



Citizenship and
Immigration Canada

Citoyenneté et
Immigration Canada



Final Report

G8 EXPERTS ROUNDTABLE on Diversity and Integration

October 4, 2006 • Lisbon, Portugal

PREPARED BY:

The Metropolis Secretariat
Citizenship and Immigration Canada

www.international.metropolis.net



FUNDAÇÃO
LUSO-AMERICANA



Canada

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Integration for Economic Benefits	
2.1 Context.....	7
2.2 General observations	7
2.3 Challenges	8
2.4 Policy and programme interventions	9
i Ongoing improvements to selection policies.....	9
ii Adapting pre-arrival and post-arrival integration measures	10
iii Reducing systematic labour market barriers	12
iv Language ability and economic integration	12
v Partnerships as a vehicle to improve economic integration	13
vi Addressing the issue of undocumented workers.....	14
vii Working in new ways with source countries.....	15
3. Diversity and Integration	
3.1 Context.....	17
3.2 General observations	18
3.3 Challenges	18
3.4 Policy and programme interventions	18
i Promoting national identity and respect for cultural diversity	18
ii Language acquisition as a support to social integration.....	20

iii Addressing the question of immigrant rights.....	21
iv Strengthening opportunities for positive interaction between groups	21
v Defining approaches to citizenship that reinforce integration	21

4. The Role of Civil Society in Integration

4.1 Context.....	23
4.2 General observations	23
4.3 Challenges	24
4.4 Policy and programme interventions	24
i Establishing common objectives, models and principles.....	24
ii Clarifying government roles and coordinating government actions.....	24
iii Recognizing and harnessing the potential of civil society	25
iv Effective communications.....	26
v Promoting involvement of individual immigrants.....	27

5. Diversity and Security

5.1 Context.....	28
5.2 General observations	28
5.3 Policy and programme interventions	29
i Exercising political leadership.....	29
ii Encouraging community leadership	30
iii Continuous learning and sharing of best practices	30

6. The Unique Circumstances of the Children of Immigrants.....31

7. Conclusions33

Annexes

Annex A: Resolutions from July 16 th G8 discussion on “ <i>Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st century</i> ”	34
Annex B: G8 Roundtable: Topics for Discussion.....	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a report of a G8 Roundtable on Diversity and Integration, held in conjunction with the 11th International Metropolis Conference (Paths and Crossroads: Moving People, Changing Places, October 2-6, 2006).

Delegates from all G8 countries¹ met in Lisbon, Portugal on October 4, 2006 for the Roundtable. Participants from the European Union and Portugal also attended. More than forty delegates representing a cross-section of senior government policy-makers, elected officials, academic researchers and members of civil society shared their perspectives on diversity, integration and social cohesion.

The discussions centered on four topics: integration for economic benefits; diversity and integration; the role of civil society in integration; and diversity and security. A fifth crosscutting theme emerged from the discussions, notably the unique circumstances of the children of immigrants.

This gathering represented the first opportunity for immigration experts from G8 countries to assemble in this type of forum to explore these issues. The meeting attempted to achieve an improved mutual understanding of the challenges and opportunities posed by integration and diversity. The meeting also gave participants an opportunity to establish new relationships, thereby creating the potential for continued bilateral and multilateral dialogue.

Delegates articulated the many ways that their countries are managing diversity and integration. The discussion identified unique aspects of the integration challenges being experienced in each country. At the same time, it brought to light common experiences and challenges being faced across many countries. Participants shared their experience with innovative measures in use or being contemplated in their respective countries. In this regard, the discussion was particularly useful in identifying key principles for managing diversity and integration. This afforded participants the opportunity to consider

¹ Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States.

measures being used elsewhere from the perspective of how they might be adapted and applied in their own countries.

There was a strong affirmation that, in developing immigration policies and programmes in response to changing needs, factors associated with diversity and integration must be taken into account.

A copy of this report in French and in English is posted on the Metropolis web site at www.international.metropolis.net.

1

INTRODUCTION

The Chairperson welcomed participants and noted that the impetus for the Roundtable had been the G8 Summit in St. Petersburg in July 2006, where social and economic integration were discussed both as part of the formal meeting and at a separate discussion on diversity, integration and social cohesion.

During the formal G8 Summit, leaders acknowledged the importance of integration in their discussion of “Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st century,” one of the Summit themes. At the conclusion of the discussion of this topic, G8 leaders resolved to promote social and economic integration of immigrants into host countries and societies, with education being recognized as one of the effective means of doing so. G8 leaders made three specific commitments in this regard, as follows:

1. We will promote civic participation, as well as equality of opportunity and cross-cultural understanding to help people to maximize their individual potential and overcome barriers to their participation in society. Inclusive, respectful and equitable societies provide the most conducive conditions for acquiring
2. We will facilitate social, cultural and professional integration in our societies by promoting life-long learning, and encouraging the language competencies commensurate with levels of skills and experience. We also call for joint research and exchange of knowledge, experiences and best practices among the G8 countries and other stakeholders in this important area.
3. We will aim to maximize the human and social capital of all people through policies that recognize that diversity in the educational sector and in the workplace, advance innovation and stimulate creativity. Successful social cohesion policies, including education for democratic citizenship, will help to combat intolerance and discrimination. Our education systems should facilitate achievement of these fundamental

skills and knowledge, promoting innovation and driving economic and social success. We view cultural diversity and knowledge of foreign languages, openness to new talent and the mobility of the labour force as essential attributes of innovative and inclusive societies.

goals, while taking into consideration that each country employs a range of different policies to promote acceptance and integration in its economy and society.²

Related to this formal G8 discussion, and at the invitation of Russia, the Prime Minister of Canada led his colleagues in a discussion on diversity, integration and social cohesion. At the conclusion of that discussion, G8 leaders agreed that it would be useful for experts from their respective countries to continue the exchange on these issues and that the 11th International Metropolis Conference would be an ideal venue for such a discussion. The Metropolis Project Secretariat of Citizenship and Immigration Canada organized the Roundtable in collaboration with the Luso-American Foundation of Portugal, which hosted the meeting in its Lisbon offices. A member of the Russian delegation addressed participants at the outset of the Roundtable, linking the Roundtable to the discussion by G8 leaders at the St. Petersburg Summit.

