Social Media Analytics and Decision Support Tools
Enabling Sustainable Integration Policies and Measures

UNITEEUROPE

www.uniteeurope.org

D2.7
WP2
Analyses Summary Report

R - Report, PU - Public

The UniteEurope Consortium:

Participant no.	Participant organisation name	Short name	Country
1 (Coordinator)	INSET Research and Advisory	INSET	Austria
2	Erasmus University Rotterdam - Department of Public Administration	EUR	Netherlands
3	SYNYO GmbH	SYNYO	Austria
4	Imooty Lab	IMOOTY	Germany
5	Malmö University - Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare	MHU	Sweden
6	ZARA, Zivilcourage & Antirassismusarbeit	ZARA	Austria
7	City of Rotterdam	CITYROT	Netherlands
8	City of Malmö	CITYMAL	Sweden
9	University of Potsdam, Department for Public Management	UP	Germany

Document Information

Contract Number: 288308

Lead Beneficiary: UP

Deliverable Name: Analyses Summary Report 1

Deliverable Number: 2.7

Dissemination Level: PU

Contractual Date of Delivery: September 30, 2012

Delivery Date: September 28, 2012

Authors:	Dr. Verena Grubmüller	INSET
	Dr. Bernhard Krieger	UP
	Dr. Peter Scholten	EUR
	Dr. Rebecca Moody	EUR
	Rianne Dekker	EUR
	Henrik Emilsson	MHU
	Dr. Irmgard Wetzstein	SYNYO
	Dr. Katharina Götsch	INSET
Checked by:	Dr. Bernhard Krieger	UP
	Dr. Peter Leitner	SYNYO

Table of contents

4

Tables

1 Introduction

This report serves to summarise work package (WP) 2 "City Administration Analyses and Research Studies" which is being completed with this deliverable. It also marks the second milestone "M2" of the project.

In the first place, WP2 strives to systematically explore and analyse the use context to which the tool will be deployed. Thereby, the focus is on relevant actors, processes and workflows in the partner and associated cities, but also on technical systems and communication interfaces in the city administrations, as well as their current and planned measures and policies in the realm of migrant integration. These in-depth analyses of practices and processes at city level are serving the aim to ensure that UniteEurope benefits urban policy-makers in an optimal manner.

Furthermore, international best practices of social media analytic tools (SMAT) are debated in the work package by analysing existing media analytics and decision support solutions which should provide helpful insights that are meant to serve the design and development of the UniteEurope tool. Finally, the identification of pan-European target groups and a disquisition of legal, cultural and ethical aspects are completing this work package 2. Research on pan-European target groups (e.g. EU policy-makers) and their specific needs shall reveal further target groups next to city administration and is meant to ensure that the European Monitor on Urban Integration (i.e. the version of the tool which will specifically be designed for these groups) will deliver valuable information that enhances the European policy development. Research on legal, cultural and ethical issues should mainly serve to prevent negative effects of the project. Based on interviews and the consultation of individual experts, the legal, cultural and ethical issues report is guiding the technical concept and design of the analytics tool.

In general, WP2 can be considered the social scientific core of the project which creates a solid basis for further social scientific studies as well as for the technological architecture and development. The sensitivity for the interdisciplinary usability of the results was guaranteed, above all, by the work package leader (WPL), the University of Potsdam, representing the gateway between social and political as well as computer sciences.

Having been accomplished within the first project year, there were important synergies in WP2 with WP3, in particular with regards to methodology. Moreover, results of the studies in WP2 were directly integrated into the conceptualisation of WP4 and opened out into the formulation of use cases which set the basis for software development. Finally, whilst work for WP6 has not yet been taken up, it can be considered dependent on WP2, since the tasks of WP6 will be to a large extent testing the accuracy of the results of WP2 and of their technical interpretations with regards to usability.

This report at hand will summarise the tasks that have been accomplished in the frame of WP2, structured according to the deliverables D2.1 to D2.6, and will demonstrate their synergies and/or mutual effects with other work packages and deliverables, as well as their im-

pact on the future work. Whilst most of the deliverables in WP2 have been based on qualitative methods of social sciences, the report at hand merely constitutes a summary of the work accomplished and is mainly based on the experience that we have gained throughout this one year lasting work process. For details concerning the applied methodologies in the frame of the different deliverables, it is recommendable to consult the said reports per se.

2 Synergies within WP2 and beyond

Even though some deliverables in WP2 were sharing a common methodological approach amongst each other, a chronological listing of the individual deliverables, as done in section 3 of this report, can be considered the most accurate way of outlining the work accomplished within the frame of WP2; this is particularly due to the fact that each deliverable produced a series of results that were, in parts, taken as a basis for the subsequent deliverables.

Having said that, there is still a number of synergies and common points within WP2 and beyond, that need to be pointed out prior to the listing of deliverables:

2.1 City case studies

The first three deliverables in WP2 (**D2.1, D2.2 and D2.3**) can, in a more global sense, together with Deliverables D3.1 (Taxonomies and dimensions of integration) and D3.2 (Integration issues report) of WP3, be considered core parts of our city case studies. D3.1 being the theoretical basis for our work, the other four deliverables were built upon a high coordination of methods, which ensured the comparability of research results for the three principle cities (Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam) and the cities researched upon thereafter (intended for the cities of Barcelona, Birmingham, Ljubljana, Turin, Marseille, Copenhagen and Vienna). Increased synergies in the research have contributed to a more systematic way to generate knowledge in the form of academic publications or more scalable software. This also required a closer coordination among the involved research partners in the planning of the deliverables concerned, as well as in the application of the research methodology (literature research, document analysis, interviews).

Literature review & document analysis

Reviewing secondary literature and collecting and analysing policy documents played a key-role in drafting D2.3, D3.1 and D3.2. Deliverable D2.3 mirrored the state of the art of available literature on integration policies in the three cities. Broadening the scope of this state-of-the-art paper led to a more comprehensive report, consisting of:

1. an overview of conceptual literature on migrant integration (classifications): EUR (D3.1)
2. an overview of literature on migration issues in the three cities: EUR/MHU/UP (D3.2)
3. an overview of literature on the institutionalisation of migrant integration in the three cities: EUR/MHU/UP (D2.1)
4. an overview of literature on migrant integration policies in the three cities: EUR/MHU/UP (D2.3)

As an ordering principle for this literature review, we used the conceptual grid from D3.1:

Integration areas			
Socio-economic integration	**Socio-cultural integration**	**Legal-political integration**	**Spatial integration**
Labour market participation	Identity formation	Citizenship (naturalization, social/civic/political rights)	Housing position
Educational participation/schools	Accommodation of migrant cultural practices/institutions	Anti-discrimination	Spatial dispersion versus segregration (gettoïzation)
Health care position	Inter-ethnic contact	Group specific legal provisions	Symbolic uses of space (mosques etc.)
Policing	Mutual perceptions	Political participation	
Use of social benefits	Public attitudes toward migrants	Political organization	
Participation through voluntary work or parenting	Delinquency (with migrant specific roots)	Participation in civil society (migrant organizations)	
Average income level	Acceptance of basic values and norms	Consultative structures	
Language comprehension			
Skills level (educational achievement)			

