



Project no.: CIS8-CT-2006-044446
Project acronym: IDEA
Project full title: Mediterranean and Eastern European Countries as New Immigration Destinations in the European Union

Instrument: Specific Targeted Research Project

Thematic priority: PRIORITY SSP-5A AREA 8.1. B.2.5.

Final Activity Report

Period covered: from 01.01.2007 to 31.06.2009

Date of preparation: 14.08.2009

Start date of project: 01.01.2007

Duration: 30 months

Project coordinator name: **Prof. Marek Okólski**

Project coordinator organisation name: **Warsaw University/ Centre of Migration Research,
Banacha 2B Street, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland**

1st version

Executive Summary

The project „Mediterranean and Eastern European countries as new immigration destinations in the European Union” (IDEA) is a joint endeavour of 11 research teams from various EU member countries:

1. Warsaw University – WU/CMR (Centre of Migration Research; website: www.migracje.uw.edu.pl), Poland – Project Coordinator (contact: Professor Marek Okólski, email: moko@uw.edu.pl, Ms. Malgorzata Timoszek (since May 15th 2009 Ms. Magdalena Radomska), email: m.timoszek@uw.edu.pl; tel. +48 22 6597411);
2. Université Paris X Nanterre – UPX (Institut des sciences sociales du politique), France;
3. Univerzita Karlova v Praze – UKP (Department of Social Geography and Regional Development), Czech Republic;
4. Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche – CNR (Institute for Research on Population and Social Policies), Italy;
5. Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy – ELIAMEP, Greece;
6. Instituto Universitario de Investigación Ortega y Gasset – IUIOG, Spain;
7. International Organisation for Migration – IOM/CEFMR (Central European Forum for Migration Research Warsaw), Poland;
8. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia – MTA (Centre for International Migration and Refugee Studies, Institute of Ethnic and National Minority Studies), Hungary;
9. Centro de Investigação em Sociologia Económica e das Organizações – SOCIUS, Portugal;
10. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique – CNRS (Laboratoire Méditerranéen de Sociologie), France;
11. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften – OEAW (Das Institut für Stadt- und Regionalforschung), Austria.

One of the major aims of the project was a comparative analysis involving three groups of countries that at various periods started to systematically attract international migrants: the pioneers of Western Europe and the latecomers representing two distinctly different regions of the continent – the Mediterranean region and the new accession countries of Eastern Europe (together named MEDEEA countries). It was expected that such an analysis might enable researchers to deepen the understanding and interpretations of past and current migration trends, and design a projection model capable of predicting future migration in the European Union. Another important objective of IDEA consisted in providing the policymakers (both in new destination countries and at the community level) with a sound knowledge that would facilitate their efforts to improve the management of migration flows and immigrant integration. By this IDEA offers scientific support to the much-needed development of migration policies in the EU.

The project was launched on the 1st of January 2007 and was fully implemented by the 30th of June 2009.

IDEA logic assumed a step-wise research activities that began with the study of pioneer immigration European countries, which was followed by the study involving

Mediterranean countries and in the next step by countries of Eastern Europe. Research concerning the second group of countries was partly modeled on research concerning the first group while that concerning the third group was to a large degree modeled on the two others. The study was based on a common approach and methodology devised jointly by the partners in the early stage of the project. In addition, partners made all efforts to use reliable and verifiable, and most of all comparable data.

The following major areas of activities were the subject of IDEA research teams work during the IDEA project implementation:

- Devising of methodological guidelines and structuring of the project
- Presentation of the historical background to current migration trends in the "old" European immigration countries (represented by Austria and France) and synthesising of immigration patterns and related "migration system" of those countries
- In-depth analysis of historical determinants and patterns of immigration in Mediterranean countries
- Description of the contents and role of migration policy in shaping migratory flows in "old" and "new" European immigration countries, and analysis of the effectiveness of that policy
- Assessment of the impact of immigrants upon receiving countries
- Providing an input for the model of future immigration;
- Presenting historical patterns of immigration, explaining how a specific "migration system" evolves and defining the role of migration in shaping migration-related phenomena in the CEE countries,
- Preparing final reports for Southern European countries (Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain)
- Developing models for regional analysis for Western, Southern and Central Eastern European countries;
- Preparing a projection model for MEDEEA countries;
- Preparing national reports for Eastern European countries
- Preparing national policy-oriented executive summaries;
- Preparing regional synthesis report for Mediterranean countries;
- Preparing regional synthesis regional report for Eastern European countries
- Preparing and organising a Final Conference in Poland
- Dissemination activities aimed at discussing and promoting the results of the project and providing different types of audience with publications based on the IDEA national and regional reports as well as with policy recommendations stemming from the project.

All the scientific and disseminating activities planned for the whole period of IDEA project duration have been fully completed. A brief description of the activities is presented below, in sections devoted to the description of the realisations of particular tasks within project workpackages. .

Standard research procedures were followed by all participating teams during the project implementation. They included the review of literature, screening of policy documents and legal acts, secondary data collection and processing, and occasionally field work (principally – in-depth interviewing of institutional actors on migration scene). Important role was played by continuous inter-team consultations and discussions at IDEA meetings (special



sessions of the consortium accompanying the meetings of Coordinating Committee). Two such events took place in 2008: the 24-25th of January 2008 in Athens (the second consortium meeting) and the 3-5th September in Prague 2008 (the third consortium meeting). On those occasions IDEA greatly benefited from the involvement of members of the Advisory Committee. Some of them delivered comments in writing regarding the content of the national reports and suggestions for the further research and comparative studies. In

addition, each of the nine policy oriented executive summaries has been thoroughly reviewed by one of the members of the Advisory Committee.

Policy recommendations elaborated within the IDEA project were presented on several occasions and deeply discussed with experts, who by delivering valuable comments and suggestions allowed for a significant improvement of the policy-oriented executive summaries. Policy recommendations elaborated by all the national teams enabled the preliminary comparative analysis of the policies in the countries being at different stages of “maturity” in immigration. The synthesis of policy recommendations and of policy-oriented executive summaries was prepared and presented during the Final Conference in Cracow, Poland (see below). It has become a part (a chapter) of a book manuscript being the final outcome of the project (a deliverable D 7.1).

Teams representing each region worked separately in order to find the regularities concerning migration realities and policies within the particular group of the IDEA countries. After the first synthesis report that referred to the “old” immigration countries, namely France, Austria and Germany was prepared in previous stage of the project, the second regional synthesis was elaborated. It was intended to summarise (compare and synthesise) the results of the research activities conducted in the Southern European countries (Greece, Portugal, Spain and Italy). In order to achieve the goal of preparing the synthesis report for these countries, at the beginning of 2009 a regional workshop was organised. The meeting took place in Lisbon and was hosted by the Portuguese partner (SOCIUS). In the consecutive months the synthesis report was successively revised and improved. In the result of intensive and fruitful co-operation of the Southern European research teams (SOCIUS, IUIOG, ELIAMEP, CNR) a report titled “The making of an immigration model: inflows, impacts and policies in Southern Europe” was finalised and edited as No. 8 of the IDEA Working Papers in May 2009.

One of the results of the country reports in the Mediterranean region is the fact that many similarities in the development of immigration and migration policies in the region could be found while comparing the situation in the given countries. One of the commonalities is a persistence of a sizeable illegal, irregular or undocumented immigration and a failure or ambivalence regarding control of that phenomenon by the state. Another similarity refers to the one of migration policy tools preferred in the Southern European countries, namely the regularisation programmes. The most important characteristics of the “young” immigration countries investigated within the IDEA project were presented during the Final Conference in Cracow and a separate chapter on that issue is included in the book

manuscript, summarising the findings of the IDEA project. Collaboration during the comparative analyses conducted in the Southern IDEA countries occurred to be very inspiring, which resulted in a scientific results of a high scientific and practical – due to numerous policy-oriented aspects – value.

As it was expected in the beginning of the project, all the teams representing the CEE region found it difficult to apply the concept of migration cycle, although all the CEE countries considered could be described as becoming (“future”) immigration countries. Nevertheless, the scale or perseverance of immigration in each of the three countries do not imply to treat them as “immigration countries” yet. In the course of comparative analyses it occurred that the three countries analysed reveal several differences in the characteristics of their migration status transformation. The task of synthesising the experience of countries, where net immigration is only in “embryonic” stage, was extremely challenging.

The analyses presented in the regional synthesis reports have shown that countries in the Mediterranean and Central-Eastern Europe do not go through exactly the same stages of the migration cycle as the Western European countries did two or three decades ago. Nonetheless, the migration cycle concept can be used as a blueprint or as a reference to investigate whether a country fits into the concept or it is considerably different in undergoing of the transition of migration status.

In the course of preparing the regional synthesis reports for Central European and Southern Countries the team leaders, often accompanied by assigned editors, from relevant countries worked in sub-groups, accordingly to the focus of the synthesis: on CEE or Mediterranean countries. The members of the Coordinating Committee from Central Eastern European Countries as well as from Southern European countries were also involved in disseminating the knowledge and organising scientific events based on the IDEA project outcomes. They were supported by the members of the Advisory Committee who actively participated in consulting the scientific and disseminating elements of the project.

There were also held some scientific events (seminars, workshops or round table discussions) organised within the framework of the IDEA project. Research activities of this kind carried out within the project were crowned with organising of the widely announced and by all means successful international conference. The **Final Conference** summarised two-and-a-half-year research work conducted under the guidance of CMR WU. Leading European migration experts gathered in Cracow, from 3rd to 5th June 2009, to discuss immigration experiences of European countries, the challenges that they face, and the issue of new and flexible



migration policy (more information is presented in the part of the report related to workpackage 7).

On the occasion of the Final IDEA Conference as well as in the evaluation of final reports of the project, IDEA greatly benefited from the involvement of members of the Advisory Committee. The vast majority of the Advisory Committee took part in the Final Conference as well as active part in the discussions during the conference and closed meeting of CC and AC. AC members contributed to the dissemination activities, participating in the roundtable meetings or seminars dedicated to presenting IDEA project findings.

The Final Conference of the IDEA served also as dissemination of new knowledge that was produced in the project. Participants were provided with many **promotional materials** in folders including the conference Agenda, Conference leaflet, University of Warsaw catalogue and memory sticks with preloaded Working Papers (Nos. 1-12), Policy Briefs (Nos. 1-10), IDEA Newsletters (Nos. 1-10), European Policy Brief devoted to IDEA project, conference papers, and IDEA databases (4 databases plus instruction). The participants of the conference could also look into additional conference materials, available at the Conference desk, such as printed version of the European Policy Brief, Conference Papers as well as Publications provided with by the European Commission for this occasion.