In opening the Roundtable discussion, the Chair reinforced the fact that the meeting was intended to be an informal exchange. As participants agreed to invoke the Chatham House Rule³, this report does not attribute any of the comments to specific individuals or countries.

The dialogue centered on four areas:

- integration for economic benefits;
- diversity and integration;
- the role of civil society in integration; and
- diversity and security.

(Descriptions of each of these topics were shared with participants in advance of the meeting to set the context for the discussion.)⁴

This report presents the results of the discussion on each of these topics. It highlights the various challenges described by participants in their respective countries as well as their experiences with policy and programme interventions that have potential for or are showing success.

As noted earlier, the unique circumstances of the children of immigrants emerged as a recurring theme throughout the discussion. The report includes a summary of participants' observations on particular considerations associated with addressing the distinct needs of these children.

2 <http://en.g8russia.ru/docs/12.html> See Annex A for the full set of resolutions from the July 16th G8 discussion on "Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century."

3 www.chathamhouse.org.uk

4 See Annex B for topic descriptions shared with participants in advance of Roundtable meeting.

2 INTEGRATION FOR ECONOMIC BENEFITS

2.1 Context:

Among the reasons that countries allow or even encourage migration to their territories is to gain from the contributions that migrants can make to the economy – contributions that flow from the skills and experience that migrants bring with them. Promotion of immigration for economic benefits is important for G8 countries. Mobility is important from a global perspective. As noted at the July 2006 G8 meeting, “development of a global innovation society depends on the mobility and integration in all nations of people, knowledge and technologies.”⁵ From a domestic perspective, many G8 countries are confronting the challenge of aging populations and low fertility rates. These factors are anticipated to create shortages in the domestic labour supply of most G8 countries and have focused the attention of policy-makers on determining the most effective ways to import the required skills into the labour market. Although the importance of planning for current and future labour demands is receiving attention, this has not always translated into effective recruitment policies.

Attracting immigrants with labour market potential is an important first step. Equally important are measures to ensure that immigrants are able to make their intended contributions to the domestic economy. Impediments that immigrants may face in finding a place in the labour market in line with their potential include language deficits, non-recognition of foreign credentials and experience, limited access to social networks and domestic resistance to employing immigrants, especially in high-skilled occupations.

2.2 General observations:

Roundtable participants acknowledged and agreed that economic benefits were one of the drivers for immigration. One participant argued that – family reunification and humanitarian objectives notwithstanding – the primary reason why countries should be more open to immigration was for economic benefits. Most participants agreed that in order to realize these benefits, countries needed to have integration practices that helped migrants enter the labour force. Participants stressed the impor-

5 Report of July 16th G8 discussion on *Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st century*.

tance of governments finding effective ways to make better connections between immigration policies and labour market needs. This could include, but was not limited to, improved selection policies. Some participants stressed that immigration strategies must go beyond recruiting and selecting immigrants with employment potential. As noted earlier, what happens after arrival was considered crucial. Participants felt that measures to support economic integration were important, not just during the initial settlement period, but also over the long term as immigrants take time to establish themselves in the labour market.

One participant argued that the economic model of the receiving country can affect the ease with which an immigrant integrates from an economic perspective. This participant described a country where the economy is very flexible and open and where high value is placed on entrepreneurship and home ownership. In such an economy, the participant suggested that social and economic integration for the immigrant happens in the same way as for the native-born, notably through establishing a place in the economy and working towards home ownership. By contrast, it was argued that economic integration could be difficult for immigrants in countries with highly structured economies that are characterized by barriers to economic and social mobility even for the native-born.

Geographic concentration of the economy was viewed as another factor influencing economic integration. A participant from a country with a geographically diffused economy noted that there was no concentration of immigrants in any urban centres. Immigrants were located throughout the country and this has proven to be

a positive factor in their economic integration. By contrast, an example was cited of a country where 40 percent of immigrants lived in and around one major urban centre, with high levels of immigrant unemployment in some parts of the city. Another example was noted of a country where the number of poor neighbourhoods, particularly in a few major urban centres, was growing, largely due to an increasing gap in earnings between immigrants and native-born. It was suggested that relative dispersion or concentration of immigrant populations might require different types of integration measures to facilitate employment successfully.

2.3 Challenges:

Participants articulated a number of challenges that their countries are facing in their efforts to promote economic integration. These include the need:

- to improve planning for the overall level and composition of immigration flows, including selection policies that better reflect anticipated labour demands;
- to complement selection policies with pre-arrival and post-arrival integration strategies to help immigrants find and keep jobs that match the experience and skills they bring;
- to reduce labour market barriers to help ensure that skilled and unskilled immigrants are able to make their intended contributions to the economy;
- given the limits of government interventions, to innovate policy approaches to facilitate greater involvement of non-governmental players;
- to respond to the changing and wide-ranging language needs resulting from the growing diversity of countries of origin and the increased

variety of literacy and educational backgrounds; and

- to communicate more effectively with countries of origin to share information on labour market needs and qualification systems and to increase understanding of national academic practices and traditions with a view to improving the recognition of foreign experience and credentials.

2.4 Policy and programme interventions:

Participants discussed a number of policy and programme interventions that have potential or are showing success in their respective countries. Many emphasized that no single measure would improve the potential for successful economic integration and that a range of interventions was important.

i Ongoing improvements to selection policies

Selection policies were considered by many participants to be important for successful economic integration, given that one of the goals of selection systems is to make effective links between the labour needs of the domestic economy and external sources of labour. However, participants acknowledged that a continual review of selection strategies was necessary to strengthen their ability to make these links and, in so doing, to contribute to successful economic integration.

