



Evaluation Summaries

Promoting Equality in Diversity: Integration in Europe

Quick Facts

Countries: Europe Region
Final Evaluation: June 2006
Mode of Evaluation: Independent
Technical Area: International Migration
Evaluation Team: Anna Lucia Colleo,
external evaluator
Project Start: July 2004
Project End: December 2006
Project Code: RER/04/05/EEC
Donor: The European Union (587,640 US\$)

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

Global objectives of the project were to support community engagement throughout EU member states in facilitating integration of and combating discrimination against immigrants.

Specific objectives were to identify and disseminate effective practice; define evaluation standards, indicators and a methodology to identify practice that is viable, effective and potentially replicable in other contexts; organise exchange of experience and knowledge; facilitate access of stakeholders to material, knowledge and technical resources; promote inter-sectoral alliances and mobilise multiple constituencies; and give a European dimension to effective national responses

Present situation of project

The project encompasses a variety of components and actions: from theoretical to applied research, development of practical tools and guidelines for action, to supporting the creation and follow up of a dynamic discussion forum, where synergies are encouraged, action motivated and resources mobilised. The project is acting as a catalyser for integration and anti-discrimination intervention.

Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation

The review will investigate the appropriateness and efficiency of the project design and management, the project's relevance to promote immigrant integration, the effectiveness of project initiatives and the consistency between their implementation and the original action plan, the actual impact of the project, the degree of institutional and financial long-term sustainability it could ensure, and its added value in promoting integration of and preventing discrimination against immigrants.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation is based on the review of all relevant project documents, i.e. the project application form, including the budget sheets, the logical framework matrix, the progress report, and project outputs. Additional findings have been drawn on the content of interviews with partner organisations and professionals who played a crucial role in the project.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The project was conceived and can substantially be seen as a step forward in a long pattern of changes in the behaviour towards integration and anti-discrimination of stakeholders and actors at different levels.

It also provided a solid forum basis for attracting the attention, interest and consideration of policy makers and relevant practitioners on the necessity to foster integration and contrast discrimination.

Specific objectives have been by large if not entirely met, although much remains to be done to realise the project's impact further: the practice evaluation tools and methodology are potentially very relevant to contribute to promote effective anti-discrimination action, but they have not been concretely applied and verified yet, and this includes non application and non verification of the practices compiled in the compendium prepared by the project.

The implementation capacity of the Lead Partner remains a crucial aspect, which along the project's life the ILO Department of International Migration has substantially progressed in addressing.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

As previously illustrated, the project involved a composite range of partner actors, targeted different stakeholders and produced a variety of outputs. Specific measures to advance the potential of its diversified outcome should be devised to promote further coherency of anti-discrimination activity at all levels, with particular reference to relevant EU and EU Member States' policies and directives.

In particular, future action should focus on:

The further dissemination of outputs and tools through the ILO's, the partners, and the involved social partners' established networks

The identification of key government, practitioners and civil society stakeholders in target countries and possibly in other EU countries as well to disseminate results to,

including in meeting events and through interactive tools

Making available the principle elements on integration of immigrant workers that the project has gathered to promote further exchange amongst key stakeholders and define a concrete and specific Agenda for joint EU-ILO Action

The application of project tools, particularly the practice evaluation tool: pivotal applications can be realised to gather feedback and refine the criteria. The first although not the only application basis should be the practices compiled in the project's Compendium of Practices, to make the Compendium of Practices become a Compendium of Good Practices: this would serve as a pivotal exercise on the concrete application of the evaluation tool as well as the preparation of a new relevant output

Training initiatives to enhance the capacity of key stakeholders in each target country and possibly in other EU countries as well to make appropriate use of the project's outputs

Information and awareness campaigns tailored on specific target groups and beneficiaries

Overall, this review concludes that the capacity of the ILO to mobilise stakeholders and access established networks brought a strong added value to the project. It translated into practice the possibility that global and regional actors join forces towards a common goal.

This notwithstanding, the project has been hampered by a number of adverse capacity factors that need be properly addressed if similar initiatives are to be put in place in the future.

Important lessons learned

The coordination structure of any ambitious and multi-partner project must be well established and should remain a solid reference during the whole project implementation.

The lead partner's capacity to keep the project team cohesed and encourage the commitment and mobilisation of partners is crucial to the project's success. Coordination has direct

repercussions on the partners' sense of ownership of projects.

In terms of project's progress management and timely administrative support the capacity of the ILO has proved inadequate, which delayed the schedule of project implementation and again weakened the partners' sense of project ownership.

The lead partner, as well as the *quasi* totality of other partners, had either underestimated or not made available the staff resources that were necessary to ensure efficiency in carrying out their responsibilities under the project.

However, it must be pointed out that the lead partner has put appropriate efforts in tackling the challenge of aligning its internal procedures and established *modus operandi* with the demanding financial, administrative and visibility requirements set by the European Commission's Project Cycle Management.

The ILO has internal technical units that coordinate projects implemented by its field offices or by sub-contractors, but acting as the coordinating agency of equal partners is certainly a new field of operations for the ILO. This project was a learning case, and it by no doubt set progress, for internal procedures have been made more flexible to meet needs that were unusual for the ILO, as it for instance pertains contractual arrangements with external organisations. The progress set here has marked a pattern and has established valuable precedents for future action.

With reference to project design, a detailed description of the support structures that will be made available for implementing a project is a crucial tool to estimate appropriately the resources that shall be needed to implement the project. It helps forecasting project implementation needs adequately and pre-assign internal resources as necessary.

Similarly, a more precise identification of the project focus, beneficiaries, stakeholders, and levels of intervention boosts the clarity and focus of a project.

The stakeholders' determination and explication is particularly relevant as the type of stakeholders vary with the type and extent of integration measures to promote, and

activities and objectives should mirror the choice: to make but a few examples, policy makers can develop and launch measures that foster immigrant integration in the labour market, but have little to do with immigrant integration in workplaces, where integration can be impacted by law provisions and regulations and by the action of activists and advocacy groups, including trade unions, social actors and religious congregations.

The project has been designed to tackle integration and anti-discrimination in relation to labour markets and work places but the application form was not exhaustive in clarifying its specific field of action.

Another important lesson to learn is that all partners should be actively involved or at least appropriately informed on the progress of all activities and the realisation of outputs, and maintain a general overview of project development and achievements. Chances to exchange views, discuss and fine-tune approaches, methodologies and ways of operating are very important quality check and learning opportunities, and outstanding sustainability elements. Even more so if chances take the form of regular and frequent meetings where the partners can directly exchange and get to know each other and their activities, including beyond the project realm.

This is a critical point in project implementation, especially for projects with large partnerships. In this project, partners as well as working groups have almost exclusively focus on their part of activities, and on the results they contributed to produce. The sense of ownership they were able to build is by large related to individual results, and less to the overall project action and goals.