During the project implementation, especially in final year of the project, the activities of the project team were heavily oriented towards various dissemination activities, such as: a) producing publications, b) organising conferences, workshops and seminars, c) communication with media, and d) other.

a) Publications

Among produced publications the **book** manuscript is the most important and comprehensive publishable product that is planned to be realised. The book contains: introduction describing and explaining goals of the project, a methodological part on 'migration cycle' concept, final research results of particular regional teams, outcomes of forecasting exercise and immigration policy implications. Two regional synthesis reports – one devoted to the Southern European countries and the second one to the Central Eastern European countries – will be published within the next few months. The second report mentioned has been already delivered to the publisher. Moreover, some of the national teams plan to publish extended versions of their national reports as books, e.g. Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic and Italy. Some of them will be published in national languages (e.g. in the case of the Czech Republic and Hungary). IDEA project findings have been also publicised in articles and papers prepared by IDEA researchers for different joint edition initiatives.

IDEA Working Papers and **IDEA Policy Briefs** series have been issued during the project implementation. Till the end of the project 14 Working Papers. All those papers discussed immigration patterns in the European countries investigated against the background which constituted a common IDEA conceptual framework. They were devoted to: the first devoted to Austrian experience in immigration, and the second one to a cluster of "old" immigration countries, French experience in immigration, immigration towards Greek, the Italian transition from an emigration to immigration country, immigration to Portugal, forecasting of immigration flows until 2025 for selected European countries, Spanish case of immigration, Southern European migration regime, immigration transformations in Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary, and two extra issue from Greek team – on Romanian and Polish immigrants in Greece. They are available on the project website. Moreover, 10 Policy Briefs elaborated within the framework of the IDEA project were also publicised on project website. They included policy recommendations for the European countries investigated (Austria, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary) and the last Policy Brief constituted a synthesis of the contribution of all teams that *inter alia* stressed the need to create a more innovative, flexible and pro-active migration policy, responding to the phenomenon of "fluid" migration (short-term migration, circulation, mobility with no intention of settling down) as a part of the EU *acquis communautaire*

Additionally, 11 issues of **IDEA Newsletter** were published. They covered the most important events and achievements of the IDEA project in 2009. Thus, they were devoted to 1) meeting in Athens as well as migration policies and policy recommendations in France and Austria (No. 1), 2) summaries of the study on immigration and immigration policy in the

Southern European countries (2 issues of the IDEA Newsletter) (No. 2), 3) meeting in Prague, summaries of the study on immigration and immigration policy in the Central Eastern European countries (No. 3), 4) summary of analysis in Italy (No. 4), 5), Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary (No. 5), 6) conclusion of meeting in Prague (No. 6), 7) forecasting of immigration flows until 2025 (No. 7), 8) immigration into Southern Europe (regional synthesis) (No. 8), 9) results of migration trends comparison in Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic (No. 9), 10) information on (No. 10) and 11) summary of IDEA Final Conference in Cracow (No. 11).

b) Scientific events addressing the target audience

The IDEA researchers referred to the results and preliminary outcomes of the IDEA project while presenting their work during different scientific or policy oriented conferences and seminars. Besides the final international conference there were organised other scientific events for target audience. Mediterranean countries were involved in several individual dissemination activities taking the form of roundtables or seminars. In Italy a **roundtable** with policy makers, NGOs and migration experts was organized in Rome. It was devoted to the presentation and discussion of the main conclusions reached by the Italian team. Around 110 people participated in the event (all Italians), including students, researchers, NGOs members and journalists. The event had a large diffusion on mass media. Articles on the round table were published by newspapers and broadcast by radio and TV networks. In turn the Greek team organised a workshop, titled “Leave your Myth in Greece” - Networks and Pathways of Seven Important Immigrant Groups in Greece. The workshop aimed at bringing together NGOs, local authorities, policy makers, researchers and journalists. The Portuguese and Spanish teams were involved in organisation of International Conference on “Immigration Policy in Southern Europe” in Lisbon. The conference was attended by outstanding policy-makers representatives of institutions working on migration issues, immigrant leaders, and researchers, mostly from Portugal and Spain (but also from other Mediterranean countries and from the coordinating institution). All the above described events constituted an exemplification of the demand for policy-oriented knowledge regarding migration processes and migration policies in Europe.

Scientific events for target audience also took place in Central Eastern Europe. One of the meetings aimed at promoting the findings of IDEA project was a seminar organised with the cooperation of the Ministry of Interior in Poland. The seminar was attended by top or middle-level officials representing Poland’s state administration. During this seminar CMR researchers provided a presentation about irregular migration and migration policy as a way of responding to this phenomenon in the Southern and other Central-Eastern European countries.

Next year second **seminar** was organised with the cooperation of the Ministry of Interior in Poland. The seminar was attended by top or middle-level officials representing Poland’s state administration. During this seminar CMR researchers provided a presentation describing major results of project analyses regarding immigrants presence on the labour market in Poland, immigrants’ integration and migration policy including project recommendations. Another meeting aimed at promoting of IDEA results that additionally provided synergies with educational activities (and two other international projects supported by the EC), was a seminar organised in cooperation with Centre of International Relations. The seminar was addressed to representatives of non-governmental organisations that deal with migration issues. CMR researchers presented major findings of the project as well as notified the audience about data collected and analyses. Small-scale round-table discussions attended by researchers, NGO representatives and policy-makers were also held in the Czech Republic and Hungary.

c) Communication with media

Media in different countries were widely informed on IDEA activities, results and upcoming events. Journalist attended some of the scientific events, for example the above mentioned roundtable in Italy or conference in Lisbon (where also television coverage was provided). Special measures were undertaken during the preparation of IDEA Final Conference in Cracow. Information on the conference and project results was put at the webpage of Polish Information Press Agency and appropriate press release was widely distributed among European and national media. Moreover, the issue of European Policy Brief referring project's objective and methodology, presenting new knowledge and European added value and key messages for policy-makers, businesses, trade unions and civil society actors was produced and published. It was available in printed version during the conference as well as saved on memory sticks handed out to all the participants.

The Final Conference had several significant repercussions. For instance, there were some press releases covering the findings presented during the Final Conference (eg. an article in all-Polish daily newspaper *Polska The Times*¹ and interview with one of IDEA's researchers in Polish weekly magazine *Tygodnik Powszechny*²)

d) Other

Similarly to the previous years of the project realisation, in 2009 there were intensive attempts to widely circulate the project ideas, preliminary results, development of the particular concepts. The publicly available **website** (www.idea6fp.uw.edu.pl) was updated accordingly to the completed activities within the project. The websites of the project partners included direct links to the main IDEA websites and often other briefs related to the progress in the project. In addition, individual researchers used standard IDEA **leaflets** (available in English and national languages of participating teams) to promote the project in academic circles, media and organisations.

¹ <http://www.polskatimes.pl/stronaglowna/132924,imigranci-omijaja-polske,id,t.html> ['Immigrants pass by Poland']

² http://tygodnik.onet.pl/0.0.31465.imigranci_potrzebni_od_zaraz,artykul.html ['Immigrants needed asap']

Section 1 – Project objectives and major achievements during the reporting period

1.1. An overview of project objectives

The IDEA project addressed a recent phenomenon of the change in European countries migration status from net emigration to net immigration. In particular, it took a closer look at new net immigration countries of Southern Europe and potential net immigration countries of Eastern Europe, jointly termed MEDEEA countries. The transformation of migration status was perceived in a comparative perspective, where countries of Western and Northern Europe, the “old” European countries of immigration, served as a reference.

Major objectives of the project included:

- an in-depth analysis of causes and consequences of contemporary flows of people to MEDEEA countries;
- an assessment of institutional, administrative and political background of foreigners’ inflow in European countries;
- a set of recommendation for the development of migration policy based, among other things, on a forecast of immigration to selected European countries.

All those objectives were strongly migration policy oriented. In order to achieve the above mentioned objectives the project involved the following:

- reconstruction of past immigration patterns leading to a comparative analysis of similarities and differences between three groups of European countries: (a) “old” immigration countries (Western and Northern Europe), (b) “new” immigration countries (Mediterranean countries, including Portugal) and (c) immigration countries “in the coming” (Central and Eastern Europe);
- analysis of the contents and effectiveness of migration policies in all three groups of countries;
- analysis of current immigration patterns in all countries concerned with a focus on migration developments in major groups of sending countries;
- devising universal analytical tools capable of forecasting immigration in all countries concerned.

The project objectives presented a serious challenge to the IDEA researchers. Most of all, immigration and migration policy have been widely perceived as a priority issue for the European Union. So far, however, striving towards more efficient management of migration flows and migrant integration posed substantial problems and was by no means a smooth and entirely successful process in the community. On the other hand, past longitudinal studies on immigration and the transformation of migration status in particular were to a large degree limited to individual European countries or groups of relatively homogeneous countries. Very little effort could be observed in the area of relevant comparative research. Thus the project in its policy-oriented comparative respect was a pioneering endeavour. Moreover, the fulfilment of its objectives required an innovative interdisciplinary approach whereas and necessary

research activities asked for a concerted collaboration within the international team of researchers.