One of the reasons cited for continued review of selection policies relates to the complexity and pace of change in the environment in which selection regimes operate. That environment encompasses the full range of factors influencing global migration trends and global and domestic economies. Participants referenced the continuous change in migra-

tion flows and the fact that, in some cases, borders are becoming more porous, notably in geographic regions such as Europe where mobility rights between certain countries or among groups of countries have increased significantly. Such factors pose challenges in predicting and planning for migration flows and potential sources of labour.

Several examples were cited that illustrate some inherent limitations to selection regimes that aim to manage domestic migration, support labour needs and constitute a first step towards successful economic integration. Participants noted that there are challenges in predicting changing dimensions of the domestic economy and associated labour needs. Even where countries are successful in accurately forecasting labour needs, selection strategies take time to have the intended effect. Therefore, there can be a lag between when labour needs are identified and migrants arrive to fill them. The economic prospects of immigrants upon arrival can be negatively affected by labour market conditions that are less favourable than anticipated when the selection criteria were established and the decision to migrate was made.

Participants noted that establishing thresholds for education and experience through selection criteria does not guarantee successful economic integration. Over the last decade, one country with significant experience and expertise in selection systems has experienced poorer economic performance among immigrants than in the past. It has also observed higher levels of unemployment among immigrants than among the native-born. This has occurred despite the fact that immigrants with high employment potential have been selected, based on their education and

experience. In another example, a participant referred to the selection model of a country that opts for only skilled immigrants and noted that typically such immigrants have relatively low integration needs. Despite this approach to selection, however, this country is now experiencing and must respond to an influx of unskilled workers with limited educational backgrounds and no knowledge of the national language. In contrast with these experiences of countries that have well-established selection systems, it was noted that in some countries with relatively unsophisticated selection systems, there are high levels of employment across immigrant populations.

These examples suggest some challenges in the ability of selection policies to manage immigration and support economic integration. Participants identified several specific measures that could improve the utility of selection systems. A higher level of employer and industry involvement was recommended to improve planning for future labour market needs. As well, participants suggested that governments work to reduce lag times between the identification of needs and the arrival of immigrants. Participants also felt that effective relationships between sending and receiving countries could help economic integration. For example, countries recruiting immigrants might specify to potential sending countries their specific labour market needs and language requirements. (A later section of this report explores the concept of working more closely with countries of origin.)

Participants reinforced the fact that no matter how effective the selection system, the potential remained for continuous change in labour market conditions in the domestic economy as well as hard-to-predict external factors

that might influence the destination choices of potential migrants. Although effective selection strategies were viewed as a factor in successful economic integration, participants insisted that they are not a panacea and that such strategies often need to be complemented by integration measures.

ii Adapting pre-arrival and post-arrival integration measures

Several participants explained how historical immigration flows to their countries have influenced traditional approaches to economic integration and the kinds of post-arrival integration measures that they have established. Several examples of past trends that have shaped immigration and integration policies were articulated. Some G8 countries have traditionally been immigrant-receiving countries, with significant experience in post-arrival supports. Others have been countries of emigration and have limited experience in this regard. Some countries have established family reunification as a primary objective of immigration while serving labour market needs has been the primary goal of others. For some countries, past immigration largely served a demand for temporary workers, and measures to support long-term integration were not considered necessary.

Participants acknowledged that policies founded on past premises now require adaptation. Migration flows today are different from those in the past and significantly more diverse in their composition, and these changes are creating the necessity for new kinds of economic integration measures. Participants highlighted several examples of changing circumstances in their respective countries. Some countries of emigration are, for the first time in their history, becoming countries of

immigration. One country with immigration policies traditionally centered on family reunification goals as an overriding objective is now receiving young immigrants looking for employment and needing support to enter and advance in the labour market. As noted earlier, one country that has historically focused on recruiting skilled workers is now facing an influx of unskilled workers with language and other needs. In all cases, arriving immigrants have distinct economic integration needs that are often quite different from those of previous immigrants.

One participant described a very significant challenge in addressing the economic integration needs of immigrants who arrived long ago as guest workers. Over the course of many decades, government authorities have considered these immigrants as temporary residents and have consciously limited investment in measures to support their long-term social and economic integration. With several generations of such workers now permanent residents, there is a pressing need for policies to support their economic and social integration. An overriding focus is promoting language skills and educational attainment.

Some participants felt that economic integration measures are more accessible and effective when delivered through existing social and economic infrastructure. For example in some countries, primary and secondary school education is compulsory even for minors illegally residing in those countries. Participants stressed the importance of accessibility. Some countries prefer to promote access through the implementation of economic integration measures at regional and local levels, while central governments focus on providing guidelines, monitoring and promoting best practices.

Participants noted that in some countries, within Europe in particular, facilitating access to housing is considered an important way to contribute to the economic integration of immigrants. Access to housing is viewed as one of the most pressing issues that newcomers have to confront in their integration. In seeking suitable accommodation, migrants can meet obstacles due to discrimination and inadequate social networks. Furthermore, in some countries family units are becoming a larger proportion of the population of newcomers. This is driving the need for a greater range of accommodation than in the past: accommodation needs for immigrants range from that required by a single migrant for a limited period of time to housing for families expecting to establish permanent and stable residence in the country. Some participants considered that helping immigrants find access to appropriate housing was an important early step towards economic integration. Being established in an appropriate home, they thought, was a way for the immigrant to create an economic foundation and achieve a sense of equality within society.