Table 1: Integration dimensions and areas

Interviews

Interviews were part of **D2.1, D2.3** and D3.2. Carrying out separate interviews with often the same interview partners appeared counter-logic, which is why we integrated the interviews for these three deliverables. This means that the interviews needed a common structure that applies to all three deliverables, so that summaries of the interviews in the form of protocols could be used as sources for all the three deliverables. A comprehensive interview guideline provided the basis to acquire the relevant information for the following matrix, which is based upon the taxonomy of integration issues as well as on the policy cycle:

Policy aspects / Taxonomies and Dimensions of Integration (D3.1)	Integration issues, (problem definition) (D3.2)	Policymaking (D2.3)	Policy institutionalization and policy practices (D2.1)	Policy Evaluation	Role of social media in migrant integration at local level (D2.2)
Factors determining the taxonomies of migrant integration processes	*Actors involved in enforcing awareness, information sources, information used*	*Actors involved in setting the agenda and formulating policies, information sources, information used*	*Actors involved in information source information use approaches*	*Services evaluated, persons / actors involved in evaluation, information source, information used,*	*Perceived relation between social media and migrant integration processes, use of social media in local policies*
Socio-economic Dimension					
Socio-cultural Dimension					
Legal-political Dimension					
Spatial Dimension					

Table 2: Interview matrix

The deliverable D 2.2 is also based upon extensive interviews, however with a different set of interlocutors mainly working in departments providing information and communication infrastructure for the cities.

Integration of reports

In spite of the shared methodology, we needed to make sure to have separate deliverables, which required the deliverable coordinators to safeguard the production of coherent deliverable reports.

2.2   Extension of target groups and approach of external experts

Whilst the city case studies provided a thorough analysis of urban target groups – which constitute the main target group of UniteEurope –, D2.5 put a further focus on so called pan-European target groups which can be summarised as actors in the realm of migrant integration with a pan-European focus (for a more precise definition see the section below). Since pan-European actors are meant to be targeted with a special version of UniteEurope, the questions that arose in the frame of our study proved to be highly similar to those of our municipal target groups, even though taking a narrower dimension.

Thus, synergies could be used in the methodological approach, notably in the application of the interview guideline that had been developed in the frame of the city case studies, which was adapted to the nature of pan-European actors. This led to the fact that the structure of investigation was arranged in a similar manner, which helped to keep results comparable in spite of the institutional differences of urban and pan-European groups.

By collecting a comprehensive list of pan-European target groups and getting in touch with representatives of selected organisations for conducting interviews, contacts were established in the frame of Deliverable D2.5 that could also be used to a large extent for acquiring external experts' opinions for D2.6.

2.3   Coordination of publication opportunities

The synergies of the deliverables, particularly those that are part of the city case studies as well as the extension of target groups outlined above, can be extended to the publication of research results and therefore build a link to WP7, in particular to the scientific publications (D7.4 and D7.7).

The aim concerning the city case studies is to coordinate the five deliverables in a way that allows for a maximum of academic publication opportunities involving the expertise of all partners concerned while time not deviating from the project deadlines. On the one hand, the five deliverables constituting the city case studies are designed to provide building blocks for the grid model that is produced by the end of WP3. On the other, the deliverables will be the basis for the first type of publication that is envisioned: a special issue on migrant integration at the local level (with the three cities as the three case studies) and the role social media (might/will/can) play in this process. For this it is important to 'frame' the relation between the deliverables in a manner that fits the design of an academic publication of an appropriate size.

3 Overview of deliverables in WP2

The following section provides an overview of the Deliverables in WP2 and summarises their most important aspects and results. The Deliverables in question are:

- D2.1 Public administration workflow and key role report

- D2.2 Public administration technical systems report

- D2.3 Integration policies and measures report

- D2.4 Best practices report

- D2.5 Pan-European target groups report

- D2.6 Legal, cultural and ethical aspects report

3.1 Public administration work flow and key role report (D2.1)

This deliverable builds – together with D 2.2, D 2.3 and D 3.2 – the analysis of the city cases for UniteEurope. It was finished and submitted to the European Commission in March 2012. According to the internal agreement in December 2011, the University of Potsdam undertook efforts for getting access for research to the City of Berlin and completed this research, whereas the Erasmus University Rotterdam and the City of Rotterdam investigated the public sector in Rotterdam in cooperation. Equally, Malmö University and the City of Malmö were responsible for investigations in Malmö. Whereas the University of Potsdam lead the deliverable and thereby carried out the coordinative tasks in between the three focus cities, the university partners guided the research in "their" respective city. Additional to the report on Berlin, the University of Potsdam was responsible for the development of the interview guideline as well as for authoring the introductory and conclusive parts of the deliverable.

3.1.1 Work flows and key roles in each municipality

All three cities have their different administrative set ups, especially when it comes to the policy field of migrant integration. Rotterdam has often been a pioneer municipality regarding integration policies, which have served as examples for other Dutch municipalities. In this respect, Rotterdam frequently communicates with the national government (mainly the Ministry of Interior) regarding their policies. Currently, Rotterdam does no longer have policies specifically aimed at third country nationals. After 2006, there have been 'participation and citizenship' policies, aimed at the societal position of all citizens of Rotterdam. In practice, these policies often do have a specific focus on the position of ethnic minorities consisting of immigrants and their children. In Rotterdam, the main administrative actor in integration policies is the department of Youth, Education and Society (JOS). Part of this department is the team 'integration and civic integration'. In development and execution of policy measures, JOS consults different public and non-governmental actors. Other departments, such as so-

cial affairs and employment (SoZaWe) and the municipal health services (GGD) are cooperating in policy programmes, for instance dealing with labour market participation and health issues specifically prevalent among ethnic minorities. Sub-municipalities are involved when issues arise primarily in certain geographical districts.

Even though municipalities in Sweden traditionally have considerable autonomy and far-reaching powers, the central state government and its authorities play a very important role in local integration policies. It is the Swedish Employment service that is responsible for and coordinates the introduction for newly arrived humanitarian migrants in Malmö. It is also the Employment service that has access to almost all resources in terms of labour market policies. The room for manoeuvre for the City of Malmö is also limited because the state defines what kind of integration services the city must offer. Nevertheless, the municipality plays a major role when it comes to integration policies at local level. It is the municipality that decides how integration services are organised and they control a wide range of policy areas that can affect the local integration processes. It is also the city that is ultimately responsible for its inhabitants and has to deal with the day to day issues that arise in the integration field. Within the municipality it is the City Office that is most important in the formulation of integration policies. Within the City Office responsibilities are shared between the Commissioner's unit, the commissioner of labour market and adult education, as well as the Unit for integration and labour market (civil servant organisation that determines the overall policies for integration issues). It is between these two units that most of the communication about integration policies flows. Thus, these units are also the most obvious future users of UniteEurope. The local Employment service, in contrast, mostly implements national policies and therefore cannot be identified an obvious user of UniteEurope. Neither are non-governmental organisations as they play a very marginal role in local integration policies in Malmö.

