Foreword

When it comes to migrant integration, the local level matters. Where migrants go and how they integrate into their new communities depends on the specific characteristics of cities and regions. Local authorities play a vital role in this integration. Cities can learn from each other and the data and practices collected in this report help to provide local, regional, national and international policy makers and practitioners with better evidence for integration policy design.

This report describes why and how countries, regions and cities can adopt a territorial approach to migrant integration. It brings together lessons around 12 points for consideration in the development and implementation of migrant integration programmes at the local level. This report draws on both a statistical database on migrant integration outcomes at subnational level and a survey of 72 cities. Among those surveyed are nine large European cities (Amsterdam, Athens, Barcelona, Berlin, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Paris, Rome, Vienna) and one small city in Germany (Altena). Part I provides an overview of what we know about migrant integration at the local level. Part II focuses on the objectives for effectively integrating migrants at the local level. It provides a “Checklist for public action to migrant integration at the local level” along with concrete examples of actions that could be implemented. This checklist can be used as a self-assessment tool.

The report is an output of an OECD-European Union initiative contributing to the programme of work of the OECD Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC) in the Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities. This work also contributes to the OECD Horizontal Project on ensuring better integration of vulnerable migrants by focusing on improving the integration capacities of the local governments. The final report was approved by written procedure on 8 December 2018 [CFE/RDPC(2017)11].
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