1.2. Objectives for the reporting period and their implementation

In the reporting period of the project the major objectives were as follows:

- devising of methodological guidelines and structuring of the project;
- presentation of the historical background to current migration trends in the “old” European immigration countries (represented by Austria and France) and synthesising of immigration patterns and related “migration system” of those countries;
- in-depth analysis of historical determinants and patterns of immigration in Mediterranean countries;
- description of the contents and role of migration policy in shaping migratory flows in “old” and “new” European immigration countries, and analysis of the effectiveness of that policy;
- assessment of the impact of immigrants upon receiving countries;
- providing an input for the model of future immigration;
- preparing of a basis for further empirical research (concerning MEDEEA countries).
- presenting historical background and current migration trends in the Mediterranean countries and preparing the input for the model of future migrations, including trends, characteristics and determinants of migration in these countries;
- presenting historical background and current migration trends in the Central Eastern European countries as well as the input for the model of future migrations in CEE countries, including trends, characteristics and determinants of migration
- preparing a set of qualitative scenarios for MEDEEA countries;
- constructing a model of migration flows and preparing quantitative predictions, using the demographic database for MEDEEA countries elaborated within the framework of the project;
- creating models for synthesis reports for the three different, due to the “maturity” of migration experience, regions;
- in-depth analysis of migration policies in the investigated countries, attempts to assess the effectiveness of those policies;
- providing the highest quality of the project's results as well as cohesion between project's results and practical needs of migration policy and policymakers through discussion workshops, seminars for policymakers and other dissemination activities.
- investigating whether the factors critical for migratory flows in Western and Southern Europe are also important for the countries of Eastern Europe
- assessing which of the immigration policies adopted in the Western and Southern Europe could be implemented in Eastern Europe
- reconstructing the old immigration patterns in Eastern Europe in order to test the hypothesis, that patterns of immigration in new destination countries recall historical patterns in old immigration countries

- explaining how a “migration system” (a set of resource countries) develops
- increasing knowledge on current migratory flows in the East European countries, with special emphasis put on the structure of the immigrants (identification of the main sending countries, analysis of the reasons of immigration and activities undertaken) and factors that influenced overall migration trend in each country
- assessing the impact of the immigrants, both legal and illegal, on the overall economic, social and political situation in East European countries and the measures undertaken to deal with these issues in different countries
- analysing structures and policies in place to deal with immigration (including the institutional arrangements, administrative capacity, legislative and policy frameworks)
- providing policy recommendations based on the qualitative and quantitative migration forecasts and on the results of analysis of past and current migration flows
- presenting policy recommendations and other results of the research during the Final Conference in Poland

All of the planned tasks have been completed. In the first year of the project, 2007, a collective work on methodology of the project, which involved all participating teams, was finalised. Its effects included a set of methodological guidelines and a common analytical framework. In addition, a suggested template for national reports was adopted. All teams representing the MEDEEA countries made a considerable effort to structure their research according to those commonly developed principles.

A report on immigration in “old” host countries (Austria and France) was thoroughly discussed and finalised. The French part of the report took a very long historical view and analysed the interplay of immigration and migration policy throughout the entire 20th century. With regard to the most recent developments it accounted for phenomena of vital importance for the present day European Union, such as migration management, especially the co-development strategy and the impact of globalisation on new forms and dynamics of foreigner inflow and immigrant integration. It also focused on such specific novel issues as effects of gender neutral migration policy and a link of ethnic entrepreneurship with circular migration. In turn, the Austrian part is limited to the period that begins with the late stage of European guest worker and recruitment-based migration, that is with the 1960s. It portrayed the Austrian case as pretty uniform with regard to types of flows and national origin of immigrants, and rather orderly in terms of the effects of migration policy. Relative simplicity of the Austrian case made it possible to identify and characterise major phases in the “migration cycle” of that country, which (apart from the above mentioned common analytical framework) might serve as a reference in the analysis of migration to MEDEEA countries. On the other hand, this part of the report presented an old immigration country being far from social and political consensus with regard to the principles of immigrant integration policy, and the on-going related public discourse and political debates.

The report concerning “old” host countries was accompanied by a policy oriented executive summary, also broken down into two parts (reflecting two different cases – Austrian and French). It clearly pointed to enormous complexity of migration policy, its natural limitations and its holistic nature, especially inseparability of its admission and integration component. Although in both national experiences integration was conceived as integration into a nation, it was argued the respective policy should neither aim at ultimate assimilation nor cultivate ethnic diversity for its own sake. As indispensable aspects of integration the report suggested a structural harmonisation, that would be active and consistent striving for mutually accepted goals by immigrants and the host society, a

multiform and multilevel participation in integration policy, a critical importance of local approach to national integration policy, and new, emerging with globalisation form termed transnational integration.

In addition, all MEDEEA national teams completed structuring of their research, and four teams representing countries of Southern Europe (Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain) produced the first draft of their national reports. Similarly to the analysis of Austrian and French case, that piece of research dealt with immigrant flows and stocks, and migration policies although – due to being in “earlier” phase of the migration cycle – the emphasis in southern countries’ reports was less on integration of immigrants and more on the inflows and activities of migrants, especially those undocumented. After a series of intra-IDEA discussions those reports took a form of the synthesis report dealing with immigration and migration policy in “new” host countries.

In 2008 the Mediterranean research teams focused on finalising their national reports and after that they elaborated the basis for comparative analysis. In the result of these activities a draft version of the synthesis report titled *Southern European Comparative Report* was prepared and shared with the teams representing other regions in January 2009.

IDEA researchers representing Southern European countries prepared also policy oriented executive summaries, which were circulated before the third IDEA meeting in Prague, in September 2009. Those documents, including mainly migration policy developments and recommendations for the future, were then discussed and improved accordingly to the useful suggestions passed to the particular project team from a Mediterranean countries.

Moreover, the second year of the project was spent on summarising the results of the studies in writing: for the mid 2008 draft reports were prepared, then for the end of the year the teams from CEE countries focused on improving their reports and prepared their final versions. At the same time the discussion over the possibility of elaborating a model of regional synthesis took place in recent months. By the end of the reporting period all the teams representing CEE countries prepared the scheme of regional synthesis and were prepared for the regional workshop in Budapest in February 2009. The work on reports for CEE countries confirmed the expectations or even concerns expressed from the very beginning of the project implementation, namely those related to different phase of migration status transition, in which each of the CEE countries finds itself. Nevertheless, the analysis conducted for the purposes of the IDEA project are certainly of a high value for those countries. Since the phenomenon of immigration is rather new for them as well as the migration policies are not so developed as in the “old” immigration countries, the task of in-depth analysis of the prerequisites for the migration status change, the drivers of immigration, attitudes towards migrants as well as the state approach to migration and immigrants to some extent fill the gaps existing so far.

The activities related to gathering data for the projection model, qualitative and quantitative scenarios for the MEDEEA countries proved to be a very complex task, however due to the multiplied efforts of the research teams this task was successfully completed. The methodology planned at the beginning of the project was extended through the additional method of study, namely the quasi-Delphi method used to obtain the experts opinion and assessments regarding the future migration and demographic trends. In the result of the activities connected with the projection model and future scenarios, the IOM (CEFMR) team prepared a forecasting report entitled: *Forecasting of immigration flows until 2025 for*

selected European countries using expert information. The report was based on a qualitative analysis and as its main research tool was the Delphi survey with experts.

During the second year of IDEA realisation the dissemination activities were significantly more intensive. It was possible mainly because the preliminary results were ready to be published or presented in front of the greater audience than the project team members. Discussions over the preliminary project results or the project methodology with experts or researchers from outside the project team contributed to both scientific knowledge dissemination and inclusion of the practical issues within the IDEA project. This, in turn, allowed for further analyses, involving high scientific standards in realisation, but at the same time – having practical outcomes, especially in the area of such a phenomenon as immigration in the European Union.

In 2009, the CEE research teams focused on finalising their national reports and after that they have elaborated the basis for a comparative analysis. In the result of these activities a draft version of the synthesis report titled *Central-Eastern European Comparative Report* was prepared and shared with the teams representing other regions in June 2009. The report contributed to increasing knowledge on current migratory flows in the East European countries, with special emphasis put on the structure of the immigrants (identification of the main sending countries, analysis of the reasons of immigration and activities undertaken) and factors that influenced overall migration trend in each country. National reports as well as the synthesis report analysed structures and policies in place to deal with immigration.

IDEA researchers representing Central-Eastern European countries prepared also policy-oriented executive summaries, which were circulated before the regional workshop in Budapest, in February 2009. Those documents, including mainly migration policy developments and recommendations for the future, were then discussed and improved accordingly to the useful suggestions passed to particular project teams from the CEE countries.

During the third year of IDEA realisation the dissemination activities were significantly more intensive. It was possible mainly because the final results of analysis in Austria and France and Southern countries, as well as preliminary results of analysis in CEE underwent a scrutiny of evaluation and revision, and were ready to be published or presented in front of the greater audience than the project team members. Policy recommendations and other results of the research were presented during several scientific events, of which the Final Conference in Cracow, on the 3rd – 5th of June 2009, was the most important one (see description of workpackage 7). Seminars, workshops and conferences with scholars, policymakers and broader audience were organised almost by every team participating in the project (see “Final plan for using and disseminating the knowledge”). Discussions over the preliminary project results or the policy recommendations with experts or researchers from outside the project team contributed to both scientific knowledge dissemination and inclusion of the practical issues within the IDEA project

The success of the project can be also depicted with a long list of publications and other disseminating activities (for details please refer to “Final plan for using and disseminating the knowledge”).

1.3. Problems with the implementation and the corrective actions

It was found in an early stage of implementation of the IDEA project that the timing of project activities, especially related to the workpackages: 3, 4, 5 and 6 needed a major

adjustment. Already during the kick-off meeting in the 3. month of the project (the 2nd of March 2007) it was realised that the start of research on migration in “potential” host countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) was planned too late (only in the 13. month). It was decided then to launch the activities related to the workpackage 3 as soon as the project methodology was developed. Thus, in the 13th month of the project realisation the activities included in the workpackage 3 were rather continued than initiated as it was previously planned. Consequently teams representing the three Eastern European countries became involved in extensive structuring of their research, data collection and (occasionally) field work already after the first consortium meeting (on the 20-21st of June 2007). By the end of 2007 all those teams completed a considerable part of desktop research and data collection.

With regard to workpackages 4-6, which constituted a whole of research activities addressing immigration developments in the future, major changes in the IDEA research strategy were introduced on the initiative of IOM (CEFMR), a team responsible for a quantitative forecast of migratory flows (lead contractor). That issue was discussed and the changes approved in principle during the meeting in June 2007. The changes were further outlined and specified by IOM (CEFMR) in September 2007, in a circular letter to the co-ordinator and other teams. In general, it has been recognised that the model applied to migration forecasting (subject of activities within workpackage 6) would be stochastic and based on Bayesian statistical inference. Estimation of the model required both the posterior and prior knowledge, the former extracted from existing statistical registers of adequate contents and quality (subject of activities within workpackage 5), and the latter elicited from experts using two-round quasi-Delphi technique (subject of activities within workpackage 4). According to the original concept (as described in Annex I of the IDEA project), the model estimation was to be based entirely on statistical material derived from the registers whereas the expert knowledge or other information of qualitative nature were to serve the devising of various scenario-based variants of the forecasts. Such new structuring of the whole forecasting exercise led to postponement of the deadline for providing data input for the model by participating teams until early 2008, the time when the model was completed and type of requested data or length of time series were fixed. Consequently, it was decided to change the starting date of workpackage 4 from 20. month to 13. month, and of workpackage 6 from 16. month to 13. month. Also, end month for workpackage 5 was changed from 15. month to 25. month.

