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1. Executive summary

This is a study of ‘self-organized community development with refugees’. Preliminary investigations by the research team suggested that a novel development is that bottom-up initiatives are increasingly recognized as legitimate stakeholders in community development processes.

The report applies a ‘minimal definition’ of community development: local activities to establish and strengthen durable relations between refugees and members of the host society, allowing for processes of shared decision-making. The report takes self-organization to refer to both ‘refugee self-organizations’ and to ‘grassroots initiatives of members of the host society for or with refugees’.

The empirical work was carried out in four European cities: Utrecht (the Netherlands), Milan (Italy), Birmingham (United Kingdom) and Brno (Czech Republic). A total number of 32 interviews were conducted: 22 with innovative organizations or initiatives, 4 with local government bodies and 6 with external experts (46 individuals in total).

The Dutch case is characterized by a tendency to move from initiatives for refugees to initiatives with refugees (here referred to as co-production). In spite of this, earlier-founded self-organizations of refugees are less recognized as relevant players with respect to community development as described in this report. Utrecht is a city with a generally generous attitude toward helping refugee integration, not only by the third sector, but also by the local government.

In the Italian case, community development is not the prime objective in dealing with refugees: a substantial part of all refugees does not intend to stay. Therefore, the study reports on a ‘counter case’ in Milan: the ‘Migrants Hub’ in the central train station, an innovation in refugee transit management. The Hub is supported by a wide network of organizations, including commercial firms.

The English case is characterized by a ten year-effort to move toward a refugee community support infrastructure in Birmingham at a time when government funding has dried up. Nevertheless, Birmingham is a City of Sanctuary, in which many volunteers work hard on developing communities.

The Czech case is characterized by making the shift from being a transition country to becoming an arrival country. Self-organized community development with refugees is still in its relatively early stages. Like in Milan, but unlike in Utrecht and Birmingham, the organizations that were interviewed do not focus exclusively on refugees.

How can ‘self-organized community development with refugees’ be understood in the context of the aforementioned cities? What are its characteristics? Even though the countries differ in the extent to which they work on community development with refugees, communities (as a support base) and networking (as an instrument) are generally important across all cases, at least for recruiting support and developing new, local networked ways of working with refugees. This might be an innovation in its own right. Bottom-up initiative both reflects the desire of people to be involved in addressing social issues, and a need to cope with heavily restricted public services. Despite the appreciation of the efforts of volunteers, there is a feeling that a
larger role for the third sector may not be an innovation, but a mere substitution of public services.

There are many possible community development strategies. Some organizations or initiatives establish entirely new social groups; some focus on networks around individual refugees; others on establishing interfaces between different groups, organizations or communities; some work in, or with existing communities; sometimes community development is a side-effect of connecting refugees to volunteers through basic service delivery.

Next to ‘refugee self-organizations’ and ‘grassroots initiatives of members of the host society’, the study suggests other ‘degrees of self-organization’: involving refugees as co-founders or co-governors; connecting refugees to grassroots initiatives taken by members of the host society; or facilitating or promoting self-organization in vested organizations.

How did this social innovation stream emerge over time, in the local context? Refugee self-organizations and grassroots initiatives of citizens step in when public institutions in the asylum system are unable or unwilling to cope with sudden changes in the number of new arrivals (often due to negative public opinion). The recent rise of the number of refugees coming to Europe is a shared milestone in all countries. Moreover, restrictive policies have limited public facilities for community development with refugees since the turn of the century. Bottom-up initiatives (and other NGOs) have attempted to fill this gap, often advocating for more generous public support. Some initiatives strive after local impact, other after impact on the national level. Both can be innovative in their own right. Innovation does not necessarily target systemic change.

What are the features of the organizations or entities that push this innovation stream? Organizations and initiatives are generally highly oriented toward social needs. They are rather oriented towards service delivery than to advocacy. Advocacy often happens cautiously, through indirect channels, although some (British) organizations have argued that it can be very beneficial to link it to service delivery. They work on the basis of values like trust, tolerance, human rights or respect for diversity and hospitality. Collaboration between organizations with different values is often possible if the shared intention is to support refugees. Organizations generally seem to be fairly open, both in terms of having a non-hierarchical organizational structure, and in terms of being open to collaboration for specific shared concerns. Sharing a neighborhood is not a prime factor for organizations to collaborate, but a new refugee shelter in the area can be a cause for new initiatives and collaborative efforts. As said, lack of funding is a major constraint. Largely because of this, organizations have no option but to rely largely on the work of volunteers. Fortunately, there are many who are happy to help, but they often do not see their role in substituting professional services on a long-term basis.

What relations do these entities establish within their local contexts? In all four cities, the local government is supportive and seeks cooperation with the third sector. Cities are often in conflict with their national governments. Companies are not dominant in ‘self-organized community development with refugees’. The organizations and initiatives studied generally operate in loose networks around particular themes or focal points.

What impact do the socially innovative activities have on beneficiaries and actors involved? The primary impact is that they satisfy needs of refugees by providing services that were non-
existent. Next to this, volunteers gain experiences, knowledge and a feeling of fulfillment. Finally, the work often involves establishing cross-cutting dialogues in the local community.
2. Introduction

2.1. Community development with refugees

This study reports on social innovation in the community development domain. Early on in the research process, we decided to narrow this broad domain down by focusing on activities pertaining to refugees. Such a focus makes sense, given that community development is often defined as an activity for the benefit of a particular social group. Bhattacharyya provides some examples of activities that might be regarded as community development: ‘enticing industries to a small town, organizing peasants, mobilizing for minority or gender rights, providing elderly care, agitating for environmental protection, cultural rights, or better schools’ (1995: 61).

Such a focus on activities is well-suited to the study of social innovation: finding new solutions to neglected, or previously inadequately addressed social needs. The novelty of such solutions might be restricted to the local level, but can also diffuse. They are expected to imply an improvement for the beneficiaries and actors involved (H.K. Anheier et al., 2014).

The specific focus on refugees stems from the sudden increase in the number of refugees coming to Europe over the course of the project. The vast numbers crossing the Mediterranean was certainly one of the most pressing issues of the year 2015. Never before had over 60 million people been displaced worldwide. In 2015, UNHCR reported 21.3 million refugees. A dreadful number, close to 4000, died at sea while crossing to Europe in one year only. Many countries spent much of 2015 and 2016 debating whether borders should be closed or even fenced off, how to handle the groups of people walking down the roads of Europe and camping out close to train and bus stations, and how these people should eventually be distributed across the continent.

It seemed likely that other questions would come up soon enough: questions regarding cultural differences, fear of community disintegration, and how to gain and maintain public support for receiving refugees in the wake of the rise of populist politics. Headlines of European newspapers reflected widely differing sentiments, ranging from the Willkommenskultur of German Chancellor Angela Merkel’s statement Wir Schaffen Das, to Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s plan to ‘protect’ his national community by fencing of the Southern borders. Every day we found articles about voluntary efforts to welcome refugees or to house them in private residencies, next to articles about worries regarding the 2015 New Year’s Eve incidents in Cologne or protests of far-right groups like Pegida. Looking beyond the immediately pertinent questions, such as shelter and other emergency support, a focus on community development seemed relevant with an eye to the future.

Despite the acuteness of the refugee situation, we decided to not only focus on new arrivals. Nor did we want to focus on asylum seekers, still in procedure, only. Community development is also highly – or perhaps even more – relevant for those who have already obtained their refugee status, and for refused asylum seekers.
2.2. Defining community development

Research about community development with refugees is often not based on an explicit definition of community development.¹ The implicit definition often seems to be: community development is the work done by community development workers. This labels it as a professional discipline, with its own journals, such as the Community Development Journal. The strength of the discipline may be doubted, however: one author remarks ‘Community development’ is likely to be taught as one of twenty-four units in a Bachelors degree’ (Lenette & Ingamells, 2015: 99).

Some articles provide basic descriptions, discussing, for instance ‘community development programs designed to help communities meet their own needs’ (Amowitz, Heisler, & Iacopino, 2003: 580). An editorial article, introducing a special issue on the topic, entitled Community development with refugees: towards a framework for action (Craig & Lovel, 2005) does not give an explicit definition, but presents a seven-point framework. It focuses on the question ‘what participation needs to take place with refugees from armed conflict?’ (2005: 132). The seven steps include participation by refugees in: identification of needs, mobilization of resources, identification of intervention options, decision-making on choice of intervention, delivery of the action/intervention, developing skills and identifying and measuring process and end-point outcomes. Clearly, these steps present a process-oriented view of community development.

When explicit definitions are provided in articles dealing with refugees, they tend to vary strongly:

One way of framing the practice purpose of community development is to enhance the relationships between persons and the networks, processes and structures of their social, economic, cultural and political contexts (Lenette & Ingamells, 2015: 98)

I define community development as local antipoverty measures that provide economic opportunities and goods for residents while enhancing their social connections and opportunities for decision making (Stewart, 2012: 406)

SSTT agencies [the focus of the report] define community development as a ‘process which contributes to the strength of a community by increasing its social capital, developing self reliance through encouraging cohesive relationships and external partnerships, enhancing and harnessing community skills and resources, and promoting participation in decision making and leadership to ensure community ownership (Department of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Social Development, Child Youth and Family, and Community Employment Group quoted in Mitchell & Correa-Velez, 2010)

These definitions have only one element in common: a focus on enhancing relationships (also referred to as connections, social capital, external partnerships). The latter two definitions share a focus on participation in decision-making. These two points have informed the empirical work of this study. At the same time, we felt a more inductive approach was called for, asking: what does community development with refugees entail?

¹ Based on a query (“community development” AND (refugee* OR “asylum seeker*”)) on the Web of Science portal, October 4 2016, generating a sample of 22 articles. Additional queries, using terms like “community integration”, “community capacity building” and “community organizing” provided a few more relevant results.
A question that these definitions do not address is: what is to be understood as a community? Bhattacharyya (1995) warns us for assuming that people sharing an ethnicity or living in the same area form a community. Communities may also be formed along lines of religion, political affiliation, or class, to name a few, or intersections thereof. Similarly, we may not assume that people sharing a refugee background will automatically form a community.

For this study, we have chosen to add a focus on community development activities that target cohesion between those with a refugee background, and residents of the host societies. This brings the community development concept close to the notion of community integration:

*Community integration encompasses the following: (a) physical integration: the use of community resources and participation in community activities (Segal, Baumohl, & Moyles, 1980); (b) social integration: engagement and interaction with other community members (Wolfensberger & Thomas, 1983); and (c) psychological integration: the development of a sense of belonging in relation to neighbors and the neighborhood (Solomon, Lee, Chatterjee, & McClaine, 2010).*

Particularly the latter indicator makes it clear that it is important to examine the local level, or perhaps even the sub-local: the level of the neighborhood.

To sum up: in the present study, we apply the following ‘minimal definition’ of community development: local activities to establish and strengthen durable relations between refugees and members of the host society, allowing for processes of shared decision-making. On top of this, many other features may be added to the definition, depending on the local context. Apart from applying this minimal definition, we strive to refine the specific dimensions of community development with refugees in a number of target countries.

### 2.3. Destination cities and transit cities

The study was carried out in four countries: the Netherlands, United Kingdom, Italy and the Czech Republic. Within each country, we decided to focus on one specific city, given the definition of community development as a *local* activity. The empirical work was carried out in four cities: Utrecht (the Netherlands), Milan (Italy), Birmingham (United Kingdom) and Brno (Czech Republic). We return to the motivation for these cities when describing the overall methodology of the study (chapter 3).

This selection of countries – and cities therein – seemed to provide a relevant mix of ‘destination countries’ and ‘transit countries’, as seen from a refugee’s point of view. At the start of the project we underestimated the implications of this mix. Countries that are considered ‘transit countries’ are no less active in dealing with refugees than ‘destination countries’, but community development is not the prime objective: a substantial part of all refugees does not intend to stay.

Particularly in the Italian case, finding projects relating to community development and refugees turned out to be difficult, if not impossible. For the Czech Republic, this was somewhat different, considering that it is developing into a destination country. It turned out to be possible to find a number of relevant innovative activities there. We decided to look for a ‘counter case’ in Italy: an innovation in refugee transit management. The ‘Migrants Hub’ in the central train station of Milan offers basic support to refugees in their transit to other destination. Even though it does not result in durable relations *between refugees and the citizens of Milan*, we can take learning from the way in which a *wide array of organizations formed*
relations to provide this service. This locally networked form of service delivery will also turn out to be an important element in the other city-cases.

2.4. Finding a relevant innovation stream: self-organization as legitimate stakeholders

Preliminary investigations of the research team aimed to establish important ‘innovation streams’ in the domain of community development with refugees. By streams, the ITSSOIN project refers to topics or trends in which different players were active in developing ‘innovative activities’.

These investigations were based on desk research, expert consultation in three out of four countries, review of academic articles in which community-related projects and activities for refugees were labelled as socially innovative, interviews with representatives of international umbrella organizations and validation workshops with members from inside and outside the ITSSOIN consortium (for a more extensive presentation, see Mensink, Van den Berg, Navrátil, D., et al., 2015). From a longer list – also including microfinance, combating discrimination, community-based health, social activation and work integration – we finally selected self-organization as the ‘innovation stream’ on which we would focus. Going through the aforementioned steps of our preliminary investigation, this seemed to be the most relevant.

We take self-organization to refer both to ‘refugee self-organizations’ and to ‘grassroots initiatives of members of the host society for or with refugees’. The former were introduced mainly on the basis of interviews with experts, while the latter was introduced on the basis of validation within the project consortium. Considering the definition of community development as activities establishing relations between refugees and members of the host societies, it was felt that the initiative for such activities ought to be regarded ‘from both sides’.

Refugee self-organizations are defined as:

Organisations rooted within, and supported by, the ethnic or national refugee/asylum seeker communities they serve. . .[and] established by the refugees and asylum seekers themselves – or by their pre-established communities (Zetter & Pearl, 2000: 676).

Citizens’ or grassroots initiatives are defined (general definition, not specific to a refugee context) as:

Collective activities by citizens aimed at providing local ‘public goods or services’ (e.g. regarding the livability and safety) in their street, neighbourhood or town, in which citizens decide themselves both about the aims and means of their project and in which local authorities have a supporting or facilitating role (Bakker, Denters, Oude Vrielink, & Klok, 2012: 397).

What these definitions have in common, is that they both describes bottom-up forms of collective action: a group of people pursuing a public goal, ideally with a high degree of self-organization and self-determination, in the sense of being independent from government or market pressures (Bakker et al., 2012). Moreover, the focus on ‘self-governance’ is an important link our ‘minimal’ definition of community development.

These definitions are ideal types. It is not our intention to examine only activities – constituting the broader innovation stream – that meet these criteria exactly. We speak of organizations or initiatives ‘with a degree of self-organization’. Next to ‘ideal typical examples’, we are also interested in independent refugee groups operating in the context of a
professional organization, in initiatives that refugees and members of the host society take together, in citizen initiatives that partly fulfil a task for which they receive governmental subsidy, etc. Our objective is to provide a broad and open exploration of the notion of ‘self-organized community development with refugees’.

In this context, it needs to be stressed that refugee self-organization and grassroots initiatives are not new as such. More than a decade ago, Craig and Lovel wrote:

Despite the generally hostile political environment to refugees worldwide, there is at grass-roots levels a new momentum to share community development expertise with groups struggling to tackle social exclusion resulting from armed conflict across the world (2005: 133).

Similarly, refugee self-organizations have existed for a long time (Zetter, Griffiths, & Sigona, 2005; Zetter & Pearl, 2000). What is new, according to our preliminary investigation, and the subsequent case work that we present here, is the notion that these bottom-up initiatives are increasingly recognized as legitimate stakeholders in community development processes. This is the actual innovation stream we study in this report. For practical purposes, however, we refer to it as ‘self-organized community development with refugees’.

With respect to the counter case of the ‘Migrants Hub’ in Milan: considering that its objective is not to establish community development as we have defined it, logically, we will not find ‘self-organized community development’ here either. Nevertheless, we will see that there are many aspects with a degree of self-organization in the delivery of this transit management service.

2.5. Research questions

Considering that the unit of analysis of this study is an ‘innovation stream’, rather than on specific ‘innovation activities’, our objective has not been to establish to what extent individual initiatives are innovative. At the same time, we can only study a relatively abstract stream by studying the concrete activities of organizations or entities that constitute it. We aim to understand a number of things:

1. How can ‘self-organized community development with refugees’ be understood in the context of the aforementioned cities? What are its characteristics?
2. How did this innovation stream emerge over time, in the local context?
3. What are the features of the organizations or entities that push this innovation stream?
4. What relations do these entities establish within their local contexts?
5. What impact have the innovation activities that constitute the innovation stream had on beneficiaries and actors involved (e.g. influence on decision-making and relations between refugees and members of the host societies)?

2.6. The time horizon

We did not start off with a preconceived time horizon for studying self-organized community development. We did, however, note a common trend of increasingly restrictive migration policies in all four countries, roughly since the turn of the century. We assume that this influences self-organization to some degree: if public provision of services diminishes, one might expect an increase of self-organized services or approaches for community development. Additionally, it was expected that the recent increase in the number of arrivals in Europe would somehow leave its mark on our study. Next to protests against new reception centers, there was a simultaneous blooming of new initiatives to support refugees in all countries. In spite of
these assumptions, we adopted an open view with regard to the time horizon. After all, there
have been earlier phases of restrictive policies and of increases in arrivals. In the country case-
studies, we would put effort in tracing back the origins and milestones for the development of
the specific innovation stream.

2.7. In the ITSSOIN-project

This study contributes to the broader ITSSOIN-project, which hypothesizes that third sector
organizations (for a definition see H.K. Anheier et al., 2014) are more likely to be involved in
social innovation than commercial firms or governments. This is based on the particular
features of such organizations, like their social needs orientation, their independence from
market pressures, their ‘utopian’ agendas and their high degree of civic engagement.

Establishing the innovativeness of the sector could be a relevant way of stressing the impact it
has on society. This report presents a number of explorative case studies as part of a larger
effort to investigate this hypothesis.

The focus on self-organization of this report does have a downside with respect to the
exploration of the overall hypothesis of this project. ITSSOIN’s goal is to establish whether
third sector organizations are overrepresented in socially innovative activities. Given that we
have sought to find self-organizations, or at least, projects with a degree of self-organization,
we are likely to sample initiatives in the third sector. This implies a non-negligible bias with
respect to the core hypothesis. This implies that the study that we report on here will
necessarily have a more explorative take on the hypotheses than reports in some of the other
domains.

3. Overall methods and analytical approach

3.1. Process tracing in strategic action fields

This report is loosely grounded in the ideas of process tracing and strategic action fields.
Process tracing (Bennett & George, 1997) is applied to study the emergence of social
innovations and the entities involved. This approach aims to identify causal connections
between particular incidents, and to identify which actors and mechanisms have been involved.

It would go too far to say that we attempt to establish ‘micro causality’ or ‘causal chains’.
However, we do examine key events and turning points in the development of concrete
initiatives, the local contexts in which they emerge and developments at the national and
international level with which they engage. From earlier reports (e.g. Mensink, Van den Berg,
Navrátil, Špalková, et al., 2015), we have learned that policy changes at the national level, and
international trends of stricter measures have a strong impact on the functioning of the asylum
and integration system. Where possible, we attempt to pinpoint phases in developments, or to
make explicit comparisons with earlier situations. It might be that the notion of self-
organization developed over time as well, or that it spread over time, to other groups or cities
for example. Every case chapter contains a section illustrating the history of the innovation
stream.

The analysis of these processes that explain the emergency of self-organization as an
innovation is studied in the contexts of the fields in which they emerge. Here, we loosely
borrow from the Field Theory approach (Fligstein, 2001), which explains interaction in so-
called ’strategic action fields’. Such fields are often assumed to be characterized by a state of
competition between actors, no matter whether the field is composed of commercial firms or
academics. We do not take over this assumption a priori. We do, however, take over the approach of studying power relations between different stakeholders. This may come out in many different ways: in subsidy relations, permits, access to certain target groups, specialized knowledge, social capital, etc. Every case study involves a section on the relations in the field.

3.2. Mode of selection, sampling and/or recruitment

We focused on residential areas with organizations or other civil society groups (e.g. refugee community organizations, local citizens groups, or vested civil society organizations) that meet the following criteria:

- They develop new initiatives that meet the need to foster community integration (‘social innovation’), in a way that goes beyond offering basic services to refugees
- These new initiatives should foster solidarity and agency (‘community development’). This implies a two-way process, focusing on social inclusion, rather than ‘assimilation’
- These initiatives may include or target integration with various refugee groups, including asylum seekers, refugees with a status or undocumented migrants.

We started off on the assumption that there is no such thing as ‘the best area’ for research. We investigated a few areas before settling on one, but figured that most urban areas would generate a number of cases that would be of interest. As said, Italy is an exception, considering that self-organization is limited, particularly with regard to self-organization of refugees. Already in the preliminary investigation, it became apparent that refugees preferably spend as little time in the country as possible. Italy, therefore, is presented as a counterfactual case, but nevertheless as an innovative one. The ‘Migrants Hub’ at the Milan train station is a new way of assisting refugees in transit. While selecting an area, we also anticipated averting areas that are already under research, trying to prevent overburdening activists and initiators with weighty interviews and questionnaires.

Partners in the Netherlands and the Czech Republic opted for a middle-sized city (Utrecht and Brno respectively), the United Kingdom and Italy for a large city (Birmingham and Milan). This makes up for an illustrative diversity in the sample, on the other hand giving the area’s a shared urban frame. Table 3.1 summarizes the cities and number of residents represented in the country studies.
Table 3.1. Cities and number of residents represented in the country studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
<th>Rank of the city in the country (regarding the number of inhabitants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>1,101,360</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>1,236,837</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Brno</td>
<td>369,559</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>338,986</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Argumentation for the choices in each country is fairly different. In the Netherlands, Utrecht is less over-researched than e.g. Amsterdam and the Hague provided fewer examples of innovative initiatives. Moreover, the municipality is known for its open and principled position towards providing shelter and additional services for undocumented migrants. The choice to focus on Brno in the Czech Republic is inspired by similar considerations: the researchers preferred not to focus on a more cosmopolitan city like Prague in order to find more locally embedded practices of community integration. The probably abundance of socially innovative initiatives in cities like Amsterdam and Prague might also be a downside in terms of a lack of overview. For the United Kingdom, the proportional presence of large refugee communities has played a role in selecting the geographical area (Birmingham). Moreover, it has its own refugee innovation strategy, being one of the important cities in the ‘Cities of Sanctuary’ movement. What the choice for Birmingham has in common with the choice for Utrecht, is that both are ‘no gateway’ for new arrivals into the country. Brno is located in the South-East of the Czech Republic, where many recent groups of refugees crossed the border. Interestingly, for Italy, Milan is mentioned as a potential focal area for nearly opposite reasons: it is a gateway for migrants to leave to the rest of Europe. We can imagine a matrix like the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway</th>
<th>No gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-sized</td>
<td>Brno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large/metropolitan</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Type of interview, recording and transcription

All interviews were conducted in the local language, and some in English or French to be able to communicate with refugees themselves. The interviews generally lasted between an hour, and an hour and a half. All interviews were recorded – with the exception of a few interviews with refugees, because of privacy and security concerns – and were literally transcribed in the
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2 Sources:
languages in which they were conducted. The transcripts are handled and stored by the researchers in the respective countries, according to national privacy and ethical regulations.

3.4. Interview guide

Interviews were conducted on the basis of a common open-ended questionnaire (Appendix B), provided by the topic leader, which was subsequently translated and adapted to fit the context of the different cities of inquiry. Given the diversity of cases – such as the Italian case partly figuring as a ‘counter case’ – flexibility of topic lists seemed important. The theme leader provided two topic lists, one for representatives of particular social innovations and one for external experts. The former involved topics under the following headings: 1. Introductory questions, 2. Organizational matters, 3. Cause and motivation for new initiatives, 4. Collaboration and networking, 5. Relation with government, 6. Impact, societal and political outcomes, and 7. The social innovation stream. The latter involved the following headings: 1. Introduction, 2. The social innovation stream, 3. International comparison, 4. Concrete initiatives, and 5. Social innovation in the refugee sector.

3.5. Interview partners

Interviews were held with: a. representatives of organizations, initiatives or projects that could be labelled as socially innovative (either a manager, staff member or a volunteer), b. external experts that could report on these social innovations in a broader context (at the local, regional or national level) and c. refugees involved (either as beneficiaries or as representatives of the organizations) with these innovations. Given the objective of shedding light on the role of different sectors (public, private and third sector), and on the way social innovations are embedded in a broader field of relations, we attempted to conduct interviews with a broad range of stakeholders. Generally, this involved interviews with third sector entities – ranging from established organizations to informal civic groups, both at the local and national level – and with public officials of the respective local or regional governments. Involvement of the private sector was less frequent and less intensive, with the exception of the Milan case. The country chapters provide an overview of the organizations and innovations covered. Table 3.2 gives an overview of the number of organizations and persons interviewed per country.

Table 3.2 Number of organizations and persons interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Third sector</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>External expert</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8 (11)*</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>13 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>10 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22 (30)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>32 (46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of organizations / initiatives interviewed, number of people included in brackets

Table 3.3 gives an overview of the organizations that participated, also listing those that declined participation, or that did not respond to our requests to participate. Reasons for declining participation were generally due to time restraints due to insufficient funds. This was particularly apparent in the British situation.
Table 3.3 Organizations interviewed (including declination and non-response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>External experts</th>
<th>Declined participation / no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Villa Vrede (‘Peace Villa’)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Refugee Organizations the Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pharos, Dutch Centre of Expertise on Health Disparities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dutch refugee council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Welcome to Utrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mexaena Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doenja Language coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. African Sky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cooperativo Farsi Prossimo</td>
<td>2. ASL (Local Health Authority)</td>
<td>2. Comune di Milano (Social Policies Department)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Save the Children - Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Informatics Without Borders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GMI (Young Muslims of Italy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cambio Passo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lifeline Options</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. West Midlands Refugee Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Humanitarian and Business Development Consultancy - Consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Restore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. St. Chad’s Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hope Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.6. Coding framework

Analysis of the interview transcripts were based on a common code list (see Appendix C), provided by the theme leader. The code book facilitated descriptive coding, with codes corresponding largely to the overall topic list described earlier. Codes were grouped in broader categories: 1. innovativeness of the organization/initiative/project, 2. The innovation stream, 3. Organizational characteristics, 4. External relations and 5. Impact. Coders were encouraged
to use, or add their own codes to cover specificities of their particular case. Partners took measures to assure inter-coder reliability, using either double-coding for all interviews or for some pilot interviews.

3.7. Process analysis

Part of the analysis involves getting a good understanding of the process behind the way the innovation stream developed in the four countries that we study. We facilitate this by using a basic model to map out the phases the innovation stream went through. Scholars use different stage models, but these generally seem to apply to the level of 'innovation activities' that together constitute an 'innovation stream'.

Murray, Caulier-Grice, and Mulgan (2010) introduced a model that is strongly based on linear models of technical innovation that were developed in the 1940s (Godin, 2006). They distinguish six stages: 1. Prompts, inspirations and diagnoses, 2. Proposals and ideas, 3. Prototyping and pilots, 4. Sustaining, 5. Scaling and diffusion and 6. Systemic change. These steps might well apply to a series of activities that an organization or initiative might go through. They are not well suited, however, to describe the stages of an 'innovation stream' that is the result of a combined effort of a set of organizations; a 'stream' does not have a single actor that may develop prototypes, for instance. Moreover, this model is based on the assumption that the objective of social innovation is always to achieve systemic change. Given their definition of social innovation, this ultimate objective is not self-evident: ‘new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations’ (Murray et al., 2010: 3). Meeting social needs and creating new relationships does not necessarily require generating systemic change.

Other scholars instead stress the importance of studying social innovation in a local social context (Moulaert, Swyngedouw, Martinelli, & Gonzalez, 2010). The objective may also be to meet the needs of a rather specific social group. Scholars following this idea have different models, in which the final stage might be described as ‘achieving impact’, i.e. the satisfaction of social needs.

We take over the idea of ‘impact’ as the objective of a social innovation, stressing that this can be both local and specific and national/global and systemic. We do not assume a priori that all innovations aim to achieve systemic impact, nor do we pose that systemic innovations are ‘better’ or ‘more important’ than local ones. Nevertheless, we do acknowledge that it is empirically interesting to assess the plans that organizations or initiatives may have beyond the local level. Based on these considerations, we use a slightly adapted, and somewhat simplified model of the stages of the innovation process at the organizational level: 1. Causes, 2. Development, 3. Sustaining, 4. Local impact, 5. (Scaling) and 6. (Systemic impact). For all four countries, we assess to what stage of the innovation process the organizations we have interviewed have progressed. The Italian case is, again, an exception, considering that the innovation process concerns a shared project of multiple organizations.

A next step is to trace the process of the ‘innovation stream’, i.e. beyond the level of specific organizations (or projects). In our view, this implies a qualitative assessment of the wider application of the notions that are developed by the organizations that we have studied. To some degree, this involves extrapolation. The organizations studied have different relations to the notion of ‘self-organized community development with refugees’. As said, some are examples of refugee self-organizations, some are grassroots initiatives working with or for
refugees. Some are organizations that are not self-organizations themselves, but they do work with such groups or initiatives. They obviously have rather specific objectives relating to the content of their work. In many cases, however, these objectives are interrelated with notions close to self-organization, such as the societal participation of refugees, or involving citizens of the host country in working with refugees. We attempt to assess to what extent such wider notions have extended beyond the level of concrete organizations and the cities studied. Moreover, we place the local situation in a broader context, often relating it to policy developments or other trends.

4. Co-produced communities in Utrecht, the Netherlands

4.1. Description of the social innovation

In this country-chapter, we aim to provide more understanding about the emergence, development, and impact of the social innovation stream ‘Self-organized community development with refugees’ in Utrecht, the Netherlands. The Netherlands, like the United Kingdom, is an arrival country, as we reported in an earlier report (Mensink et al. 2015). People with a refugee background arriving in the Netherlands, mostly aim to stay in the country and apply for asylum. In 2015, the Netherlands admitted 58,880 refugees in the country to apply for asylum.3 Utrecht, the fourth city in the Netherlands, hosted around 2,000 new arrivals with a refugee background both in 2015 and in 2016 (see paragraph 4.6). In addition, in those years, the city had to provide independent housing for approximately 500 (2015) to 800 (2016) people that had been granted a status.4

The social innovation stream ‘Self-organized community development with refugees’ was manifest in Utrecht. We started exploring the field of advocacy and services for refugees in Utrecht in autumn 2015. At that time, the number of refugees coming to the Netherlands exceeded the capacity of regular shelters for refugees, and new arrivals were housed in emergency shelters across the country, including in Utrecht. Those circumstances spurred civic initiatives - both by grass roots groups of local residents and by vested organizations. They offered educational-, social-, and recreational activities for and with refugees. At the same time, we found initiatives that offered services for undocumented migrants. We included two day-care centers for undocumented migrants and homeless people in our research, who sought to actively involve migrants and refugees in their services, provided them with opportunities to learn, recreate and take up tasks themselves, to meet others and sustain existing relations. Third, we investigated refugee community organizations in the city, offering opportunities to refugees to improve capabilities, meet others and expand personal networks. In sum, self-organized community development with refugees in the Dutch case includes grass roots initiatives of local residents for and with refugees, vested organizations that offer refugees the
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opportunity to have an active (participative) role in the services offered, and refugee community organizations providing services for the newcomers.

Below, we introduce the initiatives in more detail (section 4.2). After that we discuss the dimensions of social innovativeness in 'self-organized community development with refugees' (section 4.3). In section 4.4, we go into the historic roots of self-organized community development with refugees in the Netherlands and provide an account of the process of social innovation, including the emergence, development and impact of our social innovation stream. The succeeding part of the chapter (section 4.5) goes into the organizational features of the initiatives included in our sample, which also helps us to overlook the relations between the actors involved (strategic action field, see section 4.6 'Relations in the field'). Section 4.7 deals with impact and obstacles of social innovation. We end with a summary on what stands out in the manifestation of social innovation with refugees in the Netherlands.

### 4.2. Introducing the organizations

Over the course of a few months, we regularly cycled around Utrecht to get a sense of what self-organized community development with refugees means. The area to the South and South-West of the city center hosts most of them. For roughly 20 years now, there has been an asylum reception center, located in a group of stately early 20th century buildings. When large groups of refugees started to arrive in 2015, three emergency shelters opened for the period of a few months each. The third shelter opens in the fall of 2016, and is supposed to be an innovative concept of refugee housing about which we will say more later.

Some initiatives have a fixed location that we could visit. Villa Vrede has its day center for people without a residence permit in a single-story building next to a modern church. Paperless refugees drank coffee outside, some assembled work in the community room. Ubuntu House is a 'neighborhood center for people without a neighborhood', located in a ground floor apartment on the corner in a residential area, with colorful writing on its windows.

Other initiatives do not have a location of their own, but organize their activities in community centers – such as Mevaena, a support group for Eritrean refugees – or at emergency shelters or reception centers – such as Welcome to Utrecht, which coordinates many voluntary initiatives, Doenja language coaching and Pharos ‘Get down to work’-project, which focuses on the right of asylum seekers to volunteer. A substantial part of the work, however, is simply done at the volunteers’ or staff members’ homes, where we held some of the interviews. Or at the office: New Dutch Connections, focusing on networking and participation for refugees, coordinates their work in several Dutch cities from a lively attic in a classic estate in the park. We visited the municipality at the newly constructed city hall, integrated with the central train station, as their innovative asylum housing location is currently still under construction. We met with the coordinator of African Sky in a café close to the station.