All of the above-noted measures focus on helping the immigrant to integrate economically. Participants stressed that it was equally important to establish measures to respond to the new multicultural composition of their societies. Such measures, as discussed later in this report, could include educational efforts to increase mutual knowledge and understanding among sectors of society and initiatives to support greater interaction among groups.

iii Reducing systemic labour market barriers

Participants noted that immigrants can face a range of barriers as they seek to enter the labour market. Some of the barriers are associated with personal characteristics of the immigrant upon arrival, including limited language skills. Other barriers, such as non-recognition of foreign credentials and experience, are imposed by the destination society. Many countries are working on targeted strategies that encompass measures to support entry of the immigrant into the labour market. This may include working in collaboration with employers and establishing closer relationships with a number of stakeholders, including unions, professional associations, ethno-cultural groups and civil society.

Language is considered to be one of the main barriers to integration into the workplace for many immigrants. Even if immigrants have adequate conversational language skills upon arrival, they may lack the specialized workplace language skills and vocabulary that are required in many trades and professions. (This subject is discussed more fully in the next section.)

Recognition of foreign credentials and prior work experience is an issue being faced by many countries. It was noted that employers may value foreign experience from some countries more highly than others. In some cases, they discount foreign experience entirely. Part of the problem appears to be a lack of familiarity on the part of employers with the relevance of work experience from an ever-increasing range of source countries. As source countries change and the migrant population becomes more diverse, non-recognition of the training and experience can become a barrier to labour market entry and advancement.

As noted earlier, some participants felt that effective relationships between sending and receiving countries were an important element of selection policies. Improved information sharing, it was argued, could improve access to the labour market in the receiving country by improving the understanding of labour market needs and the potential fit with the skill sets and experience of individuals contemplating emigration from sending countries.

One participant noted that sometimes barriers to the labour market exist because of timing anomalies. For example, an employer or particular economic sector may have immediate labour needs. However, by the time selection criteria are adjusted and immigrants with the necessary skills arrive, the needs may have changed. It was suggested that one way to address this is to promote greater involvement of employers in identifying future needs, both in the short and long term. Also discussed was the potential for countries in need of certain skills to target specific countries or educational programmes abroad to seek out qualified people who might be attracted to move.

iv Language ability and economic integration

Participants reinforced three key messages regarding language proficiency and economic integration. First, language ability is fundamental to the economic integration of newcomers. Second, language needs for individual immigrants may change over time. Third, the language skills and language acquisition abilities of newcomers vary greatly. With regard to the latter point, it was noted that basic language training programmes must constantly adapt to keep up with the increasing range of

source countries and greater diversity in the educational backgrounds and literacy levels of immigrants.

For some immigrants, a basic level of language ability is an economic survival tool that is needed upon arrival. For others, language needs may be less pressing upon arrival but may become so over time. For example, participants noted that a lack of language proficiency was not necessarily a labour market barrier for unskilled workers. In fact, some countries have had several generations of immigrants who were able to sustain themselves without knowing the national language. However, over the longer term, language acquisition for such workers may become important to support career advancement and to help them achieve full participation in the economic life of a country.

Participants spoke of the emphasis that many countries place on language acquisition and the various models that exist for funding language training. For some countries, language training for adults has traditionally been a pivotal element of government-funded settlement services. Participants from countries that have traditionally not supported language training through government funding suggested that to move to such a model now would be financially prohibitive. Instead, opportunities for private-sector and employer-led initiatives are being explored, as well as public-private partnerships that leverage government funding.

Some countries have developed government-funded “enhanced” language training programmes that promote “employment-oriented” language skills for immigrants who have mastered the basics of the language. The objective of these programmes is to strengthen work-related language skills and, at the

same time, increase opportunities in the labour market. Participants noted that employer involvement in such programmes is important to their success and can ensure the relevance of training components that address work-related language and communication skills. Such programmes can incorporate bridge-to-work measures, including mentoring, work placement and other assistance that might help in accessing the labour market. Employer involvement in the design and delivery of the programmes is therefore important.

v Partnerships as a vehicle to improve economic integration

Participants noted that several countries are facilitating the economic integration of newcomers by encouraging partnerships across all levels of government and the private and not-for-profit sectors. Many sectors have the potential to contribute to economic integration. These sectors include labour, industry, municipalities, housing, education and health care, as well as religious and ethno-cultural organizations. Consultations and partnerships with these sectors are becoming more and more important to complement the experience and skill sets within government organizations that have lead responsibility for integration. By involving this wide range of sectors and civil society organizations, governments are able to tap into the broad experience and knowledge that is necessary to address integration issues. Some participants argued that partnerships had the potential to be more effective than any one organization acting alone. Others stated that partnerships are a best practice that should continue to be developed and encouraged.

The range of partnership opportunities includes: simple agreements that deal with basic tools such as language

acquisition; mechanisms to assess equivalence of foreign certification/experience; and complex arrangements with the private sector and other immigrant organizations that facilitate integration into the workplace, training, retraining and professional development.

vi Addressing the issue of undocumented workers

Many countries are experiencing very high numbers of undocumented workers. This situation is creating negative socio-economic repercussions and, for those workers ultimately destined to remain in the country for the long term, it poses unique integration challenges.

Participants cited a number of consequences resulting from the illegal presence of such workers. By working outside the mainstream economy, they can avoid taxes while, at the same time, they draw on social services (notably education for their children). The presence of large numbers of workers willing to work at less than market wage rates can place downward pressure on overall wage rates in certain sectors. Over time and in some sectors of the economy, the persistent employment of undocumented workers can create a perception on the part of both migrants and employers that illegal work is “legitimate.” One participant noted that the model of parents working outside of the law might influence the values of children of migrants, negatively affecting the respect that such children have for the laws of their country. The presence of large numbers of illegal workers can also, over the long term, create downstream societal burdens, including, for example, health care, as such migrants often do not have access to preventative health care services.