It follows from the above that those very changes made one of the objectives for the reporting period partly obsolete and premature, namely the requirement to provide input data for the model of future migration. It was decided that particular national teams would assist IOM (CEFMR) in the collection of necessary data throughout the year 2008.

Another problem with the implementation during the reporting period stemmed from the involvement of two teams in the research on immigration to France and a difficulty in co-ordinating their work. Initially the teams worked separately which did not guarantee a uniform and coherent final report on France. After the first consortium meeting, the discussion between the team leaders and the co-ordinator brought about a greater clarity concerning the expected contents of French study and the division of work among the two teams, which in the second half of 2007 led to a close collaboration between them. In effect, the French part of final report on the immigration in “old” destination countries and of policy oriented executive summary has become a joint product of the two teams.

In 2009 no problems in project implementation were reported by the coordinator or members of Coordinating Committee. Thus no deviations from the work programme occurred.

Section 2 – Workpackage progress of the period

2.1. Workpackage 1: Established countries of immigration in Europe - overview

2.1.1. Workpackage objectives

Workpackage 1 included the following objectives:

- To present the historical background to current migration trends in the countries of Western Europe of established immigration (France, Austria, Germany etc.) in a comparative perspective, focusing specifically on the political, social, economic and geographical factors that have caused structural changes in migration trends over the last 20 years, and drawing special attention to the turning point from net emigration to net immigration
- To present historical patterns of immigration in “old host countries” and explain how a “migration system” (a set of resource countries) develops;
- To define the role of migration policy in shaping legal and illegal migratory flows;
- To compare the development and effectiveness of migration policies (incl. integration programmes) in the countries of interest;
- To compare the institutional background and mechanisms of managing migratory flows;
- To investigate current migratory flows in “old host countries”;
- To assess the impact of the immigrants on the overall economic, social and political situation of the countries of interest;
- To provide input for the model of future migrations;
- To prepare a basis for structuring further research concerning Mediterranean and Eastern European countries.

Work related to all these objectives, except two, started immediately after the kick-off meeting, that is in 3. month of the project.

Work related to structuring research concerning MEDEEA countries started immediately after the first consortium meeting (June 2007).

Since the activities that did not started in the first year of the project were related to the input (data) for the model of future migration, the next year (2008) was partly devoted for those activities.

2.1.2. Progress towards objectives

All objectives have been fulfilled in the reporting period 2007-2009. Three teams, namely: UPX, CNRS and OEAW, were equally involved in the activities leading to implementation of those objectives, except the last two. Among major standard activities were: collecting data, reviewing literature and desktop research. In addition both French teams inquired into selected country-specific topics related to the objectives of workpackage 1. The UPX team focused on the impact of colonial past on present debates on migration policy in France and on development of ethnic entrepreneurship as a means of immigrant integration and perpetuation of foreigner inflow to France whereas the CNRS team became

involved in the study of circular migrants in French agriculture and their international networks. The coordinator was continuously engaged in overseeing activities of these teams and those activities consistency with the project methodology, in particular. The first consortium meeting (June 2007) discussed extensively various parts of the draft report elaborated by each team. Final reports were prepared on time and circulated among the participating teams in the middle of January 2008. Policy oriented executive summaries concerning the Austrian and French case accompanied those reports. Discussions during the second consortium meeting (on the 24-25th of January 2008) devoted to these reports and respective policy-oriented papers were highly approving of their contents and scientific standards. In opinion of the Coordinating Committee (meeting of the 24th of January 2008) the objectives ascribed to the three teams within the framework of workpackage 1 have been fully accomplished.

The one activity which was an exception to the timetable (“providing input for the model of future migrations”) started in 2008 (not in 2007), just after the methodology of gathering data needed for the model of future scenarios was presented. Both French and Austrian teams participated in the Delphi based research, which required consulting the research tool, contacting experts and assistance in the data gathering and preliminary elaboration.

The last of the above mentioned objectives („preparing a basis for structuring further research concerning Mediterranean and Eastern European countries”) involved all 11 teams. A leading role was assumed by WU. The substance of relevant activities was first of all working out a common methodology of the project based on the outline presented in Annex I. Initial document prepared by WU was then assessed by two teams: IUIOG and OEAW, and discussed by the Coordinating Committee during the kick-off meeting. Based on that discussion a final draft of IDEA methodological guidelines was presented by WU and circulated among the participating teams before the first consortium meeting. A special session of the meeting was devoted to the discussion on that paper. One of outcomes of the discussion was a decision to prepare a special document extending on the issue of conceptual foundations of the project. The document was to serve as a basis for a common analytical framework of all teams from MEDEEA countries. A relevant paper was drafted by IUIOG (Joaquin Arango) in October 2007. Three teams (UPX, ELIAMEP and UW) offered their written critical comments. Along this line of IDEA activities, in December 2007 WU (Marek Okólski) produced a document extending the contents and perspective of common analytical framework in such way as to better account for reality of Eastern European countries (“potential” immigration countries). The three documents and respective written assessments/comments constitute a complete albeit rather flexible basis for structuring research activities concerning MEDEEA countries.

Moreover, in 2008 the OEAW team prepared a synthesis report for “old” immigration countries. Not only Austria and France were compared within the framework of these comparative analysis, but also Germany and the UK were taken into consideration in order to test conceptual framework of the IDEA. The crucial question was the applicability of the migration cycle concept and the main drivers behind it. The synthesis report was presented and discussed at the IDEA-meeting in Prague in September 2008.

The last half of the year in 2009 was devoted to the preparation of a final version of the synthesis paper that was presented during the Final Conference, and to the dissemination activities of the results of analyses carried out in Austria and France, and presented at various seminars in countries involved in the project.

2.1.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

The only deviation from the workprogramme was a postponement by Austrian and French teams of collection of the data suitable for (required by) the model of future migration. The reason was an initial error in the project timetable, the fact that construction of the model was originally planned after 16. month of the project while delivery of data for the model before 12. month. The consortium realised that it did not make sense to produce empirical input for still unspecified model and took an appropriate corrective action. It was decided the Austrian and French teams would collaborate in securing an adequate empirical input for the model of future migration throughout the year 2008. Due to the unsatisfactory data the French case was not taken into account in the process of providing data for the model of future migration. However, the French team (UPX) partly took part in the forecasting exercise through staying in contact with experts and exchanging information with workpackage 4 coordinators.

2.1.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Work-package no.	Date due	Actual/ Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
1.1.	Report on the immigration in established immigration countries	1	January 2008	January 2008			UPX, CNRS, OEAW
1.2.	Policy oriented executive summary	1	January 2008	January 2008			UPX, CNRS, OEAW
1.3.	Input for a projection model including trends, characteristics and determinants of migration	1	January 2008	January 2009			UPX, CNRS, OEAW
1.4.	Methodological guidelines of the project	1	January 2008	January 2008			WU

*) if available

2.1.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
1.1.	Decision on methodology of the project and specific aspects to be investigated within the workpackage	1	June 2007	June 2007	WU
1.2.	Decision on the structure of further parts of the project (WP2, WP3) to be taken during meeting summarising research within this workpackage	1	June 2007	June 2007	WU

2.2. Workpackage 2: Mediterranean countries as new immigration destinations

2.2.1. Workpackage objectives

Workpackage 2 included the following objectives:

- To present the historical background to increasingly diverse current migration trends in the countries of Mediterranean drawing special attention to the turning point from net emigration to net immigration;
- To present historical patterns of immigration in Mediterranean countries and development of “migration systems”;
- To assess the role of migration policy in shaping legal and illegal migratory flows in Mediterranean countries;
- To compare the institutional background and mechanisms of managing migratory flows;
- To investigate current migratory flows to Mediterranean countries and identify factors that influenced overall trend evolution in each country;
- To assess the impact of the immigrants on the overall economic, social and political situation of the countries of interest;
- To provide input for the model of future migrations.

Work related to all these objectives but the last one has started shortly after the kick-off meeting and continued throughout the year 2007 and then in the first half of 2008, when also the work that was to provide input (data) for the model of future migration started.

2.2.2. Progress towards objectives

Four teams were involved in the implementation of objectives of the workpackage 2 representing Southern European countries (“new” destinations): Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. Their work has been structured on the basis of common IDEA methodology and analytical framework developed within the workpackage 1.

Accordingly, all teams took a similar course of research activities. They started their research from devising a detailed research plan, which was followed by data collection, a review of the literature concerning historical developments of immigration and migration policy, and screening relevant legal acts. Then the desktop research took place focusing on the characteristics of flows and stocks of immigrants, methods of dealing with immigration by policy makers and institutional structures, effectiveness of migration policy, and causes and effects of recent migration trends. One of the tasks common for the four teams was grasping major characteristics of emerging migration system in the respective countries which would enable a comparative analysis of similarities and differences observed in the group of “new” European host countries. Next step in the research activities included a series of in-depth interviews with the main actors, such as policy makers, representatives of migrant associations, trade unionists, local administrators or labour inspectors. The interviews solidified the results of analyses based on various data of secondary nature and they shed more light on those aspects of migrant inflow and functioning in destination countries, and of migration policy where available data proved insufficient.

Work plan and some preliminary research results obtained by all four teams were presented and discussed during the first consortium meeting in the middle of 2007. By the end of 2007 the teams were ready with first draft of their final reports. The results of the above mentioned activities were presented in January 2008, during the second IDEA meeting in Athens, where the first drafts of final reports were thoroughly discussed. Despite their unfinished form, the reports were positively evaluated by discussants (including eight members of IDEA Advisory Committee). It was claimed that they contributed to better knowledge of the specificity of Southern European migration regime and consistently revealed a number of commonalities, especially a persistence of a sizeable illegal, irregular or undocumented immigration and a failure or ambivalence regarding control of that phenomenon by the state.

Discussions also facilitated the ways of arriving at a coherent final report submitted later in 2008. In August 2008 all the Mediterranean teams were ready with the policy oriented executive summaries for their countries. Those documents were commented in writing by the IDEA researchers before the meeting in Prague, in September 2008, and then thoroughly discussed during the meeting. The discussions greatly contributed to the improvement of final versions of the reports and policy oriented executive summaries. The group meeting as well as the exchange of ideas via email did also facilitate the preparation of the scheme of regional synthesis report, which was ready as a draft version in the very beginning of 2009.

