

# Policies and strategies influencing the impact of welcome services: a snapshot from Italy

Giulia Galera, Euricse

Foreign Immigration in the Alps and the Phenomenon of Refugees

Salecina Foundation, Maloja (CH)

May 11-13, 2017



**Euricse**

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

# Main issues

- immigration policy in Italy
- characteristics of the Italian reception system
- impact of welcome services
- local welcome initiatives, strategies and policies
- challenges and trends



Euricse

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

# Immigration policy in Italy



Euricse

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

## Emotionally charged and contradictory issue

- “migration crisis” regulated and managed as a security/emergency concern
- priority=prevent people that could contribute to meeting our economic and demographic needs to settle down in Italy
- migrants that want to move to Italy have no other choice but apply for international protection

## Minniti/Orlando law, 2017

- contrast “illegal immigration”=expel undocumented migrants
- speed up the procedures in the domain of international protection: unconstitutional as it violates art 24 and 111 of the Italian Constitution and the European Convention on Human Rights

# Characteristics of the Italian reception system

Powers to manage reception conferred to the Ministry of Internal Affairs

- temporary reception (first aid)
  - **directly delivered by government:** Hotspots; CARA
- medium-long term reception (on average 12 months)
  - **emergency-led directed by local prefectures:** directly contracted out by local prefectures to private providers (CAS)
  - **coordinated by municipalities/consortia of municipalities:** delivered in most cases in cooperation with local Third Sector organizations (SPRAR)
  - **coordinated by two provinces:** directed by the provinces of Trento (as CAS and SPRAR) and Bolzano on the basis of an agreement with the Ministry of Interior and contracted out to Third Sector organizations

Typology of reception structure	Number of places	%
Hot Spots	711	0.4
CARA	14,026	8
CAS	136,729	78.4
SPRAR	23,107	13.2
TOTAL	174,573	100

Source: Ministry of Interior, 31/01/2017



**Euricse**

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

	A		B	C	D	
					A+B+C	
Territorio	immigrati presenti nelle strutture temporanee	immigrati presenti negli hot spot	immigrati presenti nei centri di prima accoglienza	Posti SPRAR occupati (al 23 gennaio 2017)	totale immigrati presenti sul territorio Regione	percentuale di distribuzione dei migranti presenti per Regione
Lombardia	21854			1509	23.163	13%
Lazio	9855		857	4068	14.780	8%
Veneto	10404		2691	535	13.630	8%
Piemonte	12827			1242	14.069	8%
Campania	13177			1324	14.501	8%
Sicilia	4488	587	4494	4065	13.634	8%
Toscana	11587			857	12.444	7%
Emilia-Romagna	11074		596	1210	12.880	7%
Puglia	6259	124	3110	2295	11.788	7%
Calabria	3587		1090	2505	7.182	4%
Liguria	5146			512	5.658	3%
Sardegna	5269			201	5.470	3%
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	3478		1188	337	5.003	3%
Marche	3849			684	4.533	3%
Abruzzo	3456			258	3.714	2%
Molise	2860			493	3.353	2%
Umbria	2754			408	3.162	2%
Basilicata	2056			460	2.516	1%
Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano	1359			0	1.359	1%
Provincia Autonoma di Trento	1286			144	1.430	1%
Valle d'Aosta	304			0	304	0,2%
<b>TOTALI</b>	<b>136.729</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>14.026</b>	<b>23.107</b>	<b>174.573</b>	<b>100%</b>

	Rationale embedded	Local anchorage (key/ not a condition)	Networking ability (key/not a condition)	Monitoring and accounting requirements (High-low)	Relevance of work integration (High-low)
SPRAR	Support an integrated approach	Key condition	Key condition	High	High
CAS	Emergency	Not a condition	Not a condition	Low	Low
CENTRALIZED SYSTEM - provincial agency	Ensure a common direction and standardized services through an ad hoc Operative Agency	Not a condition	Condition required	Low for CAS and high for SPRAR	High
CENTRALIZED SYSTEM – pre-selection of two managing entities	Emergency	Not a condition	Not a condition	Low	Low



# Impact of welcome services



Euricse

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

- SPRAR system: virtuous example of reception services, but high bureaucratization explained by the need to monitor the process
- excellent examples of CAS (with a strong inclination towards innovation and entrepreneurship) alongside a significant number of bad practices
- shortcomings of the centralized system
  - Trentino: risk of suffocating innovation and deresponsibilizing municipalities and civil society
  - South-tyrol: pre-selection of 2 large NGOs controversial
- what makes the difference is the “maturity” and local anchorage of the managing entity
  - to what extent is the community engaged in the welcome initiative?
  - to what extent is the managing entity able to manage the asylum challenge so as to generate social and territorial innovation?



# Impact of welcome services



Euricse

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises

- correlation between the **features/local anchorage** shown by the managing entity and the **quality of the welcome services** performed
  - features: history (e.g. motivations of the founders), governance model, activities performed to the advantage of the local community in addition to reception services
  - local anchorage: embeddedness of the managing organization in the receiving territory
- the more **inclusive** and **locally embedded** the organization, the more it succeeds in:
  - supporting the social and work integration of recipients
  - generating beneficial impacts upon the receiving community thanks to the welcome initiative
  - embracing a “holistic approach” in key policy areas (e.g. housing, training and work, education, culture, health, networking)

# Local welcome initiatives, strategies and policies

Policy area	Good practice	Smart public policy/regulation
Housing	Dispersed accommodation/ in families =autonomy/self-empowerment of beneficiaries promoted from the outset	Housing of recipients in dispersed accommodations favoured/required by the tender
Training and work	Design of specific social and work integration paths based on the mapping of skills of recipients and local actors (e.g. peer-to-peer mutual learning strategies)	<p>Previous experience in the management of asylum seekers and/or the work integration of people at risk assessed by bids</p> <p>Design of social and work integration paths for recipients required by the tender</p>
Education	Engagement of teachers, parents and civil society to ensure a full integration of foreign pupils through the educational system	Enrollment in school regarded as a common good=municipality decides how to distribute children in local schools so as to ensure balanced representation of majority/minority pupil groups

Trends	Challenges
<p>selection/financing criteria emergency-led have attracted many opportunistic organizations</p>	<p>acknowledge the structural nature of the migration phenomenon and shape policies so as to value the potential contribution of locally embedded organizations</p>
<p>isomorphic pressures have pushed managing entities to provide only basic services</p>	<p>require that bid evaluations go beyond basic criteria and assess the ensemble of services delivered to beneficiaries, including the ability to mobilize community resources like volunteers</p>
<p>SPRAR system still underutilized by municipalities</p> <p>excess of burocratization of the SPRAR</p>	<p>require that municipalities join SPRAR obligatory</p> <p>seek for alternative modalities to ensure adequate monitoring and accounting (e.g. require the engagement of a variety of stakeholders in the governance of the managing entity)</p>
<p>Trentino system has ensured a high quality and standardization of reception services, which has however contributed to de-responsibilizing the commitment of municipalities and local communities</p>	<p>include the territorial criterion in bids</p> <p>expand the recourse to the SPRAR system</p> <p>experiment with more effective integration paths</p>
<p>South Tyrol model presupposes that the “reception service market” is shared by 2 pre-selected large organizations without open tenders</p>	<p>introduce the SPRAR system as requested by 6/7 small municipalities</p> <p>introduce public tenders</p>



# Thanks!

[giulia.galera@euricse.eu](mailto:giulia.galera@euricse.eu)



**Euricse**

European Research Institute on  
Cooperative and Social Enterprises