The distribution of responsibilities for the integration of migrants in Germany is carried out on three governmental layers: the national, the federal state and the municipalities. Due to its hybrid administrative structure, Berlin acts on both the federal state as well as the municipal level. This means that policies take place in the form of legislation as well as execution. Therefore, the Senat as well as the district administrations are important in the policy field of migrant integration. Within the Senat administration, there are the ministries of "Work, Integration and Women" and "Urban Development and Environment". Within the former ministry, the "Office of the Commissioner for Integration and Migration" is the department that is most relevant for policy formulation and evaluation. Within the latter, a department specifically set up for the cross-level programme "Soziale Stadt" is most relevant for issues of migrant integration (see also in D 2.3). Both departments should be included already in the testing phase of the software. On the district level it is particularly the local commissioners for integration that are relevant for local policy making, also in the phases of policy formulation and evaluation. It can be considered of high value to present the UniteEurope tool to them already in the developing stage in order to get their feedback. Also, on both governmental levels, city-wide as well as district-wide, advisory boards for migrant integration are most relevant as they are active in the policy formulation and evaluation. Furthermore they also provide a link to the

migrant communities as well as to NGOs involved in policy implementation. As Germany – unlike Sweden and the Netherlands – does not give communal voting rights to non-EU citizens, these boards constitute an important form of migrants' participation (see D2.1). In the long run, it is very likely that they will become important users of the tool.

3.1.2 Conclusions for the implementation of UniteEurope

There are three salient conclusions of this research: First, due to the differences between the cities in terms of their administrative framework, but also due to the distinct arrangements of workflows shown in this deliverable, it is important to profoundly analyse the particularities of a city before starting to deploy the UniteEurope tool. As we have learned in Malmö, Berlin and Rotterdam, the many layers of policy making within a city makes it necessary to delineate the major actors and the way they are interacting with each other. We realise that the experience we gained during this research will facilitate the application of the methodology, once the consortium decides to make UniteEurope available to further European cities. After the submission of the remaining deliverables in the work packages 2 and 3, seven more cities (i.e. Barcelona, Birmingham, Ljubljana, Turin, Marseilles, Copenhagen and Vienna) have been selected by the consortium for further research – a first step following the idea of a potential enlargement of target groups after the end of the project.

Second, it must be stated that the UniteEurope software is best deployed with actors that are relevant in the field of the strategic phases of policy making, i.e. problem definition and evaluation of measures. Many informants had been expressing their interest for the usage of the tool particularly for the latter phase. Public administration research has shown that this is indeed the most challenging phase for policy makers. Policy implementers also need to plan for their service provision. The tool can help them to adjust this implementation on short notice. UniteEurope can be deployed at all levels of governance within larger cities. The example of Berlin has demonstrated that these levels act at least to some extent quite independently. Approaching only the top level of a city administration falls short of making use of the whole potential of the UniteEurope system.

Third, in the development of the UniteEurope system it will be important to closely cooperate with the future users of the tool. The interviews have revealed that many policy makers who are not familiar with the latest trends in information and communication technologies (such as social media analytics) have difficulties in imagining the potential of the tool. We conclude that an early integration of these users in the development process could help the designers of the tool to prepare for the needs of their users. As some interviewees have expressed strong interest in the tool, one should approach them once a demonstrable version is ready.

With regards to D2.3, which was reviewing the cities' integration measures, some interesting conclusions can be drawn from this report outlining the institutional setting. First, Malmö, Rotterdam and Berlin are all three highly diverse cities in terms of nationalities of their citizens and they are actively looking for ways of dealing with this. Second, the municipalities of Rotterdam, Berlin and Malmö have considerable practical autonomy in their integration poli-

cies vis-à-vis their national governments. This again confirms the relevance of the local focus of the UniteEurope tool. Third, in Berlin and Rotterdam, several NGO's are funded by the municipal government to execute policy measures whilst in Malmö, such comparable executive institutions are (partly) owned by the city. Fourth, integration measures in Malmö and Rotterdam are often general measures and do not specifically target immigrants. They are focussing on specific geographical areas. In Berlin there are specific policies for the integration of migrants. All in all, these differences and similarities in the institutional setting of the three cities are promising for comparative analysis of the local integration policies and the utility of the UniteEurope tool.

3.2   Public administration technical systems report (D2.2)

Also in this deliverable, all university partners were involved and carried out the respective research in "their" cities. The university partners in the Netherlands and in Sweden were supported by their city partners. Additionally, SYNYO and IMOOTY contributed to this deliverable, mainly by determining the concrete research objectives and by supporting the University of Potsdam in developing an appropriate interview guideline. This deliverable was finished and submitted to the European Commission in April 2012. The deliverable lead was with the University of Potsdam.

The aim of this deliverable was to delineate the technical systems within the public administrations of the three focus cities Malmö, Rotterdam and Berlin. It is crucial to understand the technical ecosystems in which the UniteEurope system will operate. Also in this respect the selection of the three cities appears to be advantageous as they not only differ in the size and organisation of their public administrations, but also in the design of their information and communication systems.

3.2.1   Existing technical systems in each municipality

As we have already seen in deliverable D 2.1, the Berlin public administration is de-centrally organised. This also reflects the situation of the city's technical systems. As one of our interlocutors expressed it, "the public administration was set up by purpose after WW-II in a very particular, if not to say fragmented manner. It is ingrained in the constitution and we have to deal with it – also in the realm of IT." There is basically no single unit, department or organisation which is responsible for the acquisition, set-up or maintenance of the IT system. This refers to both, software and hardware delivered to the city's employees. Probably due to this, proprietary software is very common as an open source strategy would require much more cooperation. What is striking about Berlin is the difference in the computer inventory. While some departments are equipped with very new hardware and up-to-date software, some administrative institutions – mainly in the districts – operate on very old equipment both in terms of hardware and software. Despite the heterogeneity of the public administration and its technical systems, there are quite some detailed rules and procedures to follow for the deployment of software systems to the city. On the one hand these continuously developing

policies concern purchasing, installation and support. On the other hand these policies determine compliance standards for documents, networks and interfaces. It is certainly not easy to integrate a completely new software system into the computer infrastructure of different organisational settings of the Berlin public administration. Regarding the employment of social media we found that very little actually takes place. While there is an unwritten policy not to pioneer the usage of these technologies in the public administration of Berlin e.g. for purposes of e-government or opinion monitoring there are – compared to other cities – only a few institutions and projects that make use of social media as a communicative device. However, our interlocutors were quite intrigued by the possibilities the UniteEurope system might provide to them. Indeed they did grasp the chances UniteEurope offered to their daily work and contributed to the project with a number of meaningful propositions. Potential users requested features such as regular local social media reports, possibilities to follow single discussion threads, the possibility to identify regular user and discursive groups, anonymity, an interface for different sources of information (e.g. mailing lists), possibilities to share best practices among integration specialist of different cities or the adaptability of the user interface.