These nine initiatives cover a rather broad range, in many respects. They offer many different activities, cater for different target groups and were founded over the course of the past eight years. Table 4.1 gives basic information about them.
Table 4.1 Basic information about initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Project / initiative title</th>
<th>Founding year</th>
<th>(Relevant) target audience</th>
<th>Short description</th>
<th>Sector affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>African Sky</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, status holders</td>
<td>Organization of East-African women fighting for equality</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Dutch Connections</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, status holders</td>
<td>Using theatre, art and training to empower refugees to take charge of their own future</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ubuntu House</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Undocumented migrants</td>
<td>Community center for people in poverty, homeless or social isolation</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Villa Vrede ('Peace Villa')</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Undocumented migrants</td>
<td>Community center for undocumented migrants</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'Get down to work' (Project of Pharos, Dutch Centre of Expertise on Health Disparities)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Asylum seekers (Residents of emergency shelters not allowed so far), status holders as volunteers</td>
<td>Project to engage asylum seekers in volunteer work</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Welcome to Utrecht</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Residents of emergency shelters, status holders as volunteers</td>
<td>Platform to co-ordinate grassroots support initiatives</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plan Einstein / Refugee Launch Pad (Utrecht Municipality)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Asylum seekers</td>
<td>Neighborhood-integrated housing facility foster 'integration from day one'</td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexaena Foundation</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Status holders</td>
<td>Support activities for Eritreans</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Doenja Language coaching</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Residents of emergency shelters, asylum seekers</td>
<td>Language coaching, additional to existing offering</td>
<td>Third sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the basic description of what these initiatives do, or aim for, they host a wide range of practical activities. Rather than listing them per organization or initiative, Table 4.2 presents an overview of the range of activities within the sample. The majority can be described as 'services': trainings, recreation, buddy projects, individual support, housing. Other main categories are: advocacy and organization (coordinating supply and demand). In the following sections, we return to the innovativeness of these initiatives, and to the question how the activities they organize relate to community development.
### Table 4.2 Activities offered by the organizations/initiatives studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Nr. of initiatives</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Language courses, entrepreneurship trainings, different skills (communication, personal finance, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meal sharing, sports, music lessons, theater performance, social and cultural outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy, lobby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Themes: refugees’ right to volunteer, 24-hour shelter in one location (for undocumented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddies, coaches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For integration, social and economic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating supply and demand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Matching volunteers to projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic individual support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mainly for undocumented: emergency support (e.g. laundry), help with mail, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planned innovative municipal housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for neighborhood residents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Connected to housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3. Dimensions of innovativeness

#### Social needs

Social innovation starts with addressing social needs. What social needs are identified and addressed by the initiatives we studied? Even though all the initiatives we studied have a clear community development dimension, broken communities are hardly ever mentioned as a motivation. Strengthening ties between refugees, and between refugees and local residents is seen a means to other ends, like enhancing capabilities, participation in society, and becoming self-reliant. If the lack of communities is mentioned as a social need, it is generally formulated as the need of refugees to have a personal network:

> There are many arrangements for professional frameworks, but the informal framework, the network surrounding people, that is completely missing. (New Dutch Connections)

> Now there are more and more people from Eritrea, including people who don’t have a network. (Mexaena)

Many comments of informants centered around feelings of negativity connected to the refugee experience. Some of them were related to the situation in the home-country or the flight, often voiced in terms of trauma. There are different ideas about dealing with trauma’s, as the following quotes illustrate:

> It is usually not just one trauma that they deal with, but multiple, you know? And as a person you are supposed to cope with all of this, which is not quite possible within half a year. They don’t allow you to do so, and say: you are apathetic. But you are not apathetic, you are tired of life for a while, you simply have been through too much. (Ubuntu House)

---

5 This particular quotation applies to people who have experienced homelessness, but we believe it to be relevant for more of the refugee groups we describe in this study.
We talk about ‘post-traumatic growth’. Everyone always talks about post-traumatic stress, implying that they should have long-term therapy, and can’t do anything in the meantime. We believe that, for part of these people, dealing with traumas can also mean: getting active again, leaving something behind, creating a “new narrative”. (Municipality of Utrecht)

More common, however, were statements regarding negative experiences in the post-flight situation. This might involve feelings of insecurity or of being constrained in refugee shelters. One respondent describes a center in:

The least happy village of the Netherlands. There are all sorts of documentaries that show how bad it is there. They also have an asylum seekers center for 500 people. That comes down to 10% of the population, of which 100 are unaccompanied minor asylum seekers. Either out of procedure, or still in procedure. These are simply teens with a story, but also with little perspective on the future. So this was an environment with lots of violence, which I always refer to as frustration violence. [...] There were many suicide attempts. (New Dutch Connections)

Slightly less gripping, but in the same vein, is the remark that ‘people need a space in which they can relax in a safe way and develop’ (Villa Vrede).

Equally important is the lack of grip on their futures. The youths that New Dutch Connections work with ‘are often unable to think beyond tomorrow’, ‘isolated in the Netherlands’, ‘dependent on institutions’. They have a ‘wait-and-see attitude with respect to their procedures, the shelter and all sorts of things’ (New Dutch Connections). All this adds to them being ‘stuck’. Another initiative, offering a day center, argues that their driver is to offer a place to undocumented migrants that enables them to ‘go on, that they won’t get stuck, but can keep on developing’ (Villa Vrede). People need to ‘feel useful’, as a representative of a project for refugee-volunteering (Pharos) put it. People need safe places in which they can work on their futures, and need to meet other people to do this with. There is more to do than providing ‘bed, bath, bread’: also daycare, activation, which is important for self-reliance and community integration.

It is interesting to note that there are also ‘needs’ on the Dutch side that impact certain initiatives. The Welcome to Utrecht-initiative was born out of the awareness that ‘there were many people who wanted to do something’ when larger groups of refugees arrived. Of a different nature is the awareness of municipal policy makers that there was a good deal of frustration about the municipal decision to plan a new shelter in a district with relatively high youth unemployment and other social issues. This motivated the municipality to look for solutions reconciling the needs of refugees and the needs of the deprived neighborhood, in order to gain public support for the new emergency shelter. They do what we might call ‘bricolage’, in the words of our informant at the municipality: trying to ‘make new configurations of that which is already there’ (Refugee launch pad).

**Innovativeness in the approach, rather than in the activities**

A number of people we talked to stressed that the innovativeness of their work does not lie in the actual activities that their initiatives or projects offer. Even though some adopt creative approaches – two initiatives use theater to foster learning and self-efficacy – many argue that their activities are fairly basic – needlework, language coaching, meal-sharing. Both the ‘Get down to work’- and the ‘Welcome to Utrecht’-projects saw their added value in the way they do match-making between supply and demand. This facilitated flexible, spontaneous, and easily accessible volunteer activities. The Mexaena foundation adds to the existing services by
focusing particularly on one group, Eritrean refugees, who they consider to face higher barriers to integration in Dutch society than other refugee groups. More importantly, however, most initiatives argue that the innovativeness of their work lies in their approach, or their underlying principles.

**From self-organization to coproduction**

The people we talked to debated the novelty of self-organization, which was understood both as civic initiatives to support refugees and as self-organizations of refugees (see 4.4 for a historical overview). The novelty, people felt, was rather that many initiatives were generally not set up for refugees, but with refugees. 'External' experts at Amnesty International and at Church in Action corroborated this idea. Even if the terms did not come up in interviews, co-production would be an apt description. This term is used in different ways, for instance to denote the participation of citizens or voluntary organization in the provision of public services (Brandsen & Pestoff, 2006). We use it here to describe collaborative efforts of Dutch citizens and refugees to foster community development (as well as the provision of basic services, etc.).

A majority of the projects or initiatives could be described as self-organized in the sense of having started as grassroots initiatives by residents (table 4.3 provides an overview, after the next subheading). Nevertheless, they are gradually developing into more formalized organizations. Most of them share the co-production principle. Two initiatives were founded by duos composed of a native Dutch person and someone with a refugee-background, another had a refugee on the board of the foundation. A day center for undocumented migrants is run together with migrants. A similar center that also targets (other) homeless people was based on the idea of 'duoship', implying that all management tasks were collaboratively carried out by a duo of an 'experience expert' (a refugee, or a homeless person) and another expert. Two cases represent larger programs of respectively Pharos, an established third sector organization, and the Utrecht municipality. We included them as they stressed working with refugees and civic initiatives. A representative of a project to promote volunteering by asylum seekers stressed:

> At the job itself, social organizations [including civic groups] are strongly involved. They are simply Dutch people, so the idea is not to have a group of asylum seekers come over to do a job. No, they do these jobs together with Dutch people.

Similarly, a representative of the municipality said:

> The refugee council [Utrecht branch of the Dutch Council for Refugees] will co-ordinate voluntary activities together with 'Welcome to Utrecht' [a civic group]. We want to make a transition from volunteering for refugees to volunteering by refugees.

**Different types of community development**

Looking at the sample of Utrecht-based initiatives, we can also offer a more refined understanding of what community development might entail in the context of the types of projects we study here. We can distinguish roughly four approaches. First, a few initiatives simply create their own communities. The day center for undocumented migrants Villa Vrede and the small community center Ubuntu Huis that also hosts other vulnerable groups have a continuously changing group of participants – both refugees and Dutch volunteers – that has a stable core nevertheless. An initiative that offers support to Eritreans offers a similarly constant environment with pairs of a coach and a refugee, and regular meetings for the entire group. Such initiatives allow refugees and other locals to get to know each other well.
A second type of community development involves creating networks around individual young refugees. One person said: ‘we organize a caring and an empowering community for social and economic participation’. The objective of these networks is to help refugees ‘reclaim’ their futures and to foster entrepreneurship skills.

A third type is to create a ‘sense of community’ in the city, or in a particular area. Examples are initiatives that co-ordinate and interlink all sorts of grassroots activities for refugees, and the municipal plan to construct a new type of refugee housing with stronger links to the neighborhood in which it is located.

A fourth type is somewhat less direct: community development is not the primary goal for Doenja language coaching, but it is an important side-effect nonetheless. This applies to a project that offers language coaching and one that arranges for one-off volunteer tasks for asylum seekers. These services are the primary objective, but respondents assumed that the asylum seekers involved establish connections, both mutually and with the Dutch with whom they engage (see section 4.7 on impact).

In sum, we specify our focus from self-organization to co-production between refugees and Dutch citizens through forming actual communities, personal networks, a sense of community, or through basic activities that promote mutual ties. Whatever form is chosen, developing skills and capacity building is generally an important focus. Co-produced communities may put refugees in central positions in initiatives, allowing them to develop coordinating skills. Moreover, communities are often formed around activities that target skills development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Self-organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Sky</td>
<td>The initiative as community</td>
<td>Self-organization of refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dutch Connections</td>
<td>Networks around individual young refugees</td>
<td>Refugee as co-founder and co-governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu House</td>
<td>The initiative as community</td>
<td>Refugees as co-governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Vrede (‘Peace Villa’)</td>
<td>The initiative as community</td>
<td>Refugees as co-governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Get down to work’ (Project of Pharos, Dutch Centre of Expertise on Health Disparities)</td>
<td>Co-ordinate and interlink all sorts of grassroots activities</td>
<td>Refugees are linked to citizens’ initiatives (and other organizations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Utrecht</td>
<td>Co-ordinate and interlink all sorts of grassroots activities</td>
<td>Started as a completely informal citizens’ initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Einstein / Refugee Launch Pad (Utrecht Municipality)</td>
<td>Co-ordinate and interlink all sorts of grassroots activities</td>
<td>Citizens’ initiative (Welcome to Utrecht) is integrated in refugee housing complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexaena Foundation</td>
<td>The initiative as community</td>
<td>Refugees as founders and co-governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doenja Language coaching</td>
<td>Community development as externality</td>
<td>No self-organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. History of the social innovation stream

From this point on, we refer to the innovation stream in the Dutch context as ‘co-produced community development with refugees’. The history of this stream in the Netherlands is not a
linear and singular one. Grassroots initiatives and refugee self-organizations have come and gone over the past decades, and have taken vastly different roles with respect to the asylum procedure and integration of refugees. Tidal waves of growth and institutionalization succeeded periods of decline and reorientation. Moreover, the histories of third sector engagement for asylum seekers and status holders, for refused asylum seekers and the history of refugee self-organizations do neither run parallel nor linear. In this section, we briefly delve into these histories, in order to identify the events and developments that are relevant for understanding the emergence and stages of our innovation stream ‘co-produced community development with refugees’. After that, we go into the emergence and development of the innovations studied in Utrecht.

Broad historic roots

The history of civic engagement for refugees goes back quite a while. Böcker and Havinga (2011) sketch out how First World War refugees were privately hosted, noting the founding of many local committees offering support. We will not go back that far. The situation that started in the late 1970s and early 1980s is important to understand the current constellation of refugee self-organization and citizens’ initiatives. Table 4.4 presents a number of relevant historical events, as well as an attempt to point out a number of phases in this history.

Table 4.4 Events and phases in the national history of co-produced community development with refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Characterization of phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Dutch Refugee Council (VVN) founded, as a merger of earlier initiatives</td>
<td>Institutionalizing generous refugee support in public and third sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Refugee Organizations the Netherlands (VON) founded, as umbrella of refugee self-organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Regulation for Sheltering Refugees (ROA) creates generous system of private housing for refugees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Yugoslavian refugee crisis shows cracks in public system of refugee support, Refugee Council jumps in with 10,000 volunteers, next to grassroots initiatives</td>
<td>Setting up national, professional infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ROA ‘replaced’ by national institutions (IND, COA), involving large-scale shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>VON started organizing infrastructure of refugee self-organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Linkage Act leads to increasing numbers of NGOs providing support to undocumented migrants</td>
<td>Return to autonomous bottom-up initiatives (with little means)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>New and more restrictive Asylum Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Severe budget cuts for Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>VONs funding largely cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>VON refocuses on socio-cultural issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mass regularization and administrative agreement between national and municipalities leads to decrease in numbers of NGOs providing support to undocumented migrants</td>
<td>New focus on integration of refugees and undocumented migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>We are here-group starts activism of refused asylum seekers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New refugee crisis leads to new citizens’ initiatives

**Institutionalization and professionalization of refugee support**

The 1980s were a decade of institutionalization of bottom-up refugee support. Within six years, both the Refugee Council (VVN) and Refugee Organizations the Netherlands (VON) were founded as, respectively, a ‘bundling of initiatives of citizens’ (Weiler & Wijnkoop, 2011: 106) and an umbrella of seven existing refugee self-organizations (Alchouler, Baba Ali, Goudappel, Medema, & Sangin, 2008). Both rose quickly to relatively formalized positions in the support system for refugees and in policy networks. VVN started a branched-out network of local support, and VON was given the task of supporting self-organizations of refugees and of representing them at the national level. Institutionalization of self-organized refugee groups continued up to the late-1990s, with VON expanding an ‘infrastructure’ of ethno-politically affiliated member organizations. The situation of support for irregular migrants was relatively different: a number of NGOs were founded from the 1980s onward to counter policy developments which excluded undocumented migrants from essential basic services (Van der Leun & Bouter, 2015). Institutionalization did not only involve formalization of bottom-up activities in vested NGOs. Around the same time, public sector support for refugees expanded as well. The introduction of the Regulation for Sheltering Asylum Seekers (ROA) implied a relatively generous system of locally organized private housing. Some of our respondents remembered that many of the activities fostering the integration of refugees were financed by public means, and organized within the framework of public refugee shelters, not depending on civic initiative. One of them argued:

> At that time, there was no emergency support yet, which makes a large difference, as this is a group for which nothing is organized [nowadays]. People simply assumed that asylum seeker centers would take care of that part as well: the activities, sheltering, and that there was simply enough personnel to do all that […] There were all sorts of holiday houses, tent camps, such things, but not the long-term emergency sheltering that we have these days (Welcome to Utrecht)

**Setting up national, professional infrastructures**

We might say that a second phase started with the arrival of large groups of Yugoslavian refugees, for which this system was no longer tenable. This led to the introduction of a new ‘professional’, albeit less generous national infrastructure, both in the public and third sector, leaving less room for voluntary initiative. Other research, based on interviews with NGO workers, confirms this change:

> The Dutch NGO sector, whose work with refugees goes back to the 1970s, is well-developed and funded, although traditionally it relies heavily on volunteers. The 1990s, however, were characterised by a tendency to increase the involvement of professionals in work with refugees (Korac, 2005: 96).

In 1993, Yugoslavian refugees were found sleeping in the cornfields, because of a lack of proper shelter. This led to widespread outrage, as such a situation was considered inconceivable in the Netherlands. VVN intervened by organizing shelter before public sector alternatives were put in place (Weiler & Wijnkoop, 2011). This led to the founding of the current asylum authorities – including the Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (IND) – along with refugee reception centers that were relatively large compared to the earlier (ROA) housing system.
Return to autonomous bottom-up initiatives (with little means)

New regulations around the turn of the century started a third phase, implying a much stricter treatment of both new asylum requests and of irregular migrants, with much less funding. This led to a much more autonomous role of bottom-up initiatives again, but with limited means. There were much fewer asylum requests in this period and irregular migrants were legally excluded from using all sorts of public services. In the early 21st century, these new regulations were accompanied by budget cuts on the central reception agency. The agency’s work council considered the cuts on their budget a ‘ticking time bomb’. It meant that the agency could spend less means to recreation and relaxation for refugees in reception centers (COA, 2002). In 2011, another round of austerity measures were announced, this time amounting to over €50 million in a five year period (Algemene Rekenkamer, 2011). An advisory committee to government concluded:

The Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA) played a more important role in offering daily activities a few years ago. Nowadays, COA emphasizes that residents need to take their own initiatives to get to work. There have been budget cuts on supportive daily activities. An example is that the financial support for taking part in socio-cultural activities for adult asylum seekers was cancelled (ACVZ, 2013: 8)

This policy of budget cuts was also applied to VON, which saw its governmental subsidy being cut too, making them more autonomous but less influential. With respect to support for irregular migrants, civic initiative was on the rise again, with the number of NGOs offering support expanding from 30 in 2000 to about 100 in 2006 (Van der Leun & Bouter, 2015).

New focus on integration of refugees and undocumented migrants

A fourth and final phase, before the recent ‘refugee crisis’, may be said to have started with the mass regularization of undocumented migrants and the new ‘contract’ between national and local governments of 2007 (Kos, Maussen, & Doomernik, 2015; Van der Leun & Bouter, 2015; Versteegt & Maussen, 2012). This contract implied that municipalities would discontinue their support for undocumented migrants in return for a humane and sustainable asylum policy at the national level. This seemingly positive outcome drew attention away from issues regarding the asylum procedure, to refocus on social issues in refugee communities. VON reinvented itself as a networked organization dealing with social and cultural problems – female circumcision, arranged marriages, radicalization, honor-related violence – in their own communities:

Now we try to create a movement around a theme within a community, in which we do not regard self-organizations as a goal, but very much as an instrument (Refugee Organizations in the Netherlands).

Due to the regularization of undocumented migrants, the number of NGOs offering support to these groups dropped significantly (Van der Leun & Bouter, 2015). For a while, it seemed that there would be a more effective asylum procedure, and that the deplorable situation of many refused asylum seekers improved significantly. The so-called ‘We are here’ group in Amsterdam signaled that this was not the case (Kalir & Wissink, 2016; Kos et al., 2015; Pitkänen, 2014). This group of refused asylum seekers received a good deal of media attention for their collaboration with the Amsterdam squat movement and the deaconate of a local church, which they squatted at the end of 2012. The notion that refused asylum seekers ‘came out’, exclaiming that ‘they are here’, was quite a change compared to their previous subaltern lives.
Even though advocacy for the rights of undocumented migrants dates back to the 1970s and 1980s in the Netherlands, such an outspoken form of self-advocacy was relatively new.

**Bottom-up initiatives again recognized as legitimate players**

The fifth, and final phase started with the sudden increase in new arrivals from 2014-2015 onward. Like with the arrival of Yugoslavian refugees, this sudden rise in new arrivals showed the limits of the system that was in place. New citizens’ initiatives were founded in many cities, which were often welcomed by local authorities, even though communication between citizens and formal institutions was not always easy. The notion of ‘integration from day one’ created awareness of the importance of active participation of refugees. This opened new paths to recognizing the role of refugee self-organizations, even though VON and its members have not been re-established as important players.
Co-produced community development in Utrecht

Linking this longer national history to the history of the initiatives that we have found in Utrecht, a first thing to note is that they were mostly founded in the last two phases that we distinguished above.

African Sky is an exception, having been founded in the 1990s already. Having started as an organization promoting cultural events in the African diasporas, they developed into an organization fighting for the rights of women in East-African communities, at the same time as VON developed relations with local refugee community organizations and built a national infrastructure. It confirms that refugee community organizations as such are not a new phenomenon in the Netherlands.

Most of the ones that were formed between 2007 and 2015, focused on undocumented people, at least at the beginning. This is somehow at odds with the ‘national history’ we presented before, given that research suggests that the number of organizations supporting undocumented people dropped after 2007 (van der Leun & Bouter, 2015). This is probably coincidental. Over time, New Dutch Connections expanded its scope to include asylum seekers and – for Utrecht – people with a refugee status. The exception to this (primary) focus on undocumented people is the ‘Get down to work’-project of Pharos, which focuses on people in the asylum procedure. They try to involve refugees with a status as volunteers, and advocate for the right of people in emergency shelters to volunteer as well.

The initiatives that started in 2015 or 2016 are more diverse in terms of target audience. Welcome to Utrecht and the Doenja Language Coach project primarily address residents of emergency shelters, mainly because such support needed to be organized on very short notice. The Municipality of Utrecht in its Refugee Launch Pad-project, does not quite focus on a type of refugee, but instead intends to support a cohort from the moment they arrive until they are fully settled in the city. Mexaena has focused on people with a status so far, considering that the option for asylum seekers to remain in the city is still a very new development. Their objective is to foster communities of people who will be able to stay in touch easily. The national ‘Get down to work for all’-campaign focuses on undocumented people again (see section 4.6).

Other than this diversity in terms of target groups, it is difficult to show developments over time. There are no clear demarcations by founding year in terms of the use of social media, the extent of ‘coproduction’, references to notions like ‘participation’ and ‘activation’ or ‘integration from day one’.

The same applies to milestones. While it was relatively easy to pinpoint tipping-points in the 30-40 year history that we sketched before, there are no obvious ‘phases’ in the development of ‘co-produced community development’ in Utrecht. After all, the eight year span in which these
initiatives were taken is a relatively short period. All took place after the mass regularization and the administrative agreement between state and municipalities.

In spite of having a generalized overview of the phases of the social innovation stream in Utrecht, we attempt to trace the process of social innovation for each of the initiatives we studied. We base our periodization on the overview of stages as presented by Murray et al. 2010, which we slightly adapted and simplified for our case-study on community development with refugees (see section 3.7). For each of our initiatives, we aim to determine to what stage of the social innovation process the initiatives have progressed.

Table 4.5 Process tracing matrix for assessing progress on the development of social innovation by the Dutch initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Emergence</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
<th>Local impact</th>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Systemic impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Sky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dutch Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu Huis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Vrede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Get down to work’ (Pharos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Utrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Launch Pad (Municipality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexaena Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doenja Language coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Built on the process of social innovation as presented by Murray et al 2010.

At first, all of the initiatives have contributed to the emergence of the social innovation stream, as each of them introduced an activity or project that aimed at providing self-organized or co-produced services for community development with refugees. Also, nearly every initiative tested the activities or projects in practice, with the exception of the Refugee Launch Pad, which has been developed as a project proposal, but has not yet become operational.

Apart from the Refugee Launch Pad, all the initiatives have arrived at the stage of sustaining, implying that the idea or innovation is sustained beyond the first phase of emerging and testing. The initiatives have found resources (manpower or funds) for keeping up their initiative and activities. Whereas quite a few initiatives started with minimal means, or with just enough funding for one, or a few pilot projects, later on, they expanded by raising more funds, either through governmental grants, subsidies from private foundations or through contributions in-kind (generally: accommodation). Resource mobilization is one of the prime strategies that social movements employ to further their goals (Ling, 2006; McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Such steps will often imply that new initiatives transcend their informal roots. Acquiring
funding and other resources often requires a degree of formalization. Each of the initiatives in our sample have a formal status, either as a governmental agency (municipality) or as a foundation.

As to the next stage; local impact, the respondents of the initiatives of the ‘sustained level’ could also report local impact for either the volunteers and staff, the refugee target-groups or the local community. For instance, refugees were able to meet others, develop new relations or sustain existing relations, see section 4.7 on impact.

The succeeding stage of scaling refers to the phase of organizational growth, and when the idea or practice is spread across organizations and beyond the local level. This holds for three of our initiatives in Utrecht. The ‘future academy’ of New Dutch Connections is executed in other cities than Utrecht as well, and citizens platforms like Welcome to Utrecht, have also been developed in other cities in the Netherlands. In the summer of 2016, the Pharos project on volunteering for refugees was supported by funds of the Ministry of Social Affairs, and spread to 15 other municipalities throughout the country. This support by the national governmental for the project, allowing refugees in asylum centers to volunteer, can be seen as a token of ‘systemic impact’: The idea or practice is accepted in national policies, policy practice or regulations.

The Zeitgeist: social media and the current age of the ‘participation society’. 

We may conclude that both civic initiatives organizing support and refugee self-organizations have a considerable history in the Netherlands, in more or less close proximity to the public sector. Then why was self-organization mentioned by several informants as one of the most relevant social innovations of the past years? First of all, as we said before: some argued that self-organization as such is not new, but the notion that there seems to be a shift from organizing for refugees to a trend of organizing with refugees. Secondly, some pointed at the current Zeitgeist, which comprises a number of enabling factors.

First, even though not many informants named this directly as an explanation for the innovation to occur in this time and age, many of them referred to the benefits of social media. Self-organization works differently in a ‘technology-mediated’ world than in a world that is purely operated offline. Facebook and Twitter seem to make it a lot easier to self-organize, as it allows you to host crowdfunding campaigns, to gain community support, to promote events, to spread the word to local journalists and to attract volunteers:

*I found a few volunteers through my work, a few indirectly, but most of them joined through one single announcement on Facebook. Welcome to Utrecht shared it, Utrecht Cares, and some others. I had enough volunteers within a few days.* (Mexaena)

Apart from the organizational benefits, it allows volunteers and refugees to communicate easily, and to stay in touch after their offline engagement ends. At the same time, social media, and facebook in particular, seem to be virtually the only platform where those who support and those who oppose refugees meet. Their circles are considered fairly homogeneous by several informants, so that people with differing opinions rarely engage with each other in the offline world.

Second, many of the respondents referred to the national debate of the so-called ‘participation society’, either implicitly or explicitly. This term was first used by the Dutch king in his annual...
speech from the throne, in 2013 (TK, 2013/2014). It became an umbrella term, similar to the British notion of Big Society, symbolizing a governmental view of society in which all citizens participate actively, and the government retreats. This view led to an emphasis on self-organization, private responsibility, networking and active cohesion. It adds up to the notion of a network society, in which social media also play a role.

On Fridays, refugees cook for the volunteers, making it more of a communal thing [...] This is also related to the tendency of the participation society, which has a lot to do with the present times, in our own society. (Church in action)

At that time [in the 1990s], there was a different mentality in the sense that people felt: we need to help these people and they are pitiful. I do think this is still a leading factor in many initiatives these days, but at the same time there is a feeling like “you also need to do something”. It is also simply a zeitgeist type of thing [...] Is it a zeitgeist that really came from the people, or was it assigned by government? You do see the same with youth groups. The notion of sharing and doing things together has become more common, also before government started stressing that we should participate. Not everyone buys his own lawn mower, right? You do see that things change over time, which is partly due to economic circumstances. We are somehow forced to be less focused on the individual, because the economy and the composition of society is changing. (Villa Vrede)

Others do not express the link to this political debate explicitly, but do take over a lot of the terminology that is used in policy circles, such as ‘participation and activation’ and ‘social participation and economic participation.’

A final, related notion is the idea of ‘integration from day one’. A number of informants said that this is a fairly recent development in thinking about asylum. They mention research that shows that such an attitude is very helpful in terms of integration at a later stage (e.g. Engbersen et al., 2015). This awareness, which is now spreading, has been very helpful in starting initiatives for and with asylum seekers who are still in emergency shelters. Officially, it is hard to organize anything for this group, considering that their request has not been recognized officially yet. The municipality of Utrecht offer a particularly welcoming context in this regard, considering that they were the first municipality – in April 2016 – that stressed that they will try to ‘bind’ refugees to the city (Huisman, 2016). This implies that those refugees for whom Utrecht was their first base of arrival will be able to stay in the city when they receive their refugee status.

4.5. Organizational features

Funding

None of the initiatives goes without funding, even though some do not have a structural source of income. Different governments constitute the most common funding bodies, ranging from the local to the European level. The municipality provides structural subsidies to some, has an ‘initiatives fund’ for incidental support for projects and activities and has an annual ‘tolerance award’ to reward social initiatives for their work. In 2016, the award was shared by New Dutch Connections, Villa Vrede and Eet Mee!, one of the initiatives in the Welcome to Utrecht network. All three received a sum of €2500. Apart from providing additional funding, this is a much-appreciated way of showing appreciation. The municipality can both draw on funds for dealing with refugees, and on sums dedicated to general social policies. The Ubuntu House has not attempted to receive specific refugee-related funds for its work so far, while New Dutch Connections has particularly been able to receive such support for their activities for
undocumented migrants and for status holders. Other funding bodies were reluctant to fund projects for these target groups (their projects for asylum seekers are funded elsewhere).

The national government is not a common funding body for this type of initiatives. Pharos, the Dutch center of Expertise on Health Disparities, of which we have studied the ‘Get down to work’-project, is funded partially by the Ministry of Health, Wellbeing and Sports. In August 2016, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment decided to provide funding for the ‘get-down-to-work’ project to be implemented in 25 more municipalities in the coming years.6

‘Skipping’ the national level, some initiatives are, or aim to be funded by the European Commission (EC). New Dutch Connections receives funds from both the EC’s Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Return Found, for different projects. The Municipality of Utrecht, interestingly, has recently applied for a so-called ‘Urban Innovative Action (UIA)’ to fund its Refugee Launch Pad program. This notion of a stress on local and international funding is, perhaps, in line with the idea of ‘glocalization’ (Robertson, 1995), the rising importance of interconnected local and global issues.

Apart from public funding, a number of initiatives receive grants from both local and national funds or foundations. Pharos and New Dutch Connections, which have projects beyond the local level, are funded by the national Orange fund. The Ubuntu House and Mexaena were supported by local foundations. Mexaena was also supported by the Triodos foundation, connected to a bank that is known for its ethical investment policies. Other than that, some initiatives received support from churches, some could use accommodation for free, and one received donations and organized a crowdfunding campaign.

A few informants raised issues with respect to funding. First, some alluded to the disadvantages of being dependent on the funding body, even though these seemed to be worries, rather than actual experiences. Even though all initiatives see clear benefits of attracting funding, they are also weary of the bureaucracy it might involve. Our informant at Welcome to Utrecht said:

“A fund will always want to know: what impact did you have, so you set out to do impact measurements. I actually thought it was wonderful to not have anything to do with such things up to now. (Welcome to Utrecht)"

For some, like Villa Vrede, such considerations are an argument for not applying for structural funds.

A second concern is particularly relevant from the point of view of social innovation. A few informants highlighted the disadvantages of funds focusing on social innovation, for instance:

“You don’t want to start doing things, simply because it is the only way to attract funding. That can be a struggle. While I’m thinking: there are things of which you know that they are simply good, and you want to maintain them. [...] Does it always need to be innovative? Sure, you must not stand still. [...]"

---

You should reflect continuously: are we on the right track? That for sure. But then those are the small steps you take and not very major things immediately. (Villa Vrede)

The concern that a focus on social innovation makes it difficult for organizations to attract funding for their basic activities was already raised by the experts that we consulted in the exploratory phase of this study (Mensink, Van den Berg, Navrátil, D., et al., 2015). Our informant at Church in Action acknowledged this concern, but added that fundraisers need to learn to find creative ways of presenting their basic work as something innovative. She did add, however, that her own work is not dependent on external funding, so this might be easy for her to say.

**Staff and volunteers**

All but one organizations have at least one paid staff member. One or two is quite common. Only two organizations have more: Pharos' works with a team of three to coordinate their volunteer projects in 15 municipalities. New Dutch Connections is the largest, with a staff of six. A few informants spontaneously stressed the importance of having paid staff for sustainability, continuity and coordination.

All organizations work with volunteers, even though Pharos’ contribution is mainly to help local volunteer centers, to coordinate the supply and demand for volunteers. The number of volunteers seems to range from about 15 to a few hundred, even though it is often hard to know what number to count. Welcome to Utrecht has a limited number of ‘own’ volunteers, but they co-ordinate a network of many initiatives with many volunteers. Moreover, when volunteers and refugees become friends, are they still volunteers when they do activities together? The numbers are not overly important for them, but they do assume they will need to keep better track of it once the will receive funding.

Many initiatives work with refugees as volunteers. It might be that people who already have obtained their refugee status volunteer for people who are still in the procedure. Alternatively, it might be that undocumented migrants are both participant and volunteer. In Villa Vrede, for instance, they can volunteer as host or as coordinator for specific tasks, or simply help out by cleaning the center or cooking for others. Pharos’ ‘get down to work’- project is all about volunteering for asylum seekers, even though they simply call it ‘activities’, which sounds more attractive.

It is quite common for initiatives to distinguish between several volunteer roles, with different levels of requirements, responsibilities and commitments. More engaged volunteers are referred to as ‘volunteer coordinators’ or ‘super volunteers’. Such engaged volunteers can be very beneficial to the organization, because of their level of motivation:

>A group of coaches made a very elaborate work instruction for all steps in our process [...] And there is a volunteer who said: your social media could be much better. I will arrange that you will get a proper system, which can actually do what you want it to do, and will train you about how to use it. (Welcome to Utrecht)

7 In total, Pharos has 55 paid staff members working in diverse departments. www.pharos.nl/nl/over-pharos/organisatie, website visited August 2016.
Others particularly stress the benefits of working with relatively ‘unengaged’ volunteers, but mainly because they are easier to attract. This also works well for refugees as volunteers, as they are often not ready to commit for a longer term.

Having volunteers with particular skill sets can be very useful: the Ubuntu House works with ‘experience experts’ who have experienced homelessness themselves, for instance. This has many advantages, but they do not often have fundraising skills. Mexaena has volunteers who speak both Dutch and Tigrinya, to work with Eritreans.

The composition of the volunteer base in the various organizations seems to differ quite a bit. Villa Vrede stresses that their volunteers are quite mixed in terms of age, gender and ethnicity. Welcome to Utrecht, by contrast, did a (exploratory) survey that showed that volunteers are predominantly female, relatively highly educated, in the age-group of 25-40 and native Dutch. The age factor might be related to the notion that promotion is predominately done through Facebook. New Dutch Connections has many students among their buddies and coaches, or as interns.

**Governance**

With the exception of the municipality’s refugee launch pad program, all initiatives are foundations. This implies that they have a board comprised of a number of people. As said, in the case of Villa Vrede, refugees are also represented in the board of the organization. New Dutch Connections and Mexaena were also co-founded by refugees. Also in the case of the Ubuntu house, refugees are intimately involved in the governance of daily operations. Even though refugees can have all sorts of roles in other initiatives – contact person, community leader, interpreter – they do not always have a direct influence on those organizations’ policies.

There are other reasons to describe some of the organizations as ‘open’. Welcome to Utrecht is a clear example of a network organization, given that its main activity is to coordinate between different initiatives. Considering that many organizations develop quite a bit over the years of their existence, often because of pursuing new directions or taking opportunities, we may also conclude that this is a signal of a certain openness. Pharos and the municipal refugee launch pad project are probably the most traditional in terms of governance. Then again, their scale of (planned) operations exceeds the scope of relatively small initiatives like Mexaena.

**Value sets**

Already on the basis of the strong social needs orientation of all the initiatives we have studied, we may conclude that they have important value sets. Therefore, we have not elaborated on this issue extensively in our interviews. It is noteworthy that half of the informants spontaneously evoked a human rights discourse. The language coach we interviewed talked about the human rights advocacy of her parents, with which she was brought up. New Dutch Connections argues for peoples’ right to develop, whether they have a residence status or not. The Ubuntu House advocates for everyone’s right of housing, and not simply in terms of shelter for the night. The municipality, finally, puts great emphasis on Utrecht being a human rights city. All their policies, including those for refugees, should be in line with their human rights agenda.
4.6. Relations in the field

Relations with the local government

Utrecht as host town

The municipality of Utrecht is the fourth city in the Netherlands, having 338,986 inhabitants, located in the center of the Netherlands. The city’s policy regarding refugees is handled by policy-officials in the department of Social Development [Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling]. The municipality develops policy and facilitates housing and services for three groups of people with a refugee background: People awaiting asylum (prior to and during the asylum procedure), people that have been granted asylum (status holders) and asylum seekers and migrants that have been denied a status and live in the city without papers.

