISHAM (UNITED KINGDOM)

Philip BAKER

Borough of Sanctuary manager,
London Borough of Lewisham, United Kingdom.

Confirmed

LIMASSOL (CYPRUS)

Nenad BOGDANOVIC

Intercultural counsellor,
Limassol, Cyprus.

Confirmed

LUBLIN (POLAND)

Krzysztof STANOWSKI

Director of the International cooperation centre,
Lublin, Poland.

Confirmed

NORTH MACEDONIA

Robert ALAGJOZOVSKI

National coordinator for interculturalism,
One society, development of culture and inter-ministerial cooperation,
Government of North Macedonia,
Skopje, North Macedonia.

Confirmed

NORWAY (Chair)

Pia Buhl GIROLAMI

Policy director,
Ministry of education and research,
Department of integration,
Oslo, Norway.

Confirmed

PORTUGAL

Cecília MENDES

Senior adviser,
High commission for migration (ACM),
Lisbon, Portugal.

Confirmed

REGGIO EMILIA (ITALY)

Gianluca GRASSI

Cabinet of the Mayor,
Reggio Emilia, Italy.

Confirmed

REYKJAVIK (ICELAND)

Joanna MARCINKOWSKA

Immigrant specialist,
Human rights and democracy office,
Reykjavik, Iceland.

Confirmed

SPAIN

Karoline FERNANDEZ DE LA HOZ

Director,
OBERAXE (Spanish Observatory Against Racism and Xenophobia),
Government of Spain,
Ministry of inclusion, social security and migrations,
Madrid, Spain.

Confirmed

TURKEY

Burak YASAR

Migration expert,
Directorate general of migration management (DGMM),
Istanbul, Turkey.

Confirmed (absent)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE MEMBER STATES

LUXEMBOURG

David MARQUES

Social Assistant at the Department of Integration,
Ministry of the Family, Integration and the Greater Region,
Luxembourg.

Confirmed

GERMANY

Katharina BOSCH

Desk Officer
Department Community, Unit Legal Bases for Integration,
Federal Ministry of the Interior, for Building and Community,
Germany.

Confirmed

HUNGARY

Adrienn TOTHNE FERENCI

Chief of Cabinet,
Office of the Ministerial Commissioner,
responsible for Developing Neighbourhood policy of Hungary,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade,
Budapest, Hungary.

Confirmed

MALTA

Alexander TORTELL

Head of Integration and Anti-Racism Unit,
CDADI Member,
Human Rights and Integration Directorate,
Ministry for European Affairs and Equality,
Valletta, Malta.

Confirmed

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Konstantin Kosorukov

Senior Counselor,
Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation in Strasbourg.

Confirmed

OBSERVER STATES

CANADA

Mary COULTER

Counsellor (Migration),
Mission of Canada to the European Union,
Brussels, Belgium.

Confirmed

JAPAN

Hideaki KOJIMA

Consulate-General of Japan in Strasbourg,
The Office of the Permanent Observer of Japan to the Council of Europe,

Confirmed

Strasbourg, France.

MEXICO

Jorge JIMENEZ
Special advisor
Mexico City, Mexico.

Confirmed

EXPERTS/SPEAKERS

Rosaria DE PAOLI
National coordinator,
Italian Network of Intercultural Cities (Città del Dialogo)
Milan, Italy.

Confirmed

Carla CALADO
National coordinator,
Portuguese Network of Intercultural Cities (RPCI)
Lisboa, Portugal.

Confirmed

Cécile GREBOVAL
Programme Manager,
Gender Equality Division,
Council of Europe,
Strasbourg.

Confirmed

Triantafillos LOUKARELIS
Chair of the Steering Committee on Anti-Discrimination, Diversity and Inclusion (CDADI)
Italy.

Confirmed

Maria MAROUDA
Chair of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)
Greece.

Confirmed

Safak PAVEY
Senior Policy Adviser
UNHCR

Confirmed

Gemma PINYOL
National coordinator,
Spanish Network of Intercultural Cities (RECI)
Barcelona, Spain.

Confirmed

Claire ROBERTS LAMONT
Public Outreach Coordinator
UNHCR

Confirmed

Daríá TERRADEZ SALOM
General director for the relations with the EU and the State,
Valencia Regional Government
Valencia, Spain.

Confirmed

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

**DG II - Directorate General of Democracy
Directorate of Anti-discrimination**

Ivana D’ALESSANDRO

Head of the Intercultural Cities unit,
Secretary of GT-ADI-INT.

Confirmed

Irena GUIDIKOVA

Head of Anti-discrimination and cooperation division,
Co-Secretary of GT-ADI-INT.

Confirmed

Andrea WICKSTRÖM

Project officer,
Intercultural Cities unit.

Confirmed

Evgeni RADEV

Support officer
Intercultural Cities unit.

Confirmed

Yann PRIVAT

Administrative assistant,
Intercultural Cities unit.

Confirmed