In contrast to Berlin, the city of Rotterdam organises its IT infrastructure centrally; the Chief Information Officer is responsible for this. The IT strategy is also the responsibility of the Chief Information officer, who is appointed by the city council. There are several Decentralised Information Officers who work throughout the municipality. Departments and process owners are responsible for the software they want to implement but are supported in doing so by the Decentralized Information Officer and the Security Officer. The aim for the city of Rotterdam is to maintain to work with an IT infrastructure which is centralized and does not belong to one department. Main points within the infrastructure are that information should be easily shared, basis registrations must be used, applications are mostly open source and information should be accessible from any place at any time without having a breach in security. For employees the City of Rotterdam holds the idea of 'bring your own device' which means that employees are able to bring the device of their choice to work and work with this device. The use of social media is fairly large in the city of Rotterdam; several different platforms are used in order to inform citizens on what is going on in their city. Within the information architecture this also comes forward since goals within information policy are aimed at participation and process and request oriented working. Not the tasks of the city should be central to the IT system, but rather citizens' and businesses' needs. In terms of user requests it is crucial for the city of Rotterdam that the UniteEurope tool would operate in a cloud of some sort, since the city is not willing to run it itself. Also the tool must be accessible from any time and any place, matching the aims of the city of Rotterdam. Furthermore, several ideas have come up in order to make the tool more useful for employees within the city.

Also the City of Malmö organises its IT-infrastructure centrally, though leaving room for adaptation within each department. The general IT strategy is developed in the City office and decided upon by the City assembly. The Service department is responsible for implementing the policies and give support to the other departments and end users. The decisions on what

devices to purchase are taken by one of the local IT coordinators. It is her responsibility to make sure that it works within the existing IT environment. The ambition is to work with a single IT-platform for the whole city and to turn the IT environment virtual. The first step was to provide the employees an own digital personal profile which can be accessed from any of the city's computers. At the moment, the whole IT-infrastructure is undergoing a process of change. The plan is to present a new strategy and action plan during 2012 which makes it difficult to envisage the situation in the coming years. The city successfully encourages its employees to make use of social media, in the main for communicative purposes. Close to 100 official Malmö social media accounts are listed at Malmö.se. Facebook is the most widely used with almost 50 accounts. However, the units working on integration seem to be reluctant to employ social media. There are some social media activities to improve policy by engaging in a dialogue with the citizens. The city of Malmö already provides a social media monitoring tool to all employees. It is therefore important that UniteEurope offers added value. As many civil servants are not accustomed to work with web-tools, it is important that UniteEurope focusses on usability.

3.2.2   Conclusions for the implementation of UniteEurope

Out of the findings of this report, there are three conclusions arising for the further development of the software: First, the technical infrastructures of the three cities are – partly in itself as in the case of Berlin, but certainly among each other – profoundly heterogeneous. There is a variety of actors involved in each city who decide on the purchase, implementation, maintenance, support and abolition of software systems. While most cities provide some kind of infrastructure that makes it possible for users to operate software via servers, it is not reasonable to deliver the UniteEurope software as a service from these infrastructures. Rather it makes more sense – as the City of Rotterdam specifically requested – to operate UniteEurope from an external server that stores and analyses data, as well as runs the application. The software will – from the perspective of the user – be a tool that they access via the Internet. As a consequence, the software will not be deployed to the cities themselves. Even if the development of interfaces for a particular city might make sense, this will certainly not be a priority.

Second, potential users of the UniteEurope software in the three cities mainly work from personal computers that are equipped with different operating systems and browser software. In many cases the software is not up to date and its installation took place a couple of years ago. Even though the usage of Internet Explorer 6 is rare, it has been reported during the interviews with integration specialists. Nevertheless, until the UniteEurope software will be deployed in 2014, most of these users will have upgraded. However, the developers of the UniteEurope software should take into account that some users will always have to rely on older versions of browsers.

Third, there are quite a few technical guidelines and requirements for software to be deployed to the three cities. Whereas the UniteEurope development team will – where necessary – make itself familiar with them in more detail for the three cities, it is advisable to follow

the development standards of World Wide Web Consortium. Furthermore user requests had been articulated by some of our interlocutors in the city administrations. However, usability and accessibility will be the predominant development principles which shall – in doubt – outbalance the inclusion of specific and interesting features.

3.3 Integration policies and measures report (D2.3)

This was the third deliverable of the city case studies in this work package. In this deliverable it was the University of Rotterdam that took on the lead, as well as that carried out the research efforts in the Netherlands, supported by the City of Rotterdam. The University of Potsdam was investigating the policies and measures regarding migrant integration in Berlin, whereas the University of Malmö undertook research in Sweden, this time – due to a lack of person months – unsupported by the city of Malmö. However, as the researcher of the university had extensive work experience in the realm of migrant integration in Malmö, this lack had been fully compensated. INSET was part of this deliverable, too, and contributed by extensive reviewing of the deliverable report which was submitted to the European Commission in June 2012.

This deliverable describes a rich history of integration policies and measures in Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam. Some interesting conclusions can be drawn for each city case separately and for the city policies in comparison with each other. Conclusions are framed with regard to the theory based integration taxonomy that was outlined in Deliverable D3.1.

3.3.1 Conclusions for each city

Berlin

Berlin is one of the cities in Germany with the highest share of migrants. In some districts (such as Mitte and Neukölln), up to 40 per cent of the inhabitants have a migration background. Accordingly, the public administration and politicians deal with integration issues on a daily basis. However, legally structured and regulated integration policy emerged only recently. Especially the work of the current integration commissioner, Günter Piening, aimed at promoting a stable, sustainable and long-lasting integration policy.

Before Piening took office, we identified two major integration policy periods in Berlin. During the first period in the 1960s and 1970s the federal government invited so-called guest workers to Germany which were expected to return to their country of origin once their manpower was not needed any longer. Following the ban of guest worker recruitment activities in 1973, the Senate of Berlin soon realised that the migrants already living in Berlin would not move back to their origin countries. The awareness of people with a migration background increased as they settled permanently in Berlin. Consequently, starting in the mid-1970s, the Senate initiated first policies that aimed at integration of the people with a migration background that came to Germany as guest workers. The Senate of Berlin instituted the so-called "commissioner for foreigners" in 1980. Barbara John was the first to be in charge as the

"commissioner for foreigners" launching the second identifiable period of integration policy in Berlin. This period was characterised by the national attempt to slow down immigration to Germany on the one hand, but to foster integration of people with a migration background already living in Berlin on the other hand (i.e. socio-economic and cultural integration, inter-cultural opening of the public administration, simplification of naturalisations, etc.). John's tenure ended in 2003. Even though John was highly committed to the integration of migrants, the legal institutionalisation of integration policy was the major aim of the third period of integration policy, which started with the inauguration of Günter Piening as the newly labelled "commissioner for integration and migration".