In 2015, the Netherlands admitted 58,880 refugees in the country to apply for asylum. That same year, Utrecht housed nearly 1,000 new refugees in temporary emergency shelters on locations in the city center and the neighborhood Kanaleneiland. In addition, Utrecht hosted 450 refugees in the vested Asylum Reception Centre (AZC) that has been there for more than 20 years. In the course of 2016, the capacity of the Asylum Reception Centre was increased to host 850 people that had gained access to the asylum procedure. The municipality also planned an innovative emergency shelter in Overvecht ‘Refugee Launch Pad’ to be opened for 400 refugees. In addition to these groups of refugees, the municipality also facilitates housing and services for undocumented migrants in the city. According to an official fact sheet of October 2015, the municipality provides the means to offer 225 people ‘bed-bath-bread’. This does not cover housing needs for all the homeless migrants and asylum seekers living in the city, though.

Progressive policies

Utrecht has been developing progressive policies on housing and services for people with a refugee background for many years. In 2002, the city council adopted a proposal of the municipal board to offer shelter to homeless migrants without papers. Shelter was available for people who still had a chance of being granted asylum or another residence permit, and for people that were denied a status and who wanted to return to their home country, but were not able to return. The policy line of the national Government ordained that these people had to leave the country, and they were therefore excluded and sent away from the official asylum
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10 Letter of the Mayor and Aldermen of Utrecht to the City Council, 30 May 2016, ‘State of affairs shelter for refugees’.
12 Estimates about the number of undocumented and homeless migrants are unprecise and very difficult to determine, estimates for Utrecht range from 2,600 to 4,000 (50% of the latter amount are refused asylum seekers). See Hoogteijling CBS 2002: 20; http://de肚aduutrecht.nl/zorg/aantal-dakloze-asielzoekers-utrecht-stijgt-fors, website visited August 2016.
centers. In practice, many people did not leave the country or could not return to their home country and were left to their own devices.

The municipality of Utrecht, faced with people on the streets in dire circumstances, thus decided to provide emergency shelter and services in contravention with official policy of the national government. The municipality defended its position with reference to its duty of care and aspects of public health and public order. In subsequent years, the municipality used international human rights standards and legal statements of both local courts in the Netherlands and the European Committee of Social Rights of the Council of Europe to back its ‘rebel policy’. As of 2011, the municipality aspired to become a ‘Human Rights City’, aiming to live up to human rights principles, and jointly with local third sector organizations organized events and discussions in the city that would advance human rights consciousness and a culture of human rights. The ambitions of the municipality regarding shelter and services for refugees fitted these aspirations.

In 2002 the municipality started providing funds to a foundation that had been established one year earlier by church-related organizations in Utrecht, who saw the needs of refused refugees that came at their desks for help. With municipal funds, this foundation [Stichting Noodopvang Dakloze Vreemdelingen Utrecht] started providing shelter and support to vulnerable homeless migrants. In succeeding years, Utrecht facilitated more innovative services for various groups of people with a refugee background and undocumented migrants, including specific support for young asylum seekers that had come to the country unaccompanied [ex-Ama’s; Alleenstaande Minderjarige Asielzoekers], and a reconnection programme by Barka NL for homeless Central and Eastern European migrants who could not cope with life in the Netherlands and were supported to return to their home countries. The project Refugee Launch Pad to be implemented in the new emergency shelter for asylum seekers in autumn 2016, fits that policy tradition of principled innovation for refugees and undocumented migrants. The objective is to offer refugees education right from the start, and that refugees coming to Utrecht, can stay in the city after their asylum application has been accorded. Furthermore, the education offered must not only be applicable in the Netherlands, but also elsewhere, if asylum would be denied (‘future free’ training). Courses and housing are also open to residents in the neighborhood. This new approach is intended to strengthen the capabilities of both refugees and inhabitants of the neighborhood, and aims to contribute to public support for the reception of refugees in the city.

**Coordinative governance**

In sum, Utrecht has taken a principled position towards providing shelter and services for refugees and undocumented migrants, and the municipality seeks to reach these goals in
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cooperation with the third sector. This leading role of facilitating third sector projects, fostering coordination among different professional- and civic initiatives, and advancing new partnerships, was confirmed in the interviews with third sector representatives and respondents of civic groups.

First of all, representatives of the third sector organizations and civic initiatives recognized the progressive stand of the municipality of Utrecht towards shelter and housing for refugees and undocumented migrants in the city.

"...I think that Utrecht really is a good example, how they deal [with the issue of refugees]. (Mexaena)

[The municipality of Utrecht] is a forerunner in the development of policies for refugees. [...] the well-being of that group really makes progress there. (New Dutch Connections)

All representatives we interviewed were in contact with officials of the municipality. Furthermore, they reported about local meetings and events initiated by the municipality which brought together third sector organizations, municipal officials and professional organizations in the city. These accounts confirm that the municipality seeks connection with the third sector and tries to connect all relevant local players in the local field. It confirms the leading role of the municipality in the local field.

Next week we will visit the municipality, the municipality organizes a huge event where they invite [...] all organizations in Utrecht that deal with refugees, to discuss relevant issues. (Mexaena)

The third sector representatives we interviewed are positive about the relations with the local government. Some representatives state that officials are supportive and accessible.

Right from the start, we have cooperated very pleasantly [with the municipality], they saw the use of our work [...] I am just very happy that the municipality has similar viewpoints on issues like integration, informal contacts with Utrecht residents. (Welcome to Utrecht)

[...] The officials are relatively easily accessible. (Villa Vrede)

**Municipal support**

More than half of the initiatives and projects we included in our fieldwork received municipal funds for the work they do. They also feel recognized by the local government in other ways, because the mayor takes time to pay them a visit, they are invited to meetings to present their initiative, or they receive more symbolic awards of the local government.

Yes, we are recognized, how much, I don’t know, but they provide us with funds, so they recognize us. [...] We have won the “We-make-Utrecht-trophée”, not last year, but the year before that, we were 3rd of the 15 [...] (Ubuntu Huis)

[...] Even the mayor was here, for the opening. So, that is very nice. [...] There is no opposition to our work. They are simply very happy about it. That makes the city an easy place to work. [...] That can be different in other cities (Villa Vrede)

Notwithstanding the positive experiences with the local government, some interviewees also see that more could be done, in terms of funding, or time and leeway to support projects for refugees. The coordinator of a project to facilitate volunteering by refugees explains that municipalities need to invest in their volunteer-mediation-centers [vrijwilligerscentrales] if they want to make them successfully mediate refugees to volunteer work. Another representative
explains that it is complicated for them to be granted funds because their initiative caters to diverse target groups, which does not always fit the requirements for municipal- and private funding.

*If a volunteer-mediation-center would have eight hours a week to recruit volunteers and arrange activities in an asylum center [AZC], you would be able to involve a lot of refugees in voluntary work. [...] Because they are dependent on the funding of the municipality, they have to squeeze this task in their daily work [...] for example in Utrecht and Nijmegen. They only have a few hours a week to do this. From that perspective, I think they achieve quite a lot. (Pharos)*

To conclude, third sector organizations develop innovative projects. The municipality of Utrecht facilitates these initiatives by funding, recognizing and connecting projects and initiatives in the third sector. The municipality takes an active and leading role in the local field, and by supporting initiatives, seeking new partnerships and cooperation in the local field, the municipality provides financial means, support and guidance to enhance social innovation.

**Relations to third sector organizations**

This paragraph aims to map the relationships that the investigated innovative initiatives maintain with other third sector organizations. Relations with third sector colleagues in the field facilitate the exchange of views and collaboration, which adds to developing and dispersing innovations. Local third sector organizations in the field of refugee services are acquainted with one another, and are connected. As we started investigating initiatives and organizations in the West and South West of the city, there is geographical proximity between the various initiatives. However, it was rather their common aim and target group that encouraged contacts and working relations between third sector organizations, than the physical location. For the more informal civic initiatives that were developed around emergency shelters, proximity played a more important role, as will be discussed in the section on the role of the neighborhood below. Rather than the neighborhood, it was the confined space of the city as a whole that spurred contacts and working relations. Furthermore, relations also went beyond the boundaries of the city, and beyond the field of refugee organizations.

**Fine-tuning services**

For organizations that share the same target group or common aims, such as Villa Vrede and Ubuntu Huis, both providing daycare for (undocumented) homeless, it has become routine showing visitors the way to each other’s services and fine-tuning the activities offered by them. Also welfare professional are reported to show people the way to the innovative third sector initiatives.

*[We show people the way to other services] we have a map of social services here, that’s why I encouraged to [...] write up the social map of Utrecht and keep it up-to-date, because I think that would also be one of our tasks. [...] At the beginning we have adjusted our opening times and activities [with Ubuntu Huis] [...] Now they want to target somewhat different groups, because we are also open. (Villa Vrede)*

In addition to bilateral fine-tuning, organizations and initiatives meet each other in local meetings and events. Some of the organizations participate in a periodic refugee-aid
consultation \textit{[hulpverlenersoverleg]}, which includes representatives and local professionals of organizations that provide services for refugees and undocumented migrants.\textsuperscript{16} In these meetings, representatives discuss the state of affairs in the field, but also discuss urgent individual cases. One of the initiatives we studied was the ‘offspring’ of an earlier established organization: The initiators of Mexaena had met each other while volunteering and being coached in a project of New Dutch Connections. After the establishment of Mexaena, New Dutch Connections contributed to training-sessions of the new organization. Whereas organizations sharing the same target groups maintained working-relations, organizations catering different target groups (newcomers in emergency-shelters versus status-holders or undocumented) maintained contacts, but less often this led to actual cooperation in activities or projects.

\textit{[...]} We maintain contacts with [New Dutch Connections and Mexaena], because it can be useful, of course, because they can play a role as contact person in an emergency shelter, but contacts are not intensive because it often concerns status-holders. \textit{[...]} (Welcome to Utrecht)

Apart from connections between organizations providing support to refugee groups, the respondents mentioned contacts and cooperation with organizations from other domains, such as churches and diaconal offices, sports-groups or organizations that offer language coaching. The project ‘Get down to work’ spurred cooperation between the Utrecht volunteer-mediation-center and diverse local groups, including gardening-initiatives, sports-clubs and community restaurants. This all adds to the picture of interconnectedness of the field in Utrecht, although connections also go beyond the city. Projects such as ‘Get down to work’ \textit{[Aan de slag!]} of Pharos and the Future Academy of New Dutch Connections, are also implemented in other cities in the Netherlands, but found their origin in Utrecht. In addition, the initiatives and representatives participate in national and international networks. Ubuntu Huis for example, takes part in the international movement ADT Fourth World, working for the realization of human rights to overcome poverty, whereas Welcome in Utrecht cooperates with the likeminded citizens’ platform in Nijmegen to share experiences.

Notwithstanding the interconnectedness of the field in Utrecht, cooperation is not always easy, especially if parties are stuck in a hectic field where people are absorbed by emergencies, a weighty workload and new tasks, due to the high number of refugees that had to be helped in a short period of time. One of the young initiatives hoped to be able to discuss the available services and lacunae in services with a more vested organization in the city, but this could not be planned because staff of the vested organization was overburdened. The same initiative also hoped to make use of an existing methodology on financial management implemented by a vested third sector organization. This was hampered by that fact that the initiative was not automatically authorized to use the methodology.

To conclude, social innovative initiatives and other organizations in the third sector maintain relations. Especially groups that cater similar target groups work together on issues and

services. In the confined area of the city, common goals and common target groups provide the rationale for fine-tuning and cooperation. Although not with the same frequency, the social innovative projects seek their partnerships beyond the boundaries of the city, and beyond those of the third sector. National and international relations add to dispersion of social innovations, whereas partnerships in the governmental- and private sphere can also add to further their aims and ambitions, as we will see below.

**Relations to companies**

Although relations with the private sector are not a prominent ingredient of the initiatives in our sample, cooperation with companies is sought in two of the social innovations represented in the study. In the projects on coaching of young refugees, organized by New Dutch Connections, relations with companies are strived for and encouraged in order to make them available to the youngsters coached. Visits, conversations and internships, are advanced so that young refugees can build a network and acquire experiences that inspire them to build a new future. In the project the Refugee Launch Pad, the municipality involved the Social Impact Factory as a partner in its project design. It is a young organization, with a broad network of companies, which is assigned the task of matching the refugees that aspire entrepreneurship with experienced entrepreneurs.

**Relations with other public institutions**

For the interviewees in the field in Utrecht, not only relations with the local government, third sector organizations and private actors (companies) are relevant for their work, but the governmental Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers [COA Centraal Orgaan Opvang Asielzoekers] is an important player to work with, as they manage the reception centers and emergency shelters for newcomers on behalf of the central Government. Management and staff of the Central Agency are important for initiatives that hope to support refugees, as they provide entrance to (or can constrain entrance to) the refugees living in shelters. The interviews indicated that gaining access to and working in the vested reception centers and emergency shelters can be challenging for both citizen’s initiatives and volunteer-mediation-centers. The respondents regretted these difficulties but also recognized the complicated position of COA, giving its limited official mandate and limited means for social activities, the weighty workload and fear for jeopardizing order and security in the shelters by letting in groups of involved citizens. On the other hand, one of the respondents in the ‘Get down to work’ project, saw that the relevance and importance of activation and participation of refugees was more and more recognized and supported by COA, which granted leeway for volunteer-mediation-centers to work from the Asylum Reception Centers (AZCs).

*Now I also observe at [...] COA, they really support it, and they now talk to [...] various ministries to make it known. So, I see a change of views there.* (Pharos)

In two of the innovative initiatives, contacts with educational institutions, including institutions for vocational training and academic institutions were maintained to provide refugees with access to education, coaching and training. For instance, the municipal project Refugee Launch Pad aims to offer courses entrepreneurship and business English, which can be used either in the Netherlands or elsewhere (so-called ‘future-free’ education), offered by the Utrecht Centre for Entrepreneurship and the Utrecht Volksuniversiteit respectively.
In sum, the innovative initiatives in our sample do not restrict their relations to one sector, they are connected with governmental organizations, the third sector and the private sector, which accounts for innovations that are embedded in diverse networks.

*On the one hand, you just need the formal organizations, you need the municipality, employers, institutions for secondary education and higher professional education, to be able to organize that, but you also need an enormous amount of volunteers [...] It is a kind of movement that you create and facilitate, to make it really happen.* (New Dutch Connections)

**External relations and structural platforms**

As described above, the social innovative initiatives and organizations are connected with one another and other third sector organizations via bilateral contacts, working relations, participation in ad hoc events, but also in structural platforms, such as a periodic refugee-aid consultation [*hulpverlenersoverleg*] in Utrecht. In this platform, organizations helping refugee-groups share information on trends and the state of affairs in the local field, but also inform and consult each other on individual cases. Nationwide, organizations that work for undocumented migrants meet in three-monthly meetings of the Platform Migrants without Residence Permit [*Platform Migranten zonder Verblijfsvergunning*]. Some organizations from Utrecht join these network meetings to share information and update their expertise. The platform-meetings are organized by the national support-group for undocumented people [*Landelijk Ongedocumenteerden Steunpunt, LOS*]. Both the local and national platform meetings provide opportunities for information-exchange, fine-tuning and developing new joint campaigns and projects. For instance, ties in the local refugee-aid consultation led to a project ‘Meeting beyond borders’ [*Grenzeloos Ontmoeten*], in which various publics were able to meet refugees and get to know the services available in the city for refugees.17 On the national level, ties between organizations for undocumented migrants led to a joint campaign to propagate the right of undocumented migrants to participate in society, titled ‘Get down to work for all – Opportunities for people without a status’ [*Iedereen aan de slag! Kansen voor mensen zonder status*]. The campaign attempts to expand the possibilities for volunteering, education and paid labor for undocumented migrants. Various organizations from Utrecht, including New Dutch Connections, Ubuntu Huis and Villa Vrede, have supported the aims of this campaign.18 Furthermore, external relations are maintained to gain access to specific target groups and publics, and adds to method exchange.

In sum, external contacts, including participation in platforms adds to the organizations’ expertise, prevent double work and unite the means and weight of organizations in advocacy and campaigns.

**The context of relationships: pressures and opportunities for cooperation**

As we saw above, the innovative initiatives in our sample function in both local and national networks. On the one hand, cooperation was facilitated by the municipality of Utrecht that sought collaboration and coordination by bringing organizations and initiatives together. On the other hand, respondents also reported that the hectic situation in the field and the

---

workload faced by both governmental agencies (COA) and third sector organizations hampered cooperation, as staff was absorbed by the emergency and day-to-day tasks. One of the main difficulties in the field was to connect the informal citizens’ initiatives with the professional support provided in emergency centers and asylum centers. Various respondents saw that staff of the emergency shelters and asylum centers lacked the time needed to facilitate citizen’s involvement in the support for refugees. Furthermore, staff seemed cautious and unaccustomed to accommodate groups of citizens, in the face of their responsibility for the security and privacy of the refugees.

We see that contacts with COA are different everywhere, and that you do need them to get good results. Sometimes, COA cooperates well by contacting inhabitants [of asylum centers] [...] but understandably, because of the hectic situation, they often are not eager to do it, it is not part of the official task they are paid for, it is busy enough as it is. They are often also new employees, so it is quite a lot to do for them [...]. (Welcome to Utrecht)

**Embeddedness in the neighborhood**

Apart from mapping connections with the third-, governmental- and commercial sector, we consider the role of the neighborhood in the emergence and development of social innovation. To what extent are the initiatives we studied, embedded in the neighborhood through interactions of refugees and residents? We asked our respondents if they saw contacts between citizens in the neighborhood and the initiatives for and with refugees, and to what extent these initiatives mobilized support, volunteers and partners from the neighborhood. In general, the initiatives we included in the sample, find their partners and volunteers in a wider area than the neighborhood. This implies that the immediate neighborhood is not the prime support base for the initiatives. On the other hand, especially for the temporary emergency shelters in the city center (September 2015 - November 2015) and Kanaleneiland (November 2015 - May 2016), the proximity inspired some organizations, small enterprises and citizens in the neighborhood to contribute to the reception of the refugees. One respondent reported about refugee children playing with children in the neighborhood.

Yes, I heard that, [...] people from the neighborhood, mostly younger children, had friends from the emergency shelter and played football together. (Volunteer Language Coach Doenja)

“Welcome to Oog in Al” is a volunteer organization which has been very active, also around the emergency shelter. (New Dutch Connections)

In order to facilitate neighborhood support for the reception of refugees, the municipality and COA organized consultations with inhabitants of the neighborhood surrounding the emergency shelters and the asylum center (AZC). It was the resistance to the newly planned emergency shelter in Overvecht, a deprived neighborhood, that motivated the municipality to develop a new model for the shelter: the Refugee Launch Pad, which aims to provide housing, education and social services for both the refugees and residents of the neighborhood.

It started when we encountered quite some anger during meetings in the neighborhood Overvecht, which was understandable in the wake of the eroding welfare state, an economic crisis and people found it especially unfair that they had to wait so long to find housing. In Utrecht it takes eight to nine years. And people think: those refugees get everything at once. A lady [from the audience] stood up and said: what do we get in return? That remark stayed with me, I did understand [...] we have to do something to make the neighborhood accept [the new shelter]. I thought: housing is a big issue in Utrecht, would it be possible to mingle housing and to be able to promise Overvecht [the neighborhood] it might cost you something, but it also brings you something. (Municipality, Refugee Launch Pad)
The effects of this new approach, for both the refugees and the neighborhood, will be monitored and investigated by community-researchers of Oxford University (Municipality of Utrecht). The municipality is not only interested in finding evidence for effects on the local community, but it also wishes to make the approach transferable and applicable for other cities in Europe.

4.7. Impact and obstacles

As social innovation is geared towards addressing social needs, we see indications for effects and impact as an important stage in the process of social innovation. Furthermore, looking into obstacles to progress, adds to our understanding about the process of social innovation. In our field research, we therefore asked our respondents to reflect on their experiences and perspectives regarding the gains and achievements of the social innovative projects and the obstacles they saw.

Impact for the refugees

The main gains that respondents mention are an increased well-being and improved capabilities for the refugees that have been supported by the innovative services. Furthermore, through their visits of meeting-points and participation in activities, refugees are able to meet new people, develop friendships and maintain existing friendships.

A lot of youngsters that we trained or participated in our programs, are still connected with us. […] The relation between coaches and the coached youngsters is often permanent. […] Some of these boys who have been supported by our coaches, can now go to university and actually have a rich social life. (New Dutch Connections)

One representative sketched a modest picture of the initial gains of the efforts to make refugees volunteer, but increased well-being is seen by all respondents as an essential stepping stone for successful participation and self-reliance. Furthermore, it prevents people from becoming ill and apathetic.

It is not immediately a life-changing experience, but it is a bit like when you have a day out, and gain positive energy. You have met people, you have spent your time doing meaningful things, that is a positive experience that will stay with you for a while. That’s how I see it, and it really works. (Pharos)

[…] You also hear them say: This little trip, this will make us sustain for another two months. That I have been able to be out of that environment [the shelter], in a normal home and household. That I have seen your children. That we have played football. That truly is very nice. That helps, that works. (Volunteer Language Coach Doenja)

Respondents working for undocumented migrants explain how investing in this group of people is not only beneficial for the refugees themselves, but also for society as a whole:

You take all competences with you, wherever you go, whatever you do […] That awareness is growing, also in policy. Thus, the idea that it is disadvantageous for both society and individuals to do nothing. […] It is all about making the pool of [refused] people that return to their country bigger. People who are more active, while feeling well and resilient, connect more easily with the world outside. Because, if you stay on the couch the whole day, paralyzed, because you do not dare to go out, then you will never go away. (New Dutch Connections)
Impact for the volunteers

The initiatives we studied advanced opportunities for people in the city to take part in supportive actions. They made active citizenship and volunteering for refugees possible. The citizens’ platform Welcome to Utrecht saw the coordination of citizens’ initiatives as one of its main tasks.

I: To offer a structure to make that happen. R: Exactly, that is what we try to do, to facilitate the support of the Utrecht inhabitants and at the same time to work on the [needs of refugees] … so we look from both sides where the power is. (Welcome to Utrecht)

The initiators and volunteers of innovative activities see satisfaction, improved competences and received appreciation as the major gains of their work.

I carried on because I saw that they enjoyed it, and then I also enjoy myself […] Because it is big fun, and you see that it is very much appreciated. That really makes it worthwhile. (Volunteer Language Coach Doenja)

Some respondents have been able to expand their personal network and encountered new friendships. Respondents had also learned about worlds and refugee experiences, that had been new to them. This was explained as positive, but supporting people in difficult situations was also demanding.

You learn so much about a world unknown, that’s fantastic. (New Dutch Connections)

Every time it is difficult that [your effort] is only a drop in the ocean. (Volunteer Language Coach Doenja)

In one of the innovative initiatives, ‘experts by experience’, such as refugees or former homeless persons, help managing the organization in ‘duoship’ with another expert. The use of this expertise in the support of (former) homeless people is seen as effective and fulfilling. Another respondent appreciated the contacts with her fellow-volunteers.

I often feel what people need, because I have been there myself, I understand what they feel, what they go through […] [one of the young visitors] was very different when he came here for the first time. Seeing people blossom, is very wonderful. […] It really means a lot for myself too, I have been homeless myself, I have a house now, but I learn so much of [helping run this place] […] (Ubuntu Huis)

It is very nice to work with people [the volunteers] that also work in so good spirits […] (Welkom to Utrecht)

Impact for the community

The respondents saw results from their work that go beyond the personal gains of refugees, initiators and volunteers. The representative of the citizens’ platform Welcome to Utrecht had noticed that the activities had led to many informal contacts, not only between refugees and Utrecht volunteers, but also between volunteers from diverse circles and groups.

The Ulu Mosque […] had provided a room to collect and sort clothes […] Islamic girls organized that […] and then other mosques joined, but also a lot of native Dutch people, so you got a lot of wonderful conversations while sorting clothes. (Welkom to Utrecht)

We think it is very important that those initiatives and activities also induce informal contacts. So it is not only a sort of occupational therapy: go out sporting a bit and then you feel fine and that is it. But
we think it is wonderful if it also brings friendships, or if people will do more for people. We have seen that this happens quite a lot, although we do not have a precise picture. (Welkom to Utrecht)

Comparing our interview-data on impact with the four different types of community development we anticipated in section 4.3, we find support for actual manifestations of community development. [PM to be written]

But I also need the people here, as much as they need me. [...] We are friends for each other, or you could say we are family. And that is what I need [...] this actually is my substitute-family. (Ubuntu Huis)

Obstacles

As to the obstacles, the hectic situation and lack of time and mandate of governmental and third sector organizations has already been mentioned. One of our respondents mentioned the limited budget and austerity policy of the Government as disadvantageous to an easy reception of new approaches to participation and social activation:

We always thought: activating people is important, but there was a sober policy in the Netherlands and [the Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers, COA] were not allowed to do that and they didn’t have the manpower to do it. (Pharos)

Two representatives of innovative organizations saw (a lack of) money and funding regulations as a constraining factor to do what they want to do.

I think that in general [people and policy-makers] tend to think compartmentalized. [...] so projects are often only for this or that group. (Ubuntu Huis)

Money is of course always an obstacle, now we get money for a particular target group, and I would prefer to function without those constraints. But that is impossible, you get money for a certain target group. (New Dutch Connections)

4.8. Summarizing the Dutch case

The Netherlands is a destination country for refugees that come to Europe. Furthermore, it has a long history of civic engagement for supporting refugees. The social innovation studied in this report; self-organized community development with refugees, has emerged in the Netherlands roughly as of 2005, after a period of more restrictive asylum regulations and budget cuts on both public services and third sector organizations working for refugees. Respondents have explained that neither self-organization by local residents nor refugee community groups were a new phenomenon then, it was rather the approach and the underlying notions that accounted for the social innovation.

Motivated by lacunae in services for refugees, and stimulated by experiences and research data that a lack of participation leads to unsuccessful community integration and apathy, third sector organizations and the local government in Utrecht started to develop services for participation, activation and community integration by refugees. Furthermore, the innovation stream entailed a shift from organizing services for refugees to organizing services with and by refugees themselves. In the Netherlands, several of the social innovative initiatives we investigated embraced the principle of co-production, which means that refugees have a say in the management and a practical role in the organization of the activities. The urgent scarcities that were witnessed during the recent arrival of large numbers of refugees during 2015 and 2016, stimulated spontaneous support by local residents, and the formation of citizens
platforms like Welcome to Utrecht to match supply and demand of services for refugees. The policy ideology of the 'participation society' emphasizing active citizenship and self-reliance was seen as an enabling factor, giving leeway to the emergence of co-produced citizens' engagement, whereas a sky-high workload, lack of budget and manpower was seen as constraining the development of social innovation.

Overlooking the action field in Utrecht, we found that initiatives from the third sector are predominant instigators of social innovation in the field of community development with refugees. For an important part, this comes with our selection of self-organized community development as the innovation stream. Due to this focus, public actors are underrepresented in our sample. However, the municipality of Utrecht played an important role in the development of the social innovation stream, by inventing new solutions themselves (the Refugee Launch Pad), and by involving active citizens, organizing local gatherings, and providing funds for specific innovative services. In the Utrecht case, the interplay of third sector engagement and an ambitious local government catered for a broader acceptance of some new principles in the support for refugees: the importance of activation and participation from day 1, the benefit of offering 'future free education', also to refugees that have not yet obtained a residence permit, and the right of refugees to stay in the same city during and after the asylum procedure (no dispersing). One token of this broader acceptance was the Ministry of Social Affairs supporting the project to allow refugees in procedure to do volunteer work.

5. The "Migrants Hub" in Milan, Italy

Italy has been chosen as a sort of "counter-case" in the field of community development by way of self-organization for its peculiar status of transit country. While the country struggles to manage the high flows of migrants arriving on its shores, initiatives related to refugees' integration are scattered through the country at local or regional levels. Beyond the vast panel of third sector organizations and churches working locally for refugees' integration with the community (i.e. from offering language courses, to calling to citizens for opening their houses to host refugees), work integration is the focus of the most recent initiatives involving public administrations and local companies (i.e offering internships and job grants, or promoting refugee start-ups in the field of agriculture and crafting).

5.1. Description of the social innovation

According to two informants, more than 86000 migrants have passed through the City of Milan in 2014 and 2015, of which only a few more than 600 have requested asylum. This is quite explicative of the status of Italy, and the city of Milan in particular, as a transit point for migrants who want to reach other destinations.

The Migrants Hub of Milan (hereafter, the Hub) is a space of which primary objective is offering information, relief and orientation to migrants. Moreover, multiple services are offered: from primary health care and assistance, to cultural and linguistic mediation, children's protection and support, personal hygiene kits and showers, computers and free wi-fi access, camp beds for temporary hospitality. The hub was born to respond to the dramatic health and safety conditions of migrants occupying the Central Station of Milan. People observing the flows of migrants sleeping on the floors of the Central Station pushed the Municipality to find a solution to their conditions, as well as to guarantee the security of citizens and passengers through the Central Station. Thus, it was initially a way to manage the emergency, rather than a place of integration. Nonetheless, the Hub was chosen as a case study primarily for two
reasons, which will be further discussed in detail: it is considered highly innovative in the field of migrants’ transit management, and its potential to be replicated in other urban contexts is considered extremely high (confirmed by all informants of both rounds of interviews, as described below).

The Hub, born out to manage the emergency, soon became a structured, multi-service space, where migrants can temporarily stay while being assisted in the choice between applying for asylum in Italy (and being transferred to a shelter) or leaving the country (and being invited to leave the Hub to leave space available for other migrants).

All informants consider it a highly innovative model in the transit management of migrants, “for how it was built and the number of organizations involved, but even more than this, it is an innovative model of action to the issue of departing migrants...that is something you can agree or not, you know... with the Dublin regulation you may have some troubles” (Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo). The involvement of the community and the high number of partners of very different sectors, with different values, competences and target areas of need has contributed, in the accounts of many informants, to foster solidarity and reciprocal trust between the organizations involved and the local community. All informants, with no exception, describe the Hub as innovative: it is the first example of how an emergency situation can lead to building new interactions between a high number of very different actors, with a new governance model and decision-making mechanism, and a renewed solidarity and trust between organizations and local communities, built on the basis of different values but working towards the protection of the same public good - either seen as migrants’ support or as a safety related issue. To say it in the words of an informant “the Hub is innovative because it is a project realized by people in a context of emergency, they did not know each other, they did not have any kind of collaboration before, but they shared the same value, the need to help these people, and only on this basis they were able to do a very good team work” (GMI). As the informant from the Municipality reported, “the first aspect of innovation I see is that it was a way to make the third sector responsible: they entered the project completely, supporting also all costs …(…) This is completely new, we have always had some national funds supporting these kinds of initiatives...”. All informants also agree that the experience of the Hub has a high potential to be replicated into other contexts, since it does not exist any similar experience in other Italian or European cities. Thus, we can describe the Hub as a social innovation in transit management, rather than in community development, even if the response from the local community and the city was impressive, as it will be further described.

5.2. Introducing the organizations

The vast array of organizations involved in the Hub comes from very different sectors. They are reported in the following table 5.1.

Table 5.1 – List of actors: sector, activity, role in the Hub and date of interview (grey for interviewed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Sector (Target area of need/activity)</th>
<th>Role in the hub</th>
<th>Interview dates (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comune di Milano [Social Policies Department]</td>
<td>public (municipal level) social services, minors and families, immigration, integration, elderly</td>
<td>General Oversight and Responsibility</td>
<td>10 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS [Local Health]</td>
<td>public (regional) public health</td>
<td>Health care and control of infectious diseases</td>
<td>21 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genio militare</td>
<td>public (governmental level)</td>
<td>operations of military genius</td>
<td>Restructuring space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protezione Civile del Comune di Milano</td>
<td>public (municipal level)</td>
<td>assistance in case of emergencies/disasters, health, active citizenship</td>
<td>Restructuring space/First operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondazione Progetto Arca</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, families in need, migrants, addiction</td>
<td>Restructuring space &amp; Management/Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>migrants, marginalization, minors and families, social housing</td>
<td>Operations (main target: families in shelters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children - Italy</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children's rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations (main target: minors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF [Informatics Without Borders]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>fighting digital divide</td>
<td>Providers of computers and internet connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SosErm</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croce Rossa [Red Cross]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>assistance in case of emergencies/disasters, health, active citizenship</td>
<td>Operations/Only first days of emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Angels</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, migrants, addiction, elderly</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunità Sant’Egidio</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, families in need, migrants, addiction</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albero della Vita</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children's rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations (main target: minors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre des Hommes</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children's rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP [Clutural Association of Paediatricians]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>diagnostic and therapeutic protocols, international cooperation</td>
<td>Primary health Care (main target: children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP [Italian Society of Paediatricians]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>physical and psychological wellbeing of children</td>
<td>Primary health Care (main target: children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMI [Young Muslims of Italy]</td>
<td>third sector - advocacy</td>
<td>active citizenship, culture, sport</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambio Passo</td>
<td>third sector - advocacy</td>
<td>primary assistance of Eritrean migrants</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The range of social needs organizations work for is quite varied, more uniform for third sector organizations. Organizations will be further described in details below. Overall, all the organizations involved are more focused on service delivery than on advocacy, with a few exceptions. Also, migrants related activities are the specific target of a small minority of the organizations involved, which is reported to have an impact in terms of competences and skills, as explored below.

5.3. History of the social innovation

The Hub of the Central Station was created as a response to the immense flows of migrants arriving to Milan. In particular, the deterioration of the situation in Syria has caused more than 170,000 migrants arriving on the Italian shores in 2014 (Italian Ministry of Interior, 2015). A map and a time line of the Hub build by the researchers are reported in Annex 2.

The so-called “migrants’ emergency” in Milan started in 2013: in October, the Municipality launched the Emergenza Siria programme: a network of volunteers and NGOs began to operate in the Central Station area, in particular in the mezzanine (“Mezzanino” or “Ammezzato” in Italian) – a space in the middle of the stairs for the access to the rails (number 1 in the map). In particular, Fondazione Progetto Arca (born in 1994, active in the assistance of people in need, more specifically homeless and vulnerable people) was providing food and primary assistance to refugees in coordination with the Municipality, and driving migrants to available shelters, in case of request for asylum.

In 2015, the situation became extremely critical. The arrivals continued unexpectedly during the winter too and by the end of January 2015 the presence of refugees was much more than the shelters of the City could absorb. In fact, based on an agreement between the Prefecture and the Municipality, 550 places in 6 centres had to be ensured to refugees, but they were almost the double. With the continuous flows of arrivals, the lack of communication with the central government, the dispositions from the European Union who was asking to register all the refugees and take footprints, together with the critical situation normally faced with homeless in winter (the so-called “cold emergency”), the structures dedicated to host migrants were at risk of collapse.

In this situation, the idea of the Hub started to arise. In particular, by observing that more than 90% of migrants did not in fact request asylum, there was the need for a system that would

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAIM [Coordination of Islamic Associations of Milan]</th>
<th>third sector - advocacy</th>
<th>representation of Islamic association</th>
<th>Primary support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandi Stazioni</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>management of railways stations</td>
<td>Availability of space (Owner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKEA</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>home furniture</td>
<td>Donating Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>online retailer</td>
<td>Donating hygiene kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Union and many others who want to stay anonymous</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>Donations of money and goods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ensure migrants assistance for a maximum of 3 days before their leaving, in order to avoid, on the one hand, that they slept in the station or on the streets and, on the other hand, that they became a target for smugglers who were concentrated around the Central Station. Together with Fondazione Progetto Arca, many organizations were active in welcoming migrants.