The year 2008 was also spent on providing an input (data) for the model of future migration. In order to achieve this objective the research teams firstly discussed the availability of the data, the methodology of the forecasting exercise and then took part in the Delphi study at the national level. This required consultation of the tools, contacting experts, assessing the availability of the information needed for the model of future migration.

The final six months of the project in 2009 were devoted mainly to the dissemination activities of the results of the analysis in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain at various seminars

in countries involved in the project (see “Final plan for using and disseminating the knowledge”).

In addition, following a regional seminar (Lisbon, January 2009), a synthesis report summarising the outcomes of research pursued by the four national teams was improved and ultimately completed. It focused on cross-country comparisons regarding immigration patterns and development of migration policy in these four Southern European countries. A draft version of the report was ready in the very beginning of 2009 and the final version in April 2009. Conclusions drawn in this report allowed statements like that a Southern European model of immigration still exists, however needs updating – the model encompasses many similar traits, factors and outcomes, although specific contextual frameworks make a difference (e.g. the evolution of migration flows has been quite similar, demographic characteristics of immigrants in four countries were very similar and the labour market insertion of immigrants displayed many commonalities, migration policies present some similarities in terms of general evolution and objectives, but also many differences resulting from institutional contexts).

All in all, the tasks related to the workpackage 2 have been fully completed.

2.2.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

No deviations from the workprogramme occurred.

2.2.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/ Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
2.1.	Report on the immigration in Mediterranean countries	2	January 2009	August 2008			CNR ELIAMEP IUIOG SOCIUS
2.2.	Policy oriented executive summary	2	January 2009	August 2008			CNR ELIAMEP IUIOG SOCIUS
2.3.	Input for a projection model including trends, characteristics and determinants of migration	2	January 2009	January 2009			CNR ELIAMEP IUIOG SOCIUS

*) if available

2.2.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
2.1.	Decision whether WP3 should include additional elements that proved significant during WP2 – to be taken during meeting summarising this workpackage	2	January 2008	January 2008	WU

2.3. Workpackage 3: Eastern European countries as new immigration destinations

2.3.1. Workpackage objectives

Workpackage 3 includes the following objectives:

- To investigate whether the factors critical for migratory flows in Western and Southern Europe are also important for the countries of Central Eastern Europe;
- To assess which of the immigration policies adopted in the Western and Southern Europe could be implemented in Eastern Europe;
- To reconstruct the old immigration patterns in Eastern Europe in order to test the hypothesis, that patterns of immigration in new destination countries recall historical patterns in old immigration countries;
- To explain how a “migration system” (a set of resource countries) develops;
- To increase knowledge on current migratory flows in the CEE countries, with special emphasis put on the structure of the immigrants (identification of the main sending countries, analysis of the reasons of immigration and activities undertaken) and factors that influenced overall migration trend in each country;
- To assess the impact of the immigrants, both legal and illegal, on the overall economic, social and political situation in East European countries and the measures undertaken to deal with these issues in different countries;
- To analyse structures and policies in place to deal with immigration (including the institutional arrangements, administrative capacity, legislative and policy frameworks);
- To provide input for the model of future migrations.

Work related to some of these objectives (e.g. investigation of importance for “potential” host countries of main factors of immigration in “old” and “new” destination countries) started shortly after the first consortium meeting. Activities addressing other objectives were initiated gradually towards the end of 2007.

The year 2008 was fully devoted to activities aimed at achieving the objectives mentioned above. All the research teams representing CEE countries focused on completing the national analysis of immigration realities and policies as well as initiated discussions over policy recommendations.

2.3.2. Progress towards objectives

According to IDEA timetable, this workpackage was to start in 13. month of the project after learning enough from the case of Western European and Mediterranean countries. It was originally assumed that before that date only “soft” preparatory research activities should be pursued. However, already during the second consortium meeting it became clear for all three East European teams (WU, UKP and MTA) that any further delay was unwarranted. By then personnel of the three teams was recruited and trained with regard to project objectives and methodology, IDEA analytical framework was thoroughly discussed, team-specific research plans were developed and structured according to the profile adopted in case of “old” and “new” immigration countries. In effect, research work of all three teams was launched in the middle of 2007, six months in advance and intensively continued throughout the year 2008.

The teams started their activities from devising a detailed research plan. Then they engaged in making data inventory, review of the literature and policy or legal acts screening. Related desktop research has been considerably advanced. In addition, in autumn 2007 UKP team became involved in a field work related to a survey of illegal immigrants in 13 selected Prague zones.

Major conceptual problem in front of teams representing CEE countries was related to a short duration of immigration experience of their home countries and fragility or uncertainty of a claim that the inflow of foreigners to these countries has become a lasting structural phenomenon.

In coping with this problem the teams made an attempt to overcome the visible difficulties in comparing the migration status transition among the countries investigated within the IDEA project. One of the concepts discussed by the project leaders from CEE countries related to the possibility of focusing the analysis on the role of capital cities in attracting migrants and facilitating transition of migration status in the whole country. There were intensive e-mail discussions concerning the way that CEE involved in the IDEA project could be compared as far as their “maturity” according to the concept of migration cycle is concerned. As it was expected from almost the very beginning of the project migration realities in the CEE countries differed significantly from one another, which made the simple comparisons impossible. That is why the discussions over the possibility of further comparisons had to be initiated just around the phase of preparing firstly the draft, and then the final reports for these countries. Accordingly to the timetable of the IDEA project the draft versions of the national reports were prepared by the research teams representing the CEE countries during the project interim meeting in Prague (the 3-5th of September 2008). The final reports for Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland were submitted in December 2008 and circulated among the IDEA research teams from the three groups of countries. The final versions of the reports served also as basis for creating a model of further regional synthesis report. At the time of writing this periodic report the discussions over it constitute one of the priorities.

A number of discussion papers have been prepared and presented to a series of team workshops (and to a WU/CMR seminar held in September 2007, attended by some 40

migration specialists). The final outcome of those investigations became a position paper entitled *On the transformation of migration status among European countries*, which now belongs to a set of documents that constitute the IDEA methodology (deliverable 1.4). Topics of special interest discussed within the Czech and Hungarian teams were attitudes towards immigrants (e.g. xenophobia and racism in the Czech Republic) on the part of “inexperienced” host society and effects of high incidence of irregular migration on the course of immigration.

In order to complete the task related to presentation of the final reports, the teams continued their activities aimed at gathering different kinds of data, among other through the analysis of the statistics, review of the literature and policy or legal acts screening. Related desktop research has been considerably advanced. The studies on literature or existing data, including the statistical ones, were accompanied by some empirical studies. These were mainly in-depth interviews with experts. However, other empirical data gathered through activities in other research projects conducted by IDEA researchers were also reflected in the analysis for the IDEA project. For instance, the Czech team based some parts of their analysis on the information obtained, among others, within the framework of the project “International migration and migrants' illegal economic activities in the Czech Republic in a broader European context”, while the Polish team referred often to empirical data gathered during the realisation, among other, of the project “Migration Policy and the Labour Market”, involving lots of different studies related to the issue of labour migration and the role of immigrants on the labour market in Poland, access to the labour market as well as migrants' economic integration.

At the end of 2008 all three teams have prepared their final reports, which were circulated among the IDEA research teams from the three groups of countries. The final versions of the reports served also as basis for creating a model of further regional synthesis report. After a series of comments, the national reports of CEE countries were revised and edited in order to be published as IDEA Working Papers in May 2009. The third year of the project duration was devoted to the dissemination activities of the results of the research (see the proper part below) conducted in the CEE countries.

In order to facilitate work on the comparative analysis a regional workshop for research teams from CEE countries was organised in Budapest, in February 2009. During the meeting the research teams from CEE countries worked out a detailed outline of the synthesis report and divided responsibilities for particular tasks. In the aftermath of the Budapest workshop the synthesis report concerning CEE countries was commented in details in an interactive way by researchers representing the three teams. Particular immigration trends were compared and discussed in order to work out a unite cohesive and comprehensive analytical procedure. Afterwards, an improved and revised version of the report was prepared and it was further amended by national teams. Finally, the advanced version of “Report on immigration to Eastern Europe” was prepared in June 2009. The regional synthesis report revealed that there were clear differences among the three countries. While Poland displayed a continuous excess of labour supply, the situation in the Czech lands was just the opposite (with Hungary being somewhere in-between). However, in all three countries migrants seem to complement (not substitute) the domestic labour, which can be result of still low shares of immigrants' populations. There are symptoms that the more migrants are in the labour market, the more they substitute domestic labour.

The policy oriented executive summaries for all the CEE countries involved in the IDEA project were submitted in January 2009 and circulated among all teams. They revealed the work that should be still done in these CEE countries in order to recognise their migration

regimes as based on the reliable and systematically gathered data, concepts agreed upon by the competent decision makers.

All in all, the tasks related to the workpackage 3 have been fully completed.

2.3.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

A major and the only deviation from the project workprogramme has been a change in timetable of this workpackage, namely moving its start date from 13. month to 6. or 7. month. Such a change allowed for completing the tasks of the workpackage 3 in time.

Although deliverable no. 3.1 “Report on immigration to Eastern Europe” was submitted in January 2009 (25th month of the project), in subsequent months it was revisited and improved and delivered one more time in June 2009 (30th month).

2.3.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/ Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
3.1.	Report on the immigration in Eastern European	3	January 2009	January 2009			WU UKP MTA
3.2.	Policy oriented executive summary	3	January 2009	January 2009			WU UKP MTA
3.3.	Input for a projection model including trends, characteristics and determinants of migration.	3	January 2009	January 2009			WU UKP MTA

*) if available

2.3.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
3.1.	Assessment of the results of cross-European comparison to be carried out during the meeting summarising the results of WP3.	3	September 2009	September 2009	WU UKP MTA

2.4. Workpackage 4: Qualitative scenarios for MEDEEA countries

2.4.1. Workpackage objective

The workpackage objectives are as follows;

- To set up scenarios of the development of migration processes in MEDEEA countries;
- To prepare scientific basis for the preparation of future migration policies;
- To define qualitative assumptions for forecasts of the most important migratory flows concerning the MEDEEA countries and to quantify these assumptions.