After several years of work, Günter Piening succeeded with his plan to institutionalise integration policy in Berlin. In December of 2010, the Senate passed the Integration and Participation Law of Berlin (PartIntG). The law includes specifications of integration policy in Berlin (definition of aims and objectives of integration policy in Berlin, i.e. fostering migrant participation or encouraging the intercultural opening of the public administration, permanent establishment of integration commissioners and the advisory board for integration, structural adaptation of integration policy infrastructures in the districts, etc.). Analysing integration policy today, it appears that the basis for institutionalisation of integration policy was established. However, completing this institutionalisation may take a few more years. This is especially obvious in the Berlin districts. In some districts the integration policy infrastructures still need to be developed and established.

However, the fact that the Participation and Integration law was just recently passed does not mean that the Senate and the districts were not eager to tackle major integration issues by formulating fitting policy goals and measures. On the contrary, the Senate as well as the districts of Mitte, Neukölln, Spandau, Pankow, Marzahn-Hellersdorf formulated their own integration concepts which contain goals and objectives as well as practical measures. Examining both administrative levels, it becomes clear that each district has created objectives and measures that cater to their specific needs. For example, Neukölln's integration policy goals and measures emphasise the fight against (youth) delinquency and other criminal activities whereas other districts such as Pankow or Treptow-Köpenick regard anti-xenophobic policies and related measures as more important.

Summing up, we come to the conclusion that integration policy in Berlin is already quite advanced. However, the institutionalisation of the structures legally stipulated in the Integration and Participation Law still need more time for a full implementation – especially on the district level.

Malmö

Malmö was hit hard by the economic crisis in the early 1990's. At the same time as the number of jobs declined, the immigration of refugees and their relatives increased and has been large since then. Even if the local labour market has expanded, the inflow of unemployed

migrants has been high and kept the employment rate for foreign born as low as about 40-45 per cent during the whole period up until today.

To change the situation the city of Malmö chose a two-pillar strategy. The first was to stimulate economic growth by several large infrastructure projects. These projects were also an important part of the strategy to develop attractiveness and change the negative discourse about Malmö. The second pillar was to improve welfare and increase the human capital amongst the population. The city and central government have themselves or together launched several large projects to improve local welfare, especially in areas where many immigrants live.

National policies, laws and regulations are playing a very important role in local integration policies. The city of Malmö cannot control the inflow of migrants and they are obliged to provide a specific set of integration policy measures. Integration policy in Malmö and Sweden has relied on a strong tradition of universal welfare policy, which has been supplemented with special treatment of newly arrived immigrants. The focus has been on introduction programmes, employment and employment services, language training and anti-discrimination. The municipality's influence on integration policies is thus limited. Although the implementation of integration policy is decentralised, it is state legislation, regulation and funding that are most important for its design.

The main ideology of integration in Malmö is mainstreaming. Most money and efforts to improve integration is spent on general socio-economic measures like schools, employment and adult education. In addition, there is a specific group provision, introduction programmes, for newly arrived humanitarian migrants which is coordinated by the state agency the Employment service. About 600-1000 persons are enrolled per year in Malmö. The programme takes maximally 24 months and shall include language training, civic orientation and labour market activities.

The municipals labour market programmes focus on people who have low skills and are considered far from the labour market. Many in this target group are migrants, so they often constitute a majority of participants in the programmes. It is the same when it comes to adult education. Almost all participants in primary adult education are migrants and they represent a large share of other adult education students as well. In spite of the mainstreaming strategy, there are some socio-economic measures that target migrants. The municipality is obliged by the state to offer free language training to all adults without basic skills in the Swedish language and to offer mother tongue education to pupils. The city also has arrangements to integrate newly arrived children in schools.

The main legal-political policy measures are to work against discrimination and racism. There is a local action plan against discrimination that is followed up yearly. It focuses mainly on counteracting discrimination within the city's own administration and services through increased awareness and diversity training of staff. The city is also involved in anti-racism ac-

tivities like the Holocaust Memorial day and the annual anti-racist film festival. To celebrate new citizens a citizenship ceremony is held every year at the Swedish national day.

There are several and diverse measures that deal with the socio-cultural dimension of integration. There is a yearly diversity award. Some measures, like the contact person programme and the project Integration in associations, stimulate inter-ethnic contact and civil society participation. A programme to work against violence against women, including honour crimes, is in place. The precarious situation of the Roma minority is addressed in the Roma information and education centre.

The spatial dimension is an important part of most integration measures. But the issue of ethnic and socio-economic segregation is also addressed through a specific Neighbourhood programme. The objective is to improve living conditions in five neighbourhoods by improving the physical environment and invest in infrastructure and social capital.

Rotterdam

As one of the most diverse cities in the Netherlands, Rotterdam has often functioned as a predecessor in the policy domain of immigrant integration policies. Early policy initiatives in the spatial domain of integration in 1972 and 1979 were revoked by the Council of State of the Netherlands. The city executive aimed to enforce spatial dispersal in the Afrikaanderwijk after riots took place there.

In 1978, Rotterdam's first integration policy came into force when it became clear that guest worker immigration was not a temporary phenomenon and the social-economic position of immigrants worsened. Policies focused on the legal-political and socio-economic dimension integration and were of multiculturalist nature. Equal citizenship was valued important for an equal position on the labour market and for immigrants' political participation. At first, measures focused on equal rights as a prerequisite for socio-economic integration and no specific socio-economic measures existed for immigrant groups yet.

After 1985, the Rotterdam authorities concluded that generic measures were not sufficient to fight immigrants' socio-economic deprivation and temporary specific socio-economic measures were enforced. The policy became more demanding instead of accommodative towards immigrants. Policy on the socio-economic dimension of integration can be characterised as republicanist. Still, socio-cultural issues were left to the public. The municipality did publish a document that proposed to create space for mosques. From 1998 to 2002 Rotterdam experienced a short period that was characterised by multiculturalism. Socio-cultural measures were taken to promote and celebrate the ethnic diversity of Rotterdam's population.

In 2002, the new city executive in which the political party Liveable Rotterdam had a majority, announced a radical break with the previous policies. The assimilationist policy discourse on the socio-cultural and spatial dimension of integration was innovative and politically contest-

ed. The civic republicanist policy on the socio-economic dimension of integration was less contested and was continued in the period from 2006 onwards.

Rotterdam's current integration policy is not named 'integration policy' but has been transformed to a 'citizenship policy' targeting all citizens of Rotterdam. However, there is a special focus on the weakest social groups. The policy reflects the economic situation and budget cuts that have to be made. Integration policies are developed on the socio-cultural and socio-economic dimension of integration. They are of civic republicanist nature demanding more self-sufficiency and active citizenship without distinguishing between ethnicities. Policy measures – except for the organisation of civic integration courses – are executed by NGOs that are subsidised by the municipality. Currently, the subsidy infrastructure is getting limited to four areas of expertise: diversity, emancipation, non-formal education and anti-discrimination.