In April 2015, the situation became unsustainable, as the number of daily arrivals was rising, reaching the peak of 1500 a day. As a consequence, with the shelters completely full, many refugees did not have any chance but to sleep on the ground of the station. Several proposals were made: finally, Grandi Stazioni (a private company managing railways and owner of the spaces at the Station) gave a temporary space for the Hub in some empty commercial spaces and previous offices of the company in the Central Station (number 2 and 3 in the map). While these were temporary, another two spaces were identified as suitable for setting up the Hub. The first is the former railways recreational club, very close to the Station (Via Tonale, number 4). Here the personnel of Genio Militare (the section of the National Army specialized in construction) was sent, after an official request of the Mayor of Milan, and was able to restructure the space in around two weeks, in partnership with Protezione Civile (the Civil Protection corps) and Fondazione Progetto Arca. However, Grandi Stazioni did not intend to lose the possibility to rent those spaces to commercial activities and it started to renovate another space, 1.5 km from the Station (number 5).

On the 10th of July 2015, the Hub was transferred to Via Tonale, a 450 square metres space addressed to host the operators who assisted migrants, managed their transit or guided them to shelters in case of request for asylum. Beyond this core activity, a lot of services are offered in the Hub: Save the Children and Albero della Vita (literally Life’s Tree, an Italian voluntary association working with minors) set up a space for children; IKEA furnished the space; Terres des Hommes (an association born with the aim to protect and improve children’s rights) distributed kits for personal hygiene and water (donated also by Amazon, the world’s largest online retailer, with the Milan headquarter close by the station); the ATS guaranteed medical assistance; Informatics Without Borders (an association of computer technicians with the mission of narrowing the digital divide, hereafter ISF) donated computers and Wi-Fi cables in order to ensure the possibility for refugees to communicate with their families. Paediatricians from both the Cultural Association of Paediatricians (hereafter, ACP) and the Italian Society of Paediatricians (hereafter, SIP) volunteered to cover health assistance in morning hours and an immense quantity of linguistic and cultural mediators and translators, but also volunteers and citizens speaking African and Arab languages and dialects ensured the communication with refugees.

In 2 years, since the beginning of the emergency, Milan offered assistance and shelter to 84,500 refugees (62,2% Syrians, 27,7% Eritreans; among them, 16,700 children) through a network of organizations formed spontaneously right after the observance of the emergency situation around the Central Station, and able to cope with the high peaks of arrivals. The civil society was also extremely active: the calls for donation of food, clothes and other goods found an impressive response of a large part of citizens. The support received in distributing goods and communicating with migrants was also impressive. Also companies made contributions, donating goods for more than 520.000 euros.

The Hub was transferred to the newly renovated space in Via Sammartini 118 in May 2016: 700 square metres with two connected spaces and the intention of Grandi Stazioni to make the space available in a form of free leasing for 3 years, with the possibility of extension for other 2
years. Nonetheless, the situation is far from being totally under control, as if the arrivals increase, the City will find itself again under pressure and struggling with lack of places available in shelters.

5.4. Organizational features

The organizations studied are not composed of refugees, who are in this case only beneficiaries of the services offered. As a consequence, refugees are not represented in any organizational structure. The Coordination of Islamic Associations of Milan (hereafter, CAIM), GMI and CambioPasso are formed primarily by second generation immigrants and almost exclusively by young people – students and young workers.

The organizations involved in the Hub are private for profit, non-profit and public. Public sector organizations are:

- The Social Policies Department of the City of Milan, which is in charge of everything regarding immigration policies. The Municipality kept the overall coordination of the Hub and managed the relationships with the regional and governmental level;
- The ATS, in particular with its Hygiene and Public Health Department, responsible for health safety and infectious diseases control.
- Protezione Civile and Genio Militare were particularly involved at the very beginning, in the operations of restructuring and furnishing the space.

Two medical doctors from the ATS represent the only public personnel with a continuous physical presence in the Hub. They work in a little space addressed to check-ups and very limited surgery interventions. Doctors have been selected on the base of a call specifically launched for the Hub: among the selection criteria, not only a specialization in infectious diseases, but also linguistic competences and capacity to adapt to stressful situations were included. The two medical doctors selected are from Egypt and Syria, they perfectly speak the needed languages as well as Italian, and they work almost full time at the Hub. Moreover, a third medical doctor was selected to support the ATS in collecting and archiving data coming from the Hub, to monitor the existence of certain diseases and their development.

The map of private actors involved has resulted in:

- Grandi Stazioni, the owner of the space hosting the Hub, made the spaces available under invitation of the City Mayor;
- IKEA, the famous home furniture company, openly supported the Hub furnishing the spaces dedicated to children;
- Amazon, the largest online retailer, donated hygiene kits - with products for personal hygiene;
- Western Union, the company leader in money transfer, made generous donations, as several other companies which donated hundreds of thousands of euros as well as food, clothes and other in-kind donations and prefer to remain anonymous.

Third sector organizations are by far the most numerous. They present an enormous difference in size, mission and structure, which we have categorized based on their similarities.

- Organizations focused on people in need: Fondazione Progetto Arca, Farsi Prossimo, City Angels and Comunità di Sant’Egidio. Their activity aims at assisting the part of the
population more in need (poor or vulnerable people, such as homeless, families, elderly or people with problems of addiction). Their budget comes mainly by public contributions, as they are often contractors of the Municipality (for example, Fondazione Progetto Arca and Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo are managers of shelters). Fondazione Progetto Arca has an enormous fundraising capacity, as it has been recognized from other informants too: almost 90% of its budget comes from private donors. Fondazione Progetto Arca is notably expanding (“we have been able to increase our personnel from 50/60 people to more than 250 people now in two years” reported one of their informants). The Hub experience has also contributed significantly to this growth: a number of volunteers from CambioPasso, GMI and other groups which very active at the Central Station in the days of emergency, have been then hired by Fondazione Progetto Arca, which was very weak, especially in some specific skills (for example, linguistic and cultural mediation).

- **Organizations focused on migrants and minorities:** Coordination of Islamic Associations of Milan (hereafter, CAIM), GMI and Cambiopasso. CAIM and GMI act for the promotion of civic engagement, fostering the reciprocal knowledge and dialogue between different religions or ethnic groups, though in practice almost completely involved in the emergency – providing food, shelter, legal assistance and overall support. CambioPasso has also been considered more oriented to advocacy, though it was born out of the observation of the conditions of Eritrean migrants in Milan, providing shelter, assistance, food and clothes, but still with a high degree of activism and the attempt to push institutions to do more on migrants’ hospitality and the rights of Eritreans in particular. They are the only organizations with a specific target on migrants or (religious) minorities among all organizations involved in the Hub. Born as informal groups, they were particularly active in the first phase of the case study, organizing informal primary assistance before the intervention of the Municipality and other organizations. They operated exclusively as volunteers, in particular supporting the other organizations as they were able to speak the languages needed and have an extensive knowledge of the situation of the migrants’ countries of origin. Cambiopasso (composed of around 15 people, all volunteers) was founded with the mission of delivering primary assistance to Eritreans; GMI has the mission to promote active citizenship and civic engagement of young Muslims in Italy and CAIM has a wider mission of representation of Islamic associations in Milan. However, in the emergency peaks they all organized groups involving everyone interested in helping, in order to offer assistance to refugees at the Central Station, thus their activities were quite uniform. Later, these organizations did not formally participate at the structuration of Hub, although some of their volunteers were hired by Fondazione Progetto Arca or joined the group of SosErm. These organizations rely exclusively on private donations.

- **Organizations focused on children:** Save the Children, Terres des Hommes, Albero della Vita, ACP and SIP. The first three organizations find a common mission in the protection of children’s rights and their nutrition, health and education. They operated as volunteers in order to assist children and, for Save the Children in particular, to identify unaccompanied minors. Save the Children is responsible of the space dedicated to children recreation and education, which is occupied by its operators every day, from 10 to 18 Monday to Friday, and from 10 to 15 on Saturdays and Sundays. The other shifts are covered by Albero della Vita which shares the space. These organizations have a long tradition in the protection of children’s rights (they were founded respectively in 1919, 1994 and 1960) and have a budget mainly based on private donations and fundraising, with the exception of Terres des Hommes which has...
78% of its budget coming from public funds. ACP and SIP are included here for their focus on children: their mission is to provide diagnostic and therapeutic protocols, treatment evaluation and other activities for children’s wellbeing. Paediatricians from these two associations contributed as volunteers in the medical assistance of children, “every morning for at least two hours for more than one year and a half” as reported by Save the Children, sharing the space used by the ATS for check-ups and small surgery, under the responsibility of the ATS.

- Organizations focused on humanitarian assistance and intervention in emergency situations: Red Cross, SOSErm. Although these two organizations are very different, they operate in the same context of emergency. In fact, the Red Cross was active mainly at the beginning of the Hub, when the Municipality and the Region were still discussing about the presence of the ATS, which was still not structured. SOSErm was born as an informal group of volunteers, which now has become institutionalized, formed by citizens who were contributing to the assistance of refugees at the Central Station. Hence, it was born out of the emergency with the only purpose of giving relief to refugees in that situation.

- Other organizations: ISF. ISF has a mission completely different from all other organizations: founded in 2005 by a group of Italian managers working in the IT sector, it aims at reducing the digital divide assisting those living in situation of poverty and marginalization. As most of the other organizations, they contributed to the Hub with their own resources, providing the space with hardware and internet connections at their own cost.

With a few exceptions, most of the organizations involved in the Hub contributed with their own resources. Either they were participating by using their funds and with a significant number of volunteers (like Save the Children), or collecting funds purposively for the Hub (like Fondazione Progetto Arca, whose informants reported to have 6 million euros of funds dedicated to the emergencies, and Terres des Hommes which gathered large donations by enterprises). In both cases, third sector organizations participated with their own monetary and human resources, and not because of any kind of financial agreement with the Municipality or any other public institution.

5.5. Relations in the field

The Hub is a network of several actors with the Municipality at the centre, being the “director” of the whole process. Overall, the relations of the Municipality with other institutions were not always easy, in particular with the Central Government and the Region (Lombardy). The government was perceived as absent, not helping in managing the migrants’ emergency and criticized for it was keeping sending part of the asylum seekers from other cities to Milan, while the Municipality was still struggling with all temporary migrants.

On the side of the Lombardy Region, the political debate was sharp. The Region is politically guided by Lega Nord, born in 1989 with the fusion of several separatist regional movements from the North of Italy and with a specific vision against migrants and fiercely against a welcoming approach to the issue of migrants and immigration in general, even more explicit during electoral campaigns. On the contrary, the political party guiding the Municipality of Milan, currently and in the past five years, is a leftish party, one of the primary opponents of Lega Nord in the country. As a consequence, initial discussion around the severity of the emergency were sharp, especially due to the nature of the Central Station of Milan, a strategic
node for all the Region, Milan being the major city of Lombardy and the primary connection of Lombardy to Europe. There were also discussions around the health service to be provided by the ATS, as health is a regional competence. As the informant from the ATS reported “there were enormous fights between the two institutions: I remember the Municipality on one side which was asking more, the Region on the other which wanted to give less...the initial feeling was that political and ideological aspects were prevailing on practical aspects”. This distance was finally reduced and the dialogue between the two institutions has been finally considered a big improvement in a delicate issue such as migrants’ assistance.

A critical issue was the absence of an operator of the Municipality in the Hub: the Municipality had a stable operator in the Hub only for a few weeks, who then left. The general feeling from informants is that the oversight of the Municipality is needed. As an informant effectively reported “they have to breathe the incoming flow [of people], live it, know what is happening and where it is distributing...” (ATS). As a response to this choice, the informant from the Municipality confirmed they have decided to not have a physical presence in the Hub, “because there were tensions between the organizations...we have a contractual agreement only with Arca, we don’t have an agreement with all the others, and coordinating them was turning a bit difficult”. In this respect, some informants suggested that a contribution from the Municipality would be welcome, also to ensure the role of general oversight and coordination, as one interviewee reported: “you know, today the Municipality has not the power to say ‘you do this’ or ‘this is right, this is wrong’ because it is not paying for [the Hub]. I think this is a big shortcoming” (Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo).

For what concerns the relationship with third sector organizations, only Fondazione Progetto Arca had a contractual relationship with the Municipality, while all other organizations had Fondazione Progetto Arca as their main referee. Most of the organizations had already established relations with the Municipality and all of the interviewees recognized the political will of the Municipality was essential to manage the situation and outlined the importance of having the Municipality guiding the network. The most difficult aspect in this respect was reported to be the volunteers’ management. According to the informant from the Municipality, it was difficult to manage the volunteers’ enthusiasm with the structured, bureaucratic process faced for identification, registration and transfer of migrants to shelters, in case of request for asylum. As the informant reported, “volunteers are extraordinary and fundamental, it would be impossible to manage such a high number of migrants without their help...but they also have to understand their limits: after that, it’s the institution which must move...they cannot do anything, and sometimes they cause problems ... they want to do too much”.

The relationship with the Municipality has been thoroughly described for its relevance, the Municipality being politically responsible for the Hub, for its coordination, monitoring and evaluation. Nonetheless, the network in the Hub is formed by the diverse third sector organizations coordinated by Fondazione Progetto Arca. A specific section of the interview topic guide was addressed to explore the characteristics of this network, in particular some dimensions: the reciprocal trust between actors, their competencies, the degree of central or shared decision-making, the flexibility and adaptation to changes. While some organizations already knew each other (e.g IKEA is a major donor of Save the Children, Fondazione Progetto Arca and Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo has long worked together, so as Comunità Sant'Egidio which has worked with most of the advocacy oriented organizations), most of them worked with the others for the first time.
The level of trust was considered high by most of the interviewed. As the informant from the ATS reported, “that moment when we started to see the Hub...there were the first real efforts of integration [between organizations involved], since people started to know each other and to work together (...) despite we are all different, we were all rowing in the same direction”. This common objective guiding such diverse organizations is recurrent in interviewees’ accounts. As another informant reported, the reciprocal trust has grown due to the fact that the organizational values may be different, but the objective was clear and common.

However, coordination is considered, by most informants, as the first problem, especially in the first weeks. The decision-making is highly concentrated in the hands of Fondazione Progetto Arca, the general manager, as it is responsible for the contractual agreement with the Municipality. All informants outlined the high flexibility of the network, able to adapt to unexpected changes. Not only volunteers, but the personnel involved had showed an incredible capacity to adapt and to offer an immense amount of volunteer time and work, well beyond the salaried activity.

Responses are less uniform on the degree of skills and expertise involved. In general, informants applauded the overall management, considering the difficult and stressful situation in which the organizations were daily involved. On the other side, most informants were critical of the fact that the mission of many organizations, including the general manager, was not targeted to migrants, thus lacking specific expertise: most operators were considered certainly knowledgeable of dealing with vulnerable people, but not aware of the peculiarity of psychological, cultural, linguistic and other difficulties that migrants can face. More than one informant also complained about the skills of some volunteers and operators involved, as they were totally unprepared to deal with highly and repeatedly stressful conditions. As an informant from Cambiopasso reported on volunteers, “they have all sorts of competencies. Some of them have very big hearts, but are not practical at all...you know, they feel like activists...”.

5.6. Impact and obstacles

The Hub is an extremely recent experience. Although it is difficult to comment on the impact of such a young case study, informants’ accounts report some preliminary opinion in this respect. First of all, the Hub has contributed to fill the gap of a service which was non-existent and highly needed. As the informant from the Municipality reported, “of course we would have assisted these migrants anyway, somehow, without the Hub…but not with such dignity. The Hub is a structure which is modern, organized and clean… people were sleeping on the ground before that”. In this respect, the impact of the Hub has been enormous, also from an informant managing a city shelter, who recognized that “without volunteers, and the mediation expertise of many of them, our work would have been much more difficult, for sure…” (Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo).

Beside this, we can divide the findings emerged from interview data analysis in three different aspects: the impact the Hub had on the volunteers, on the community and on the migrants.

Almost all informants agreed that the Hub had a huge impact on volunteers, since it allowed an impressive mobilization of efforts, donations and time from operators, but also general citizens. Many volunteers, as previously mentioned, were also hired by the general manager. The majority of people were volunteers, and the few people involved as paid personnel – primarily the operators of Fondazione Progetto Arca and medical doctors of the ATS – engaged themselves much beyond their paid hours. Citizens donated tons of food, clothes, blankets and other goods. Companies donated hundreds of thousands of euros and goods. People from the Municipality, including council members and staff of the Social Policies Department, were seen there unloading, selecting and distributing goods in the days of emergency. All together, all for a common goal.

The impact on the community was considered high from all informants. Reciprocal knowledge and dialogue were fostered through this experience, in a local community, the one around the Central Station area, which is used to a high rate of criminality, smugglers, homeless, people with addiction and generally vulnerable people. Particularly interesting in this respect was an account from the informant from GMI, who suggested that the experience of the Hub has brought them to be more known in the local community: “this experience has contributed to integrate us, young Muslims born in Italy, with the Milanese civil society...because in the end we were all guided by the same values, disregarding the different religion or origin”. The contribution of GMI was primarily on food support and linguistic mediation, but the whole Muslim community was involved, as a few mosques through the action of CAIM offered night and day hospitality to migrants during the peaks of arrivals. The informant from CambioPasso (literally “ChangeStep”, born as an informal group of young Eritrean volunteers, now constituted in association), also suggested how the response from the local community was impressive, “people made their garages available, their shops, their private spaces” just observing the number of people sleeping on the streets around the Central Station area. Also the informants from Fondazione Progetto Arca reported how the local community in the Central Station has been a fundamental vehicle for the Hub, “you cannot imagine here around...the newspaper shop, the people sitting at McDonald’s...when they see migrants, they call us and we come and bring them [to the Hub]...”.

The fact that these organizations were so active and brought their knowledge and expertise, as well as their effort to go out of the dimension of informality and become formal associations, has also been reported as a positive element in their relationship with the Municipality. As an informant from GMI reports, “we have done all informally as volunteers, without any
We also told the Municipality we couldn’t do this for long, we have done more than one month [of translation and linguistic mediation primarily] each day with shifts to cover the whole day and night...we needed more support”. In fact, as the informant from the Municipality reported, at some point the presence of volunteers needed to be structured, also to effectively respond to the high need of coordination existing – to have the possibility to be invited to coordination tables and to be recognized by the operators working in the Hub and in the shelters. Nonetheless, even before the formation of formal groups of volunteers, the Municipality has always listened to these groups, for their rooted presence in the community and for their profound knowledge of the countries of origin of migrants and their situation. As an informant from CambioPasso reported, “we have always given information to the Municipality about how to deal, orient and assist these migrants...and despite they never recognized us formally, they have accepted our suggestions...we were extremely happy when the Hub was finally open! (...) we pushed for its opening for a long time...

Finally, the impact on the final beneficiaries – the migrants – is the most critical to assess. On one side, the Hub was considered necessary as a place for orientation, before anything else – assistance, relief, registration and eventually transfer to the available shelters, responding to a concrete, existing need. As an informant reported, “for sure [the Hub] is a positive experience, because at least you can stay, even if for a short time, in a place which is safe and to be assisted (...) even if it’s only getting legal information, talking to migrants about the request of asylum but also alternative solutions, helping them joining their families... we have the chance to do all this”. The alternative would have been thousands of people, including children and families, sleeping on the streets, close to smugglers and in precarious health and safety conditions, as reported by an informant, “Luckily enough we have the Hub! If it wasn’t there, I wouldn’t imagine the chaos...”. If this is the impact of the Hub, the post-Hub process is the most criticized, which is the reason why it was difficult for informants to comment overall on the impact of the assistance to refugees in Milan. The City of Milan is struggling with the whole process of registration and hospitality of asylum seekers. Shelters are full, and the Hub is turning itself into a shelter for asylum seekers. This is not in its nature, and many informants report this risks becoming detrimental, as the Hub is needed as it is – a place of first assistance and orientation, facilitating and accelerating all the steps needed for hospitality or immediate departing. As an informant reported "the Hub was born to do a certain job, and it was doing it very well ...now it is not so well anymore, because it should go back to be a Hub".

One of the most interesting aspects is how the Hub has been considered highly replicable from all informants. As an informant reported, “the Hub is not replicable, it is extremely replicable! The only thing needed is that those who have done it here go and train other people in other cities...you can do it in Paris, in Brussels, but also in Naples, in Palermo...(...) it is not that we have a special vocation here, it is just hard work”. Another informant reported, “it would be so easy to replicate it! You just need human capital, and the “right” organizations which know how to collaborate and keep the network strong...nothing more than this”. However, the majority of informants, still considering the Hub as highly replicable, recognize one of its peculiarities in its driver: a Municipality particularly sensitive to the issue of migrants, and a key condition for success. As an informant from the third sector reported, “I always stress the fact that our City Council was very good in these years, it has always stimulated citizens for donations, not monetary donations, but of goods... (...) and it was the Municipality which made the effort to try to bring all of us around a table and ask us to be more collaborative and coordinated”. Another informant reports how the Municipality was active in contacting third sector organizations already working in the
Mezzanino, and making them convene to sort out how to manage the future Hub. Without this presence, most informants admitted the Hub would have been so effective.

6. Towards a refugee (community) support infrastructure without government funding in Birmingham, United Kingdom

6.1. Description of the social innovation

Although London is the area, to which most refugees come initially (with three gateways in the form of airports/hararbours in close proximity), the introduction of the country’s dispersal policy meant that other big cities - such as Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow - now host large proportions of refugees as well. Many of them have been thus under pressure to develop strategies at a regional levels to cope with the additional demand. Birmingham is the second or third largest dispersal area after London and it is also a City that implemented innovative strategies such as Cities of Sanctuary (a social movement) and is now for example one of the largest City of Sanctuary.

Another crucial context factor for understanding the situation in Birmingham is the complete lack of government funding for community development. Obviously, refugees are legally British citizens and thus they have rights as any other citizen to mainstream public services (including health and housing). What is not available is government funding for additional support – including community support – that this group might arguably require, including legal aid and other support. Respondents noted the absence of a refugee community support infrastructure, but added immediately that the challenge to build this up is enormous, given the absence of public funding. Organizations with refugees are (severely) overburdened. This is the social context in which we have to imagine the emergence of ‘self-organized community development with refugees’. It raised the question whether innovation equals ‘substitution’ of public services.

6.2. Introducing the organizations

The Piers Road Association was formed in 2007 and became a charity in 2009. It serves refugees, asylum seekers and vulnerable communities. Their mission is to relieve suffering, loneliness, distress, educational disadvantage and other life challenging issues. Furthermore, they aim to build the confidence of newly arrived migrants, helping them to stand on their own feet and participate in UK society. This support enables them to form their own organization with other members of their community. One of their priorities is encouraging their engagement with the long established host communities, the majority of whom are of Irish, Caribbean and South Asian heritage.

The Association works with 23 different refugee community groups based in the building. They all have access to the building seven days a week with its office space and IT facilities. The present groups are from many African countries plus more established groups from Kurdistan, Iran and Afghanistan. The groups provide support to their own members both on and off site. Their activities include family support and community and other social events.

On site the association provides courses in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), diet and other health issues, job search, literacy and benefits. Some of their partners put on their own courses for refugees in the catchment area, for example, African men’s health issues. Some of their innovative work focused on: telephone helpline, befriending, and linking with
career opportunities in Further Education (for anyone above 16yrs). They also collaborate with local lawyers to offer immigration advice and with the local prison to offer interpreting and welfare support to prisoners who do not speak English.

Lifeline Options was established in 2005. Whilst originally established as a company limited by share, they recently changed their legal status to a Community Interest Company. They provide marketing and promotion of refugees in the West Midlands area; and over time they also started serving the interests of other migrants. Lifeline options is registered with the Office of Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC) to provide free legal advice and assistance to asylum seekers; this includes legal advice to people seeking to re-open their asylum application and assistance to obtain welfare support from the UK Border Agency whilst preparing applications or waiting for decisions. They assist hundreds of people each year utilising the skills of their clients to run the office and raise funds. In the past, they also provided placements to social work students and human rights graduates from the UK and Europe.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary started in 2010 and provides support to refugees and asylum seekers in Birmingham and the surrounding areas. They offer a friendly space for individuals. With the help of volunteers and donors, they provide a range of practical support including food parcels, hygiene products, clothing, kitchen and bedding items. Many of the people that they support are destitute without any other support. They run English classes for over 100 students each week; provide welfare advice addressing problems with asylum support and housing; give immigration advice; signpost to other organisations where necessary. They organise a weekly social to combat the isolation that many refugees and asylum seekers experience. Since 2012 St. Chad’s Sanctuary hosts the representative of the West Midlands area of the Regional Asylum Activism Project (RAAP).

Student Action for Refugees (STAR) is a national student-led charity that engages students to welcome fellow refugee students as well as refugees in their local communities in the United Kingdom. STAR societies exist at 35 universities with 15,000 to 20,000 students being involved; student volunteer groups participating in 53 refugee projects providing different activities across the country. Students also engage in education and awareness raising initiatives on their campus by educating fellow students. STAR runs a number of campaigns and activities:

1. They lead a large national campaign on improving access to universities for asylum seekers and to encourage universities to grand scholarships; the aim is to improve access to universities for asylum seekers and encourage universities to grand scholarships; they also provide training and support to student volunteers on welcoming fellow refugee students and engaging in education and awareness raising initiatives on their campus by educating fellow students, for example inviting a refugee to speak about their lived experience.

2. National campaigns as part of the Still Human Still Here, which consists of a coalition of over 60 organisations campaigning for ending the destitution of refused asylum seekers;

3. Campaigns concerned with current refugee crisis which aims to strengthen legal matters for the protection of refugees.

STAR is particularly active in Birmingham through the Regional Asylum Activism project (RAA), which coordinates activities/campaigns across the three largest dispersal areas outside London i.e. Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds; the aim of RAA is to connect these with political decision-making which is still often centred in London.
Whilst the research was carried, a new local consortium was developed which consisted of six organisations, including the African Community Council for the Regions, Hope Projects, Humanitarian and Business Development Consultancy (HBDC), Lifeline Options, Zimbabwean Association and Centre for Peace and Security. HBDC is the organisation that we interviewed which is taking some of the initiative in developing the consortium. The purpose of the consortium will be to help local refugee organisations working in collaboration and deliver services to bridge the gap that was left by the increasing closure of projects and reduction of services provided by larger organisations, such as Refugee Action and Refugee Council. The involved organisations are advocating from a grassroots - regional level to build a consortium where community organisations can come together to run different projects, to help them deliver services and to get funding through joint funding applications, in order to meet local needs.

The Birmingham office of the British Red Cross (BRC) provides services for refugees in the West Midlands, Staffordshire and Warwickshire. They operate outreach clinics together with partner organisations across the area. Their drop-in clinics provide similar services around destitution support. In the following analysis the focus is mainly on the refugee services provided by the Birmingham office.

In Birmingham the City of Sanctuary (BCS) was initiated by two of the interviewees who had good contacts to local authority and another recognised actor in the field working for a befriending service for refugees. Together, they formed a strategic committee to raise interest and to lobby city council to pass a resolution declaring Birmingham City of Sanctuary in 2015. There is an elected committee of 12-15 individuals from varies organisations who meet once per month to plan city-wide activities such as picnic in the park. They organise meetings with city council officers to look at ways to make services more migrant friendly - the aim of City of Sanctuary is to ensure that there are organisations and service that welcome refugees and provide signposting to available services and support.

**Target audience, social needs orientation and value sets**

The Piers Road Association supports the local community, refugees and asylum seekers. Most of their support is focused on refugees with a status as this was easier from a legal and funding perspective (due to rights and entitlements that refugees have and restrictions for supporting asylum seekers). However, where there were opportunities they also sought to support asylum seekers (almost unfunded or with very little funds). For example, they organised free meals for Zimbabwean community, which was largely made up of asylum seekers; asylum seekers thus benefitted from the existence of the project although direct support was limited. PR has strong abilities to pick up needs as they arise within the organisation’ network. PR has strong partnerships with local organisations and groups, which enables it to gather information about needs and respond to those (by providing a wide range of support options which are flexibly responding to local issues). It is called upon by refugees and organisations if they are in need (e.g. local priest contacted them about a refugee who needed urgent appeal).

The interviewee at Lifeline Options reported that changes in policy and practice created a lack of capacity in the refugee sector, with an increasing number of projects closing down. This is also how LO started their work, taking over the client files of what was considered a largely dysfunctional Refugee Council in the Midlands. Their social needs orientation is closely connected to current gaps in service provision; LO plans to help addressing those social needs through their partnership with HBDC and as part of the local consortium. They are considering
‘repositioning’ themselves to have a wider impact and an increasing leverage through connecting themselves with other local refugee organisations to improve service delivery and to attract funding. The Director and his wife who are managing the organisation have strong social values sets built on humanitarian principles, which they pursued over decades in different job roles but also volunteering huge amounts of their time and energy to those humanitarian causes. They take huge personal sacrifices to help refugees. The Director solved his pension fund to keep the organisation alive. Their work is focused on the most essential human rights for anyone seeking asylum and or being a refugee.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary has a strong social needs orientation by catering for the basic needs of asylum seekers and refugees, particularly those who have become destitute. Challenge of working with this vulnerable group is that they supporting individuals whose human rights have been violated. This includes for example individuals that have recently been granted refugee status but who do not get the entitlements they should be getting and who sometimes become destitute as a result of system errors and inefficiencies. The organisation seeks to provide a safety net for those. It also responds to changing patterns of dispersal as much as possible. One challenge is the limited information they receive from the Home Office on dispersal patterns. Independence from government funding is seen as important in order to be innovative. Challenges of daily operations are mainly logistical, e.g. having the right amount of resources in place to meet the needs of refugees, space limitations and challenges of balancing volunteer pool. Legal challenges include that they have to restrict access for children to certain parts of the building in which they can ensure supervision. Values of the SCS are anchored in Christian values and include tolerance, humanitarian principles, hospitality and respect for diversity.

STAR’s ability to organise campaigns and influence policies allows them to achieve important changes and innovations; they are in a unique position to respond to urgent political issues. Their advocacy actions are organised through networks at a local, regional and national level, which allows them to respond to needs at these different levels. At the same time they coordinate the provision of support through volunteer students at a local level. They address human rights violations and other issues, such as those related to the current refugee crisis, with their national and regional campaigns. For example, their national involvement takes place through the Still Human Still Here campaign and their regional involvement (including in Birmingham) takes place through the RAA.

STAR has built strong connections with communities (for example through their student volunteers but also through collaboration with local organisations, including in Birmingham); their aim is to give a voice to those most affected including asylum seekers, refugee aid workers and local communities. STAR recognises that changing attitudes is crucial to promote pro-refugee policy changes.

At a local level they operate proactively and powerfully in addressing social needs; for example to address access issues to healthcare, they gathered the testimony of over 50 refugees who were unable to register with their local NHS. This evidence was presented to NHS managers through a private advocacy campaign, allowing STAR to address issues quickly, while maintaining good relationships with the NHS. Maintaining good relationships with public agencies is an important goal that helps them to continue achieving their aims and objectives. Only at a last resort, if the other party does not cooperate, those issues are made public. Managing and negotiating the interests of different parties is one of the core challenges for
STAR in addressing social needs. This approach requires a confidential, ethically and politically sensitive approach, while at times confrontations might be necessary to achieve change.

The new local consortium as envisaged by HBDC sees innovation in new ways of engaging with local residents from settled communities and this is seen as a particular challenge in addressing social needs. The focus of the consortium will be on assessing needs and learning and monitoring those with the aim to ensure that social needs are met and assessed on a regular basis and more systematically. Quality and accountability are seen as essential values in order to establish credibility with funding bodies and partners. The consortium and the organisations it is made of are driven by values such open-mindedness, humanitarian principles, tolerance/acceptance; ethics; and transparency.

The target audience of the refugee services provided by the British Red Cross are destitute individuals. Their main aim is to alleviate destitution and to support individuals out of destitution. The interviewee described that the BRC has a holistic perspective of individuals’ needs. They do not cover all needs of refugees, but they aim to attend to their basic needs first (e.g. making sure that individuals do not go hungry, that they have a place to sleep) to then focus on other issues that are usually around individuals’ immigration status. To their knowledge, they are the only organisation in the area that combines casework with financial support. Their values are about being compassionate, courageous, inclusive and dynamic.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham aims to exemplify good services and voluntary effort as well as to educate and raise awareness about refugee issues in host communities. They are guided by the values of solidarity and welcome aiming to “to build a culture of hospitality for people seeking sanctuary in the UK.”

Types of activities: service delivery vs. advocacy
The Piers Road Association’s main focus is on providing support and services to refugees including immigration, benefits, employment, housing and debt advice. Advocacy is provided only indirectly and is not a main purpose of the organisation; the interviewee explained that there was no immediate need to campaign on behalf of refugees locally because the vast majority in the community had a migration background and there was no anti-refugee movement. The interviewee explained that there was also no immediate need for them to provide one-to-one advocacy as this was already done by other organisations (to which they would refer or signpost refugees).

However, at a city level the interviewee got involved in advocacy or lobbying through the City of Sanctuary in Birmingham, which was initiated by him. He is well networked including with the local council, which made it possible to convince local government officials and councillors (together with other ‘activists’ he knew). Support from the local council is important for both, advocacy and (although to a lesser extent and more indirectly) service provision. For example, the fact that their work is recognised and well regarded by councillors helps them in getting funding (for example they have a recommendation on their website). Advocacy (done in a friendly way through influence via networking) and service delivery complement each other.

Most of the work of Lifeline Options is focused on providing legal advice to refugees and asylum seekers. In addition, LO engages heavily in building capacity of other (refugee) organisations including by providing training and offering advice but also by working closely...
with HBDC and the consortium. LO engages in advocacy work only indirectly via those organisations, and the interviewee explained that this was due to capacity constraints. However, the interviewee emphasised the importance of advocacy and how it was closely interlinked with service provision. In particular publicly funded service providers needed to be made aware of the challenges faced by refugees and asylum seekers. Research and advocacy was thus important in identifying and raising such issues, and LO (either directly or by supporting other refugee organisations such as HBDC) got involved in those initiatives. An example was research carried out by Oxford University about undocumented mothers and children, which in turn raised awareness among local government and increased the number or organisations delivering services to address the issue.

Whilst St. Chad’s Sanctuary’s focus is on providing friendly support and a space to refugees and asylum seekers, teaching ESOL, sorting out the distribution of practical items, providing immigration and welfare advice, it is also active in advocacy through its involvement with RAA and through their partnership with STAR. For example, they host in the RAA coordinator and support her in collecting information on relevant issues, in particular on the conditions of different types of refugee accommodations provided by G4S, the world’s largest security company (private sector). They develop questionnaires with the RAA coordinator, which is designed to check whether G4S meets contractual standards. Volunteers then gather the necessary information to identify potential issues. The problems they identify are first discussed with the G4S and if they were not addressed adequately, the RAA coordinator takes up these issues at a higher level. Advocacy is seen an important function that helps to identify the underlying needs of and challenges refugees face; this prevents issues from developing into wider problems. At an organisational level, the advocacy engagement has benefits as it creates a wider public awareness about the role SCS plays in the refugee field. However, SCS recognises service provision as their primary responsibility and volunteers only engage in information gathering, if they have enough volunteers to cover the basic services. Challenges of combining advocacy work with service provision are more tied to their limited capacity.

STAR has both advocacy and service delivery functions and they are closely interlinked and operationalised through the same networks and partnerships. In terms of service delivery, the organisation initiates, supports and coordinates the provision of services through their student volunteers (organised through student societies) who make links locally to provide activities; an example in Birmingham are IT skills classes for women, which are provided in collaboration with Hope projects. At the same time, STAR coordinates campaign work through their student network; for example they mobilise students on national issues to write their local MPs or support them in lobbying in their communities for raising issues with MPs (with the aim that MPs support the issue in Parliament). So the lobbying work at a local community level can then have national impact and change the conditions of service delivery for refugees.