From the perspective of the workers themselves, there can be negative effects on their human rights, including lack of recourse for inappropriate actions against them. Illegal migrants can be subject to exploitation in the form of low wages, poor working conditions and sub-standard accommodation.

The associated concepts of under-employment and less than full economic integration were discussed in relation to undocumented workers. Participants suggested that even in countries where most undocumented workers are employed and economically integrated to some degree, workers may be locked into one job or sector, and they are often limited in terms of their ability to progress. Participants emphasized the importance of thinking about the consequences of barriers to full economic integration for those undocumented workers destined to remain in a country for the long term. The notion of full economic integration implies that the even the illegal immigrant would have opportunities for upward mobility and increased societal participation and, perhaps most importantly, improved prospects for the social and economic integration of their children.

In this regard, participants felt that a pressing issue requiring attention was addressing the negative consequences of undocumented migrants working outside the mainstream economy over multiple generations. They argued that, in these circumstances, a reduced incentive for immigrant parents and their children to acquire adequate language skills and education could result in the creation of barriers to economic integration affecting multiple generations.

Participants stressed that there is no easy solution to the issue of undocumented workers. It was suggested that two

different categories of intervention be carefully considered to stem the flow of undocumented workers, specifically: selection systems, combined with improved collaboration with source countries. In addressing the situation of undocumented workers who are already well established in the economy, participants noted the role that amnesties and other such arrangements might play.

Some participants argued that selection systems that address the domestic need for unskilled workers could slow the significant growth of undocumented immigrants by establishing measures that favour a more regular and systematic flow of unskilled workers. Participants noted that improved cooperation with the governments of source countries could facilitate legal migration through improved temporary worker programmes, combined with efforts on the part of source countries to discourage illegal migration. Some participants favoured the imposition of quotas to equate labour market demand with foreign supply. They argued that if a country needs unskilled workers, but the immigration system does not provide appropriate channels for legal entry, the number of undocumented workers is likely to increase.

For those undocumented workers that are well established in the economy, some countries are creating flexible arrangements that would allow employers and employees to come forward to regularize the status of a given employee without penalty. Participants also raised the possibility of regularizing legal status through amnesties, although the negative consequences of amnesties were noted. Such measures have the potential to act as draw for further flows of illegal

migrants, thus ultimately diminishing the integrity and fairness of legal channels for immigration.

vii Working in new ways with source countries

Some participants spoke of the importance of establishing effective relationships between sending and receiving countries, arguing that such relationships could help economic integration in a number of areas, notably:

- recruitment;
- training and vocational programmes;
- information sharing to facilitate an earlier start to the integration process; and
- arrangements to support systematic migration and discourage illegal migration.

Participants noted examples of effective cooperation with countries of origin that are helping receiving countries to recruit labour to meet specific needs. Some countries have concluded bilateral agreements on labour migration management with a number of source countries.

Agreements cited provide for:

- exchange of information concerning labour availability in the country of origin and labour market trends in the country of destination;
- elaboration and publication of a list of nationals of the country of origin willing to migrate for work reasons; and
- tools for data collection (for example, databases of would-be migrants).

It was also emphasized that sending countries can play an important role in initiating the integration process at the earliest possible stage, ideally prior to arrival in the new country. It was argued that integration supports made available to migrants upon arrival are likely to be

more effective when they continue an integration process that started prior to arrival. In this context, participants noted that some countries are working with sending countries to enlist their support in the emigration process of their nationals. Pre-arrival supports could take the form of information shared with migrants to improve their knowledge of the labour market in the country of destination, employment opportunities in specific geographic regions and other relevant information to help them make informed choices about migrating. Countries of destination could also make available in countries of origin a range of information to support earlier adaptation upon arrival (for example, considerations regarding housing, schooling and the health care system).

Participants noted that language courses and vocational training programmes also form part of the collaborative agreements with countries of origin. Local authorities, social partners, international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are implementing these programmes with two objectives: to train workers destined for the labour market of the receiving country; and to develop productive entrepreneurial activities in the country of origin. Some countries afford foreign workers who have attended these programmes preferential treatment to enter the country within the annual quota system. One participant argued that this type of mechanism could represent an effective tool for the management of migration, and ultimately economic integration, as it promotes a better matching of labour demand and supply and an easier integration into the country of destination.

Finally, as noted earlier in the context of undocumented workers, the governments of source countries and countries of destination can work collaboratively to facilitate legal migration through such measures as improved temporary worker programmes and coordinated efforts to discourage illegal migration.

3

DIVERSITY AND INTEGRATION

G8 countries are experiencing diversity in different ways, owing to their unique histories and ongoing experiences with migration. In this part of the discussion, Roundtable participants described a range of ways that countries are incorporating diversity and integration into public policy. The range and depth of the insights suggested that all countries are reflecting carefully on the meaning and dimensions of diversity and integration for their respective societies as they explore how best to manage these issues.

3.1 Context:

Immigration brings together a diversity of nationalities, ethnicities, races, cultural practices and religions. It has the potential either to strengthen or erode the internal cohesion of a society, depending on how skilfully the issues are managed, how adeptly challenges are anticipated and how well strategies are designed and implemented. Integration strategies are often regarded as important means to help immigrants and receiving societies adapt to each other. However, there is no common

understanding of what is meant by integration or how to go about accomplishing it effectively and justly.

Some countries view integration as a means of reinforcing and maintaining a stable national identity. For others, integration efforts may be more limited, intended to complement immigration programmes aimed at advancing a country's economic goals. Some countries have adopted a model based on cultural assimilation, where maintenance of the national culture is paramount. Others have developed models founded on principles of multiculturalism, where different cultures, values and languages are recognized and where minorities are treated as groups endowed with separate collective "identities" and sometimes special rights. Others prefer a republican model of integration that emphasizes full membership and full equality in the national society on the understanding that with this, there is a letting go of previous identities. This approach emphasizes national unity and national identity. Some countries follow a model of integration that places the onus to adapt on the immigrant, while other countries consider integration a "two

way street,” involving a mutual adaptation by both immigrants and the native-born population.