3.3.2 Comparative conclusions

Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam have been confronted with relatively large influxes of immigrants over the past decades. As highly diverse cities, they are dealing with integration of third-country nationals on a daily basis. A comparison of integration policies of the three cities shows some interesting results.

First of all, we see that the policies of all cities are targeting multiple areas of integration in terms of the taxonomy of deliverable 3.1. In the tables overviewing policies and measures in the city chapters we categorised them according to the main area of integration but in many cases, measures combine several domains. For instance, civic integration courses that aim to improve immigrants' language proficiency while teaching them about cultural habits of the country of residence. The spatial dimension of integration is often dealt with, while not explicitly mentioned in the policy documents. Most measures target specific areas of the city such as specific district, neighbourhoods or even streets. We see this particularly in Berlin and Rotterdam.

Second, we observe that all three cities are struggling with the target groups of their integration policies. In Berlin, next to 'immigrants', 'foreigners' and 'Spätaussiedler' currently the more general distinction of people with a migration background is used. Malmö and Rotterdam try to refrain from ethnic categories altogether.

Malmö and Rotterdam do no longer speak of 'integration policies'. Their policies are targeting the population as a whole. Their policies can be characterised as republicanist policies that contain a liberal egalitarian view on immigrant integration. The policy is adverse to the institutionalisation of majority as well as minority cultures. Instead, it is oriented at the individual and its membership as a citizen of the urban society. In accordance with this model immigrant integration is named in colour-blind and individualist terms, such as 'citizenship' or 'participation'. The only 'ethnic' categorisation that remained is that of recent immigrants who are obliged to take a civic integration course. A difference between Malmö's and Rotterdam's

republicanist integration policy models is that in Sweden integration for a large part is seen as a state responsibility while Rotterdam asserts that it is the responsibility of immigrants themselves.

In contrast to Malmö and Rotterdam, the we interpret the integration policies of Berlin as multiculturalist in nature. This is in contrast with the current political discourse and can possibly be explained by administrative specialists with more multiculturalist preferences who play a large role in the development of integration policies.

Third, we can conclude that in Berlin and Rotterdam, the main actors engaged with the execution of integration measures are NGOs. In Malmö, where less government services are privatised, the main actor in this is still the local government. Also, the integration policies are quite centralised and differ less between cities. Interviews with key actors taught us that the interventions developed by the NGOs are often implicitly targeting socio-economic integration issues, but are more socio-cultural as they seem. Many projects have socio-cultural aims next to socio-economic goals. In Malmö, without the NGOs as executive partners, the measures are less socio-cultural of nature.

3.4 Best practice report (D2.4)

SYNYO had the leadership of this deliverable and set up with INSET and IMOOTY a list of social media analytic tools that SYNYO evaluated thereafter. The deliverable was reviewed by Malmö University and the University of Potsdam before being submitted to the European Commission in July 2012.

3.4.1 Structure of the report and methodological approach

This deliverable gave information about the development of social media analytics tools (SMAT), the definition of those concepts and the description and differentiation of related fields, then overviewed SMAT in general and illustrated best practices in detail. Partly based on Deliverable D4.1 ("Concept for the monitoring and decision support tool") and Deliverable D2.2, and aiming to serve especially Deliverable D4.5 ("Interface designs and dashboard mockups 1"), the overall objective of the report was to learn from best practices in social media monitoring and analytics as well as from decision support systems, deduce concrete implications for the future UniteEurope tool and, consequently, give ideas to the further development of the UniteEurope tool.

After some basic information, a general explanation of the SMAT concept and related fields, the core of this report was the presented best practice analysis, in which 100 most advanced tools were identified first. Based on this basis, a systematic overall analysis of the tools was conducted, aiming at overviewing the social media analytics landscape in general by focusing on costs, venue, languages, source coverage, purpose, structure, features, visuals and usability. The results show, that the analysed tools in general have some common ground,

for example with regards to source coverage, features and visual presentation (mostly bar, line and pie charts), and that the considered tools and are mostly user-friendly and intuitive.

The overall analysis was followed by a detailed analysis, in which ten SMAT were systematically selected from the 100 best practices SMAT list. Based on a predefined structure, the ten chosen tools were each analysed in detail. In brief, the detailed analysis focused on features, visuals, and the relevance of the ten tools for the UniteEurope modules (main dashboard, organisation monitoring, campaign tracking, live monitoring, multi streams, integration monitoring, measure and case library and benchmark analytics). Implications for the UniteEurope tools were deduced from each of the ten analysed tools and mostly refer to user-friendly interfaces and individual and customisable options of reporting and visual presentation. Furthermore, implications were deduced from advanced SMAT, inter alia in context with team workflow systems, engagement features and customisable and user-friendly interfaces.

3.4.2   Learning points for UniteEurope

The best practices report also dealt with sentiment analysis as this is a core feature of nearly every analysed SMAT. Within the report it was argued that automated sentiment analysis is never free of failure. Nevertheless, as sentiment analysis is a central aspect of almost all advanced SMAT, the implementation of this feature within the UniteEurope tool should be given a thought. Moreover, UniteEurope can surely learn from the large variety of sentiment reports provided within sophisticated SMAT.

Although the UniteEurope tool will not be conceptualised as a decision support system (DSS), it will contain a measure and case library module, which aims to support the tool users in decision-making and in which tool users will be able to request predefined measure suggestions on the one hand and create cases themselves on the other hand. Concerning this module, it is surely valuable to keep the concept of computer-based decision support in mind.

Within the best practices report, the concept of DSS was, in a nutshell, defined as system, which facilitates decision-making. This broad definition reflects the complexity of the field, which is also obvious due to different DSS types (communication-driven, data-driven, document-driven, knowledge-driven, model-driven, web-based) and fields of application (e.g. clinical, spatial, environmental). 20 exemplary DSS were selected, whereby a broad framework of DSS was chosen for the collection process to be able to capture a wide range of different and advanced DSS and give ideas for UniteEurope's measure and case library.

Yet, a tool for political decision-makers and NGOs on a local and on a pan-European level, in which social media mentions about integration are aggregated and analysed in-depth does not exist. However, lessons for best practices within the planned UniteEurope tool can be learned from sophisticated SMAT and DSS.

3.5 Pan-European target groups report (D2.5)

INSET was leader of this deliverable. Other involved partners were the University of Rotterdam, the University of Malmö, ZARA and the University of Potsdam. INSET and ZARA cooperated in identifying relevant actors in the European context. The University of Potsdam contributed to this deliverable by providing the methodological approach. The partners decided to employ similar research methods in order to ensure that all users have the possibility to provide input to the same degree. While INSET carried out the analysis and drafted the report, the university partners reviewed the deliverable.

3.5.1 Methodological approach

In this deliverable a set of pan-European organisations was collected in order to learn more about their needs and interests with regards to the European Monitor on Urban Integration. The original selection was thoroughly extended in the frame of an in-depth desk research and the benefits of a 'snowball effect' initiated by our partner ZARA who is very well linked with potentially interested organisations all over Europe. By developing categories of user groups and main fields of activity we created a matrix where each organisation can precisely be placed. Out of the entire set of organisations, we selected representatives of each user group and of each category for conducting guideline-based, semi-structured expert interviews.