Organisations that are part of the new local consortium are providing primarily support and services to asylum and refugees. Their main aim is to be stronger together and be able to compete with large service providers. The consortium seeks to have a strong capacity building component which will build the capacity of their member organisations as well as of organisations they plan to work with. Although the interviewee did not consider advocacy as a primary aim of the consortium, the stronger position of the consortium locally would allow them to have more influence on service provision and issues affecting service provision for refugees. There was also evidence of some experience in this area. For example, in the past HBDC provided evidence on destitution issues to a national scrutiny committee.
The British Red Cross refugee services focus on destitution support. There are two elements to this; first they provide financial support (£10 per week per person over a maximum period of 12 weeks) and second, they do casework for clients. This work is embedded in their advocacy function, as it allows them to identify potential issues that need to be advocated. The advocacy team is located at the BRC office in London, with the priorities of advocacy identified regionally feeding into the national strategy. One recent example is the campaign to extend the 28-day period for asylum seekers, who have been granted leave to remain, after which their accommodation support and subsistence allowance ends. The regional office in Birmingham raised this issue to the national advocacy team in London, who presented the case in parliament to recommend an extension to 40 days.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham does not provide directly any services. Rather, it groups different services under the BCS umbrella together, to generate public awareness of the services required by refugees and the possibilities for local communities to provide those services. The movement has been active in developing the stream of Schools of Sanctuary in Birmingham. It is also a network convenor for ESOL teachers and volunteers. The movement engages in advocacy through emphasising positive messages about the need to provide sanctuary in the media and in schools (through the school of sanctuary stream).
6.3. Dimension of innovativeness (and how organisations were founded)

Innovation, for the Piers Roads Association, was defined in the context of lack of refugee infrastructure identified ten years ago in the North West Birmingham community, which became a high dispersal area with many refugees and migrants. The initiative from housing association and led by one individual (interviewee); an opportunity of a large building space came up for cheap rent; since then the interviewee has built on this and hosts a wide range of refugee and a few other community groups. He applies for funding for rent so that he does not have to go to troubles to chase groups, which might not be able to pay. He regards social innovation in the context of community cohesion: By sharing space and activities; by identifying needs (as they arise within the organisation and the groups they are hosting); and by developing new initiatives based on identified needs (such as befriending and telephone helpline). Social innovation was also seen in the context of financial pressures and budgets cuts that the sector experienced, which forced the organisation to think creatively and focus their mind on what was needed most urgently. Examples are a befriending and telephone support service helping refugees feeling supported and in knowing about and accessing health and other public services.

The way the organisation is set up allows groups hosted in PR to focus on self-organisation; for example, individuals leading those groups have become Trustees and developed new abilities and capacities in their role as Trustees that also help them if they decide to apply at the job market. PR's stated mission is building the confidence of newly arrived migrants and helping them help themselves; for example, this could happen by joining with other members of their community to form their own organisations and by establishing links with their host communities. This might be either actively supported or evolve more organically through the shared space and the open-minded, supportive and innovative environment. On the other hand there might be also some gaps in self organisation; for example, the fact that groups do not have to apply for funding themselves to pay the for the building rent means they are more reliant on someone doing this for them.

For Lifeline Options, innovation was seen in the context of operating with small funds and the desire of coming together with other organisations to address refugees’ and asylum seekers’ needs. The main purpose of LO is to provide legal and welfare advice to clients but they also get involved in a wide range of activities and have taken on much broader responsibilities for building capacity of other refugee organisations. The interviewee (and Director of the organisation) understands service provision reaching beyond their own provision; they develop services by assessing, connecting and developing capacities of refugee organisation; and helping them to self-organise. The interviewee stated that the refugee sector has drastically changed over the past decade and that the community needed to adapt and address these changes through linking themselves with other organisations (building networks) and through self-organisation. Since their training and capacity building work with employers as part of their European Union funded project (from 2005 to 2007/8), LO has been organising their work through networks of organisations, which are similar in value sets, but differ in the specific activities depending on groups of refugees and the support they offer. LO initiated and supported the idea of the consortium (Organisation 5). LO develops the capacity of other local refugee organisations in the Birmingham area; the Director provides them with the expertise and skills. This is likely to have empowered organisations to be self-organised; for example, the manager of HBDA confirmed that LO had an important role in establishing his organisation; also the fact that the consortium is now developing and LO is not leading but contributing to it.
suggests some kind of emancipation of other local refugee organisations which enter the consortium as equal partners.

For St. Chad’s sanctuary, innovation was seen in the way the organisation provided basic welcoming and a ‘face of hospitality’ for asylum seekers and refugees following Christian values. The idea for the project idea came the interviewee (manager of the organisation) who had been involved with refugee communities in two different parts of the West Midlands, Wolverhampton and Smethwick. The concern was that asylum seekers whose asylum claims have been rejected ‘vanished’ from those communities. She established SCS in 2010 near to the Home Office reporting centre with the support of the Catholic Archdiocese and the Salvation Army, with the latter providing the building space for SCS. Providing hospitality and welcome meant that there was a security net for those who reached a phase of destitution where they have no or very limited access to public funds. Hospitality was seen as a way of tackling destitution and avoiding, that individuals would ‘disappear’. Basic hospitality support for example included offering a cup of tea or coffee, toilets and a friendly smile. SCS had strong elements of self-organisation through the active contribution of volunteers in service provision. Volunteers and individuals from refugee communities identified social needs such as the provision of food, clothing and hygiene product as well as English language classes. They also helped to check that the largest provider of refugee accommodation met contractual standards (monitoring function).

For STAR, innovation stemmed from the organisation’s ability to achieve political change at local, regional and national levels through multiple partnership working. The organisation’s capabilities to innovate and influence the sector were anchored in flexible ways of working with a wide range of partners. Two post-graduate students founded the organisation in the 90s. Its political influence is routed in a large volunteering infrastructure the organisation built since then and in its abilities to negotiate and communicate and to manage the complexity of connecting individuals and organisations across different levels and areas of action and decision-making. The organisation developed a learning culture and capacity because they had to respond to the series of changes that the sector experienced over time (policies, regulation and public perception). From such experiences the organisation managed to learn how to survive and grow. The organisation identifies social needs through their work with different actors, including asylum seekers, refugee aid workers and communities. Self-organisation plays an important role in their approach to innovation; for example their student groups organise themselves and operate depending on the group’s interests and local infrastructure. STAR’s national office provides support to the groups in form of training, capacity building and coordination of activities. In terms of refugees and asylum seekers, STAR’s work is strongly focused on empowering them in their communities but also giving them a voice at the national level. For example, with the work they do through the RAA they seek to ensure that the experiences of local refugees and asylum seekers inform the campaign. They also provide local campaigners with opportunities to take part in national actions; RAA also helps run events to educate people about the reality of asylum in the UK and to gain their support for a more humane system; for example they organised a big event in Birmingham Bull Ring at which local asylum seekers spoke to shoppers about their experiences in the UK and gathered petition signatures in support of Still Human Still Here goals.

For the new local consortium, innovation was regarded as supporting individuals and organisations in their different lived experiences and identities; identities could be diverse such as being: an asylum seeker; refugee; ‘ordinary’ member of a British community; a
community leader; a politician; a local organisation. The idea of the consortium is built on “a new desire” of refugee organisations to reach out to local communities (for example represented by their community leaders). This new desire might suggest that historically some refugee organisations have worked more inwards focused (which is likely to be linked to the way projects were funded, for example through single group grants). Innovation was seen in addressing the growing lack of provision and large disinvestment by regional bodies such as Refugee Action, Refugee Council and the Red Cross, which were no longer able to provide basic support to clients. The gaps in service provision presented new opportunities for refugee organisations to take charge and organise themselves through collaborations such as the consortium. The new desire was described as wanting to reach out and have a broader community focus. The interviewee described innovation as a process of ‘seeing things differently’ and one that is influenced by existing situations, the specific context and assessment of needs. The interviewee thought that innovation built on capacities and strengths developed from surviving previous challenges.

In the past, the British Red Cross has not been involved in advocating on refugee issues. Their campaigning function has developed recently, recognising that if they want to become a leading organisation in this field they need to be heard. A few years ago there were other organisations at the forefront, such as Refugee Council and Refugee Action. However, due to the increasing closure of organisations the BRC found itself in a position where it had to support more and more refugees and asylum seekers. Innovativeness in the field results from responding to needs by adapting their service provision. This form of innovativeness is tied to a process that relies on listening to refugees (and refugee community organisations). It was through listening to clients that the BRC started to do casework, apart from providing financial support. One future trend identified by the interviewee was the need to work increasingly together with refugee community organisations to gain a better understanding of the needs of refugees and to market their services to other refugees. This is not actively happening at the moment. This may be due to capacity issues, but this is also an area that the British Red Cross has not been actively involved in before.

The innovativeness of the City of Sanctuary movement in Birmingham is its emphasis on social connections and the formation of networks that cut across conceptions of ethnicity, legal status and allegiance.

Table 6.1 summarizes what might be understood as community development and as self-organization in the framework of these organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Self-organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piers Road Association</td>
<td>Refugee support happens at the interface with other communities (i.e. organisations and people from different communities are all under one roof)</td>
<td>Refugees act as governors of organisations; founder is a non-refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline Options</td>
<td>Focused on refugee and asylum seeker community and not on interface with other communities; Asylum seeker and refugee support in form of legal aid and basic service provision; also provides</td>
<td>Refugees support the project as volunteers and refugees influence the organisation informally; but formally organisations is community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilitations to other refugee organisations and thus builds social capital; interest company without board; founder is a non-refugee

| Student Action for Refugees (STAR) | Refugee supports happens at the interface with other communities: For example students work with refugee projects and organise education and awareness raising initiatives in communities | Board includes one refugee; otherwise people with wide range of expertise working in refugee field; STAR was founded by students |
| Consortium represented by Humanitarian and Business Development Consultancy (HBDC) | Refugee support planned to happen at the interface with wider community (including wide range of local stakeholders such churches, police, housing) | Consortium consists of managers of refugee organisations, some of whom are refugees |
| Birmingham British Red Cross | Refugee support at the interface with community (for example in form of outreach clinics that are hosted by churches etc) | Reports to national British Red Cross; not governed by refugees |
| Birmingham City of Sanctuary | Refugee support at the interface with community (in form of awareness raising events and shared activities in schools etc) | Organised primarily by non-refugees; representation at Committee of national City of Sanctuary; Trustees (primarily) non-refugees |

All organisations we identified and interviewed belonged to the third sector. This reflected the dominant role of the third sector in this area of service provision and advocacy for refugees at the local community level. All organisations we interviewed took on substantial financial and personal costs and risks by operating in this sector; this included the risk of financial losses (for example one interviewee solved parts of his pension fund to keep the organisation going) and the costs of wellbeing by giving up their leisure time (for example one interviewee did not have a single free day for months). It was evident that they shared strong social value sets. Values included humanitarian, ethics (e.g. confidentiality), tolerance and open-mindedness, human rights, participatory principles, democratic values and diversity. Organisations had in common that their strong values enables to survive the challenges they faced in form of funding cuts, restrictive regulations and negative public perceptions. Their ability to self-organise was evident and was closely linked to their ability to survive and learn from responding to challenges over time.

Their concepts of innovation varied between organisations but were often defined in the context of severe budget cuts and large lack of funding. The majority invented and sustained new ideas of conveying positive messages of supporting and integrating refugees. Collaborative working was often at the heart of (planned) innovations.

### 6.4. History of the social innovation

The social innovation field in this part of the work package crosses a range of policy areas including community development, migration and refugees. Community development movements and players (government funded) are focused on addressing issues linked to large number of migrants (usually this refers to migrants who come to the UK for economic reasons) but includes some refugee specific activities.
Historically, there was no separation between immigration and asylum policies and immigration rules in regards to border control were also applied to asylum seekers. A wide range of restrictive policies and legislation have been introduced over the past decades. In addition to the ones below, a range of other policies affected refugees such as: tougher visa regimes; financial penalties on air and truck carriers; British immigration officers posted abroad; controls at various European ports; increased surveillance. Taken together such policies resulted in reduction in number of asylum seekers.

Another interviewee reported that over the past twenty years the situation of asylum seekers in the United Kingdom had dramatically changed. In the past, asylum was not stigmatized and individuals had the right to work and manage benefits. However, in 1996 these rights were withdrawn, which increased the pressure on local cities by shifting the responsibility for asylum seekers’ support to local councils. These changes also entailed a shift in public attitude, because the public was increasingly questioning why refugees were living in their community and claiming support. Another complicating factor was the large increase in the number of asylum seekers, due to for example the war in in Yugoslavia, with over 100,000 individuals seeking refuge in the United Kingdom. This led to an expansion of the refugee sector, with an increasing number of charities, NGOs and government agencies catering to the need of asylum seekers and refugees. However, the emphasis on service provision was not met by an equal emphasis on advocacy work. Negative public attitude towards asylum seekers grew during this time, and government responded to this with a more restrictive public policy. Table 6.2 presents the most important events with respect to understand the history of this stream.

Table 6.2 Key events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Concept of ‘community cohesion’ introduced in national policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>National Refugee Integration Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Department of Work and Pension’s employment strategy ‘Working to Rebuild Lives’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Pilot of Sunrise programme by NASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Refugee Integration and Employment Services (RIES) set up in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Commission on Integration and Cohesion announced by then Secretary for Communities and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Development Foundation became independent body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Government ended Refugee Integration and Employment Service (RIES) in 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We could regard the period between 1993 and 1999 roughly as a first relevant phase in the development of the British asylum timeline. This period is characterized by the introduction of new legislation, and of the infrastructure for asylum support. In 1993, the new Asylum and Immigration Appeals Act was introduced. As a result of this, the rate of refused asylum seekers applications increased from 16 to 75 per cent in 1994. This was followed by a new Immigration and Asylum Act in 1996 (updated in1999) and by the introduction of the national dispersal policy in 1999. That same year, the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) was founded.

The notion of community development entered policy discussions in the early 21st century. In 2000, the Home Office, through the National Asylum Support Service started operating newly introduced dispersal policy. The National Refugee Integration Strategy started that same year (Home Office 2000), which was updated in 2005. This strategy names community development as a useful approach for promoting integration but does not mention specific activities or outcomes. Following a number of riots and disturbances in England in 2001 and the subsequent
**Report of the Independent Review Team** (Cantle, 2001), the concept of ‘community cohesion’ was introduced in national policy. The National Refugee Integration Forum (NRIF) was established by the Home Office in 2001 to implement, monitor and develop the government’s National Refugee Integration Strategy.

This period is also characterized by more restrictive legislation and increased government control. This sometimes led to tension between the national governments and local authorities. The 2002 Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act restricted asylum seekers from working and vocational training and the 2004 Asylum and Immigration Act increased government power to process applications, detain and remove asylum seekers. The revised 2005 National Refugee Integration Strategy (Home Office 2005) sets out that integration can only begin when asylum seeker has become a refugee; this distinction was not made until then in practice and generally not supported by local authorities. The Department of Work and Pension’s 2005 employment strategy ‘Working to Rebuild Lives’ includes plans to provide refugees with support in finding accommodation and employment. The Pilot of Sunrise programme by NASS is a national employment programme which provides refugees with one-to-one consultation and mentoring services to enable them become economically active. The Refugee Integration and Employment Services (RIES), finally, was set up in 2005. It contracted out to twelve regions; contracted services included advice and support for twelve month period for every refugee.

A next phase started with the introduction of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act in 2006. This gives government and Home Secretary new rights to refuse any person from protection if there is suspicion of terrorist involvement. The NRIF diminished in 2006 (by Home Office). That same year, a Commission on Integration and Cohesion was announced by then Secretary for Communities and Local Government. The advisory body produced the report “Our Shared Future” in 2007, in which community cohesion was presented as something that must happen so that different groups get on well together. The aim is to tackle tensions in communities between different ethnic groups. The Community Development Foundation, an (until 2011) government funded body set out the role of community development in relation to refugee integration and community cohesion. However, the focus of this body (which was in 2011 transformed to a social enterprise and closed business in 2015) was on development approaches applicable across different communities.

This period is also characterised by an effort to come to clearer measurements of issues regarding asylum and immigration in general terms. The House of Lords selected a Committee on Economic Affairs to examine the *Economic Impact of Immigration*. Detailed population counts were carried out to ensure the accuracy of migration counts e.g. Treasury Committee, Eleventh Report of Session 2007–08, *Counting the Population*, HC 183. Additionally, the Migrants Impacts Forum was established in 2007, in order to improve the evidence base for understanding changing patterns of migration. Finally, indicators to measure community cohesion and inclusion were introduced in in surveys. The Public Service Agreement (PSA) 21 covers community cohesion and includes “the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area”. This indicator is measured through the national Citizenship Survey and included as a Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI).

The past couple of years were mainly characterized by severe austerity measures. In 2011, the national government ended the Refugee Integration and Employment Service (RIES). This implies that practically no public funding remained for refugee integration, for the first time in
political history. This led to major cuts for the Refugee Council’s one stop, bilingual support service, totalling 62%, or an amount £2 million. The funding for the wraparound initial accommodation facility was cut by 50% to £726,000. In 2015, the Immigration Minister announced that the Home Office will be introducing a flat rate of asylum support of £36.95 per week. This change meant a 30% cut in the support given to refugee children. Finally, the new Immigration Bill (now Immigration Act 2016) introduced new sanctions on undocumented workers and rogue employers. It provides better co-ordination of regulators that enforce workers’ rights. Moreover, it prevents illegal migrants in the UK from accessing housing, driving licences and bank accounts. It introduced new measures to make it easier to enforce immigration laws and remove irregular migrants.

Faced with such severe cuts, there is hardly any publicly funded refugee sector left and there are also no developments from a community development side that could support refugee organisations. Arguably, refugee organisations might only be able to survive if they have sufficient abilities to self-organise.

The stages in the innovation process for Birmingham-based organizations

The emergence of the organizations studied needs to be understood against this background. Table 6.3 provides another historical overview, explaining to what ‘stage’ of the innovation process these organizations have developed.

Table 6.3 Process tracing matrix for assessing progress on the development of social innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergence</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
<th>Local impact</th>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Systemic impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piers Road Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Chad’s Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Action for Refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBDC Consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Piers Road Association operates at a local level and had local impact, but its founder has also regional influence. For example, he initiated the City of Sanctuary for Birmingham. His project is well-established regionally, including policy makers, private funders. There is no evidence of national influence. Lifeline Options operates at the local level. As for the Piers Roads Association, the founder has connections to the regional level. The organisation has grown in the past but nowadays it is severely affected by budget cuts and thus it is only just able to sustain. There is growth only in the sense that LO seeks to engage with the planned network of other local refugees organization (the HBDC consortium). St Chad’s Sanctuary has both local and regional influence or connections. It started as small project and is now steadily growing. STAR clearly aims at national impact. It has a large network of students and a wide range of other initiatives and collaborations. The HBDC Consortium is still in its early stages of
emergence. Ideas for the consortium have been discussed, and an initial partner agreement has been made. The British Red Cross operates at a local, regional and national level. It is represented in regional networks, which it also facilitates. Recent restructure operations and budget cuts could mean less influence in the future.

6.5. Organizational features
Organisational culture and governance, including roles of staff and volunteers

The Piers Road Association has the formal status of a charity with one full-time employed person (who is managing the organisation) and one part-time employee (who is a cleaner) and is overseen by Board of Trustees. Trustees consist of the leaders of the groups hosted by the organisation and have migration and refugee background. Trustees are thus part of the organisation but they also present external partners in their capacity as leaders of groups that PR works with. PR is host of this wide diverse range refugee and other community groups (most of which are represented at PR’s Board through their leaders who act as Trustees). Individuals engaged with those groups spend their time contributing to organising and running as well as participating in activities. Some of the groups also provide more formal employment of staff and volunteering opportunities, which also allows PR to link with many local communities. Diversity is highly valued and PR operates on principles of acceptance, tolerance and trust.

Lifeline Options is a Community Interest Company (CIC), which is a type of social enterprise and is run by the Director of the organisation and his wife. They also employ a contracted accountant and have the support of two to three volunteers, who help running the organisation. LO relies on the support from two to three volunteers who have a refugee/asylum seeker background. Two are asylum seekers that are highly skilled in technological matters and speak perfect English; they are supporting LO in modernising the organisation as increasingly some of the immigration issues require technological skills. One is a Sudanese student, who has legal expertise in family reunion and the other volunteer is a Zimbabwean without status who has lived almost 20 years in the UK. The third volunteer comes once a week to deal with correspondence and client requests. The role of volunteers is seen as invaluable for the running of the organisation; they are supporting the organisation’s ability to maintain and develop a basic infrastructure despite restricted office space and very limited funding. In addition, they create new links to their specific ethnic communities. LO’s internal organisational culture is built on strong humanitarian principles that guide the delivery of services and support.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary is voluntary project run as a registered charity, which is a partnership of and supported by St. Chad’s Cathedral and the Salvation Army. Trustees are the Director of the organisation, a local Reverend and a Canon; the latter two are representatives of the Salvation Army and Catholic the Archdiocese Birmingham. The interviewee is the project manager; she works on a part-time contract and volunteers the rest if her hours. The Director’s work is unpaid and she volunteers her time to this role. Four new staff members were appointed more recently supporting the growth of the project. This included four staff members on service-level contract working part-time (20 to 25 hours).

The project builds on a large volunteer pool of about 100 volunteers – hours of volunteers are estimated to equate to 9 full-time employees. Volunteers provide the vast majority of services and are the ‘face of hospitality’. The interviewee explained that the organisation is heavily reliant on volunteer support and would not be able to operate without them. This includes the Director and founder of SCS who acts in a volunteering capacity. For example, on a day they
require 20 volunteers to distribute food, cloths and other items to around 100 to 120 asylum seekers and refugees.

Volunteers are very much part of the organisational decision-making. They participate in the weekly team meetings and meetings rotate each week to give different groups of volunteers a say. In these meetings the daily operations of the charity are discussed to respond rapidly to changes in social needs. On a regular basis the organisation develops new policies, which regulate the amount and type of items that can be distributed to asylum seekers and refugees. Minutes of meetings are disseminated so that all volunteers are aware of the decisions made.

Some volunteers support the organisation through providing translation services and through providing cultural understanding and provide the organisation with valuable insights on issues that might not necessarily come up in initial face-to-face contact with refugees. For example, an Eritrean volunteer identified problems in the distribution of food at G4S accommodations that were preventing orthodox Christian Eritrean refugees from eating at the hostel/hotel due to their strict fasting traditions.

STAR is a student-led charity. It functions as a membership organisation, with members being organised into groups (student and non-students), which are led by a committee – the Board of Trustees which includes student Trustees and Trustees who are experienced and influential activists in the refugee field. The Board meets quarterly to discuss the work of the charity. STAR has around twelve employees and the large student volunteer base is organised through the so-called STAR student societies at 35 universities.

STAR is heavily reliant on student volunteers. Students at Nottingham University established STAR-Network, which functions as a membership organisation with the STAR groups as its members. STAR groups are student union societies, which are constituted within their university's student union and then affiliated to the STAR national charity. The large student network provides the basic 'infrastructure' of the organisation, which allows it to operate activities and campaigns across the UK. STAR'S student members meet annually at the AGM at which they elect Trustees, view the Annual Accounts and plan STAR'S work for the coming year, as stated in the annual trustees report. This indicates that student volunteers are actively involved in planning and decision-making, with five of ten Trustees being students. Their work includes campaigning to change policies with adversely affect the lives of refugees and asylum seekers; educating people about asylum in the UK; fundraising to support STAR'S work; volunteering to support refugees and asylum seekers in the community. In a recent project the Birmingham student volunteer group focused on developing IT skills of refugee women in collaboration with Hope Projects, further receiving funds from the Institute of Research into Superdiversity (IRiS) at the University of Birmingham.

Members of STAR staff mainly engage in regional and national campaign work and provide training courses for volunteer groups. The Regional Asylum Activism (RAA) project was described as a form of separate project of STAR, which employs three campaigners (local coordinators) in Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds.

STAR uses a range of social media channels such as Facebook and Twitter as well as other media channels such as newsletters; information are provided in an accessible and easy-to-read format that reaches a wide audience and explains in simple language hoe to get involved.
Advocacy work is understood as a complex process. STAR addresses the dynamics and different dimensions of advocacy through working in formal and informal collaboration; they often work in bottom-up ways (e.g. in form if grassroots campaigns on asylum rights) but also lead on and participate in regionally and nationally led campaigns such as the RAA project and the Still Human Still Here campaign.

The new local consortium is built on a partnership agreement that was made between the six participating organisations. Whilst the consortium is not yet fully established, some knowledge exchange activities already are going on between the six organisations that come together as consortium. HBDA plays a leading role although all partners within the consortium will have an equal status.

The British Red Cross is a registered charity. Its organisational structure has recently changed. Previously every region was autonomous having its own director and strategic decision-making power. Through the restructuring this has slightly changed, with strategic decisions now being made between the (regional) head of services and the national management team. The role of volunteers was described as key in the BRC, which relies heavily on the recruitment of volunteers being generally staffed by 70% volunteers. There is also a volunteer head on the strategic board who participates in decision-making on the overall direction of the organisation.

The BRC Birmingham office refugee services count with three full-time and one part-time employee, in addition to six or seven volunteers. The latter engage in casework and work as interpreters and administrators. The impact of the volunteers was described as crucial, due to their links with diverse communities, including refugee and local communities. The example of one volunteer was given, who raised money from the church and organised church members to provide toiletries that were needed by the Birmingham Clinic. This activity did not only represent a volunteering act, but also highlighted issues of refugees and asylum seekers outside the community.

The Birmingham City of Sanctuary is an unincorporated association. It has adopted a constitution, which has twelve elected members on the committee and five co-optees. The network has over thousand supporters with around 20 individuals being actively involved in the movement, beyond the 12-15 committee members. The committee meets monthly and supporters meetings are hold once or twice per year. Rather than working together with volunteers, the interviewee described the BCS as a 'hub' to direct individuals who wanted to volunteer to other organisations. This indicates a potential difficulty of establishing structures that facilitate (long-term) engagement in a movement that is rather loosely defined.

Most of the organisations had had the formal status of a charity and had the required Board of Trustees. One individual managed and coordinated the organisation, who was also the founder of the organisation or – in one instance - had been managing the organisations from it early start (STAR). Organisational structures were very flat and allowed for decentralised and bottom-up decision-making. Some organisations had more formal ways of ensuring that staff and volunteers’ voices contributed to the operational decision making, whilst for other organisations this was more informal and organic. It was less clear how the strategic direction was discussed with and influenced by staff and volunteers; some organisations had difficulties in being able to have a strong strategic direction due to the external pressures and changes, which made it difficult to plan ahead. Organisations had to have very strong values shared by
members of the organisation (volunteers and staff), which played an important in the organisation’s ability to survive (even without strategic direction) and also set sometimes the principles of how the organisation operated (e.g. values of empowerment, respect and trust reflected at an organisational in high levels of delegation). Most organisations relied heavily on volunteers and valued their input highly. Some recruited and organised volunteers from the wider community whilst others primarily utilised the time of individuals who engaged with the project (usually refugees and asylum seekers). Refugee and asylum seeker volunteers had an important role in linking the organisation to local refugees. Only the larger organisation (STAR) had a formal support and training infrastructure for volunteers in place.

**Funding & resource diversity**

Initially - under the Labour government – the Piers Road Association got funding from the Migration Impact Fund (£120,000 for first two years) and from the Community Development Fund. They then started seeking funding from Big Lottery funded charities. Often those were smaller grants. They have two main private funders: Cadbury Trust provided them with £60,000 over a 3 years period, which they received 3 times over 9 years; Tudor Trust provided £25,000 per year which they received 2 times. PR operates on a budget of £65,000 per year. Although PR generally is well funded, in more recent years getting funds has become more difficult and requires the manager spending a lot of time and efforts on applying for funds.

The organisation takes on a coordination function for the refugee groups they are hosting; it is well linked to local organisations, local government representatives and politicians and can thus get access to knowledge and resources fairly easily. Similarly, as the host of many refugee groups it can also get knowledge of social needs and access to resources to address such needs (e.g. through volunteers who speak the same language).

Initially Lifeline Options received European funds from 2005 to 2007 as part of the Equal Progress GB partnership; did not find successor to fund their work (or at least one that would match their needs). Until 2010 LO received some funds from local council and they were also getting some small funds from training contracts with universities, but both of these funding streams ceased to exist. Currently LO is being funded through self-donations. The director has cashed two years worth of accumulated pensions to finance the activities of LO.

The organisation faced a range of barriers in addressing legal needs of refugees and asylum seekers due to high transaction costs existent in the legal aid area, which government increased by setting higher regulation standards. LO was not in position to employ staff, which also affected other community organisations and individuals using their services, who face difficulties in accessing legal aid. LO sought to address some of the high transaction costs in the refugee sector by working to provide coordination for other local community organisations. Many of those organisations historically struggled coordinating their activities and working together, partly because of to their own time and budget constrains. Lack of skills, knowledge and experience present an important barrier for such organisations working together in a more strategic way. The experience of the Director of LO in working in this field for regional and national humanitarian organisations is thus potentially important in reducing some of the transaction costs that exists between the at the moment only very loosely connected local organisations.

The challenges of working this way are the often loosely defined links, which make it difficult to organise, require time investment and provide LO with limited control. Strengths are the
identification through shared values, knowledge sharing across areas of expertise and flexibility to respond to changes quickly. They also have the potential to address different challenges (political, financial, etc.) by accessing a diverse resource pool.

The annual budget of St. Chad’s Sanctuary has been £40,000 over the last years, but has recently risen to £80,000. SCS receives in-kind and financial donations from the wider public and relies on smaller grants from different trusts and charities, including Cadbury Trust, Caritas, Handsworth Charity and Awards for All from Lottery Fund. They further receive support from many parishes and smaller community groups. For example, one catholic parish nearby used to organise fundraising events for them. They do not receive any support from local authority. Reporting requirements for smaller grants were fairly low - flexibility to respond quickly to changing social needs without having to refer to the terms and conditions of funders. However, they need to report to management committee to approve major expenditures.

Whilst in the past, the governance structure had been more informal, the growth of project was seen as requiring a more formal governance structure to coordinate and manage activities and resources. The organisation had a range of mechanism in place to detect and respond to changing social needs (e.g. through their weekly revisions of internal policies of distributing goods). In addition, their cooperation with the RAA coordinator provided them with access to information and knowledge about regional needs and with opportunities to coordinate their activities with other organisation.

Trust foundations such as Paul Hamlyn Foundation and Esmee Fairbairn Foundation are the primary funders of STAR. Furthermore, the organisation received donations from the subscribers to the STAR newsletter and from their own fundraising events. They do not receive any funds from government. Overall their funding sources reflect an independent governance structure and possibly only limited contractual reporting responsibilities.

RAA is funded entirely by the Network for Social Change, a group of private donors. It is likely that reporting responsibilities and monitoring requirements are relatively low and more flexible compared to those of most public funders. Through their different networks they are able to access a wide and diverse range of knowledge, expertise and skills. Through their networks they are able to detect social needs and access resources for example in for of volunteers. Maintaining and developing relationships of these different networks is likely to require substantial coordination efforts.

The new local consortium seeks to reduce the transaction costs that existed between the formerly only loosely connected organisations. The consortium is currently only based on a formal partnership agreement (memorandum). In the future the consortium will share resources such as an employed independent accountant and consultant. A shared learning and monitoring function is seen as a core component of the new network and it is hoped that employing an independent person taking on an accountability function will increase objectivity and transparency of transactions between the organisations. Accountability is seen as an important goal of the consortium as well as the willingness of organisations to accept each other as equal partners. The ability to organise is seen as a condition in order to be able to work with local government and communities and compete for funding with larger organisations.
The refugee services of the British Red Cross in Birmingham receive core funding from the national office, which is non-government funding. For the last five years they also received funding from the British Lottery but this ended in March 2016. Their main accountability is to the national Red Cross office in London.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham currently operates largely without funding and only gets a small grant of £1,000 from the national branch. This money stems from the Guardian appeal donations. Different Trusts, such as the Barrow Cadbury Trust, have expressed interest in funding the movement. However, the interviewee expressed the difficulty of establishing a strategic agenda that might facilitate attracting funding for their activities.

6.6. Relations in the field

Before introducing the relations that the five organisations that we study have to other actors, we first introduce the relevant players in the Birmingham context.

Introduction of national and Birmingham actors

The UK Border Agency deals with integration of refugees whilst Communities and Local Government Department only has very limited influence in such matters. The Home Office (HO) is a ministerial department of the Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, responsible for immigration, security, and law and order.

Overall the role of community development bodies in the refugee sector has been limited: Community development approaches in this area (and bodies adopting those) have been focused on building links between migrants and host communities more broadly. Their work has been focused on supporting different sections of the community to work together and to increase access of vulnerable individuals (assuming they are entitled) to service provision. Community development work in relation to refugees has been done by specialist agencies and organisations and is not part of mainstream community development movements.

Local, regional and national media had a highly substantial influence in shaping and influencing public perceptions of refugee issues. Media players are also influenced by political parties and by local councils; for example, nationalistic political parties such as the British National Party used the media to present refugees as scapegoats in their campaign for votes in North East England towns. Some councils have made agreements with the local newspapers that would get in contact/ check accuracy of the refugee news with them first before publishing them.

Historically, most policy making in the refugee sector was decided from the London Mayor due to highest numbers of migrants and refugees in the capital and also because many refugee organisations have their headquarters in London. This is increasingly being challenged by other large cities and regions, which as a result of the dispersal policy are nowadays host large number of refugees.

The role of national refugee charities changed dramatically over the past years: Large budget cuts meant they are operating on a minimum and cannot act as service provider and coordinating body locally anymore; instead they focus on the most urgent campaigning and advocacy issues and on responding to national crises situations. The voluntary sector is perceived by many refugee and asylum seekers as independent from the government, and seen
by refugees and asylum seekers as a way of creating meaning in their lives, and still having connection to their own culture.

Under Labour, the third sector was heavily relied upon to take up the franchised work of providing services to refugees. This included a wide range of different types of voluntary sector organisations including NGOs, refugee community organisations, employer organisations, trade unions; this has changed with the current government which massively cut the funding for service provision.

The Role of refugee organisations at a local level has been in the past to provide training and counsel for refugees who fall outside mainstream provision. They also negotiate with employers for work placements. As low-threshold institutions they are in direct contact with refugees and asylum seekers. They have an important role in fostering social capital and community networks. However, even in the past they often had to fight for short-term funding, which barriers towards long-term strategic planning and sustainability of these organisations. Recent funding cuts have meant that many of them closed down completely.

In Birmingham the City of Sanctuary was declared by a formal strategic committee in 2015 and is, as a city wide campaign network an important actor (sees previous section for details).

Another important network is the West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership. Strategic Migration Partnerships are local authority-led partnerships which aim to provide structures and forums of engagement for effectively dealing with migration at a local, regional and national level. They were established following the introduction of regional dispersal policy. They are made of representatives of local authorities, practitioners, community leaders and activists. The partnership has specific monitoring and knowledge exchange function to understand what is going on locally in terms of refugees (this is for example how they identified the need to support unaccompanied children).