3.2 General observations:

Participants described several state models currently being used to manage integration. They explained the unique diversity challenges that each country is facing and the historical traditions that have influenced the evolution of each model. Despite many differences, there was a high degree of consensus that social and political integration was an important means to achieve social cohesion. Some suggested that there were strong links between social integration and economic integration and emphasized that the latter does not work without the former. Participants generally agreed that ways of managing diversity must continue to evolve and that countries cannot rest on past successes. With new challenges, approaches must be adapted. From a historical perspective, participants noted that immigrants themselves are often a catalyst for change: as migrants become active participants in society, they have forced national models of integration to adapt.

3.3 Challenges:

Some of the principal challenges identified by participants included:

- fostering respect for multiple cultures while also encouraging national identity;
- improving mutual understanding among societal groups;
- reducing barriers to language acquisition
- ensuring access to rights; and
- encouraging approaches to citizenship that foster societal participation and integration.

3.4 Policy and programme interventions:

Participants articulated a number of policy and programme interventions that have potential or are showing success in their respective countries.

i Promoting national identity and respect for cultural diversity

All participants spoke of increasing diversity in their countries in one form or another. Several tensions were noted as countries confront the challenge of supporting social cohesion and national identity and, at the same time, providing opportunities for the expression within society of multiple cultures, ethnicities, races and religions. There are new pressures from groups of migrants who are seeking to establish a place in the national identity. Participants noted a re-emerging debate in some countries regarding the question of whether to settle and assimilate immigrants or allow them to remain separate culturally. Another tension in the debate is whether to place a priority on the promotion of respect, dignity and understanding between different cultures or rather, to emphasize a national culture to which everyone should adhere. It was clear from the range of perspectives shared by participants that some countries are reflecting on how to manage multiculturalism, while others are reflecting on whether or not to accept it as a model at all.

One participant shared insights from a recent European survey on multiculturalism, which highlighted several contradictory aspects of the debate. For example, the survey identified instances where multiculturalism was the national model but where fracture points and debates were emerging nevertheless, most often in relation to local issues. Interestingly, it was also noted that,

even in the face of considerable public debate about multiculturalism, there has not been a significant policy shift away from it. Further, although public opinion surveys suggest a high level of support for multiculturalism, significant political debate continues. Finally, it was noted that the survey reported that while 75 percent of Europeans surveyed supported multiculturalism, 75 percent felt that there was a limit, and that the limit had been reached.⁶

One participant stressed the necessity of looking at multiculturalism across at least two dimensions, specifically the degree of inclusion within the mainstream society and the level of cultural retention. The importance of moving away from the “either/or” mentality was argued in favour of adopting policies aimed at achieving both strong inclusion in the mainstream society *and* high levels of cultural retention.

Participants spoke about the importance of common national values. One participant stressed that social cohesion is founded on respect for a minimum set of civic values without which the society would not function. Language was considered by many to be one such value. Participants acknowledged that defining what is meant by national identity or a national “way of life” was becoming difficult. Participants noted as well that, as societies become more diverse, it is becoming harder to dictate national values. Nonetheless, participants identified several measures being used to promote national identity among immigrants. Some countries require immigrants to sign contracts that articulate national values and request their attestation of support for these values. Others limit themselves to promoting expectations of civic responsibility through integration programmes and

publications that provide the immigrant with a portrait of the history of the country and the founding values and traditions.

Several participants felt that as countries work to reinforce national identity, they should at the same time find ways to recognize the multiplicity of cultures represented in their populations. Some countries provide formal mechanisms and even funding to groups within society to help them reinforce their heritage, culture and traditions. Some are looking at the possibility of expanding religious instruction in schools to encompass a broader range of religions. In another example, a participant described a model where assimilation around a national identity is encouraged in the “neutral” public space, notably schools and government institutions, while expression of cultural differences is encouraged in the “outside sphere,” including personal residences and religious institutions. A premise underlying this model, the participant stressed, is the notion that “while our differences are great, what we have in common is more important.”

Participants spoke of the need to be mindful of potential fracturing points associated with multiculturalism. Past approaches are being tested in the face of increasing societal diversity. For example, some countries are seeking ways to confront and limit cultural practices or family traditions that are not acceptable in their societies, particularly those negatively affecting the rights of women. Some felt that existing policy instruments that support integration and diversity may be insufficient to accommodate increased numbers of immigrants from an ever widening range of backgrounds. The discussion reinforced the need for ongoing analysis

⁶ European Monitoring Centre Report, July 2006 www.eumc.eu.int

to support new ways of looking at the idea of multiculturalism and national identity.

ii Language acquisition as a support to social integration

In the face of increased diversity, language acquisition was unanimously viewed as a critical unifying factor and essential not only for economic but also for social integration. In fact, acquisition of the national language was seen as an important pathway to cultural adaptation. It was argued that competency in the national language can help immigrants develop an appreciation of the culture and identify opportunities for greater participation in society.

Participants considered that the ability to communicate in the national language was an important foundation on which to establish societal relationships and interactions. One participant stressed that understanding a common national language (or languages) also provides an important means for people from all parts of the world to communicate with each other in their new country. Again, language serves as a unifying factor in the face of societal diversity. Many countries are recognizing that language acquisition needs to be encouraged and promoted on the basis of these broader benefits that can accrue to the immigrant.

Countries are looking at ways to promote language acquisition in more settings. Schools are becoming an important channel through which to reach newly arrived immigrant children and youth. One participant also noted that schools are a crucial means to address the language deficits of children born in the receiving country to immigrants who have never learned the national language. Motivating and supporting such children in their language

acquisition can be problematic, particularly in situations where there is a limited family history and experience with formal education. In such instances, children may have less incentive to learn a new language and may find less support at home in doing so.