3.5.2 Conclusions for the development of the European Monitor on Urban Integration

This accumulation of data revealed several interesting facts for the development of the European Monitor which we take as conclusions for our further work. As expected, needs and interests do vary to some extent between and among the different user groups. This is not entirely surprising for the fact that we had to summarise user groups based on the highest common factor of the organisations, ignoring other aspects such as size, financial capability or ideology.

Nevertheless, this type of categorisation allowed us to summarise the following common points:

- **Governmental Organisations** can be accredited to be the most homogeneous of our user groups with regards to their mandates. They tend to be rather hesitant towards social media in general and state to prefer traditional survey methods. They also expressed concerns regarding the lacking objectivity and lacking representativeness of user generated data. In spite of these doubts we did detect an interest though when it comes to the perception of integration related campaigns and measures among the social media society. In this regard we do see a clear connecting factor which we can approach these organisations with in the conception of the European Monitor.

- **Non-Governmental Organisations** constitute the biggest part of European organisations in the field of migration and integration. Many of them are very active in social media and our interview partners from this group expressed their strong interest in a tool that provides civil society feedback to policy-makers. Privacy issues were mentioned as important when analysing social media contents; especially the data and identity protection of irregular migrants was formulated as an issue that had to be handled with caution. This feedback from the interviewed NGOs affirmed us in our effort to proactively deal with the legal and ethical challenges that social media analytics might pose. Deliverable 2.6, which was worked on simultaneously, examines all these questions in detailed manner.

- **Research Centres and Universities** with a specialisation in migrant integration use a wide range of information sources. So far, their own social media activity is not very high and certain concerns regarding the quality of user generated data have to be addressed when targeting this group. The ability to get precise and comparable information through the filtering system has to be highlighted. The fact that most research centres that focus on migrant integration are interested in (1) integration at the city level and (2) the public discourse on migrants and integration suggests that they constitute a promising target group for the European Monitor.

- **International Governmental Organisations** were very interested in our research project and the tool development and might be a good target group once the tool is finished. The willingness of the three interviewed organisations to test the first trial version will give us more insights in the specific needs and demands of this user group. What is especially valuable for IGOs is the tool's ability to compare cities across Europe – a wider scope of participating cities would be very helpful in this regard.

Furthermore, the following conclusions can be drawn out of the categories according the areas of activities of the organisations:

- The category of **Legislation and/or Execution of Migration/Integration Policies** is almost congruent with the user groups GOs and IGOs. From our interviews we learnt that a great variety of information sources is important for an evidence-based process of policy-making. So far, most representatives of this category have been reserved towards social media. Therefore, the scientific methodology of the European Monitor will have to be explained when approaching this group. Nevertheless, we consider this a promising target group because social media analytics would offer them time- and cost-effective data on people's online discussions, reactions to policies and measures and focal points within the integration discourse.

- The category of **Research and/or Policy Advice** applies to very different organisations from all user groups and it is therefore difficult to identify commonalities. International governmental organisations from this category expressed their very strong interest in social media analytics while for research centres a certain hesitance towards

social media research was identified. The potential benefit of social media analytics in general and the European Monitor in particular will need to be stressed.

- We consider groups that claim to **represent migrants and advocate** for them as particular promising target group for the European Monitor. Continuous and prompt information on migrants and integration issues from the grass-roots level are essential for these groups' work.
- **Services for migrants** are often provided by local organisations which is why we only examined a small sample of this group. But as a matter of fact, we can conclude from our research that associations from this category might be especially interested in the European Monitor because (1) for them it is essential to know what local people think about migrant integration, (2) they could learn from others cities and their services and (3) the data from social media could help them identifying migrants' needs in terms of services.
- For organisations in the **Awareness-raising and Mobilisation** category the European Monitor offers the chance to track the impact of their campaigns and to identify hotly debated integration issues at an early stage.

Summing up, we can state that this thorough compilation of target groups has provided us with two essential types of information which we exploit for the further development of the European Monitor: **Firstly**, we do have a data base of organisations where we have detected a founded interest in the tool, which we will be able to contact for demonstration reasons and potentially beyond. **Secondly**, due to our profound study in the frame of this deliverable, we could deduct needs, interests as well as concerns in a qualitative social scientific manner which will allow us to tailor the tool according to practical requirements. These are aspects that will substantially enrich our work on the European Monitor and will contribute to the high quality of the UniteEurope tools.

3.6 Legal, cultural and ethical aspects report (D2.6)

The University of Potsdam was leading this deliverable and contributed to the ethical part which was – in the main – researched upon by ZARA. The universities of Malmö and Rotterdam addressed the cultural aspects of UniteEurope. INSET organised and hosted the focus group workshop and collaborated with the external legal expert on the legal challenges and the ethical expert on ethical challenges the UniteEurope project will face. The final draft was authored by all involved partners and reviewed extensively by the advisory board, as well as by further legal and ethical experts. It was submitted to the European Commission in August 2012.

3.6.1 Conclusions for the further work of UniteEurope

This deliverable drew the attention to legal, cultural and ethical aspects of UniteEurope, which led to a veritable sensitisation within the consortium for concerns beyond research and

development. Being advised by several external experts we have pointed out the most essential challenges in these fields.

Dealing with the legal, cultural and ethical aspects as three distinct sections, we became very well aware of the fact that in many respects, the issues in these fields that we are confronted with are intertwined and require a comprehensive approach when it comes to elaborating effective solutions. Summing up the conclusions and recommendations we can globally name four decisive subject areas that we shall profoundly take into account in the further course of the project:

Considerations on data protection

Both from a legal as well as from an ethical viewpoint, sensitivity towards data protection issues is one of the core outcomes of working on this deliverable. Even though in legal terms our undertakings are not obviously touching data protection provisions, we have learnt that in theory we can be dealing with personal data and thus we have taken safeguarding measures in order to acquire legal certainty.

Being in compliance with the law is one step to diminish ethical concerns, but must be considered a minimum standard only for coming up to ethical requirements concerning data protection. In this regard, the lack of the possibility to receive of "informed consent" by people contributing to public social media plattforms is an issue that requires precautions in order to protect the authors of postings who might not be aware of the public availability of their contents, let alone of their deployment for research purposes.

The latter can be considered a general question of ethics in science comparable to that of the method of observation, however more delicate due to the very nature of "digital reality" that allows fast and easy detection of data. All the more we consider it essential to take endeavours assuring complete anonymity by blanking out the authors' names or acronyms which they are using for communicating on the Internet.

Selection of sources and the question of representativeness

The selection of social media sources was picked out as a central theme in all three sections. This is owed to the fact that, next to the keywords that the tool will be reactive to, the sources are the fundamental basis of all content that will be produced by UniteEurope. Thus, particular caution must be applied on the methodological approach of selecting social media sources.