The Regional Asylum Activism Project (RAA) was founded in June 2012 out of a partnership between the Still Human Still Here coalition, STAR and the Network for Social Change. The project works across three regions most affected by the dispersal policies including Birmingham and surrounding (the West Midlands). The project is organised through regional activism coordinators and the work, at a national level, is coordinated by STAR. The need for regional action outside London stems from a situation in which most influential decisions about refugees are still made by the Office of the London Mayor, whereas high number of asylum seekers and refugees (partly as a result of the dispersal policy) are settling outside of London, such as in Birmingham and surrounding (the Midlands). RAA brings together asylum seekers and refugees to train, share skills and deliver campaigns; it helps local people and organisations to plan and deliver campaigns; and it supports national campaigns.

**Relations to other actors**

The Piers Road Association has links with other organisation that can provide support to or that are likely to have contact with refugees such as credit union, prisons, housing associations, schools. Partners include:

- Birmingham Community Foundation which is a network of small to medium size voluntary organisations who work with and support each other);
- The local prison (HMP Winson Green);
Handsworth Job Centre which refers to them individuals in need of specific such as ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Services);

University of Birmingham personnel who originally helped setting up PR and their Department of Super Diversity

West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership

Legacy West Midland (a grassroots organization specializing in research into community heritage and history)

Politicians who support the work of PR.

The interviewee talked about being different from other organisations which offer specific activities that they refer to. The interviewee as manager of the project is involved in regional refuge partnerships and has good relationships with other refugee activists and entrepreneurs as well as with other local government officials, and local politicians (counsellors). He initiated the City of Sanctuary in Birmingham building on and developing his relationships with other 'activists', local authority representatives and politicians.

In addition to the refugees represented in the groups hosted by PR they have also provide support to other refugees. PR reaches out to communities often with help of volunteers who speak a specific language and build relationships with schools, the local community fire station and the local Asian Women's centre.

Lifeline Options describes itself as an ‘un-unified’ organisation, which operates to a large extent through networks. They work in collaboration with local branches of national charities such as the Refugee Council and Red Cross, Children’s Society as well as with local agencies (primarily but not exclusively from the third sector) such as: Birmingham Law Centre (private company limited by guarantee without share capital), ASIRT (not-for-profit OISC registered advocacy organisation), Restore (project organised by Birmingham Churches Together which is a registered charity and collaboration of different Christian churches). They make referrals to Hope Destitution Fund and Hope Housing projects (charity which was founded through partnership efforts and operates in close collaboration with other organisations). LO is also partner of the West Midlands Migration Partnership and City of Sanctuary (in particular Schools of Sanctuary).

LO defines itself as a hub of a loosely defined network of local refugee organisations; the network consists of organisations that refer refugee clients to each other; all organisations have their own aims, provide specific activities to certain groups of the refugee and asylum seeker communities. LO provides important knowledge and skills and that they offer to the network.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary works through a loosely defined network with other organisations, in particular Christian ones, including Restore, Birmingham Community Law Centre, Brushstrokes and Solihull Welcome (community project funded by Father’s Hudson Society). Each of these organisations or projects offer a different mix of support, such as befriending, immigration advice and distribution of resources. SCS further has connections with the University of Law, Birmingham University, Newman University and Aston University – hosting individuals engaged in research projects or volunteers on placements. The organisation hosts the RAA project coordinator for the West Midlands and has strong links with STAR-Network. STAR provides, at times, financial resources for SCS and they share volunteers. The managers/ coordinators of both SCS and RAA attend the West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership.
The collaboration with the RAA coordinator has improved SCS’s capacity to deal with issues in a more focused and targeted way drawing on the advocacy expertise of the coordinator.

STAR has built a wide range of networks and partnerships at local, regional and national levels. It manages and coordinates relationships with multiple partners; together the network is able to create social change and whilst STAR seems to have a powerful position and responsibilities, many of their decisions are made in horizontal ways. STAR has local networks that can be used to assess needs as well as respond to needs. They commonly work in collaboration with other organisations in both their campaign as well as their service delivery work. For their campaign work they seek to access to a comprehensive mix of skills and expertise (for example one actor representing the legal side and providing advice on how to proceed within the regulations). Through their involvement in the Still Human Still Here campaign, they are linked to a coalition of over 60 organisations which allows them to have more influence campaigning for ending the destitution of refused asylum seekers.

In Birmingham, the STAR network is – in addition to the student association - active through the Regional Asylum Activism (RAA) project coordinators are further hosted in local refugee organisations, which include the Refugee Council in Leeds, St. Chad’s Sanctuary in Birmingham and Refugee Action in Manchester.

As to the new local consortium, working with partners is still new to some of the smaller refugee organisations; they increasingly realise that it is something important they need to develop. In particular the relationships with local community leaders, churches and local government is seen as important to develop.

The British Red Cross has good relationships with other charities and grassroots organisations in the area as well as the large private sector company, G4S. They work closely, for example, with Hope Projects by supporting them with the casework of their clients. They collaborate with St Chad’s Sanctuary – this includes plans to provide clothing together to meet the demand of the large number of new asylum seekers arriving in Birmingham at the beginning of this year. BRC described the relationships with those smaller third sector projects or organisations as reciprocal.

The BRC refugee services team in Birmingham is also active in regional networks. They are the facilitator of the West Midlands Asylum and Destitution Group, which hold monthly meetings. They attend the West-Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership and other multi-agency forums. Those partnerships or networks bring different organisations together that support asylum seekers and refugees, including social services and health organisations. The BRC interviewee described the connections and links established through those networks as formal in an informal way: “By being able to have those organisations there, you are presenting it almost in an informal way to see what is the best way forward; before getting to the stage where you have to write formal letters”.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham collaborates with the City council, local schools and other organisations; the chair of the Birmingham network is also part of the national City of Sanctuary committee. Participants of the Birmingham City of Sanctuary are well connected; some of them worked for the City council and others are being active in different (refugee) community organisations, such as Oasis Church, Restore, Piers Road Association, Regional
Asylum Activism Project linked with St. Chad’s Sanctuary. The School of Sanctuary project is led by a retired teacher, who devotes her time to develop partnerships with local schools.

**Embeddedness in social/local context**

The Piers Roads Association was created by an opportunity that arose in form of a building that could be rented cheaply through a Sikh solicitor who wanted to support the community. The founder already had developed previous relationships with refugee groups when he was asked by a housing association to carry out a local needs assessment. In the needs assessment he identified that the need for a shared space in which organisations could come together (and this is how the organisations started). The shared space provides opportunities for individuals from different refugee and migration backgrounds (“who would otherwise never meet”) to get together. The organisation is described as an “all singing all dancing refugee house”. The concept of social capital needs to be interpreted in the context of the local community, which is highly diverse with many people having a migration background. This meant that there was no resistance from the community as might have occurred in other, less diverse parts of Birmingham. Whilst individuals tolerate each other and occasionally get together, it was less clear if there were strong connections between different groups; this could point to an understanding of refugee communities as very different communities that do not necessarily share an identity or other commonalties; and which are more likely operate loosely.

Lifeline Options operate in the local context but they believe that their experiences as an organisation are not specific to Birmingham as such but to other dispersal areas; most of their organisational existence is influenced by national policies such as dispersal polices. LO’s understanding of embeddedness in a social context is tied to that of network formation with other community organisations. LO creates social capital by helping to develop the capacity of individuals and organisations and helping to set up new projects and organisations. It employs principles of self-organising and empowerment; social capital in this sector is likely to be influenced by strong value sets that unites the players in the field. There is a constant new flow of individuals coming through the routes of asylum with similar kinds of needs. Engaging refugee volunteers plays an important role in establishing relationships with refugee community. For example, one of their volunteers is Sudanese and this has strengthened relationships with the Sudanese or Arabic community (“they feel that there is somebody there”). LO contributes to community cohesion by building networks among e.g. Zimbabwean and Congolese refugee community.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary was defined by strong sense of (volunteer and refugee) community that builds on values of tolerance, humanity and diversity. They established long-term relationships with asylum seekers and refugees, for example through their participation in English classes, which fosters a feeling of a ‘second home’. Community cohesion is facilitated by community activities, such as the yearly summer school week and day trips with volunteers followed by a barbecue and/or garden party. SCS itself is located in non-residential area of Birmingham with many offices and businesses. Their definition of community is not geographically defined but more in terms of networks with other (religious) actors and organisations. They receive support from many parishes, smaller community groups and charity groups, including through their volunteering networks. The cathedral staff and the archbishop are very supportive and they support them, including by offering space such as meeting rooms and the archbishop’s gardens. They also maintain close relationships with the Salvation Army next door, which is in charge of the maintenance of the building.
STAR’s social capital relies heavily on their large student volunteer base. This wide representation and active engagement of STAR groups in campaigns on refugee issues and service provision for refugees have leveraged the impact of STAR across the UK. It also embeds their activities in specific localities, through the students’ commitment to raising awareness about refugee issues among fellow students and in their respective communities. The campaigns run by STAR staff members are more regional and national-focused, while their ‘collection of evidence’ to sustain their campaigns often relies on accounts of community members. STAR has further stabilised their relationship with specific dispersal areas, through locating three coordinators in three distinct locations, including the West Midlands. RAA project coordinators are hosted in local refugee organisations, which embed them in the refugee community locally (Refugee Council in Leeds, St. Chad’s Sanctuary in Birmingham and Refugee Action in Manchester). The coordinators provide assistance and support throughout the whole region engaging with asylum seekers and refugees as well as individuals who are supporting asylum seekers and refugees. In addition, they provide campaigning support for students.

The new local consortium is still a new idea that has not developed yet. Its members are already embedded in their local community although some of the smaller organisations have operated more inwards focused and whilst they have links with their own ethnic community they are not well integrated in the wider community. This can be at least partly explained by the way funding streams operated in the past (e.g. focus on single group budgets). There is also likely to be a gap in skills and experiences to work more outwards oriented including English language skills and knowledge of how to operate professionally with other community organisations and local government. There could be also cultural and religious beliefs that stopped groups to reach out and manage the wide range of external challenges such as negative perceptions in the public and budget constrains from local government.

The refugee services provided by the British Red Cross are embedded in the local context through operating from local premises, which are owned by partners, which also support refugees. In Coventry they run their clinics at St. Peter’s Church, in Solihull their drop-in services are provided at St. Augustine’s Catholic Church Hall and they further have clinics in Stoke on Trent and Birmingham. The partner agencies are embedded locally and have strong social networks and infrastructure, which the BRC utilises.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham is still struggling to establish a sustainable and substantial representation in the area. A core challenge has been described as the missing cohesion among community groups in Birmingham and some resistance working together on refugee topics. This presents difficulties for the movement in establishing a citywide network that appeals to diverse community interests. There are also successes such as the School of Sanctuary project, which achieved local connections and embeddedness. This might create opportunities for other forms of engagement that might reach out to the wider community.

**Independence from external pressures**

The Piers Road Association experienced funding pressures; the interviewee describes the challenges that local authorities face including external pressures from the public and the media; the interviewee described the inability of local government to spend funding on refugees in the current climate of severe resource constrains (which were not even sufficient for British citizens). The role of awards and reputation including recognition of his
organisation from local politicians was regarded key in providing and maintaining existing funding opportunities.

Change in policy and practice created a lack of capacity in the refugee sector, which led to the creation of Lifeline Options. However, increasing political pressures in the refugee field are threatening the existence of LO. For example, recent changes to the Immigration Bill and increasing regulation of legal advice services provided to refugees and asylum seekers presents challenges for LO, which relied on support from individuals who would not be allowed to provide legal advice under the more stringent regulations. Government discontinued most of the funding and LO has not received any government funds since 2010 (when the Coalition government came into power). LO has no funds to employ additional staff that would be needed to address the demand. They experience a range of challenges as an organisation and only have limited office space and organisational staff.

LO is primarily concerned about the capacity of local refugee organisations in creating connections and bridging the gap and compete with larger service providers. However, LO is not sure whether refugee organisation can live up to the new role that is necessary to continue meeting social needs; it requires a range of skills and experience that many of them currently do not have.

St. Chad’s Sanctuary experienced increasing demands; the project sought to respond to this by contracting new members of staff and by expanding time spent by volunteers. Legal pressures are related to the daily operations – e.g. a wide range of individuals uses their premises, including under-age children who need to be supervised by parents/legal guardian members.

STAR had some freedom towards government as it is 100% independently funded primarily by private donors who support the cause of the project. Pressures are political ones such as the national refugee crises but also the huge on-going and increasing demand locally. Public perception (influenced through the media) played an important role over time.

Individuals working in the refugee sector observed the escalation of negative public attitude with concern, with market research showing that the public was not rightly informed about the refugee situation. This led to the impetus for refugee organisations to work towards creating a more positive and welcoming attitude among the public; it was hoped that in turn this would lead to pro-refugees policy changes. This is also where the work of organisations such as STAR is firmly located.

This provides them with increased latitude of action on how to influence politics and legal reforms. In a recent debate about the immigration bill STAR campaigned to change the government’s restrictive position towards the child refugee amendment. This was achieved through mobilizing students and communities to write to their MPs, who in turn were able to argue in the Commons debate that their constituency wants the refugee children to come to the UK. In this case, rather than being a pressure social media is used as a tool to mobilise citizen support.

The British Red Cross refugee services were describes as relatively independent from government and financial pressures since they do not rely on government funding. They do not have to align themselves with government policies and they are not subject to the same funding cuts as potentially other organisations in the area. However, the centralisation of
strategic decision-making following the restructuring processes in the BRC might imply that the regional actors will have less influence on shaping the overall direction of service provision. Potentially, regional offices will have to align themselves increasingly with national priorities.

The City of Sanctuary in Birmingham faces pressures in terms of human capital as well as financial pressures. The interviewee described this as a core challenge to establish a more significant role in the sector.

Locally, the above led to a breakdown of available refugee infrastructure, with refugees not knowing where to turn to. This increased market pressures with there being more demands than supply available. As a result, those refugee and community organisations that survived the funding cuts face substantial capacity problems.

6.7. Impact and obstacles

Challenges

The harsh rhetoric by governments, scapegoating of the media and negative public perception all presented major challenges for refugee organisations. Although this was not mentioned by interviewees some of the challenges that third sector-led refugee organisations face need to be seen in the historical context of how the majority of those were funded: that organisations over the past decade were largely government funded to provide service under tight government regulation; this restricted their ability to develop their advocacy and campaign function.

There are also changes due to economic challenges. On the one hand, this possibly implies increasing hostility but, on the other hand, it might also imply a possible change for organizations to focus more on cohesion and integration. One interviewee reported that the 2010 integration policy very much reflected the Home Office take on integration and did not consider the existence and role of local refugee organisations in areas like Birmingham. This has posed financial challenges for local refugee organisation (this refers to small local organisation and not regional or central organisations) and created difficulties for them in accessing funds locally and to compete with larger organisations. For example, in the past companies had legal aid and services that were accessible for the community, but currently there was no public funding for legal aid available.

One interviewee noted that local refugee organisations faced particular challenges because of the lack of information on how to move forward after the old refugee sector structure had ‘broken down’. Questions that arose were whether such organisations were empowered and prepared enough to move forwards and continue their programme.

One interviewee saw the challenges of addressing the social needs of asylum seekers and refugees not only tied to funding difficulties, but also to changes in policies. For example, legal advice had been over-regulated (while welfare advice was left largely unregulated e.g. food banks or advice given by churches). Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC) newly introduced standards on immigration advice was felt to lead to an extreme penalization of welfare provision.

There are a number of barriers for local organisations to operate. Fragmentation of the public sector creates instability of the institutional framework of such organisations. Moreover, the
complexity of the system makes it difficult to have an overview and share best practices and evaluation.

**Role of regional networks in influencing change; and identifying needs**

Each of the organisations we interviewed placed a lot of focus on identifying and monitoring local needs; some of this work was carried out through regional partnerships across the Midlands (the WMSMP). The WMSMP plays an important driver in coordinating refugee activities. Outside of this regional partnership (which was local authority-led), most refugee organisations worked in networks although most of them were only loosely defined and this might present challenges in trying to achieve social change at the local level. Where local organisations worked together it was primarily to organise social activities rather than advocate for change. Most organisations felt they could not or did not want to challenge the local political system. Barriers included capacity constraints; some interviewees felt that being part of a democratic system meant accepting and working with the local realities.

Church and privately funded organisations were more likely to engage in lobbying and those were much more coordinated including through partnerships with other cities and regions (such as the RAA). National organisations operating at the local or regional level or organisations closely linked to national organisations had an important role in lobbying. The connections between local, regional and national organisations or projects seemed particularly important in assessing social needs and mobilise actions.

The interviewee of the City of Sanctuary, the Birmingham wide campaign network, reported that they had experienced major challenges in collaborating with local community leaders and neighbourhood associations. This included in one instance a hostile response from a neighbourhood association. The interviewee thought that the particular difficulty of advocating at the city level was associated to the missing cohesion among the different neighbourhoods or localities.

7. **Tracing self-organized community building in Brno, Czech Republic**

Post-socialist Czech Republic has switched from being an emigration to becoming an immigration country during 1990s (Barša, Baršová, 2005). The character of immigration and the attitude of citizens towards it are influenced especially by two factors. First, the attitude of government towards the immigration, which is rather hesitant and aims rather at limiting the flow of immigrants (with some exceptions of highly qualified immigrants).

[...] because the attitude of central government is not too positive towards refugees and foreigners... I’d say the attitude of government towards the migration issue is very conservative and it basically attempts to follow the line set by the Ministry of Interior. I do not want to go into details but this line is basically about - the lower the number of immigrants, the better. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

---

Our special thanks go to Lucia Čemová because of her invaluable insights into activities organized by and for refugees and migrants in Brno region as well as great help with data collection.
And, second, the number of foreigners and refugees is not actually high enough to justify such a negative reaction of government. This may be seen during today’s situation: despite the migration crisis, which brings hundreds of thousands refugees to Europe, the number of refugees flowing into the Czech Republic rises only by a small margin. The first impact of the European refugee crisis came in 2015 and was a political one. Even if the Czech Republic is not situated on any major migration route and its level of immigration remains low (for details see the section History of the SI), most political actors reflected the issue and some of them started to utilize the anti-refugee/pro-refugee rhetoric for various purposes. The public debate driven by the political elite emphasized specially the economic (migration driven by the welfare benefits) or cultural fears of immigration (the later relates either to security - connecting refugees with the threat of Islamic terrorism – or directly to culture threat - pointing at the fact that most of the refugees coming to or through the country were from “Islamic countries” and “might erode our own culture”). However no reliable data exist in terms of the religiosity of asylum seekers or migrants – either during the refugee crisis or before that. Earlier data on the religiosity of foreigners living in the Czech Republic do not include any reference to Islam or minorities from Middle East countries at all.

Higher number of migrants is related mostly to Prague and surrounding areas where most of the foreigners in the CR concentrate (about 40% of all foreigners live in Prague and surrounding areas). Low number of migrants leads to bad quality of integration policies and lack of officials that deal with the issue. It was not until 2016 when official the function “advisor for foreigners and refugees” at the Brno City Municipality was conceived. Until then, the only function related to the integration of migrants was “advisor for national minorities”.

These factors contribute to a system of restrictive immigration policy, high administrative difficulties for getting a residence permit and absence of efforts to adjust agencies to the needs of foreigners (most of the relevant employees are not able to communicate in English etc.). The low number of migrants is also related to the low level of development of foreigners’ communities in the Czech environment, deficit of investments into integration policies, xenophobia of local inhabitants and discrimination of foreigners on many levels (e.g. when searching a job, housing, communication with public officials etc.).

I think if we would like to transpose it [the British concept of “local champion” focused on connecting the majority with ethnic communities through intercultural workers] into Brno, the difference will be that there are not many people able to do this job and the communities are not developed that much. (Interviewee 6 on the British concept of „local champion“, 2016).

The strategies of the Czech Republic during the migration crisis (strict border control, isolation of refugees in detention centres) led to the divergence of the flow of refugees to neighbouring countries. All of these circumstances lead to low attractiveness of the Czech Republic for potential immigrants. Despite this, the European migration crisis changed the public and political visibility of the migration issue in the country and since 2015 we may further observe the changes in this area.

A new phase started after the crisis broke out, during this time the things started to professionalize. But it is still in the beginnings. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

The refugee wave was important. Before that, there were some people in the field who were dealing with this [integration of immigrants] in some ways. Nobody from outside cared
about it and maybe also the environment was blocked. There were no innovations and even if there were some, they usually failed. There was no potential for any systemic pressure. As people started to be interested because of the migration crisis, they started to perceive it as urgent. They started to perceive it as an issue... which is good. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Social innovations in the area of integration of foreigners are therefore at their very beginning in the Czech Republic. We may say that so far the civic organizations have been engaged rather in the maintenance of basic services such as social and legal advisory and that the efforts for any innovations were not deemed as priority. On the other hand, several interesting cases of social innovative practices may be identified, some of them in the context of the City of Brno. The city provides a specific context for self-organized community development with refugees. Brno is a mid-sized city with population oscillating around 377 thousand inhabitants. There are no specific districts in the city that could be depicted as areas with high accumulation of refugees and immigrants per se. Even organizations with activities focused on refugees and immigrants work with clients from the whole city or even from the whole region.

Brno is a city with long history of ethnic and religious minorities, refugees and immigrants. There are diverse cultural and ethnic communities that are connected with migrants and asylum seekers. The number of immigrants living in the city also indicates possibility to find innovative activities organized by them or for them. To reveal, by the end of 2015, 30 thousand foreigners were registered in the region. From these, the largest minorities are represented by Ukrainians, Slovaks, Vietnamese, Russians, Romanians, Bulgarians, Polish, citizens of U.S., Indians and Belarusians (in descending order).

Moreover, Brno is also place where institutions focused on refugees and immigrants established by the State can be found, which brings in an interesting dynamics between the top-down and bottom-up perspectives of how to cope with the existence and social problems related with migration. There is the Integration Asylum Centre Brno, formed in 2009, which serves to persons who have been granted international protection and who joined the State Integration Program and apply for temporary accommodation in the centre. Additionally, immigrants’ integration is promoted by South-Moravia Centre for the Support of Integration of Foreigners, which is based in the city as well. We can also find an official reception centre and detention facility for foreigners (PRS a ZZC Zastávka) close to the city, which provides accommodation to newly arrived asylum seekers until the end of the basic entrance procedures.

Brno is situated in the south-east part of the country, so recent migration waves have reached it first. Activists from Brno seemed to be more involved in helping the refugees than from other Czech cities. This also has an impact on the rise of several grass-root initiatives. Moreover, the city has already experienced a refugee wave during the Bosnian War in 1992-1995.

The processes of immigrants’ integration are more socially embedded there than for example in more cosmopolitan Prague. The city, even though it is the second biggest town in the country, still maintains certain character of smaller and more “local” place and thus represents better the situation in the country than the city of Prague.
7.1. Description of the SI
Strategy of integration of refugees in the Czech Republic is oriented especially towards the issues of housing, language barriers, employment, health and social benefits. Since January 2016 the mode of dealing with the refugees has slightly changed. Compared to the previous period when the social benefits were distributed in a less organized manner the contemporary system aims at more personalized cooperation between the refugee and the social worker on the preparation of the individual integration plan. Individuals or families are registered at the employment office and they have access to public health insurance. Within the framework of the State Integration Programme the refugees are allocated money according to the number of members of the family, which they use for the integration activities (i.e. rental payment, interpreting services etc.) in cooperation with social worker. In other words, the integration is to a large extent oriented towards the meeting the material needs and coordinated at the level of the nation state. This suggests that community work which requires more local and regional coordination and attempts to go beyond the provision of material resources is underdeveloped in the country. This problem is being reflected especially by the civic initiatives from below such as Nesehnutí NGO and Mosque of Brno.

7.2. Introducing the organizations
Focusing on community integration by way of self-organization implies that objectives of the cases to be studied should ‘exceed’ the offering of basic services, and should foster solidarity and agency. Initiatives that we decided to select for our process tracing study are the Community building within the programme “Together towards diversity” [Společně k rozmanitosti] which is organized by Nesehnutí NGO, and the Mosque of Brno (organized by Islamic Community of Brno). Neither of these projects is a perfect example of a SI stream as defined by the ITSSOIN project, i.e. consisting of seeking refuge, community development and self-organization. As far as the first case is considered, the whole project has been initiated and later on guided by an established NGO which basically imposed the principle of self-organization upon people in need and attempted to empower them – so the very aspect of self-organization has been so far rather weak here. In the second case – the Mosque of Brno – the focus is less on people seeking refugee than on people seeking religious reassurance. Despite this, we consider these cases as illustrative both of the development of SI stream and of community work in the city of Brno which is in many regards representative of the Czech Republic.

The community building initiative aims at providing an alternative to standard services as well as creates a community based on mutual aid, which is innovative especially in context of Brno. Similarly, the Mosque initiative has the same functions despite of the fact, that it was not established primarily for integration and mutual aid between migrants, but for religious purposes. However, the Mosque fulfils all these functions today and it represents very important support for refugees and other Muslim migrants, since no similar activity can be found in the region.

The first case is run by a nonprofit organization focusing on the promotion of human rights and civic engagement. It represents the section of the Nesehnutí NGO that arose from the programme “Aid to refugees” [Pomoc uprchlíkům], which is focused on various forms of aid accompanying refugees' integration. The programme aims at promoting diversity in the society in general, while the Community building is important activity directly focusing on interconnecting migrants and the majority. This case only partially fulfils the condition of self-
organization as the main persons here are two coordinators (from Slovakia and Moldova) who attempt to include as many foreigners/refugees as possible into the community where locals and foreigners meet. The initiative is still at its beginning. During the course, some instances of mutual solidarity and help have started to appear, however it is hard to say that the level of trust within the community has reached such a level that would enable the coordinators to appeal to it extensively. Therefore, the instances of cooperation occur in a rather random fashion. This is something that is planned to change in the future. The initiative decisively extends to usual social services provision.

The other mentioned case - The Mosque, is a space, where mostly foreigners from Muslim countries meet. These are often refugees from Syria, Iraq or other Arabic countries but these do not represent the community as such as it is much more diverse and consists also of “integrated” migrants from early 1990s or ethnic Czech citizens. The Mosque is not a standard NGO. Formally, it has a nonprofit status but this is due to circumstances in the early 1990s when the law on churches did not allow to establish a church organization with such a low number of members. We selected this because it meets the criteria of social innovation even if this is not its primary goal (it aims at fulfilling religious needs).

### 7.3. Dimensions of innovativeness

Community work is not completely new in the Czech Republic. For a long time, these activities are conducted especially in segregated localities where community centres focusing especially on the Roma population are operated. There is a trend to further develop this type of social work (e.g. within the framework of a Coordinated approach to socially excluded localities).

In terms of community work with foreigners the bystanding experts interviewed during our field research often mention the fact that there were no motivations for any innovations for a long time in the Czech Republic.

*As far as social innovations in the field of the Ministry of work and social affairs are concerned, what I know is that they quite support them. They also favour pilot testing of methods in community work and testing of community work as such. If I speak just about foreigners, this might be a bit problematic because we all know the attitude of the central government - it is not very positive towards refugees and foreigners.* (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

It was the start of the migration crisis which caused the discussion on the implementation of mandatory quotas for reception of refugees. This made the issue of refugees and migrants visible. At the same time this public debate transformed migration policies into a hot topic. Community integration through self-organization is definitely a social innovation in the Czech Republic according to our respondents.

*I think that in the Czech Republic, community work could be definitely defined as innovation. So far it has had a rather centralized character without involving the people in the community and now this starts to turn around a bit which is good.* (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

*I cannot tell how it works here as we are still in the beginning and I cannot evaluate it. It works for a too short time here.* (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

*Definitely yes. Generally, I perceive it as the conflict between the conservative system of social services which is set in some manner and which is not capable to point out social innovation and consider it as something desirable. This tension then produces innovations which arise from outside this system. This system does not provide them with any space.* (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)
Table 7.1 gives a short summary of the community development focus of the organizations studies, as well as of the ‘degree of self-organization’ that characterizes their work.

**Table 7.1 Community development focus and ‘degree of self-organization’ of the organizations studied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Self-organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nesehnutí/ the Multicultural tea parties project</td>
<td>Community as womanhood (interconnecting foreign and local women)</td>
<td>Providing room for the initiative of the local and foreign/refugee women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesehnutí/ Community Building project</td>
<td>Community as sharing a locality among refugees and old residents</td>
<td>Providing room for the initiative of the locals and foreigners/refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque of Brno</td>
<td>Community as sharing a (Islamic) religion</td>
<td>Muslims as founders and self-governors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social needs**

The predecessor of the Community building project – “the Multicultural tea parties” project [Multikulturní čaje o páté] - was based on a regular meetings of Czech and foreign women over handicraft activities. This was meant to create a social environment where it is possible for the two groups of women to meet and establish relations. Such a space was conceived as a possibility to overcome prejudices, to share one’s life with others, provide mutual help and learn Czech. It also represented a support in contacting the organizations and social or legal advisers. There was an attempt to support the members of the group to come up with their own proposals of the agenda (self-organization) but this goal was fulfilled only to some extent.

The following project – “**Community building**” [Community building lab] - continues in the effort to create a space where social exchange takes place and relationships are created on various levels (cooperation, friendships, mutual help, information exchange). At the same time it aims at de-stigmatization and empowerment of foreigners’ consciousness of their capacity to arrange a life, which they want. The language feature (learning Czech) has disappeared and now it is upon the members of community whether it is important for them or not. The goal of the project is to enable the contact of foreigners with locals, to enable them to create relationships and mutual support, inspiration, knowledge and experience sharing. This shall lead to fulfilling of foreigners’ social needs and obtain practically relevant contacts (obtaining language skills, getting a job, housing opportunities etc.). On the other hand, the platform should be useful for people living in the Czech Republic. They may find new international contacts, exploring new cultures and languages and sharing opinions e.g. on political aspects of migration (which is a subject of frustration for many people who disagree with the strategies of the government).

*The project does not offer classic social services but rather some possibilities, offers which may be used the way one needs. The project includes two levels - regular community meetings with programming and a buddy system (after school preparations of Czech language for adults, help with the preparations for schools, preschool preparations, assistance help for dealing with officials in exchange for something from the foreigners - teaching Arabic, cooking courses etc.). The emphasis in the buddy system is on mutual exchange and on meeting for networking and relationship building. The target group is the locals and incoming people of all age groups who are interested in mutual relationship building and engaging in them. (Interviewee 2 - Nesehnutí, 2016)*

*An important starting point is the effort for a deconstruction of power positions between the newcomers and social workers/Czechs, deconstructions of assistance or aid, reinforcement of a sense*
of full-fledged membership in a society in the case of newcomers and the sense that they may contribute to community, to support their activity. (Interviewee 2 - Nesehnutí, 2016)

The primary function of the Mosque is to fulfil religious needs - to secure an adequate space suitable for worshipping. By organizing several activities (Sunday after-school learning, feast celebrations, social dinners during Ramadan) a community of people is built. For refugees the Mosque may be a significant source of social contacts and social capital in general which may subsequently provide them with practical help.

At the same time the Mosque serves naturally as a space for meeting of people with the same religious background and relationships, which result from these meetings and are important both on social and practical level. Many newcomers to the Czech Republic have found here a community of friends and fellows, social networks, which helps them to solve also practical matters such as housing or job. However, this is not the purpose of the Mosque and it does not manage the interactions of the people. These are the activities that take place more in a secondary manner. (Interviewee 3 - Mosque, 2016)

I found my job thanks to the Mosque. When I started to attend worship services with my wife, the other members noticed we were the new ones and were interested in us. They told us about the job offer and because it was a very responsible work, I needed someone to vouch for me. Another member did this for me, thanks to what I got my job. (Interviewee 5 - Mosque, 2016)

One of the functions of the Mosque (stemming from the religious definition) is the redistribution of the resources, i.e. the rich may contribute to the poor. In this regard there is a system of anonymous material help in the Mosque - a collection for an anonymous person in need is organized.

As far as the help to the believers is concerned, if anyone needs anything, it happens that the search starts on an informal level, people that may have information or resources are being addressed. In the case of exceptional need, the Mosque may organize a collection of money - e.g. if someone is seriously ill, or there is a serious situation (e.g. migration crisis in the Balkans), or if someone addresses the Mosque (e.g. once the Mosque supported an organization which constructed wells in Africa). However, the social assistance is not strategically managed or systematized, it is provided and organized more or less in and ad hoc fashion. (Interviewee 3 - Mosque, 2016)
Types of activities

Listed initiatives are based more on services than on conducting advocacy activities. Currently the advocacy activities take place mostly on the level of Consortium of NGOs working with migrants in the Czech Republic and without any substantive involvement of the foreigners (e.g. the campaign for the change of the health insurance options for foreigners).

Multicultural tea parties project was from the beginning organized as regular meetings once a month where women engaged in hand works. During these activities there was social networking, building of the relationships, information sharing etc. During the next phase these activities continued and were supplemented by the preparations for the festival (photos, food, etc.).

Follow-up project Community building have broader definition of means through which it aims at community building. It builds upon the activities which connect people. So far there were food-sharing meetings, outdoor trips, barbecue parties and camping for children. More specific activities are planned for different target groups (young families, women, unemployed etc.).

As far as the Mosque is concerned, apart from worship services, there are also celebrations of Muslim feasts (end of Ramadan etc.), social dinners during the Ramadan or remedial teaching. The latter builds up on the mutual exchange of community members (Arabic, Czech, English or math). Mosque represents the biggest Islamic community in Brno (and the only Sunnite one). For many refugees this is the only place where they can meet other Muslims. It is important not only in the context of Islamophobia in the country but also because it is much easier to make new personal ties which are necessary for integration. The refugees are equal members of the community as everyone else and may be involved in all of its activities or benefits; e.g. when somebody is in social need, an anonymous collection of resources is organized.

Target audience

In Multicultural tea parties project the original target group were the Czech women and women refugees. Because of the rising interest of female foreigners with various statuses the target group broadened to include all women who were interested in mutual exchange and are motivated to communicate in Czech.

The Community building project deliberately does not set any prerequisites for any legal status of foreigners and welcomes Czechs, expatriates, economic migrants, students, both successful and unsuccessful asylum seekers, illegal migrants etc.

The target group in the Mosque are all religious Muslims and their status is not considered.

The fact that someone is a refugee does not play any role at all. The Mosque is attended also by the refugees but this is not important for anyone. (Interviewee 3 - Mosque, 2016)

7.4. History of the social innovation

Background and timeline

Our cases are rooted in earlier period - Mosque was established in early 1990s in an era of proto-liberal euphoria (radical openness towards other cultures, religions and philosophies), while refugee-oriented programs of Nesehnuti rather took place in a period of rising criticism of neoliberal globalization, arms trade and human rights violation abroad. However the issue of
innovation of integration policies in the Czech Republic was most explicitly raised in a community of social workers, academia and some politicians after the break-up of the European migration crisis. Generally, these attempts to modify the formulation and implementation of integration policies took place in the atmosphere of society polarized over the issue of immigration. The issue of migration is quite new to the Czech public as the migrants make up around four percent of the population (and come mostly from Slovakia, Ukraine and Vietnam). Now, in the light of the so-called refugee crisis, these issues are now hot topics. The first impact of the European refugee crisis came in 2015 and was a political one. Even if the Czech Republic is not situated on any major migration route and its level of immigration remains low, most political actors reflected the issue and some of them started to utilize the anti-refugee/pro-refugee rhetoric for various purposes. In 2015 – the first year of the migration crisis – there were 1,525 requests for asylum in the Czech Republic as compared to 1,156 in 2014. However, the major concerns expressed in the public debate seem to be the economic and security ones. Even if the number of illegal migrants arrested in the country rose in 2015 and 2016, the rise was far from dramatic (from 4,822 in 2014 and 7,201 in 2015).