2.4.2. Progress towards objectives

In the reporting period many sources of information, namely collective knowledge of researchers, experience of policymakers and project findings, were conversed into informed, policy relevant vision of the future. Simultaneously with the development of the qualitative scenarios experts were asked about their feeling how these scenarios would convert into quantitative indicators, such as emigration rates or immigration ratios. In order to complete the tasks included in this workpackage the Delphi method was used by the project teams in different countries. Quasi-Delphi study involved two rounds. The questionnaire was prepared by the IOM (CEFMR) team and after the CMR (WU) comments it was revised and translated into the national languages. The national teams indicated experts and stayed in contact with them in order to obtain the completed questionnaires. The preliminary analysis was conducted by the CMR researchers, however the leadership in this part of the project was assigned to the CEFMR team, who were responsible for the forecasting exercise in all.

Setting up scenarios of the development of future migration processes was based on the various qualitative heuristic techniques. The basis for the predictions were data received within workpackages 1–3 and experience and knowledge of the researchers and policymakers both included in the project, and those invited to take part in this phase of the project, namely the experts having background in demography, economy, political sciences.

To sum up, a set of qualitative scenarios and assumptions on migration flows concerning MEDEEA countries were prepared in 2008, and the report was delivered in January 2009.

2.4.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

As reported for the year 2008, the Coordinating Committee decided to make the activities and tasks expected within workpackage 4 an integral part of IDEA forecasting exercise. Thus qualitative scenarios developed within the workpackage 4 have not been analysed autonomously but rather they became an input to forecasting model dealt with within the workpackage 6. Otherwise no deviations occurred.

2.4.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
4.1.	A set of qualitative scenarios and quantitative assumptions on migration flows concerning MEDEEA countries	4	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR), WU (assisted by other national teams)
4.2.	Policy oriented executive summary	4	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR), WU (assisted by other national teams)

2.4.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
4.1.	Decision on the methodology of setting up qualitative scenarios of the development of migration processes in MEDEEA countries	4	January 2009	January 2009	IOM (CEFMR), WU (assisted by other national teams)

2.4. Workpackage 5: Collection of data for quantitative model

2.5.1. Workpackage objectives:

Workpackage 5 includes just one objective:

1) To collect available data on stocks of migrants, inflows, outflows, stocks of population and natural change.

Work on this started in the 7. month of the project, shortly after the first consortium meeting.

2.5.2. Progress towards objectives

It was IOM (CEFMR) team who was responsible for the realization of this task. Work on this started in the 7. month of the project, shortly after the first consortium meeting. However, the majority of the collection of the data relevant for the forecasting began in the 16. month of the project.

The database of the data on total immigration flows, inflows from main geographical sources of immigrants and demographic and economic variables used for modelling purposes in the Work Package 6, was build. Most data were collected from the Eurostat database, from United Nations Statistics Division and World Bank's World Development Indicators but other sources have also been used (National Statistical Institutes, Council of Europe's Demographic Yearbooks). The task required also the assistance of the other national IDEA teams. The data have been collected for eight IDEA countries (except for Greece, for which no data were available).

It was noted that the existence and availability of historical data may limit the scope of forecasting. For some countries, especially Greece and France, there was no data published by Eurostat, other international organization and national statistical offices, allowing for forecasting immigration. IOM (CEFMR) further investigated together with national teams if there are any other sources of data which could be used. It was decided that if data turned out not to be available for a certain country, forecast would not be conducted for that country.

The outcome of the preceding research concerning the data issues (availability, quality and comparability) was summarised in the CEFMR Position Paper: *Quantitative Data, Forecasting Methodology and quasi-Delphi Knowledge Elicitation for Forecasts of Immigration to Eight European Countries in the IDEA Project* (presented during the second IDEA meeting in Athens; final version available on 10 April 2008). Around the time of the second IDEA meeting in January 2008, when the paper was circulated among the project partners, consensus has been reached regarding the type of flow considered as dependent variable, the time series of necessary data set for each country, and nature (and number) of sending countries explicitly distinguished in the IDEA database. As a result of the discussion, a decision was taken to use as an additional data source – a quasi-Delphi survey among migration experts in IDEA countries (subject of activities within workpackage 4).

The data issues, the database itself and meta-data for it were presented in the Final Report on Work Package 5, constituting deliverable D 5.2 (*Migration, demographic and economic data for IDEA countries*), that was delivered in January 2009.

2.5.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

Except that no input in 2007 from UPX, CNRS and OEAW teams was received, no deviations from the workprogramme took place.

The process of data collection was made longer and in fact started later, in 16. month of the project. Nevertheless, the tasks related to this workpackage were completed in time.

2.5.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
5.1.	Demographic database for MEDEEA countries and main source/destination countries for migrants from/to MEDEEA countries	5	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR)
5.2.	Final report on WP5	5	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR)

*) if available

2.5.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
5.1.	Demographic database for MEDEEA countries and main source/destination countries for migrants from/to MEDEEA countries	5	March 2008	March 2008	IOM (CEFMR)

2.6. Workpackage 6: Model of migration and quantitative scenarios

2.6.1. Workpackage objectives

Workpackage 6 includes two objectives:

- To construct a model of migration flows;
- To prepare a set of quantitative predictions of migratory flows to and from IDEA countries.

2.6.2. Progress towards objectives

The work on WP6 started in the 13. month of the project, thus earlier than it was planned previously (16 month). It was due to the need of proper processing of the collected data. The outcome of the task comprised Deliverables D6.1 (*Forecasting model specification for selected immigration flows to IDEA countries for 2005–2025*), D6.2 (*A set of forecasts for selected immigration flows to seven IDEA countries for 2005–2025*) and D6.3 (*Forecasting of immigration flows until 2025 for selected European countries using expert information*).

The methodology and the Delphi survey were described in the CEFMR Position Paper: *Quantitative Data, Forecasting Methodology and quasi-Delphi Knowledge Elicitation for Forecasts of Immigration to Eight European Countries in the IDEA Project* (final version available on 10 April 2008).

The study comprised of:

- modelling and forecasting gross total immigration,
- modelling and forecasting inflows from up to the three most important directions,
- assessment of the impact of economic and demographic variables on immigration flows and conditional forecasting of these flows, using the data collected in the WP5.

The adopted perspective was Bayesian, allowing for the incorporation of the subjective expert knowledge. The expert knowledge was obtained by means of the Delphi survey. It was prepared with the assistance of the CMR and other IDEA national teams. The results of the two rounds of the survey, carried out by the CMR, were elicited and quantified, and then incorporated into the models, in order to produce forecasts. The specification of the models employed for the task comprise the Deliverable D6.1, that was sent on the 31st of December 2008.

The forecasts of immigration flows, that include the characteristics of the posterior predictive distributions (medians and quantiles) as well as the results of the assessment of the impact of the economic and demographic variables on the immigration inflows were prepared. The Final Report on workpackage 6 (Deliverable D6.3), summarising the literature review, modelling and forecasting methodology, as well as the results of the tasks carried out within the D6.1 and D6.2, was prepared and its final version was sent by the end of January 2009.

All in all, the tasks related to the workpackage 6 have been fully completed.

2.6.3. Deviations from the project workprogramme and corrective actions taken/suggested

Work on the model creation started earlier than it was planned in the IDEA workprogramme. It was due to the need of making the process of data collection, accompanied by another form of research (based on Delphi method), more comprehensible.

2.6.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/ Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
6.1.	1 Forecasting model specification based on the result of the other packages and review of literature together with a data set needed for modelling (migration, demographic, economic and other relevant variables)	6	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR)
6.2.	A set of forecasts for the selected migration flows between the countries under study for 2005–2025, including both the central (most likely) variant, as well as the uncertainty span (confidence/credible intervals)	6	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR)
6.3	Final Report on WP6	6	January 2009	January 2009			IOM (CEFMR)

*) if available

2.6.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
6.1.	Selection of the menu of potential explanatory variables for the preliminary forecasting models and selection of the statistical framework, within which the models will be estimated (classical/Bayesian)	6	January 2009	January 2009	IOM (CEFMR)
6.2	Decision as to how to incorporate the results of WPs 1–5 into the forecasting model as formal model assumptions, taking into consideration which of them can be operationalised in a quantitative manner, and how.	6	January 2009	January 2009	IOM (CEFMR)
6.3	Selection of the final model to use in forecasting of migration flows, related to making a decision on whether to use formal selection criteria and/or formal model averaging techniques.	6	January 2009	January 2009	IOM (CEFMR)

2.7. Workpackage 7: Policy recommendations based on migration forecasts

2.7.1. Workpackage objectives

Workpackage 7 included two objectives:

- To provide policy recommendations based on the qualitative and quantitative migration forecasts and on the results of analysis of past and current
- To present policy recommendations and other results of the research during the Final Conference in Poland migration flows

2.7.2. Progress towards objectives



Policy recommendations were provided in a comprehensive document "IDEA Policy Oriented Executive Summary". The document was prepared by CMR team and presented during IDEA Final Conference in Cracow, on the 3rd – 5th of June 2009. The document contains a list of questions each country has to answer in order to develop flexible and mature migration policy. The key question was what the countries, being at different stages of development, could learn from each other, and by this in which way they can improve their migration policy. In general, mature migration policy – to be

effective – requires legitimisation through social consensus and public support. Immigration should be a subject of a broad debate, involving only representatives of administration, scholars and experts, but also a wide range of social actors and the media.

IDEA Final Conference

The Final Conference summarised two-and-a-half-year research work carried out under the guidance of CMR UW. All the scientific challenges and results of the project were presented and discussed by the distinguished guests during the Final Conference, which took place on the 3rd-5th of June 2009 in Cracow, at Jagiellonian University Centre in Przegorzaly. The conference gathered nearly 80 participants from different countries and representatives of various scientific, governmental and non-governmental bodies. The scholarly level of scientific discussions following each session of the conference was very high, and the conference occurred to be a great opportunity for exchange of ideas, comments and suggestions for further research.

The first session was devoted to "Patterns of immigration in the "old" immigration countries" with Heinz Fassmann, University of Vienna, Austrian Academy of Science, as a speaker and Godfried Engbersen, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands – as a discussant. There was discussed whether the model of immigration transformation based on "old" immigration countries' experiences is relevant to analyse migration history in other "old" immigration countries that were not put under investigation in the project

The second session concerned "Patterns of immigration in the "new" immigration countries". João Peixoto, Centro de Investigacao em Sociologia Economica e das Organizacoes, Portugal, was a speaker and the role of a discussant was assumed by Ferruccio Pastore, Forum Internazionale ed Europeo di Ricerche sull'Immigrazione (FIERI), Italy. The main focus of the discussion was the deliberation concerning differentiation between the Southern European and transferability of the lessons to other countries, e.g. the Central and Eastern European countries.