Tailored strategies are being contemplated to promote language skills for adult immigrants with limited educational background who may face challenges in classroom settings. Similarly, language acquisition strategies are needed for the unique situation some countries are facing, where migrants returning to their ancestral country to work in low-skilled jobs are demonstrating little interest in acquiring the national language for themselves and their children. While such immigrants may be integrated from an economic perspective, language is important for their longer term social integration and that of their children.

Finally, one participant noted that some countries have grappled with the question of whether language training should be mandatory. Others are contemplating the question. Participants noted that two countries were mandating newcomers to learn the national language. To reinforce the necessity for this, a representative from one of those countries noted that, in 2006, 70 percent of all newcomers to that country did not arrive speaking the national language. In this case, it was considered critical that language training be approached in a very structured and systematic way. There was no opportunity during the discussion to explore the consequences of non-compliance with mandatory language training.

iii Addressing the question of immigrant rights

Access to rights was viewed by many participants as important for integration. For some, this was seen as the crucial starting point for successful integration. Some participants felt that access to rights had the potential either to unify a society or to separate it into categories or classes of individuals. It was therefore necessary, it was felt, to understand rights in the context of integration. While most accepted and assumed that immigrants have rights, participants also described very distinct conditions for access to rights in each country. Some participants argued that legal status was often a determinant of rights and that placing immigrants into categories with potential limits on rights could unnecessarily constrain an immigrant's integration into society. Some participants observed that restrictions on rights could result in negative impacts on the children of immigrants, notably the potential to create disaffection with the host country in the critical formative years.

Another participant cautioned that full access to rights does not solve all problems relating to integration, noting the experience of a country that affords full access to rights for all legal migrants yet still faces challenges in integrating immigrants. It was stressed that, although rights are a starting point, they must be complemented by government interventions in the form of integration policies.

iv Strengthening opportunities for positive interaction between groups

One participant argued that it was necessary to look at social integration and diversity from a new perspective, one

that reinforced the importance of dialogue and interaction between groups (native-born with immigrants, different groups of immigrants with each other, etc.). Such interaction was viewed as a foundation both for increased participation of immigrants in society and for a higher level of engagement by society in welcoming and including immigrants in daily life. With increasing diversity and the existence of more societal groups defined by cultural or ethnic dimensions, such interactions were considered pivotal to establishing positive relationships and connections across these different groups. In supporting such interactions, this participant suggested that intercultural competencies could be effectively applied – that is, knowledge and understanding of how different cultural groups relate to each other.

The participant acknowledged that relationship-building across diverse societal groups would require an investment of time and resources. However, it was argued that such investments were needed and, ultimately, that attention was needed on two fronts: differentiating and distinguishing the needs of individual groups; and, paying attention to relationships between groups. The analogy shared was that, “while we need to focus on the dots, equally important is paying attention to the linkages that join the dots together.”

v Defining approaches to citizenship that reinforce integration

The discussion on citizenship focused first on approaches to citizenship status in the legal sense. It also centered on how countries are exploring the meaning of citizenship and the role that integration can play in fostering citizenship.

Participants spoke of a range of ways in which countries are thinking about citizenship in the context of immigration.

Some countries argued that the overriding responsibility of the immigrant is to settle and contribute economically to the country but not necessarily to advance towards citizenship status. A significantly different model was described involving the obligation on the part of the immigrant to sign a contract attesting acceptance of responsibilities associated with civic expectations and the upholding of national values. Some countries do not push or promote citizenship; however, they do provide tools to help the immigrant through the process of becoming a citizen and are working to ensure that such tools remain meaningful. Efforts include, for example, updating naturalization exams to reinforce the importance of civic engagement and to instill a sense of the country's history. Some integration programmes and policies focus on knowledge of the "way of life" in a given country.

Participants emphasized that citizenship involves both rights and responsibilities, and it was suggested that both aspects of citizenship must be promoted. The example was reiterated of a country that formalizes the responsibilities of citizenship by requiring immigrants to sign a contract that obliges them to use the national language and adhere to common values of the society. Another participant suggested a more open approach to citizenship. It was suggested that integration was so linked to local matters that serious consideration ought to be given to affording to immigrants the right to vote in local elections, even without citizenship status. This, it was thought, would be beneficial in advancing integration objectives. In all cases,

an overriding expectation, regardless of citizenship status, is fidelity to law and order.

Participants emphasized that the very definition of citizenship itself is changing and in some instances now encompasses the possibility of multiple belongings. This is true, for example, in the approach to European Union citizenship.

4 THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN INTEGRATION

Strengthening relationships with civil society has the potential to increase the effectiveness of integration.

Ultimately, responsibilities for creating integrated, cohesive and secure societies must be shared. Delegates discussed the most effective ways to involve the broad community.

4.1 Context:

Many governments believe that bringing about an integrated, cohesive and secure society requires government involvement and sometimes direct intervention through specific integration policies and programmes. Diversity is now of such a magnitude that few governments continue to believe that social forces alone will look after either economic or social integration. However, there are limits to the effectiveness of government interventions. A significant question is how best to involve sectors of civil society, including communities defined in terms of ethnicity, religion and country of origin. As well, there are questions with respect to the appropriate roles of different levels of government. A cohesive society is one, it is commonly believed,

where various levels of government and communities work together towards the achievement of common goals.

4.2 General observations:

Participants acknowledged that the nature of government involvement in integration varied significantly from one country to another. In many instances, government roles appear to be in a state of flux as countries continue to gain experience with integration. One participant described a situation where government institutions that traditionally have had very limited or purpose-specific relationships with stakeholder groups are now investing in more broadly defined and ongoing relationships. This shift responds to the potential for such groups to play a role in integration. Some participants have less experience in this area or favoured approaches that did not emphasize such engagement.