At the moment the authorities and organizations start to react by implementing particular tools among which there is also a community work. In terms of social policies the social innovation is rather at its beginning. One of the respondents claims that in other countries the community integration is part of regular policies, in the Czech context this is an activity conducted mostly from the part of the activists and NGOs which is rather tolerated than supported from the part of the public administration.

*And most importantly, from what was said by the lady from Utrecht [attending the EuroCity Summit and working with migrants] I understood that in these countries such as Italy or Netherlands it is automatically part of those policies, this is completely different than here. People are supported there to do something and it has different social status than when you do something here.* (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

So far there are no incentives from the part of the government for developing this type of integration tools. If someone succeeds in securing some financial support from the Ministry of Interior, it is more a result of long-time struggle:

*(Q: what are the settings of the system in the area of community work?)*

*Nothing much really. I have not noticed that there is any effort in the Czech Republic to systematize community work with foreigners. If I look for example at Inbíze [NGO] they have made it from nothing with a lot of pain. It was a big fight but today they are funded by the Ministry of Interior for their activities. From the state budget dedicated to the integration. A lot of money is dedicated to regional integration centres and then the problem is who and how can reflect the issue of community work. For example, Mezírka [The South Moravian Regional Centre for the Support the Integration of Foreigners] - they have a community room which is not utilized, and the question is whether they are able to do this as community work. On the other hand, it seems bizarre to me that there are some people who do community work but are not inter-linked.* (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

In comparison to the public sector, the nonprofit sector is a bit ahead in this area. Initiatives that aim at community integration arise spontaneously in nonprofit organizations (including selected cases) - given the absence of funding schemes and calls for projects or political will to support similar initiatives these arise on a voluntary basis.
I see this SI stream rather on the spontaneous activist level than on the institutional one. My experience is that people who are in touch with the foreigners are not content with the way the standard social services are provided and that is why they try to do it in a different way.

Therefore on the city level the community work is in a phase zero, while on the level of civil society there are interesting things going on. It has developed a lot. This is not supported by the public policies; it is rather based on volunteering. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

**Broader discourse**

According to the respondents the community integration trend arises from the decentralization tendencies.

_How it emerged - I think that the trend of community work follows the patterns on a global level - which is away from centralization that was privileged so far. Now it is the other way round and idea of decentralization start to enforce itself. One of the consequences of this is also a community work which reaches directly and locally people on the municipal level._ (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Both bystanding experts (Interviewee 4 and 6) distinctively target the issue of “centralization” of integration policies in the Czech Republic. As employees of the public administration they claim that their competencies in this area are very limited which has a significant impact on the development of innovations. In the Czech Republic, migration and integration policies are centralized to a large extent.

_In our case the centralization is so high that this local administration does not possess any real tools through which it could contribute to integration without entering into the conflict with the Ministry of Interior._ (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

One of the consequences of the effort of the Ministry of Interior to leave the decision-making in the area of integration centralized is recent removal of the foreigners from the Coordinated approach to socially excluded localities (joint framework prepared by the experts from public administration). This prevented the NGOs providing social services for the foreigners from taking part in coordinated funding system for all the social services in Brno. Taking part in this system would ensure interconnectedness of the social services and their activities as well as secure sufficient money flow for them (without the control of Ministry of Interior).

This centralization is deemed by the experts as a key factor why social innovations cannot take place:

_In the Czech Republic the cities have very little authority in the field of integration of foreigners. It is very centralized, but at the same time these innovations always develop on a very local level. At this moment the cities shall mention them, have a possibility to grasp and develop them, but as it is so centralized, everything is controlled by the Ministry of Interior, cities have limited possibilities how to set that policy. They do not get the money for the integration of foreigners that they could distribute according to their consideration._ (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

The problem with the implementation of integration activities lies also in the general setting of the system of refugee reception: when they are provided with international protection, neither NGOs nor local government are informed that new people are coming to the city and that they need to be cared for. Refugees are often not informed about the options they have, whom to contact and what their rights and entitlements are.
We from the municipal authority unfortunately do not have the overview about who is coming to Brno and we complain about it for a long time because in reality the integration takes place in the city, not at the Ministry of Interior. But we learn about this only when the refugees themselves needs anything or the Ministry needs anything from us as representatives of local authority. For example when he or she enters any program and shall be provided with a department, this is the time we learn about it, which is not very good. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

And also they [other countries] care more about what they need, they have better integration services… so more proactive. If you think about the fact that here a pile of asylum-seekers does not even know that there is any State integration programme. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

However, on a local level (Brno) there is a political will to improve the current status quo of integration policies and to implement innovations in this area.

If I shall speak for a local level, at least certain part of the representatives is very inclined to the cause. At least Matej Hollan and Martin Freund from Žít Brno movement [an activist movement which was founded in 2011, transformed into a political party and since 2014 is represented in the mandates in the city council]. Definitely as far as the foreigners are considered these two gentlemen very much support agenda of foreigners. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

I think that the attitudes towards community work could be different if the Žít Brno movement were not represented at the municipal authority. I do not want to say that if there were different representatives there would not be any community work, but the rise of this trend would be much slower and more difficult. When I look on the behaviour of other parties these are rather reserved in the field of foreigners than being twice as forthcoming. It probably arises from electoral preferences; the attitude of the Czech society is rather reserved. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

So I would say that Brno in comparison to the central government is a bit in a contradiction in terms of perspectives. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Respondents consider the trend towards a community work as important because of its effectiveness and capacity of foreigners themselves to identify with integration policies as these would stem from their own attitudes and needs:

The trend of community work is still more important. From the experience from other cities I feel that it is completely inevitable. It seems to me that it is very much important. Maybe it is the only way how to become legitimate in the eyes of those people and feeling, that they identify with the policy you create for them... that it makes sense for them. Because the fact that we order them something and you simply accept this... then we are surprised that the social policy is so illegitimate for those people. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Important impetus for the whole issue of foreigners in the Czech Republic was the migration crisis which set the agenda and make people think about it.

The refugee wave was important. Before that, there were some people in the field who were dealing with this in some ways, nobody from outside cared about it and maybe also the environment was blocked. That there were no innovations and even if there were some, they usually failed. That there was no potential for any systemic pressure. As people started to be interested because of the migration crisis, they started to perceive it as urgent. They started to perceive it as an issue... which is good. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

On the other hand, the media production at the beginning of the crisis and largely xenophobic reactions of the public to which these contributed lead to the reservations of the government towards the refugees despite its social-democratic political position. Populist politicians, right-
wing parties and extremist movements started to gain higher public support and started to dominate in public and media space.

**Founding year**

Due to the underdevelopment of the SI stream in the Czech Republic, it is impossible to situate the foundation of the projects into a common time period. Both initiatives originate in a different time period, therefore, it is necessary to describe their context separately.

The idea of Multicultural tea parties project arose in 2011 due to funding from the EU programme Youth in Action. At that time the initiative was a part of a project called Aid to Refugees of Nesehnutí NGO. The project was established in period of massive migration of Chechen refugees to the Czech Republic and its activities included for example organizing of leisure activities in Reception Centre Zastávka or remedial classes of Czech language for kids of refugees at the elementary school for foreigners ZŠ Staňkova in Brno. The women's group Multicultural tea parties project represented one of these activities. Moreover, it was also the only one that has survived and has been modified into the Community building initiative in 2016.

Community building initiative, besides building on Multicultural tea parties, was also created in response to the European Migration crisis as well as to the current level of integration policies that lack emphasis on socialization of refugees.

The evolution of activities within the Mosque derives from political situation in the Czech Republic since beginning of 1990s. The Muslim community began to be formed after the fall of the socialist regime since similar grouping was forbidden before.

First, the Student association was settled, based on informal meetings, accompanied by gradual increase of membership base. In 1996, the initiative was formalized and the Islamic foundation was established. The members started to gather funds and lobby for the status of the Mosque in the society. Two years later, in 1998, the Mosque, which represented first space for the practicing of religion was opened.

Important change in the orientation of activities of the Mosque came with the attacks on the World Trade Centre in 2001. Since this incident brought adverse public opinion about Islam, the representatives of the initiative expanded their efforts towards dialog with the public. In 2002 an amendment to the Law on churches and religious communities came into force and brought a possibility to obtain registration upon collecting 300 signatures. Furthermore, in 2004 Headquarters of Muslim Communities was founded as an umbrella organization for Muslims living in the Czech Republic, aiming to represent Muslims in negotiations with politicians and media or to provide advocacy etc. This had an effect on the Mosque, since the representatives of the Islamic foundation became also the representatives of the newly established organization.

The recent European Migration crisis that started in 2015 brought dramatic deterioration of public opinion about Islam, which started to have significantly negative status in the Czech society. Since then the Mosque has faced attacks (through social media etc.) while the representatives have resigned to attempt to change the situation and the public perception about Islam.
Milestones

Whereas the initiative Community building is at its very beginnings, it is possible to compare only initial phases of both projects. Both projects (Community building and the Mosque) are based on recognized need of foreigners to organize some activities. Both initiatives arose from voluntary activities of people, who considered as beneficial to create a space that would serve as meeting point for those, who share the same religion (in case of the Mosque) or the same stance on society and multicultural relations (in case of Community building).

The most important milestones regarding Multicultural tea parties project and Community building project are only few.

- In 2011 and 2012 the Multicultural tea parties project obtained funds from EU programme Youth in Action.
- The most significant was however the European Migration crisis (2015), which impelled the coordinator of completed project Multicultural tea parties to come up with some new activity in order to fulfil needs of refugees.

The most important milestones of the Mosque initiative

- During 1st half of 1990s the Student association was founded.
- In 1996 the Islamic foundation was established.
- In 1998 the Mosque was opened.
- In 2001, the attacks on the World Trade Centre caused negative orientation of public opinion towards Islam.
- In 2002 amendment to the Law on churches and religious communities came into force.
- In 2004 Headquarters of Muslim Communities, which is an umbrella organization for Muslims living in the Czech Republic, was found.
- The European Migration crisis (2015) has brought dramatic deterioration in public opinion about Islam.

The only common milestone is therefore represented by the European Migration crisis that pushed for need of creation of a new project (Community building) on one hand, and on the other, it has negatively influenced activities of the Mosque in communication out of their own community.

The following table provides important milestones having an impact on the community development in relation to migrants and refugees in Brno region as well as in the Czech Republic.

Table 7.2 Milestones influencing community development in relation to migrants and refugees in Brno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Czech Republic joining the European Union: shift from unsystematic activities of TSOs to systematic submission of projects following certain KPIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A call for grant proposals within Operational Programme Education for Competitiveness (2007-2013) sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports: representing important financial source of several university projects working with migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The European Migration Crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The change of the attitude of the political representation about the topic related to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
migrants and refugees towards integration.

| 2016 | The Brno City Municipality supports the integration of migrants and refugees aiming to create new projects in cooperation with TSOs (community projects) and universities (research projects). |

Stage of the innovation

In the following table, we assess the stage of the innovation for Nesehnutí and Islamic Foundation according to modified model of Murray et al. (2010).

**Table 7.3 Process tracing matrix for assessing progress on the development of social innovation by the Czech initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergence</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
<th>Local impact</th>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Systemic impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nesehnutí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stage of the innovation of Nesehnutí, beginning with the Multicultural tea parties and continuing by recently established initiative Community building, could be assessed as “sustaining”. The project Community Building itself exists due to voluntary work of two initiators, who are gathering funding from other projects of the organization and seeking other financial resources, to keep the project alive. In order to promote the project, the initiators are seeking for cooperation with other actors, such as local government, or other local TSOs in order to render complex assistance to migrants and refugees in Brno. The idea of community building is therefore sustaining, yet needs to be more stabilized and known to reach the next level of the social innovation process.

The Islamic Foundation, which is responsible for the Mosque initiative (established back in 1998) is involved in the innovation on the “local impact” stage. First, the initiative has an effect on the involved staff and volunteers in terms of empowerment, feeling of responsibility, participation and contribution to the community. Second, it has significant impact on migrants and refugees, since they are given the possibility to become members of already established local community, they can build new relations and obtain even material aid if needed. But also the citizens of Brno can benefit from the Mosque initiative in order to learn about different cultures. We can say that at this stage, the initiative does not spread beyond the local level (scaling stage), but has strong local impact.
7.5. Organizational features

Refugees’ influence on policy

In case of Multicultural tea parties project, the coordinators intended to involve the members of the women’s group into the organization of the initiative. But the effort was not successful.

Regarding Community building initiative, the coordinators have tried to involve the greatest number of members of the community into the decision-making about future direction of activities as well as into organizing them. Until now, all activities have been co-organized by foreigners, however, only one refugee was engaged. Higher level of participation of refugees is welcomed, nevertheless is dependent on their willingness and availability.

No special status is assigned to refugees in the Mosque. Their engagement is welcomed as well as involvement of any other believer. The same applies to coordination and decision-making processes, since the responsibility for decisions is borne by those, who run the concrete activity.

Value sets

Nesehnutí NGO is largely based on values that can be defined as left-liberal in the context of political spectrum. As an NGO oriented towards social and environmental issues, the organization is convinced that environmental and social problems have common causes as well as effects and they should be solved with this in regard. The goal of the organization is to show that the change of the society, based on respect towards people, animals and nature is possible and have to arise primarily from the bottom. Nesehnutí supports committed people who consider responsibility for the life on the Earth to be integral part of their freedom. The organization works independently on political and economic interests and by nonviolent means only.

The Multicultural tea parties project was created in order to provide aid to refugees, meanwhile Community building arises from broadly defined values, such as tolerance of diversity, equality, social equity etc.

Values connected to Islam are those important to the Islamic foundation and the Mosque. In context of community life, the principle of solidarity with those in need is particularly essential.

As manager of the Mosque notes (Interviewee 3, 2016), the main values are the religious ones, religion and mutual aid, especially aid to those in need. Generally, representatives of the Mosque consider the refugees as being often in a very socially disadvantaged position, and in a need of support in order to become autonomous.

The Mosque also attempts to create good relations with the Czech public, however, in last two years their efforts in this field have been fading, in reaction to increase of adverse public opinion about Islam in the Czech society. Even in the past, these efforts were not strongly proactive, but the representatives of the initiative have always been opened to cooperation, giving interviews, explaining topic about Islam (e.g. the representative of the Islamic foundation cooperates on Amnesty International Living Library project, focused on preventing discrimination, racism, xenophobia and extremism, where students can borrow living people instead of books). In past, they were also giving tours in Mosque.
I think that mainly in past years the Mosque exerted strong effort to address the majority. They used to offer guided tours to elementary and high school students and such. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Values of Nesehnutí as well as of the Islamic foundation are published on websites of both organizations (see Islámská nadace v Brně, 2008; Nesehnutí, 2016).

**Governance structure**

The structure of Nesehnutí NGO (which has a legal status of civic association) is clearly horizontal. The organization runs 4 independent programmes, which are focused on different topics. Each programme has its own coordinator. There are also held mandatory meetings, where issues associated with management and processes are discussed. The organizational culture seems to be very highly opened. That can be demonstrated by the Community building project, where the foreigners are invited to cooperate on current activities or even create their own.

The Islamic foundation started to develop in 1990s from below by the effort of young Muslim students. Since then it went through several stages of formalization and institutionalization. The organizational structure consists of the chairman of the Headquarters of Muslim localities and 5 other members who participate in running the mosque and organizing various events. All of them are volunteers. The organization does not have a proclamative horizontal structure. Since the organization is run on voluntary basis, everyone who is engaged into its activities has a right to decide and that is in direct proportion to the level of his/her involvement. The level of openness of organizational culture is low.

**Volunteers and staff**

The team of founders of Multicultural tea parties consisted of 1 coordinator and 2 volunteers/employees. The members of team were paid only if there was a project that could be used for their funding. When there was no project, they were working on the project for free. Later 10 volunteers in total joined the project.

The Community building initiative is run only on voluntary basis. There are 2 coordinators (volunteers) and additionally 10 to 15 volunteers (Czechs as well as foreigners), participating in the project.

The Mosque is represented by one employee, imam, while other members work on voluntary basis. There are approximately 5 members, who are in charge of running the mosque. The number of volunteers participating on remedial classes varies.

**Resource diversity**

At the beginning the project Multicultural tea parties was financed from the EU programme Youth in Action (2011), but only in terms of reimbursement of material. In spite of the fact, that the coordinator was receiving a salary, her income was financed from other projects. Therefore, she runs Multicultural tea parties in her free time. In 2012 the project became a part of festival Skamasi, and was funded from its budget. In following years, the project was financed by the resources from previous projects. Salaries of coordinators, which depended on other projects (funded by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, or EU programmes), were sometimes paid to them, sometimes not, according to availability of funding.
Community building initiative is not explicitly tied to any form of grants. Finances are provided from other financial resources that are gathered by the coordinators from other projects of Nesehnutí, such as multicultural workshops organized at schools and funded by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, or from their other employments out of the organization. There might be grants provided by the Ministry of Interior, however, Nesehnutí has a strict code of ethics, which forbids to receive funds from the Ministry of Interior and other organizations that in some respect behave unethically.

The income of the Mosque consists mainly of donations, which is actually the cause of lack of finance. Because it has been always crucial for the Mosque to be independent from bigger religious organizations as well as from governments, donations have been accepted only if the loyalty is not expected in exchange. However, this philosophy is the reason that keeps the Mosque in insolvency.

Members of the organization might like to bring new activities, but since everything works on voluntary basis, they are able to cover only the necessary services. The possibility of funding from grants was also considered, however, there is no one with capacity and knowledge of the application process and the organization cannot afford to pay to someone, who would be able to apply for a grant.

7.6. Relations in the field

Local and regional government

At the Department of Social Services of Brno City Municipality there is a position of advisor on national minorities, whose responsibility is to observe communities and network with individual actors in the field of integration. Especially after creating a new coalition in the local government, where activist movement Žít Brno got mandates at the respective department, the advisor has been more active. He is given more authority, organizes roundtables and giving speeches, is actively involved into integration policies and also implements a project of community workers. He is also very opened to support innovations in this field.

All the recently increased activity of the department is linked to the Migration crisis that brought immigrants’ and refugees’ integration as an important topic to be dealt with. Moreover, the team of the advisor was joined by a new team member, a former employee of Nesehnutí NGO, who therefore has contacts in the nonprofit sector and also inclines to new and innovative solutions not so typical for government.

Before hiring the new team member from Nesehnutí, Brno City Municipality did not pay much attention to Multicultural tea parties project, nevertheless, due to connections of the new employee, Community building initiative has been already known. Currently, the new employee is involved in writing project proposals that would enable relevant NGOs such as Nesehnutí to cooperate. Moreover, the city municipality is interested in developing the Community building project under its auspices in the future.

In 2016 the position of advisor on refugees and foreigners was established under the Brno City Municipality.
On the other hand, the relation between Brno City Municipality and the Mosque is undefined. In past, there were efforts to cooperate on both sides. The representatives of the Mosque were invited to Council for National Minorities. However, the cooperation has never been realized.

There was a time when we were trying it [the cooperation with the Mosque] from position of the local government, through the Council for National Minorities. The Municipality wanted to establish strong cooperation with the Mosque, but it faded away. Not that it would be dead, but it was put asleep. There was a concern on the side of the Mosque representative that it would require more frequent media appearance and he was afraid of negative reactions of mainstream society. During the first half of 2015 we used to invite him to our meetings, where we were discussing the cooperation. The local government has to be careful, because it should not interfere with religion, therefore it would have to be informal. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Other third sector organizations

In case of Multicultural tea parties project and Community building initiative, third sector organizations providing social and legal counselling could work as a network, which would connect their clients to these projects. Unfortunately, the staff of these organizations is rather sceptical and not motivated, since they do not believe in sustainability of such projects.

There were more such projects, well none of them had developed into more systematic and sustainable activity, and that is why the other organizations do not consider the cooperation with us as relevant. (Interviewee 1, 2016)

Moreover, the environment is quite competitive and directing a client to another NGO often means losing him/her, because the client starts to use services of other organization. That of course has negative impact on funds of the first organization, since these are received on number of clients’ basis. There is also possibility that these organizations simply do not consider innovations to be important, they have neither funds nor capacity to think in a new perspective, and moreover, they are not interested because they have enough problems to keep existing services alive.

The Islamic Foundation mostly does not communicate with other third sector organizations. However, the Mosque initiative is identical in its staff to the Headquarters of Muslim Communities, which is an umbrella organization for other Muslim communities in the Czech Republic. Interestingly, even though the religious affiliation of Muslims from the Mosque is Sunni, Shias were practicing their religion in the mosque as well, before they built their own mosque. The Mosque is therefore seen as a neutral and inclusive space.

Relations to companies

Companies in the Czech Republic are usually not involved in this topic. The relations of companies and for example the Mosque exist only in terms of donations from private donors, who are members of the mosque.

The commercial influences do not penetrate the area that much. It is very unattractive topic. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Personally, I would welcome higher activity from companies towards NNO, in the sense of CSR. Let’s leave the motivation aside, but I would like to see significantly bigger financial support from corporations, the support of the third sector. Rather than creating something by themselves, they can support existing projects in NNO. During the trip to Poland I realized that our NNO sector is very
developed, but the question of money is apparent. I would welcome the support from corporations. It could be also positive for them in terms of PR. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

**Structural platforms or committees**

Platforms are developed on the level of Brno City Municipality. The Department of Social Services organizes meetings about community planning and within the strategy of Coordinated approach to dealing with socially excluded localities a new working group was established. These platforms are already starting to show good results also due to participation of NGOs. Moreover, round tables are organized by Brno City Municipality as well.

The most active actor should be The South Moravian Regional Centre for the Support the Integration of Foreigners, which is an umbrella organization for foreigners’ integration in the region. The Centre should be a platform, where key actors meet, discuss, create and coordinate their plans. Nevertheless, meetings that are held only once a year, have rather formal character and the participation of NGOs is motivated by obtaining financial sources, since the centre has access to funding from the Ministry of Interior.

The representatives of Community building initiative participate in aforementioned meetings organized by Brno City Municipality. The Mosque is not taking part in any of mentioned platforms, however, it is involved in Headquarters of Muslim Communities that shares the same representatives.

At the national level, Consortium of Migrants Assisting Organizations in the Czech Republic is a platform that provides advocacy (for example it continues in campaign of Nesehnutí for change the conditions of health insurance for foreigners).

**Purpose of relations**

Nesehnutí is connected and cooperates with many Czech and foreigner organizations, who share the same view and opinion on nature and solutions of problems of the society, e.g. often collaborates with European organizations on grant applications. Additionally, Community building initiative aim for networking and cooperation with other actors, because the field of the work with foreigners in Brno is very small and there are only a few clients. Therefore, it is beneficial to be well informed and to render each other assistance.

Formally, the Mosque does not cooperate with any other organization but other Muslim communities. Informally, however, the members of the Mosque are connected to human rights organizations (e.g. Amnesty International or Be International). The initiative does not seek active collaboration, even though would be opened to it, since there is an effort to have good relations with the public.

**Context of relations**

In case of Community building there is strong financial pressure that hinders more intensive development of the initiative.

As far as the Mosque is concerned, there is strong social pressure directed against foreigners, mostly Muslims.
Currently the Mosque is under strong pressure, the development is mostly dropped behind. The atmosphere is rather hopeless and helpless. What could help in terms of public opinion, if the pressure is so big? (Interviewee 3 - Mosque, 2016)

Embeddedness in the neighborhood

There are no specific districts in the city that could be depicted as areas with high accumulation of refugees and immigrants per se. In case of analysed initiatives the location does not represent an important factor, since these are neither focused on a certain neighbourhood nor embedded in any, in terms of location.

Impact and obstacles

Impact

In general, all selected initiatives have achieved establishing contacts between members of communities, mutual aid and social exchange. From these, the most important benefit is seen in establishing particular relations, through these relations recognizing institutions, which could provide an aid, getting familiar with the environment, developing relations outside migrant’s family or ethnic community and access to recourses.

The Mosque has significant impact on the development of the Muslim community. Besides spiritual base it also provides some kind of psychological asylum, where to be a Muslim is natural and it is not reason to be blamed (by contrast with the mainstream society). Moreover, it provides a space where people can meet, where mutual relations, relationships and fellow feelings are created. The representation of Muslims in media and public spaces as well as combating prejudices are also very important. The tangible outcomes of the initiatives are represented by the mosque itself, by recognition of Islam as a religion in 2002, or by establishing the Headquarters of Muslim Communities in 2004.

Results for refugees

On Multicultural tea parties project:

I think, that it was not quantity, but quality. It had rather small impact, but on the level of quality of relationships. Rather fewer women, supported, networked in smaller group, but really well I think. Not that we would want to superficially reach many. That is impossible when it is about personal contact. I think that from public point of view it did not have a big impact, however, it had impact rather for the women and the volunteers. (Interviewee 1 - Nesehnuti, 2016)

The impact of the Community building initiative can be recognized in socialization and establishing relations of immigrants with other migrants and people from local community. These relations are important in the society and can help during the process of integration, allowing to gain new competencies and support migrants’ activities, while ensuring that a social network exists.

The impact of the Mosque initiative on migrants and refugees is significant. They have possibility to be part of a community since their arrival to Brno. They can meet people, create social network and build new relations as well as obtain and exchange resources resulting from these relations.

Results for volunteers
Multicultural tea parties and Community building projects have brought to volunteers a feeling of empowerment in area of refugees’ integration, contrary to powerlessness and frustration from the attitude of government. They also appreciate to spend their free time usefully and enjoy cognition of new cultures and languages.

The Mosque initiative pulled volunteers into many activities within the community, which they would never experience otherwise. Some of them were positive, some negative. The added value could be recognized in aspects such as gaining specific experiences, feeling of doing something useful, feeling of responsibility and possibility to participate in and significantly contribute to the community. The voluntary work represents a certain attitude towards their life and their community. Equally important for the members of the initiative is the possibility to organize meetings of the community, since that was not possible back in Syria due to its regime.

**Results for the community**

Multicultural tea parties and Community building projects are important for the community, because they represent a meeting point for foreigners and locals, where both sides can break down prejudices, getting to know each other and create amicable relations. And that, ultimately, is the base of a multicultural society.

The Mosque aims at educating the public about Islam and creating positive relations:

> I think that mostly in the past years the Mosque was demonstrating huge effort to address the majority. Guided tours to elementary and high school students were offered, between others. (Interviewee 6 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Complications accompanying these initiatives are represented by financial stringency and low financial stability, staffing shortage, absence of higher support from the government, sometimes low motivation of members of a community, lack of foreigners and finally lack of interest of the Czech society. Because the participatory approach is rather new in the Czech environment, it is probable there is present lack of knowledge and experience with means of community support in order to encourage the members of the community to get engaged.

> I think that the system support of innovations is hampering it. That support and openness to change does not exist here. (Interviewee 4 - Brno City Municipality, 2016)

Moreover, the Mosque is massively pressed by adverse public opinion about Islam. Suspicion of the western society about the religion appeared in 2001, however, it has been significantly strengthened since the beginning of the European Migration crisis in 2015.

8. **Country comparison and synthesis**

In this final chapter, we attempt to look for commonalities and differences between the four cases. We follow the same structure as in the case chapters. This chapter may also be read as a conclusions and discussion chapter: there are five sections, corresponding to the research questions that we introduced in chapter 1.

8.1. **Self-organized community development with refugees as innovation?**

On the basis of our preliminary investigation, we concluded that self-organization is one of the most important innovations with respect to community development and refugees. Our first
research question was: *How can ‘self-organized community development with refugees’ be understood in the context of the aforementioned cities? What are its characteristics?* After doing fieldwork in four countries, we have to challenge this idea in several ways.

**Community development with refugees not a prime issue in all countries**

As we already highlighted in the introductory chapter, we incorrectly assumed that ‘community development and refugees’ is a relevant issue in all countries. Particularly given the increasing numbers of new arrivals of the past years, refugee-related projects often focused on basic needs first. There are deeper reasons than this though. Take Italy, where initial interviews with experts quickly brought forward that refugees generally regard Italy as a transit country, as a result of which community development is not a strong need. As said, we decided to use Italy as a counter case for this reason. The central station Migrants Hub is rather an innovation in transit management, than in community development. Similarly, with the Czech Republic making the transition from being a transit to a destination country, community development with refugees still seems to be in its early stages. ‘I cannot tell how it works here as we are still in the beginning and I cannot evaluate it’, says one respondent. This makes it hard to pinpoint innovation *within* this domain, even though there are signals that the communities themselves are involved more in the work. Innovation is thought to stem from activists and civil society, rather than from government.

**Many ways of developing communities**

Given the substantial differences between existing definitions of community development (section 1.2), we decided to work with a ‘minimal definition’: local activities to establish and strengthen durable relations between refugees and members of the host society, allowing for processes of shared decision-making. This would serve as some sort of a common ground. At the same time, we strived to refine the specific dimensions of community development with refugees in the local contexts that we studies.

Indeed, it seems that community development may refer to different things in specific local contexts, or even for specific organizations. We list a few ‘strategies’ that we recognized in multiple countries. We do not mean to suggest that this is a definitive list in any way. However, we believe it is useful to consider the different potential meanings to the term. Across countries, we encountered the following.

First, an initiative, project or organization might *form new social groups*. I.e. community development really refers to building a community ‘from scratch’, notwithstanding the idea that its members may also belong to other, existing communities. This may refer to refugee self-organizations, but also to fixed venues in which a more or less consistent mix of refugees and members of the host society convenes on a regular basis (sometimes on a daily basis, sometimes less frequent).

A second strategy is to form *networks around individual refugees*. They often lack a good perspective towards the future in the country to which they migrated. Strong networks can help.

Third, community development may apply to the *establishing interfaces between different groups, organizations or communities*. Some projects establish connections between grassroots initiatives, link refugees to other relevant organizations, or create an interface between local
organizations that do not primarily work with refugees. Even though the Italian case did not focus on ‘establishing and strengthening durable relations between refugees and members of the host society’, the Migrants Hub certainly is a good example of a project that established interfaces between organizations that would have ordinarily not collaborated.

Fourth, a number of projects work in or with existing communities, referring either to communities of refugees or asylum seekers, or to ‘local communities’ in a neighborhood or village. This differs from the previous category, in the sense that it focuses less on interfaces between organizations.

For a fifth type, community development is not a direct aim, but rather a side-effect. Many projects focusing on basic services for refugees, result in community integration by establishing connections with between refugees and volunteers from the host society, for instance.

**Many degrees of self-organization**

In this report, we took self-organization to refer to both ‘refugee self-organizations’ and to ‘grassroots initiatives of members of the host society for or with refugees’. They both describe bottom-up forms of collective action: a group of people pursuing a public goal, ideally with a high degree of self-organization and self-determination, in the sense of being independent from government or market pressures (Bakker et al., 2012). We established from the beginning that such a description is an ideal type. Next to ‘ideal typical examples’, we were also interested in initiatives, projects or organizations with a ‘degree of self-organization’, such as independent refugee groups operating in the context of a professional organization, initiatives that refugees and members of the host society take together, citizen initiatives that partly fulfill a task for which they receive governmental subsidy, etc.

In the end, we found a number of aspects in the cases that we studied that may be related to self-organization. First, we indeed found ideal-typical refugee self-organizations and grassroots initiatives by members of the host societies. Some of these grassroots initiatives stress that they try to organize their activities with refugees, rather than for them. Next to that, we found examples – in Utrecht and Birmingham – of organizations in which refugees are involved as co-founders or co-governors. This might be described as ‘co-productions’ of refugees and members of the host society. Other examples involved projects to connect refugees to grassroots initiatives by members of the host society (e.g. Pharos in the Netherlands that, amongst other activities, facilitates volunteering by refugees in local citizens’ initiatives). A last type that seemed relevant, applies to cases in which established organizations facilitate or promote self-organization.

Also in Milan, we found examples of self-organization, even if the target is not to foster community development, in the sense of ‘establishing and strengthening durable relations between refugees and members of the host society’. As the Italian chapter reports: ‘people made their garages available, their shops, their private spaces’. This suggests the broader applicability of the notion of self-organization and bottom-up development.

**Communities and networking generally important**

Taking a step back from self-organization, we can argue that communities were formed and maintained in all four cities, no matter whether this happened in an innovative manner or not.
Formal community organizing entities often do not play a central role; initiatives rather stem from the (informal) third sector. Both in Birmingham and Brno, there are efforts to arrange meetings between refugees and other residents. One organization in Birmingham makes an effort to not let refugees ‘disappear’ from the community. In Milan, we might argue that an active community of organizations and individuals formed around the central station Hub.

8.2. Tracing the process of the social innovation stream

Our second research question was: How did this innovation stream emerge over time, in the local context? We have attempted to answer this question at both the local level, tracing the history of a set of local organizations, and at the national level, taking a broader perspective at relevant policies and trends influencing the emergence of the stream.

Organizations often aim at local impact, rather than systemic change

Models tracing the development of social innovation over time often take ‘systemic impact’ to be the stage that is finally strived after (e.g. Murray et al., 2010). Other authors stress, by contrast, that social innovations are particularly relevant in a local context (e.g. Moulaert et al., 2010). While this study shows examples of local organizations and of organizations with a national reach (table 8.1), the point to stress here seems to be that local impact is a very relevant and viable aim in an innovation process.

Table 8.1 Number of organizations per stage of the innovation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Nr. of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic impact</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations in the stage of ‘emergence’ have typically only recently developed a proposal describing their future activities. They are likely to develop further, perhaps even in a rapid pace. Organizations sustaining their ideas are either one step further, attempting to formalize their initiative (Nesehnulti, Brno), or are struggling to keep the operation afloat due to funding constraints (Lifeline Options, UK). Organizations reaching local impact are generally well-established at the local level, and often do not intend to expand their scope. Organizations ‘scaling’ their work obviously do expand, but are not established to such a degree that they have achieved systemic impact yet. Organizations that have impact at the national level are often well-established organizations, but they may also be local organizations that serve as an example for developments at the national level.

Innovation stream developed further in ‘destination countries’

It is very hard to draw a general conclusion about the stage of the innovation stream ‘self-organized community development with refugees’ as a whole. Considering the varying meanings of ‘community development’ and ‘degrees of self-organization’ at the local level, any generalized statement would probably fall short. The value of this study has rather been to show the variance and experiences in all these contexts. Generally, we can say that the stream is developed further in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom than in Italy and the Czech
Republic. This is largely due to the notion that the former two countries have a longer history of being ‘destination countries’ than the latter two.

**Policy context crucial in understand self-organized activities**

All country chapters sketch out a very differentiated set of relevant milestones. This is partly related to the relatively open and exploratory nature of this study, but it gives insights in the functioning of a particular national system nonetheless. Policy developments in the Dutch case show an increasingly restrictive system, accompanied with major budget cuts. The same applies to the United Kingdom; while developments at the beginning of the 21st century still stressed the importance of notions like ‘community cohesion’ and ‘working to rebuild lives’, the past decade is characterized rather by austerity. The Czech case is different again, considering the importance of the country’s EU-accession in 2004. This creates a national situation that is rather different from the Dutch and British background. Also there, however, just like in Italy, does restrictive policy play an important role.