The third session was dealing with “Patterns of immigration in the “future” immigration countries”. Dušan Drbohlav from Charles University in Prague in the Czech Republic was a speaker and a discussant of that paper was Sophie Nonnenmacher, International Organization for Migration. Both presentations concluded that in all the CEE countries a clear migration policy doctrine together with stimulated migration debate among stakeholders should be created. The issues could be learnt from the older immigration countries.

In the forth session “Patterns of immigration and immigration regimes in Europe: historical, regional, structural” Joaquin Arango, Instituto Universitario de Investigación Ortega y Gasset, Spain and Jorge Malheiros, University of Lisbon, Portugal were discussing whether the three groups of countries examined could be seen as being at three various stages of migration cycle only, or maybe additionally as migration systems regarding the type and nature of migration that has developed into a specific international migration regime.



At the fifth session titled „Immigration prospects/possible futures" Arkadiusz Wiśniowski and his co-authors from CEFMR, Poland and their discussant: Leo van Wissen, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, Population Research Centre, University Groningen, the Netherlands, debated the uncertainty related to migration forecasting and stemming from quality of used data.

The final, sixth session was devoted to “Policy recommendations” and included a paper by Magdalena Lesinska (CMR, Poland) and comprehensive comments by Theodora Kostakopoulou (School of Law, University of Liverpool, the United Kingdom). Although patterns of immigration in the Western, Southern and Eastern Europe are hardly comparable in a direct way, it was argued, all the countries experience similar challenges and face the same dilemmas related to controlling, managing and integration of immigrants. They all have to answer three main questions constituting the pillars of migration policy: 1) How to manage labour migration?, 2) How to tackle irregular immigration?, 3) How to solve the eternal problem of integration?



Proceedings of the conference, containing conference minutes and all conference papers and other presentations, were delivered in June 2009 (deliverable D 7.1).

Major findings from the project analyses were delivered in June 2009 as a book manuscript (deliverable D 7.2). However, the manuscript is under further elaboration and soon will be submitted to a renowned publisher as a book proposal. Moreover, Southern countries synthesis report and Central-Eastern Europe synthesis reports were improved by the authors and will be published as a book soon (the second one has been already submitted to

the publisher). Similarly, a number of books based on the national teams' reports will be produced, for example in Poland ("Immigration to Poland: policy, labour market, integration"), Hungary ("Immigration countries in Central and Eastern Europe. The Case of Hungary"), Czech Republic ("The Czech Republic: on its way from emigration to immigration country") and Italy ("The Italian transition from an emigration to immigration country").

2.7.3. Deviations from the project work programme and corrective actions taken/suggested

No deviations from the work programme occurred.

2.7.4. List of deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor
7.1.	Book manuscript	7	June 2009	June 2009			WU
7.2.	Proceedings of the conference	7	June 2009	June 2009			WU

*) if available

2.7.5. List of milestones

Milestone no.	Milestone name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Lead contractor
7.1.	Assessment of the results of the project during the Final Conference	7	June 2009	June 2009	WU

Section 3 - Consortium management

In the period from the 1st of January 2007 to 30th of June 2009 the Consortium management activities encompassed five main tasks specified in WP8 and WP9 (Annex I, pp. 39-40) .

Quality control

The tasks foreseen in WP 8 included:

- Quality control by the Advisory Committee;
- Quality reviews and assessments by the partners.

Quality control by the Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee (AC) to the project observed one personal change in its structure in 2008. In February Prof. Endre Sik from the ELTE University, Department of Minority Studies resigned from his participation in the project's advisory body. Parallel to Prof. Sik's resignation, the coordinator received a proposal from the Austrian team leader, who suggested Mrs. Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman from the Vienna branch of IOM (involved in the project on informal terms since the end of 2007) join the group of 15 AC experts in a more formalised way. The proposal was welcome with the coordinator's approval, the more so Mrs. Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman proved to be highly responsive to a number of issues raised by the participants of the 2nd IDEA interim meeting in Athens, that took place 24-25 January 2007.

Particular members of the Advisory Committee contributed to the following activities during the project implementation:

a) advising and passing recommendations related to coordination and scientific issues,

AC members actively took part in Coordinating Committee meetings (four meetings altogether in 2007-2009), each of them attended two of such a meetings. During the meetings they took very active and stimulating part in the discussions concerning management issues, advised on dissemination activities, for example proposed new means or initiatives where IDEA results could be promoted. AC members played an important role in scientific debates during consecutive IDEA seminars and the Final Conference; their critical views and vast practical and academic experience were highly appreciated by the participating teams of researchers.

During the 2nd IDEa meeting in Athens, one has to note down the presence (and active participation) of eight AC members, in alphabetical order: Constantinos Fotakis (EC), Antigone Lyberaki (Greece), Irina Pribytkova (Ukraine), Catarina Reis Oliveira (Portugal), Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman (Austria), Miodrag Shrestha (Serbia), Endre Sik (Hungary), Lucie Sladkova (Czech Republic). All of them provided immediate and inspiring feedback to presentations devoted to French and Austrian final reports, to preliminary versions of the Mediterranean reports as well as to three presentations made by CEFMR team.

The consultative role of AC took concrete and solid shape also during the third project meeting organised by the Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague, 3-5 September 2008. There turned up six experts who, in majority of cases, due to tight schedules had no possibility to voice their opinions in joint discussions at the previous project meetings in Sterdyn or Athens. These were, in alphabetical order: G.C. Blangiardo (Italy), Daniel Kozak

(Romania), Piotr Mierecki (Poland), Audra Sipaviciene, (Lithuania), Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman (Austria), Lucie Sladkova (Czech Republic). Their contributions made during the regular sessions and at the closed Coordinating Committee meeting enabled the team leaders to collect a number of practical recommendations, some of which were to be applied in subsequent versions of country reports and policy-oriented executive summaries. The exchange of views between IDEA teams and practitioners - AC members proved so promising both in Athens and Prague that the Coordinating Committee (CC) decided to ask the most active IDEA consultants to prepare written evaluations of all documents (with exception to CEFMR prognostic papers) discussed until late summer 2008 among the project's participants.

The presence of the Advisory Committee members during the Final Conference in Cracow allowed for enriching the level and merits of the scientific discussions, drawing conclusions upon the findings of the IDEA project. AC members contributed to these discussions suggesting further research steps, possibility of extrapolating some of the research findings. The presence of advisors from the countries not involved in the IDEA project (Croatia, Serbia, Romania and Ukraine) occurred to be extremely valuable in this sense. The mentioned AC members having the perspective "from outside" greatly contributed to discussions on immigration experiences of the three groups of countries analysed in the IDEA project. Moreover, AC members from non-EU countries could enrich the discussions indicating the differences in the area of migration policies.

b) participating in the process of assessment of scientific outputs of the project,

AC members were analysing and assessing a large number of the IDEA products. A few days after the Prague workshop six AC members received coordinator's proposal to offer critical assessments of particular deliverables. As a result, consultative tasks were divided as follows:

- evaluation of Greek policy-oriented executive summary – Daniel Kozak (Romania);
- evaluation of Spanish policy-oriented executive summary – Daniel Kozak (Romania)
- evaluation of Portuguese policy-oriented executive summary – Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman (Austria);
- evaluation of Italian policy-oriented executive summary – Lucie Sladkova (Czech Republic);
- evaluation of Czech country report – Piotr Mierecki (Poland);
- evaluation of Hungarian country report – Daniel Kozak (Romania);
- evaluation of Polish country report – Audra Sipaviciene (Lithuania).

Critical remarks expressed in a form of a few-page evaluation papers were collected by the coordinator's office and immediately forwarded to all interested teams.

c) spontaneous remarks, opinions and information

AC members were providing the Coordinator with additional materials enriching the analyses within IDEA project. For instance, Professor Irina Pribytkova provided the teams with papers highlighting the perspective of source country (Ukraine) in the context of IDEA, which could be used as a background information while working on the final reports in the IDEA project. The AC member from Romania, Mr Daniel Kozak was very active in

providing the Coordinator with different information on migration-related events and studies. For instance, he regularly passed the information on migration regimes towards Romanians in the European countries analysed within the IDEA project, especially in the Mediterranean ones. Similar activity was noted on the part of the Serbian AC member Miodrag Shresta.

d) collaboration at the national level

Apart from the participation in two project's meetings and preparing critical overviews of the above-referred IDEA deliverables, the majority of AC members were in touch with the team leaders, serving them with practical advice on the policy-oriented issues the researchers were touching upon in the subsequent drafts of their reports and executive summaries. Some AC members were also involved in email discussions with the coordinator on IDEA dissemination strategies. On this occasion one has to mention three persons who would spontaneously offer concrete suggestions and propose to use channels of communication that were already proven in practice in their professional work. These were Brigitte Schuetz-Zimmerman (Austria), Irina Pribytkova (Ukraine) and Daniel Kozak (Romania).

The majority of the AC members participated in the dissemination activities, either as speakers during seminars or conferences or as discussants. For instance, during the roundtable dedicated to presentation of the IDEA project findings in Italy, the AC member coming from Italy, Prof. Gian Carlo Blangiardo, University of Milano – Bicocca participated as a speaker. He also actively participated in consulting different steps of the project with the Italian research team. Czech team in collaboration with IOM Prague office represented by the AC member Mrs. Lucie Sladkova involved in joint organisation of the roundtable in June 2009.

AC members were also consulting the project findings or project activities on request of the Coordinator or national research team leaders. There can be given an example of the AC member coming from Portugal, Catarina Reis-Oliveira, heavily contributed to completion of the project tasks by the Portuguese partner (SOCIUS). She delivered useful recommendations to Portuguese report as well as actively participated in the final dissemination activities (conference in Lisbon). Portuguese team was sincerely satisfied with the collaboration as shows the quotation below:

AC members made useful suggestions for the project. The contact between the Portuguese team and the AC Portuguese member has been frequent and the AC member gave valuable recommendations for the preparation of the final Portuguese report. Furthermore, the Portuguese team prepared the International Conference on "Immigration Policy in Southern Europe" in close partnership with the AC Portuguese member, which belongs to ACIDI (one of the co-organizing entities) (SOCIUS, Portugal).