Whilst from a legal point of view, the core condition is that sources must be selected in a prudent manner with regards to their compliance with relevant data protection standards, the cultural and ethical perspectives impose more complex demands, coming close to the matter of representation in social media. These demands are centred on the question of "Who is active in social media?", which brings about issues of "digital divide" (exclusion of certain groups of people depending on variables such as age, computer literacy, gender, etc.), the

strong presence of populist and extremist positions in social networks and, in contrast, the weak presence of (certain groups of) migrants.

Whilst, due to the very nature of social media, UniteEurope will not be able to claim representativeness with its results, we are identifying two essential tasks with regards to the development and communication of our tool: First, we are working on a sound methodological approach in order to provide for a set of social media sources that comes up to scientific standards and minimizes random or biased results. Second, we will take measures to ensure the end users' awareness that UniteEurope is merely displaying opinions within the perpetually changing virtual or "social media reality" which, as a matter of fact, does not allow valid conclusions with regards to the situations in urban populations.

Processing and reporting of results

Following up the sources debate, also the question of how to process and report results will be of essential importance. This has been thoroughly discussed in the ethical part of this deliverable. Whilst existing social media analytics tools almost exclusively rely on quantitative display formats, UniteEurope will go for a hybrid of a quantitative and qualitative presentation of results.

This is mainly owed to the fact that in the (often very value-laden) discussion of integration related issues, the use of quantitative data only can be misleading in the sense that individual sources and/or individual users can produce above-average amounts of partial contents. As a matter of fact, it is important that those will be counted and considered by the tool; however, by providing additional context information (indication of sources and number of sources, extracts from the postings, links to the original pages, etc.), we make sure that the end user will be able to estimate the general relevance of the results by learning about their backgrounds.

Communication to stakeholders

As particularly identified in the legal and ethical parts of this report, the responsibility to fulfil the requirements brought up in this deliverable is shared between the consortium, in the first place, and the end users of the tool. Hence, we are attaching great importance to raise the end users' awareness of legal, cultural and ethical concerns and thereby contribute to prevent potential misuse.

With regards to the end users, a license agreement, manual and training materials will be equipped with sensitising information concerning the critical aspects as well as the possibilities and limits of the tool with regards of the points mentioned above. Furthermore, for assuring a wider impact, the recommendations and conclusions in this deliverable will be part of the overall communication strategy of the UniteEurope project in order to inform stakeholders about the purpose of the tool and its dedicated outcome.

4 Summary and perspectives

This summary report was led by the University of Potsdam and co-authored by all deleverable leaders of work package 2. As conclusive deliverable of WP2, it recapitulates the findings of all analyses in this work package and provides the main conclusions for the follow up of the project. It thereby constitutes the second milestone (M 2) „City administration report on all conducted analyses".

In its introductory and first parts, this deliverable has outlined the synergies that arouse among the deliverables within WP2 and beyond. Particular relevance must be given to the city case studies, which have enabled the consortium to develop and apply a common methodology serving and linking four deliverables in WP2 (D2.1 – D2.4) and two in WP3 (D3.1 and D3.2). Not only has this facilitated an effective and efficient approach to the city cases. It also builds the basis for academic publications, as well as an extension of the project to the investigation of further cities.

In its core part, this report summarises the accomplished work throughout this work package by deliverable. This juxtaposition of results allows drawing central conclusions for the further work on UniteEurope and development and implementation of the software:

Heterogeneous target groups

Both within urban as well as within pan-European target groups, we found high heterogeneity with regards to migrant integration and respective policies in general, but also concerning their administrative frameworks, their arrangements of workflows as well as their existing technical infrastructures. In any respect, UniteEurope will have to tease out and strike their common factors in order to provide its services with the greatest possible accuracy. As D2.1 has shown, it is important to analyse the particularities of a city before starting to deploy the UniteEurope to it. As there are many layers of policy making within a city it is necessary to delineate the major actors and the way they are interacting with each other. With regards to the results presented in D2.2, it must be concluded that ideally, UniteEurope will be operateed from an external server that stores and analyses data, as well as runs the application. The software will – from the perspective of the user – be a tool that s/he accesses via the Internet. Also, it needs to be taken into account when developing UniteEurope that potential users of the UniteEurope software in the three cities mainly work from personal computers that are equipped with different operating systems and browser software. However we also have to consider that mobile devices will the every-day practise of public administrators and NGOs in the realm of migrant integration.

Strong end-user focus

As several deliverables in WP2 suggest, the potential end-users, which are represented in the consortium by our city and NGO partners, need to be involved in the production of the tool at a very early stage in order to ensure its highest possible usability. Particularly the interviews for the city cases have revealed that many policy makers who are not familiar with

the latest trends in information and communication technologies (such as social media analytics) have difficulties in imagining the potential of the tool. We conclude that an early integration of these users in the development process could help the designers of the tool to prepare for the needs of their users. This holds especially true for pan-European target groups, among which we found some hesitation with regards to social media in general. As some interviewees have expressed their strong interest in the tool, the consortium should approach them once a demonstrable version is ready. In general, usability and accessibility will be the predominant development principles which shall – in doubt – outbalance the inclusion of specific and interesting features.

<u>Work with the right actors</u>

As particularly D2.1 reveals, the UniteEurope software is best deployed to actors that are relevant in the field of the strategic phases of policy making, i.e. in periods of problem definition and policy evaluation. In general, UniteEurope can be deployed to all levels of governance within larger cities. The example of Berlin has demonstrated that these levels act, at least to some extent, quite independently.

Furthermore, as found in D2.3, the municipalities of Rotterdam, Berlin and Malmö have considerable practical autonomy at least in some aspects of migrant integration policies vis-à-vis their national governments. This again confirms the relevance of the local focus of the UniteEurope tool. Also local NGOs prove to have an essential role in this regard: In Berlin and Rotterdam, many non-governmental actors are funded by the municipality to execute policy measures whilst in Malmö, such comparable executive institutions are (partly) owned by the city itself. This underpins our efforts with regards to local target groups additional to municipalities. The participation of the Viennese NGO ZARA has already proven to be very important in this respect and will certainly contribute further in the development of the UniteEurope tool.

<u>Integrate legal, cultural and ethical aspects in all phases of the project</u>

As D2.6 points out, legal, cultural and ethical aspects do play a major role throughout the whole project. Deliverable D2.6 must be seen as a kick-off in this regard which will be followed by further relevant measures. Hereby, above all the license agreement, the user manual and training materials must be mentioned. Next to technical aspects, those will be equipped with sensitising information concerning the critical aspects as well as the possibilities and limits of the tool with regards of the points dealt with in the deliverable. Also further measures of user training must be considered as the users will have considerable responsibilities in these areas. Furthermore, for assuring a wider impact, the recommendations and conclusions in D2.6 will be part of the overall communication strategy of the UniteEurope project in order to inform stakeholders about the purpose of the tool and its dedicated outcome.