**Big differences in the presence of a ‘refugee infrastructure’**

Despite the obvious importance of the refugee situation of the past couple of years, all cities have projects that stem from organizations with a longer history. In all four cities, there are organizations that work with migrants or with ethnic or other minorities, but neither in Milan, nor in Brno did we find organizations that primarily focus on refugees. The Utrecht and Birmingham cases can build on a history of such organizations. Still, in Birmingham, the awareness that a ‘refugee infrastructure’ was lacking a decade ago, was a prime driver for local organizations.

**Recent growth of new arrivals as a milestone**

Another major milestone that all cases share is the sudden peak of new arrivals of the past couple of years. In Italy, this was already very noticeable in 2013, while the other countries mainly experienced a peak in 2015. That is not to say that this ‘refugee crisis’ is the prime driver for the innovation that we studied, again, with the possible exception of the Milan case. There are many examples of self-organized community development that arose before this period already. On the one hand, the rise in numbers led to a greater pressure on the system. On the other hand, the awareness that ‘something needed to be done’ also created opportunities. Many new projects and initiatives started around 2015.

**8.3. Organizational characteristics**

As said in the introduction to this report (chapter 1), this study is part of a broader effort to investigate the claim that third sector organizations are more likely to be involved in social innovation than governments or commercial firms. This investigation involves an inquiry of a number of organizational characteristics of third sector organizations. Our third research question was: What are the features of the organizations or entities that push this innovation stream? In this section, we provide concluding remarks for these characteristics. They are connected to a set of hypotheses (see Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, & Mildenberger, 2014), which form the content of a later ITSSOIN publication. In order to facilitate this future publication, the hypothesis numbers are included in brackets when discussing a particular characteristic. They have no further bearing on the contents of this report.
The findings reported here need to be considered exploratory. Some dimensions were discussed more than others in interviews. Moreover, the notion that certain statements were made by informants in one country, does not mean that they are unique to that country. Nevertheless, they give some insights in the variation of characteristics of third sector organizations.

**Social needs orientation (H 1.1)**

Considering that most of the organizations that we have interviewed are self-organizations, or work with or for refugees, their high social needs orientation is fairly self-evident. We might distinguish organizations that have only temporarily joined into to provide refugee support, while generally working in different domains. This is clearly the most prevalent in the Italian case. For example, the companies that provided funding for the Migrants Hub might be said to have a weaker social needs orientation. Then again, their hands-on involvement is relatively limited.

**Organizational value sets (H 1.2)**

All organizations that we interviewed base their work on particular value sets. We did not set out with a predefined list of values, to hold a survey in which all informants could mark the values they subscribe to. Rather, we took note of the values that informants noted themselves. Obviously, given that most of these organizations work with refugees, a number of values reoccurred across the different country-cases, such as trust, tolerance or respect for diversity, hospitality, etc.

Some organizations noted values that are specific to their orientation, such as the Christian values of St. Chad’s sanctuary in Birmingham. Nesehnutí, primarily an organization for social and environmental issues in Brno, focuses on a ‘responsibility for life on Earth’, and works on the premise that environmental and social problems have common root causes.

Other value sets are likely to be related to the city-case, rather than to the organization. In the Utrecht case, for instance, there was a strong emphasis on a human rights discourse, with references like a ‘right to develop’ and a ‘right to housing’. This is perhaps not coincidental, given Utrecht’s human rights city agenda. For the Milan case, by contrast, the most relevant values-related feature seems to be that the consortium behind the Migrants Hub decided to support refugees, *in spite of* differing organizational values. Some regarded the support of migrants as a value in its own right, while others were more likely to stress the safety of the central station.

**Internal organizational culture (H 1.3)**

Given that these organizations are generally small in terms of the number of staff, organizational openness is mostly high. An exception is the Brno Mosque, which is considered to have low organizational openness. Other than that, organizational cultures are sometimes described as ‘flat’, as open to the influence of volunteers or people with a refugee background, etc.

The focus on self-organization should not be taken to imply that all the initiatives we have studied are informal groups. Most of the organizations and initiatives presented in this report have formed some sort of legal entity. Most Dutch and Czech cases are foundations, most
British ones are registered charities. The Italian case is somewhat more complicated, given the vast number or players from different sectors. Many initiatives started as informal groups, but underwent a degree of formalization by applying for subsidy, or a legal status. This seems to be a rather common pattern in the third sector.

**External organizational openness (H 1.4)**

Especially in Utrecht and Birmingham, the initiatives and organizations work in an extensive field of third sector organizations, consisting of both vested organizations and self-organized, sometimes informal citizens- and refugee groups. The practice of referring people to services of colleague-organizations holds for both Utrecht and Birmingham. The situation is not that all relevant organizations cooperate with everyone in the refugee sector, but organizations are acquainted with each other and are often part of loose local networks and platforms both aimed at service delivery and advocacy. The Migrants Hub in Milan is Common aims and target groups encourage contacts and working relations. Brno respondents also pointed at the barriers of cooperation by redirecting people to services of others: competitiveness and the fear of losing funds through losing a client.

**Transaction costs in detecting societal challenges and know-how (H 1.5)**

This indicator was not consistently inquired in all four cities, only in the United Kingdom. One organization reported high transaction costs in the legal aid area, another argued to attempt to reduce transaction costs by increasing transparency in the network.

**Embeddedness in social/local context (H 1.6)**

In all four cities, the neighborhood was not the prime support base for the innovative initiatives and projects studied. However, in Utrecht and Milan the proximity and sometimes visibility of locations where emergency shelters were set up, did encourage citizens and entrepreneurs from the neighborhood to provide support. In a new project coordinated by the municipality of Utrecht, embeddedness in the neighborhood was explicitly sought.

**Resource diversity (H 1.7)**

Even though most organizations or projects report on receiving some form of funding, funding is often an issue, and a very serious one in some cases. Particularly funding from the national government diminished; many organizations are dependent on local or European subsidies, or on private foundations or donations. Most organizations or initiatives have a very limited number of paid staff, often only one or two. Their work mainly relies on volunteers, ranging from a few to a few hundred. Research shows that some paid staff is important for third sector organizations, also with respect to innovation (Osborne, Chew, & McLaughlin, 2008).

The situation seems particularly pressing in the British case, with the extreme example of the director of one of the interviewed organizations dissolving his pension fund to keep his operation afloat. Due to budgetary (time) constraints, many organizations had to decline the invitation to take part in this study. Also in other countries, however, austerity measures were often mentioned. In the Netherlands, repeated cuts in budget of the reception authority were mentioned as an explanation for the rise in third sector activity. In Italy, the lack of funding from the national government, and the reliance on third sector and commercial sector funds, was deemed 'completely new'. Also many professionals, including medical staff, worked
without pay. The same applies to the Brno and Birmingham. Some projects could only be done by drawing on funding for other projects within the organizations.

This strenuous funding situation raises a fundamental question: should we regard the third sector's effort as an innovation, or as substitution? The fact that third sector organizations perform all sorts of tasks that were previously carried out, or funded by governments, might be novel, but is it desirable? Certainly, many respondents argued for the latter. The only upside that they reported is that independence from public funding implies a degree of freedom in pursuing the organization's goals.

**The role of voluntary engagement (H 1.8)**

The roles of volunteers vary widely, but we might generally conclude that they are indispensable in most organizations. Quite often, particularly in the British case, this is voiced quite strongly: volunteers are often needed to cope with limited budgets. With the exception of the Italian case, in which some organizations only participated by offering funding, most organizations largely depend on the work of volunteers. Many organizations seem to employ around 15 volunteer, even though there are also examples that have only two, or a few hundred.

In all four cities, we have found examples of groups or projects, in which all members are volunteers. Sometimes they operate within the framework of an organization with paid staff, but there are also instance of fully informal initiatives.

In organizations with a (slightly) more formal structure, volunteers can have many different roles. Some have volunteers as managers or coordinators, in others they are involved in the delivery of basic services, and in some instances they are recruited for particular skills (e.g. language, IT). Professionals, such as pediatricians in Milan, are also known to offer their assistance on a voluntary basis. In the Utrecht and Birmingham cases, we also heard examples of organizations that actively promoted volunteer participation in decision-making.

The Dutch and British cases also show examples of refugees in the role of volunteer. In the Utrecht context, this adds up to the idea of organizations as 'co-productions' of volunteers and members of the host society. This also adds up to the broader discourse of 'activating' refugees as soon as they enter the country. One of the projects specifically targeted refugees to become volunteers. In the Birmingham case, refugees were particularly reported to be important in terms of establishing connections to diasporas, or of discovering needs that other volunteers may have missed. We did not find such examples in the Italian and Czech cases, but also there, we found volunteers with a particular ethnic or religious background.

'Unengaged' forms of volunteering (H 1.9)

This indicator was not addressed directly. Only in the Dutch case did some informants stress the benefits of working with relatively 'unengaged' volunteers, but mainly because they are easier to attract. This also works well for refugees as volunteers, as they are often not ready to commit for a longer term.

**Linkage between advocacy work and service provision (H 1.10)**

Even though we found examples of organizations engaged in advocacy in all four cities, the general conclusion is that they are more focused on service delivery. We might suggest two
views on the linkage between advocacy and service delivery. The first seems to be slightly more dominant: a number of organizations we interviewed seem cautious about direct involvement in advocacy work. Villa Vrede in Utrecht works with undocumented migrants, but does campaigning through a network of other organizations that focus on the right to volunteer. Also in the British case, organizations stated to do advocacy through indirect channels, such as the City of sanctuary or RAA. In the Czech case, lobby work happens mainly through a network of NGOs at the national level.

The second view on the linkage to service delivery was only voiced spontaneously in the Birmingham case. A number of organizations stated that the two are interlinked. Advocacy can help to make service providers aware of the situation in which refugees find themselves, it can help to change the conditions for service delivery, and it can help to identify needs.

**Independence from external pressures (H 1.11)**

Independence is a difficult notion in this context. To a large degree, the work of many of the organizations we have studied is particularly a reaction to external pressures. Apart from that, there are many external pressures that have a direct influence on the organizations’ work. Stringent immigration policies on the national and regional level mean sober budgeting of time and resources for official services, as was reported in most of the countries in this study. Many organizations experienced a lack of financial means for projects and initiatives. This was experienced in all cities. As said, this seemed most pressing in the United Kingdom, where vested national organizations and local organizations faced severe budget cuts due to austerity measures. The hectic situation and lack of manpower complicates cooperation in the third sector, and hinders the integration of volunteer support and citizens’ initiatives in official services.

Informants in Birmingham reported about the difficulties of working in a climate with negative public opinion about immigrants or Islam. In Utrecht, a few informants reported that those who are ‘pro-refugees’ do not often encounter those who protest against new refugee shelters in the cities. Criticism in the neighborhood encouraged the local government to develop a new approach to shelter aimed at providing better services to both refugees and inhabitants of the neighborhood.

8.4. Embeddedness in the larger field

Our fourth research question was: *What relations do these entities establish within their local contexts?*

**The local government is supportive and seeks cooperation with the third sector**

In the four cities, the local governments generally stand out as pragmatic, as they aim at solving urgent humanitarian problems that occur around the influx of refugees in the city, and they seek to do that in interaction with the third sector. The local governments are supportive of the innovative initiatives, projects or organizations represented in the country-studies, although the level of support and the amount of energy and resources put into the field varies across cities and countries. In Utrecht and Milan, some of the initiatives receive funds from the local government. Whereas initiatives and organizations in Utrecht have easy access to the local government, and the government facilitates coordination of third sector- and governmental activities for refugees, respondents also see that more could be done to facilitate participation of refugees. In Milan, the local government funded a local third sector
organization to coordinate the Central Station Hub (which was seen as a novelty in itself), but respondents also criticized the local government for a lack of vision for sustainable long term solutions. In Birmingham, the mayor and city council supported the idea of making Birmingham a 'City of Sanctuary', but this support was merely symbolic [check this! Lack of municipal budget to invest in social innovative initiatives of the third sector ?]. The municipality of Brno is underway in developing a more active role in community integration of refugees. Brno relatively recently employed staff in its organization to work on community planning and the integration of national minorities, and the municipality organizes platform meetings and round tables with the third sector.

**Companies are not dominant in ‘self-organized community development with refugees’**

In Utrecht, partnerships and cooperation with companies is sought in specific projects. In Italy, companies were more visible to step in to relieve the humanitarian situation at the central station Hub.

**Conflicting levels of governance**

Both in Utrecht, Milan and Birmingham, stringent immigration policies of regional and national governments conflicted with pragmatic approaches and choices of local governments. Utrecht called its local policy on housing and supporting various groups of refugees and undocumented migrants 'rebellious' as compared to the national policy. Also the City of Sanctuary Movement in the United Kingdom aims to distance municipalities adhering to humanitarian principles from the more stringent national principles.

**8.5. Impact of the innovation**

Our fifth, and final research question was: What impact have the innovation activities that constitute the innovation stream had on beneficiaries and actors involved (e.g. influence on decision-making and relations between refugees and members of the host societies)?

**Satisfying needs of refugees by providing services that were non-existent**

In all cities, the organizations, projects, and initiatives succeeded in satisfying needs by providing services that were non-existent beforehand. Enhanced capabilities and well-being of refugees is seen as a stepping stone for community development with refugees.

Refugees obtained essential basic services in the Hub in Milan, but in the other cities, the services delivered in the social innovation stream were (also) aimed at enhancing capabilities and meeting others, activation, and participation. The impact of these activities was confirmed by the respondents in the cities, as they reported improved capacities and well-being, friendships and enlarged personal networks, which all adds to local community development with refugees.

---

Volunteers gain experiences, knowledge and a feeling of fulfilment

Volunteers working in the social innovative projects and initiatives reported that they gained experiences, which enhanced their knowledge and capabilities. Furthermore, people enjoy helping others and feel satisfaction.

Cross-cutting dialogues in the local community

In all cities, the initiatives led to contacts in the local community, which also spanned diverse groups in society. Examples are the exchange of knowledge and dialogue in Milan, or conversations between people from different groups in the city during the collecting and sorting of clothes for refugees in Utrecht.
9. Appendix

9.1. Appendix A: common topic lists

9.1.1. Topic list for those involved in innovations

Introduction

The objective of this study is to research new initiatives that target community development with refugees by means of self-organization. By refugees, we refer to asylum seekers, status holders and refused or undocumented asylum seekers. By self-organization, we refer to voluntary actions by refugees or inhabitants of the area (that target community development).

1. Name of the organization?
2. Objectives of organization / initiative?
3. Services offered? For which groups? Why these groups? Who offers these services?
4. Advocacy with respect to local, regional or national politics? Topics? Target groups?
   Objectives? Strategies (e.g. political framing, mobilization, utilizing ‘political opportunities’)?

Organizational matters

5. Organizational structure (departments, management, members, refugee representation)?
6. Number of staff and volunteers (what kind of volunteers (permanent, temporary, etc.))?
7. Sources of financing?

Causes and motivations for new initiatives

We would now like to talk about initiative X (note to interviewer: the assumption is you have pre-identified the ‘innovative’ project or initiative).

8. When did it start? Who took the initiative?
9. What was the direct cause (reason and motivation to take the initiative)?
10. Role of volunteers?
11. What social need is met?
12. Are there any other initiatives/projects meeting similar social needs? How is this one different?
13. Describing the trajectory: major turning points, phases, milestones? What explains changes (e.g. policy changes, new groups of volunteers, etc.)?

Collaboration and networking

14. Collaboration with other organizations ((semi-)public, ngo’s, churches, companies, national organizations, refugee community organizations, other ethnic groups)? Goals of collaboration?
15. Discussion platforms?
16. Contacts in the area? Relevance of the area for the project/initiative?
17. How is the initiative received (in the area)?
18. Influence of partners on your organization’s/initiative’s work?
19. Distribution of tasks in the network? Leadership?

Relation with government

20. Role of local, regional and national government? Direct contact? How often? Goals (e.g. lobby, acquire funding, accommodation)? Which departments?
21. Constraining (budget cuts, regulations, policies) and beneficial factors in relation with government(s)?
22. Are your services (or advocacy?) activities in line with government policy?
23. Does local government (publicly) acknowledge and appreciate your initiative/project? Why (not)? How?

**Impact: societal and political outcomes**

24. Results of your initiative/project? Added value compared to other initiatives?
25. Results of the wider network of organizations in the area?
26. Demonstrable results (e.g. new regulations, provisions, services)?
27. Impact on residents and refugees (personal success stories, new contacts, skills, participation, empowerment)?
28. Impact on the area as a whole (new connections, provisions, social capital/cohesion)?
29. Impact on volunteers and staff (satisfaction, contacts, skills)?
30. Unexpected outcomes? Negative side-effects?
31. Obstacles (e.g. funding/financing, policies, regulations, negative public opinion/media)?
32. Enhancing factors?

**The social innovation stream**

*We would now like to zoom out a bit, to assess if your initiative is part of a broader trend, also outside of the city, or even the country*

33. Would you see ‘community development by way of self-organization’ in reference to refugees as a trend/innovation?
34. When did it arise in this country? Steps? Milestones? Breaking points? Phases?
35. Is it a desirable innovation? Upsides/advantages? Downsides/disadvantages?
36. Likely to develop further? What phase is it in now?
37. How important is your initiative in this trend?

9.1.2. **Topic list for ‘bystanders’**

**Introduction**

1. Name and function?
2. What does your organization do (with respect to refugees and/or community development)?

**The social innovation stream**

*We learned from earlier interviews that community developments by way of self-organization is a relevant trend when it comes to initiatives for and by refugees (asylum seekers, status holders, refused asylum seekers).*

3. Do you recognize this trend? When and how did it arise?
4. Steps, milestones, breaking points, phases in its development (relation to context, eg. Policy changes, new refugee groups, etc.)?
5. Do you see it as a social innovation?
6. Did you consider this to be a social innovation?

“new solutions (products, services, models, markets, processes etc.) that simultaneously meet a social need (more effectively than existing solutions) and lead to new or improved capabilities and relationships and better use of assets and resources” (The Young Foundation 2012).
7. Major impact (‘disruptive’) or minor (‘incremental’)?
8. Desirable innovation? Negative side effects?
9. What stage is the innovation in? Will it develop further?

**International comparison**

*We do the same study in Italy, the United Kingdom, Czech Republic and the Netherlands and are curious about differences and similarities between these countries. With respect to said innovation.*

10. Does this trend exist in (these) other countries? Similarities? Differences?
11. Distribution of responsibilities between government and third sector different? Possible relation with the trend/innovation?
12. Other rights or circumstances for refugees here than in (these) other countries? Relation to innovation?
13. Can refugees get by with (or even without) public provision or third sector services? Relation to innovation?

**Concrete initiatives**

14. Most remarkable examples of this trend/innovation (even outside the case city)?
15. Assessment of organizations/projects/initiatives studies in ITSSOIN (name examples)?
16. More oriented to service delivery, advocacy or something else?
17. Added value compared to alternatives? For refugees? Residents? The area?
18. Embedded in local context or society at large? Involvement in networks? Relation to other parties (e.g. local government)?
19. Easy for them to carry out their work? Hindering or facilitating factors?

**Social innovation in general**

20. Do you see the refugee sector as innovative?
21. Role of initiatives from outside the sector (e.g. civic groups, companies)?
22. Relation between innovation and ‘traditional’ activities (does the need to prove innovativeness make it difficult to get support/funding for regular tasks)?

9.1.3. **Bystanders**

**Introduction**

1. Name and function?
2. What does your organization do (with respect to refugees and/or community development)?

**The social innovation stream**

*We learned from earlier interviews that community developments by way of self-organization is a relevant trend when it comes to initiatives for and by refugees (asylum seekers, status holders, refused asylum seekers).*

3. Do you recognize this trend? When and how did it arise?
4. Steps, milestones, breaking points, phases in its development (relation to context, eg. Policy changes, new refugee groups, etc.)?
5. Do you see it as a social innovation?
6. Ziet u het als een sociale innovatie?
“new solutions (products, services, models, markets, processes etc.) that simultaneously meet a social need (more effectively than existing solutions) and lead to new or improved capabilities and relationships and better use of assets and resources” (The Young Foundation 2012).

7. Major impact (‘disruptive’) or minor (‘incremental’)?
8. Desirable innovation? Negative side effects?
9. What stage is the innovation in? Will it develop further?

**International comparison**

*We do the same study in Italy, the United Kingdom, Czech Republic and the Netherlands and are curious about differences and similarities between these countries. With respect to said innovation.*

10. Does this trend exist in (these) other countries? Similarities? Differences?
11. Distribution of responsibilities between government and third sector different? Possible relation with the trend/innovation?
12. Other rights or circumstances for refugees here than in (these) other countries? Relation to innovation?
13. Can refugees get by with (or even without) public provision or third sector services? Relation to innovation?

**Concrete initiatives**

14. Most remarkable examples of this trend/innovation (even outside the case city)?
15. Assessment of organizations/projects/initiatives studies in ITSSOIN (name examples)?
16. More oriented to service delivery, advocacy or something else?
17. Added value compared to alternatives? For refugees? Residents? The area?
18. Embedded in local context or society at large? Involvement in networks? Relation to other parties (e.g. local government)?
19. Easy for them to carry out their work? Hindering or facilitating factors?

**Social innovation in general**

20. Do you see the refugee sector as innovative?
21. Role of initiatives from outside the sector (e.g. civic groups, companies)?
22. Relation between innovation and ‘traditional’ activities (does the need to prove innovativeness make it difficult to get support/funding for regular tasks)?

**9.2. Appendix B: Common coding framework**

**0.1 Respondent info**
Personal data, background, relevant issues regarding motivation, etc.

**1.1 History of initiative**
Year of founding, milestones, phases, etc.

**1.2 Innovativeness of initiative**
How does the initiative ‘fit’ in the theme ‘community development by way of self-organization’? How do respondents judge their innovativeness?

**1.3 Social need**
What social needs to they try to meet?

**1.4 Activities**
What activities are pursued? Service delivery? Advocacy?
1.5 Target audience

1.6. Goals

1.7 Mobilisation, framing & political opportunities
Do initiatives try to mobilize others, or resources for their cause? Do they actively try to frame the topics/people they engage with differently? Do they react to, or try to create political opportunities?

1.8 Social media, internet
What digital media are used?

1.9 Future of initiative
What do they still plan to do?

2.1 SI stream – about
How do respondents define the SI steam?

2.2 SI-stream – history
Background of the stream, both in the city and the country?

2.3 Broader discourse
Political context? Policy changes? Impact of e.g. social media, financial crisis, different groups of new arrivals, etc?

2.4 Desirability of SI
Do they find self-organized community development a positive development, or should governments organize it? Does the stress on being innovative disable organizations from getting their basic work funded?

2.5 Future of the SI
Do they expect this stream to develop in the future?

3.1 Refugees' role
How are refugees involved? In governance? Activities?

3.2 Values
Are values explicitly stated?

3.3 Governance
Decision making? Organizational structure?

3.4 Staff
numbers

3.5 Volunteers
numbers

3.6 Resources
Types of funding? Quantity?

4.1 Local government relations

4.2 Third sector relations

4.3 Private sector relations

4.4 Other authority relations

4.5 Platform memberships
Regular discussion platforms?

4.6 Purpose of relations

4.7 Power in relations
4.8 Embeddedness in neighborhood
To what extent do they find the local neighborhood/community relevant for the initiative?

4.9 National government relations

5.1 Impact & added value
Compared to comparable initiatives?

5.2 Results refugees
What do refugees gain from the initiative?

5.3 Results volunteers
What do volunteers gain from the initiative?

5.4 Results community
What does the community gain from the initiative?

5.5 Enabling factors
In general terms

5.6 Hindering factors
In general terms

5.7 Evaluation of impact
Does the organization perform any evaluations to measure their impact?
### 9.3. Appendix C: Italy

#### Annex 1 – List of actors: sector, activity, role in the Hub and date of interview (grey for interviewed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTORS</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>TARGET AREA OF NEED/ ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE HUB</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comune di Milano [Social Policies Department]</td>
<td>public (municipal level)</td>
<td>social services, minors and families, immigration, integration, elderly</td>
<td>General Oversight and Responsibility</td>
<td>10 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL [Local Health Authority]</td>
<td>public (regional level)</td>
<td>public health</td>
<td>Health care and control of infectious diseases</td>
<td>21 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genio militare</td>
<td>public (governmental level)</td>
<td>operations of military genius</td>
<td>Restructuring space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protezione Civile del Comune di Milano</td>
<td>public (municipal level)</td>
<td>assistance in case of emergencies/disasters, health, active citizenship</td>
<td>Restructuring space/First operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondazione Progetto Arca</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, families in need, migrants, addiction</td>
<td>Restructuring space &amp; Management/Operations</td>
<td>4 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativa Farsi Prossimo</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>migrants, marginalization, minors and families, social housing</td>
<td>Operations (main target: families in shelters)</td>
<td>12 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children - Italy</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children's rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations (main target: minors)</td>
<td>31 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informatici senza frontiere [Informatics Without Borders]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>fighting digital divide</td>
<td>Providers of computers and internet connections</td>
<td>3 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SosEm</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croce Rossa [Red Cross]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>assistance in case of emergencies/disasters, health, active citizenship</td>
<td>Operations/Only first days of emergency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Angels</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, migrants, addiction, elderly</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunità Sant’Egidio</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>homeless, families in need, migrants, addiction</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albero della Vita</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children’s rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations (main target: minors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre des Hommes</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>children’s rights, education, health and nutrition</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP [Clutural Association of Paediatricians]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>diagnostic and therapeutic protocols, international cooperation</td>
<td>Primary health Care (main target: children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP [Italian Society of Paediatricians]</td>
<td>third sector - service delivery</td>
<td>physical and psychological wellbeing of children</td>
<td>Primary health Care (main target: children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMI [Young Muslims of Italy]</td>
<td>third sector - advocacy</td>
<td>active citizenship, culture, sport</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
<td>30 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambio Passo</td>
<td>third sector - advocacy</td>
<td>primary assistance of Eritrean migrants</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
<td>13 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIM [Coordination of Islamic Associations of Milan]</td>
<td>third sector - advocacy</td>
<td>representation of Islamic association</td>
<td>Primary support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandi Stazioni</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>management of railways stations</td>
<td>Availability of space (Owner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKEA</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>home furniture</td>
<td>Donating Furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td>online retailer</td>
<td>Donating hygiene kit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many others who want to stay anonymous</td>
<td>private for profit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donations of money and goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 – Inform Consent for interview recording

Il Team del progetto ITSSOIN La invita a partecipare a questo studio sull’innovazione sociale nel settore dello sviluppo delle comunità e dell’integrazione sociale. Obiettivo dello studio è analizzare in profondità il caso del progetto HUB – Stazione Centrale di Milano.

Lei è stato invitato a partecipare alla nostra ricerca in quanto informatore chiave relativamente al caso in oggetto. A tal fine, La preghiamo di leggere attentamente le Informazioni qui sotto riportate e barrare le caselle con una X.

Per qualunque dubbio o domanda, in qualsiasi momento, La preghiamo di non esitare a contattarci (elisa.ricciuti@unibocconi.it, tel. 02/58365525, cell. 338/5231612).

1. Confermo che ho compreso le ragioni per le quali si richiede una mia intervista e accetto di essere intervistato.
2. Confermo che la mia partecipazione a questo studio è volontaria e gratuita, e che posso ritirare il mio consenso in qualunque momento e senza dover fornire alcuna motivazione.
3. Accetto che l’intervista venga registrata, e che ho il diritto di richiedere che il registratore venga spento su mia richiesta in qualunque momento.
6. Confermo la mia disponibilità ad essere citato testualmente (sempre mantenendo anonimato e confidenzialità).   Si   No

Nome e Cognome ________________
Firma__________________________
Data_______________
Annex 3 – Timeline and Map
Appendix A – Questionnaire used in interviews

Questionnaire

Title: “Innovation for refugees: Community development by ways of self-organisation”

PART OF EUROPEAN FUNDED FP7 PROGRAMME
SOCIAL INNOVATION AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
IMPACT OF THE THIRD SECTOR AS SOCIAL INNOVATION
WWW.ITSSOIN.EU

Names of Researchers: Annette Bauer, Claudia Eger
Please note that the information you provide about your name, the name of your organisation and your position will be treated with confidentiality if you - at any point during the study - decide that you want to remain anonymous.

For more information about your rights as interviewees please see the information sheet and informed consent form.

Your name:

Name of your organisation:

Your position in the organisation:

Place and date of interview:
About your organisation

1. Could you briefly describe what your organisation does, which services or support it provides and which sector (private/public/third) it belongs to?

2. What are the aims, objectives and values of your organisation?

3. Could you please briefly describe which individuals and groups your organisation is supporting? This includes individuals who benefit directly from your support (e.g. refugees) as well as individuals who benefit indirectly (e.g. family members, the local community).

4. Can you tell us a bit about how your organisation was founded or initiated including who was involved and what were the main drivers?

5. Does your organisation have an advocacy or campaigning function? If yes could (briefly) describe its core objectives.

If no, please go to question 9.

6. To what extent do you agree that your organisation...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I fully agree</th>
<th>I somewhat agree</th>
<th>I don’t agree or disagree</th>
<th>I somewhat disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... aims to change the ways individuals and society perceive refugee related issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... aims to change the ways refugee related issues are framed by politicians and in the media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... aims to increase public awareness and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... produces learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
materials to the public

... provides research, expertise, consultancy, evaluation

... distributes information on policy matters and negotiations

... develops campaigns

... organises demonstrations, protests, petitions

... attracts media coverage

... aims to hold individuals, organisations or bodies accountable for wrongdoing

... aims to set or influence political agendas

7. Please explain which key groups you are targeting with your campaign and advocacy strategy. Does the strategy address local or national priorities?

8. If your organisation is campaigning (advocating) as well as providing services, could you tell us how the organisation manages the challenges linked to combining the two functions (if any)?
About organisational structure and governance

9. Please describe the structure and governance of your organisation (in brief): Who is making strategic (operational) decisions? Who is funding your organisation? Who is your organisation accountable to?

10. What are the main funding sources? From which sectors are those and how often do those change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source or body</th>
<th>Sector (private/ public/ third); if public please add whether national or local</th>
<th>Duration of funding (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About staff and volunteers

11. How many members of staff does your organisation employ? Please specify in total number of individuals or in full-time equivalents (FTE).

12. How many volunteers participate in your organisation and how many hours do they volunteer per year? Please provide a per-person average or a total number.

13. What types of volunteering does your organisation offer and what kind of activities do volunteers engage in? By types of volunteering we mean for example formal versus informal volunteering or permanent vs. temporary. By activities we mean the kind of things that volunteers do.
14. How would you describe the role of volunteers? *For example, how do they engage in service delivery; how do they engage in operational (strategic) decisions about the organisation?*

15. How do you think that individuals who work or volunteer for your organisation contributed to an impact for the local community? Would you be able to give some examples?

16. How do you think that staff and volunteers benefitted from being part of your organisation? Would you be able to provide some examples?

**About the local community**

17. How would you describe the local community and the needs of the community; which of those needs does your organisation address?

18. Would you say that your organisation fills a gap in service provision that would otherwise remain unmet? What other support would individuals get and in how far to think that your organisation is meeting needs differently or better (adds value)?

19. How would you describe the relationship between your organisation and the local community? How do you think that the local community perceives your organisation?

20. Would you say that the local community defines your organisation? For example, do you think that your organisation could operate in the same way in a different locality?

21. How would you describe the impact that your organisation has on the local community? This includes positive as well as unintended negative impacts.
22. To what extent do you agree that your organisation is concerned with issues that are a highly important to the local community as well as to wider society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark the relevant field.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I fully agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t agree or disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

About partnership working

23. Which organisations does your organisation work with? *This might include local authorities, charities, churches, companies, refugee community organisations, social networks or groups of individuals.*

24. Could you please tell us about the most important groups and organisations your organisations works with, and (briefly) explain:

- Their role in relation to your organisation (for example, they might operate as co-producers, suppliers or clients);
- Their assets and resources (for example, they might have specialist knowledge about the needs of service users or good relationships with policy makers or commissioners);
- The main strengths and weaknesses in relationship with your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Assets and resources</th>
<th>Strengths and weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Do you consider your organisation to be part of a ‘network’ of different organisations? By network we mean, formal or informal connections between more than two organisations.

**If no, please go to question 29.**

26. Which of the following statements best describe your position in the network (several responses are possible)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Please mark the relevant field(s).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation I work for connects organisations that would otherwise not be connected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation I work is part of a closely connected network of organisations, and contributes similar kind of assets than other partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation I work for is part of a loosely connected network of organisations, and contributes a particular set of assets that most other organisations do not have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (<em>please explain</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Could you please tell which of the following statements best describe the formation of the network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Please mark the relevant field(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The network is led by an organisation that holds a lot of power and resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other organisations are dependent on one or two organisations, which have a key role in the network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations in the network have close ties and connections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations in the network are only loosely connected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. To what extent do you agree that the network has the following characteristics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I fully agree</th>
<th>I somewhat agree</th>
<th>I don’t agree or disagree</th>
<th>I somewhat disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High levels of trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of shared decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High quality knowledge

High diversity in terms of organisational purpose, activities, sectors

High levels of joint problem solving skills

High capacity for radical changes

High capacity for incremental and continuous change

High access to a range of diverse assets

High overlap in shared values

High emphasis on service user involvement

### About government

29. How does local or national government support your organisation? Have there been changes over time?

30. How well aligned do you think are the organisational aims with government policy? Have there been changes over time?

31. What are the main challenges in the relationship with local or national government? Have there been changes over time?

32. How could local or national government support your organisation to do things better or differently?
About challenges and pressures

33. What would you describe as the current key challenges for your organisation? Have they changed over time?

34. What do you think are factors that positively influence the way your organisation operates? Have they changed over time?

35. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I fully agree</th>
<th>I somewhat agree</th>
<th>I don’t agree or disagree</th>
<th>I somewhat disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is able to act independently from market pressures (i.e. competition).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is able to act independently from political pressures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation I work is able to act independently from financial pressures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation I work for is able to act independently from media pressures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community development by self-organisation

36. To what extent would you describe your organisation as self-organising?

37. How important do you think is it that organisations working with refugees are self-organising?

38. Which of the things we were talking about today do you think play an important role for organisation's ability to self-organise themselves?

39. Do you think that self-organising refugee groups or initiatives have been driving local or national innovations? How has this changed over time?

40. Would you say that self-organised refugee groups, such as yours, exist everywhere in the country? If yes, what do they have in common in the way they were initiated (drivers and barriers) or in the way they operate now?

41. Where do see the role of self-organised refugee groups or initiatives in the future?
### Appendix B: Responses from refugee organisations identified in Birmingham area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Refugee Council</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore</td>
<td>Participation only if substantial list of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Projects</td>
<td>Declined ‘Not in the position to help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Birmingham</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIRT (Asylum Support and Immigration Resource Team)</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRCH (Birmingham Community Hosting)</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Action</td>
<td>Declined ‘Too busy – small charity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narthex Sparkhill</td>
<td>Declined ‘staff shortage &amp; too busy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Children’s Society</td>
<td>Declined – no capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline Options</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian and Business Development Consultancy - Consortium</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating Sanctuary Birmingham (CSB) (charity)</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Red Cross West Midlands Refugee Services</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Chad’s Sanctuary</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR-NETWORK Regional Asylum Activism Project</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham New Communities Network</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nando Sigona</td>
<td>Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers Road New Communities Association</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Community Council for the Regions – ACCR (assoc. Freshwinds)</td>
<td>Declined - staff shortage and annual leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Voice</td>
<td>Not contacted yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanctuary</td>
<td>Responded (waiting to confirm interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Community Law Centre</td>
<td>Interview scheduled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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