The Polish member of the Advisory Committee contributed to the organization of two important dissemination activities, namely conferences (in 2008 and 2009) for target audience at the Ministry of Interior and Administration in Poland. Mr. Piotr Mierecki did also willingly consult particular issues studied in the project and facilitated very valuable contacts with experts competent in creating and evaluating migration policy.

To sum up, Advisory Committee's input in the IDEA project was invaluable and deeply appreciated by all the IDEA researchers as well as by the Coordinator. It turned out to be also very inspiring, since the majority of the AC members willingly contributed at every phase of the project duration to increasing the scientific value of the results and propose new ideas for further analysis.

Quality reviews and assessments by the partners

During the project implementation the quality assessment by the Coordinating Committee members was realised by means of assessment notes in which IDEA teams were requested to describe every six months the project state-of-the-art: how the goals of their part of the project were realised as well as what is their opinion about the way the project progresses and whether it should be improved.

In the first half of 2008 none of the partners expressed significant concerns as to the progress of their parts of the project. The only concern on a team level was signalled by the Czech team leader, who stressed the necessity to rely not only on secondary sources (as it was initially planned in the project) but also on results of own research activities that were to compensate the lack of the empirical findings or a hampered access to the studies results. The problem was overcome by the initiation of extra research work on geographical distribution of foreigners (on the example of a capital city of Prague) and the estimation of the number of irregularly residing immigrants in Prague, making thus the research endeavour more demanding than previously expected on the one hand, but more promising in terms of unique results on the other.

Two concerns on a project level were voiced by the Hungarian and the French team leader. The MTA team leader seemed to be worried by sudden communication silence over project's methodological issues that fell after lengthy discussions during the meeting in Athens. The French team leader, on the other hand, concentrated on the prognostic part of the project that, according to her, was not addressed in a satisfactory manner neither by the coordinator nor by CEFMR team. These are some excerpts from the French quality assessment form:

I have no idea how successful the forecasting is. There is no feedback so far and I assume it will be known in Prague. I attempted at one point to discuss the use of the statistics and offered to distribute an interesting text by a famous French scholar on the issue. Two partners reacted and asked me to send them the text, which I did.

As I already said I expected a different method to apply with the key experts as we usually do in key expert interviews. And once this method has been composed, I expected some discussion on the formulation of questions and the purpose of the exercise as well as the objectives it is supposed to fulfil.

In the second half of 2008 the overall project progress was assessed as satisfactory or very satisfactory by all IDEA partners. Also on a team level one could read positive comments that would stress the sense of a well accomplished piece of work:

In the second half of 2008, the Austrian team reached an important goal: a synthesis report for the old immigration countries, which was presented in September in Prague. In order to get a deeper insight, we decided not only to include Austria and France, but also some other European countries (OEAW, Austria).

The goals of our part of the project have been realised. The Italian report has been finalised and comments on it were positive. Our team has conducted a quasi-Delphi study, with very satisfactory results (only one no-reply). (CNR, Italy)

Generally, no serious difficulties that could potentially hamper the project realisation in its final six-month period were voiced. On the contrary, most team leaders commented very positively on intra-team communication during the last four months of the year, the usefulness of the September meeting in Prague as well as coordinator's attempts to prepare solid basis

for drafting two synthesis reports – the one that would refer to the Mediterranean region, and the other describing similarities and differences in migratory situation in Eastern European countries.

In 2009 the quality assessment by the Coordinating Committee members was realised by means of special assessment forms in which IDEA teams were requested to describe opinion on the implementation of general goals of the project (how the goals of their part of the project were realised as well as what is their opinion about the way the project progresses and whether it should be improved), review on research and dissemination activities, impact on target audience, collaboration with CC and AC members, as well as opinion on quality of coordination.

In general, the Coordinating Committee found cooperation within the IDEA project very satisfactory and fruitful. Although the goals set by IDEA were very challenging, well-coordinated common activities contributed to a successful realisation of the project.

All the scientific goals set within the IDEA project were fully achieved. The research teams benefited from regional meetings dedicated to discussion the contents, structure and merits of the regional synthesis reports. In general, they were also very satisfied with coordination. The majority of the project partners assessed coordination positively, considered it satisfactory. With the exception of the Hungarian team (MTA), who found some weak points in coordination and administration of the project in the final phase, as *the preparatory work for the conference in Krakow could have been much better*, but finally *the scientific part of the meeting was very good* (MTA, Hungary).

The national teams benefited from regional meetings especially. For the Mediterranean countries work on the synthesis regional report occurred to be a challenging and fruitful task, since it allowed for the exchange of concepts, in-depth comparisons of immigration characteristics in the IDEA countries investigated. In the case of the CEE countries, work on the synthesis also turned out to be a good opportunity to conduct in-depth studies regarding migration status transition in CEE.

The overall coordination was assessed positively and concerned as leading to the full and successful completion of the tasks within the IDEA project. Coordinating Committee members valued intra-consortium communication and frequent e-mails exchange, and dissemination of information by the coordinator. The quotations below depict the positive evaluation:

The intra-consortium communication was appropriate and the dissemination of information was adequate. All relevant issues were shared with all partners and discussed through e-mails or during the meetings. The timing requests for partner's answers were feasible (SOCIUS, Portugal).

The Coordinator made outstanding effort to make the project a success and in my view he succeeded it. Communication was smooth and regular and to the point (CEFMR, Poland).

The Spanish team values positively the intra-consortium communication and dissemination of information carried out by the coordination of the project (IUIOG, Spain).

The Final Conference in Krakow was highly valued (*vide* post-conference letters of appreciation received by the coordinator's office) for both scientific and organisational aspects. It was regarded as a success of the complex and very ambitious 30-month project.

Management and co-ordination of technical activities in the project

The tasks foreseen in WP9 were as follows:

- Management and co-ordination of IDEA,
- Co-ordination of data and information processing, analysing, reporting, and dissemination,
- Promotion of the project. The tasks were intertwined and as such were carried out simultaneously throughout the whole reporting period.

During the whole period of the project duration the Project Coordinator and the Administrative Coordinator were involved in standard coordinating activities, including exchange of correspondence, planning work and accepting the completion of particular tasks, forwarding relevant information

Important from the organisational point of view were the tasks carried out by the coordinator's office in connection with organisation of the interim IDEA meetings (1st in Sterdyń, Poland in June 2007, 2nd in Athens, Greece in January 2008, 3rd in Prague, the Czech Republic in September 2008) well as with the Final in Cracow, Poland in June 2009. By the very nature of these events the CMR activities concentrated first and foremost on the overseeing and enhancing the information flow between the IDEA researchers and the AC members as well as on organising particular activities on the spot or from the office in Warsaw. All meeting materials - final and interim country reports, policy-oriented executive summaries, comments, remarks and proposals - were being forwarded to the meeting participants immediately upon their arrival in the coordinator's mailbox (in addition, they were edited on the IDEA intranet). Similarly, all post-conference documents, first and foremost, minutes from regular sessions devoted to presentations and discussions, were drafted/compiled by the coordinator's office, consulted with the speakers/discussants, circulated among the meetings' participants and finally placed on the IDEA intranet.

Apart from endeavours related to the IDEA interim meetings, the coordinator's office organised events aimed at the project promotion. The first one took place at the Polish Ministry of Interior and Administration, Department of Migration Policy, on the 1st of July 2008 and gathered approximately 40 administrative officials and practitioners in the field of migration. Among guests invited by CMR there were 12 officials from the above mentioned Department of Migration Policy (including its Director and IDEA Advisory Committee member, Mr. Piotr Mierecki) as well as officials working for such governmental and non-governmental organisations in Poland as Central Statistical Office, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Mazovia Labour Office, Polish National Police, and Border Guard.

During more than two-hour seminar CMR researchers involved in the IDEA project presented the most interesting points related to the situation of illegal immigrants in countries of the Mediterranean region, and the Czech Republic. The presentations were based on the interim country reports and policy-oriented executive summaries provided by following IDEA partners: ELIAMEP (Greece), SOCIUS (Portugal), UIOIG (Spain), CNR (Italy), and UKP (Czech Republic). The discussion that followed enabled to gather a number of interesting comments that were subsequently forwarded to the authors of particular country reports and political recommendations.

The second promotion event took place in September 2008, during an annual CMR seminar in Jadwisin, Poland. Similarly to the activities undertaken in the previous year, also in autumn 2008 all CMR members and external guests invited to Jadwisin, were offered an

opportunity to get themselves acquainted with the most recent developments within the IDEA project.

The third one took place at the Polish Ministry of Interior and Administration, Department of Migration Policy, on the 6th of May 2009 and gathered approximately 50 administrative officials and practitioners in the field of migration. During this seminar CMR researchers provided a presentation describing major results of project analyses regarding immigrants presence on the labour market in Poland, immigrants' integration and migration policy including recommendations.

Another meeting focused on dissemination activities of IDEA results was a seminar organised in cooperation with the Centre of International Relations, on the 23rd of June 2009. The seminar was addressed to representatives of non-governmental organizations that are dealing with migration issues. The event gathered about 20 participants. CMR researchers presented major findings of the project as well as notified about data collected and analyses. The presentation constituted a basis for discussions touching such problems as migrants' access to the labour market, the role of the informal economy in stimulating immigration flows to Poland.

Other activities undertaken by the coordinator's office within WP 9 included (in a chronological order):

- Organising additional money transfer to UKP for the organisation of the 3rd IDEA meeting,
- Project promotion during conference organised by CMR on its 15th anniversary (21-22 November 2008) and during scientific events organised by CMR (international workshops, seminars at the Ministry of Interior and Administration, Final Conference in Cracow),
- Gathering financial/administrative information from the project partners;
- Arranging financial transfers accordingly to the decisions of the Coordinating Committee,
- Serving with the guidance on issues related to FORMS C/Financial Statements,
- Editing new issues of IDEA Newsletter (No. 1-11/ 2009),
- Editing IDEA Working Papers and IDEA Policy Briefs,
- Providing proof-reading of all official IDEA documents (including the above mentioned) by a native English-speaking editor,
- Disseminating the above-referred periodicals through a mailing list.
- Managing and updating IDEA website.

In sum, all tasks foreseen in WP8 and WP 9 for were carried out on time and with satisfactory results. Both coordinating activities, the management of the research and the disseminating goals of the Coordinator have been fully achieved. The bulk of the research materials has been already made available to the public (*via* the main website of the IDEA project). There are still vigorous disseminating activities undertaken in order to spread the IDEA project findings and enrich comparative studies in the migration field (for details please refer to the "Plan for using and disseminating the knowledge").