4.3 Challenges:

Participants articulated a number of challenges that their countries are facing in their efforts to promote civic engagement in integration. These included the need:

- to define appropriate roles for government;
- to develop mutual trust and effective communications;
- to overcome a lack of knowledge about communities;
- to find representative voices within civil society;
- to foster civic capacity, including encouragement of leadership capabilities; and
- to harness and align contributions of government and societal actors.

4.4 Policy and programme interventions:

Participants discussed a number of policy and programme interventions that have potential or are showing success in their respective countries.

i Establishing common objectives, models and principles

One participant stressed the importance of establishing and communicating common objectives, models and principles around how best to develop cohesive societies characterized by diversity. It was argued that this was a critical element of good public policy because integration processes and policies involve many players operating across all levels of government and society. Basic principles, it was suggested, should take into account the fact that many forces shape the integration experience of an immigrant and that successful integration depends on the contributions and interventions of multiple

players working well together. It was suggested that principles could include definitions of the roles of various actors.

Some participants felt that shared objectives and principles relating to integration were important not only domestically but also among countries. Some countries, recognizing that integration processes are often not defined by borders, are working to forge stronger bilateral and multilateral relationships to address immigration and integration matters. The European Union was cited as a case in point: across its membership, countries are dealing with many shared challenges related to immigration, integration and new dimensions of diversity.

ii Clarifying government roles and coordinating government actions

Articulating a clear role for the government was considered important in striving for greater alignment and coordination of government actions with those of civil society. Some participants noted that this articulation should include communicating what governments can and cannot do in supporting integration. In this context, participants acknowledged that many G8 countries are reflecting on how best to direct government actions to support integration. A participant described the approach that one country has adopted as a frame of reference to measure when government intervention is warranted. Government action, it was proposed, is appropriate in cases where the desired outcomes for a specific group of immigrants are different from those for the larger population.

It was generally agreed that some government involvement is important in supporting integration. However, there were different views expressed about

whether integration could best be achieved by direct government involvement and service delivery or by government actions that were more facilitative in nature (that is, oriented to engaging the contributions of others). Given the range of actors that play a role in integration and the opportunity to draw upon this broad base of potential contributors, some participants suggested that facilitative approaches would be particularly important for the future.

Participants were not unanimous in their views as to which level of government was most appropriate to deliver integration policies and programmes. A number of participants felt that the local level of government was closest to integration issues, arguing that integration is essentially about local issues and noting that where controversies arise about integration, it was often with respect to a local issue. While many participants stressed the importance of local interventions, others advocated more uniform integration processes that are driven centrally through national government institutions, policies and programmes. For example, one country has created a number of special institutions that, in the context of societal diversity, emphasize national culture and unity. This approach encompasses many nationally driven measures, including the collection of data on newly arrived immigrants to plan better for future integration needs.

Another participant described a country model that was very systematic in the way it delineated responsibilities among different levels of government. Under this model, programmes for new arrivals are the responsibility of the national government, while regional governments are responsible for interventions

to support second and third generations including, for example, education and youth policies.

Participants identified a range of innovative approaches to expand the reach of government integration efforts and in so doing increase opportunities for the engagement of civil society. Some central governments are disseminating educational tools to support local levels of government and others in their work to promote integration efforts and multiculturalism.

iii Recognizing and harnessing the potential of civil society

Participants noted that, depending on the country, there are many different groups within civil society that are engaged in integration, and that could potentially play greater roles. Other groups are well placed to become involved. Some participants felt that the government could play a valid role in recognizing and supporting such groups. In this context, participants felt that fostering relationships across traditionally supportive groups as well as new sectors of civil society was important in order to expand the capacity for integration. Participants stressed the importance of governments becoming more knowledgeable about the capacity that exists as a first step in engaging civil society more fully in integration.

Participants noted that NGOs are instrumental to integration. These organizations include many faith-based groups, voluntary associations and local community groups that play a role in orienting immigrants to their new community upon arrival and providing assistance throughout the period of cultural adaptation. Such groups assist immigrants in finding accommodation and providing employment and family counselling. Cases were cited of NGOs transforming

themselves and, as a result, being poised to take on greater roles. Some NGOs, for example, are developing business models for immigrants, entering into for-profit ventures and expanding services, including pre-migration counselling. The education sector was viewed as being particularly important in supporting the adaptation of immigrant children and encouraging societal participation by their parents.

Some participants felt that the notion of civil society should be extended to include the business community and employers. Some considered that these players were a critical, untapped resource that could even take on roles traditionally associated with government-funded programmes. It was noted that the private sector and employers are increasingly becoming involved in integration and that they are poised to play an even greater part. As noted earlier, this expanded role might include public-private partnerships for language training. It was also suggested that businesses could encourage employees to mentor colleagues and to help them through the naturalization process. In another case, governments are engaging employers to take responsibility for protecting their immigrant employees, including measures to support their rights.

Religious communities were felt by some to be well positioned to play a more active role in integration. One participant noted that efforts are being made to engage religious communities in organizing local forums to talk about extremism. There was, it was argued, great benefit to working with religious communities. Working alone, government cannot reach the people whose voices are needed in defining issues and solutions associated with diversity and integration.

Where the engagement of civil society is considered important, participants stressed that communities often want to participate more actively in making contributions to integration but, believing that they cannot act effectively alone, feel that they need support. It was emphasized that, while governments can support community organizations, it was important for such groups to develop their own capacities, including internal governance structures to support their involvement in integration matters. Some participants felt that government efforts aimed at community building should focus on motivating sectors of civil society, supporting the efforts of community organizations to structure themselves and, finally, facilitating involvement and opportunities for contribution. As community groups build their leadership capacity, it was considered important that they work to create the necessary bridges to government.

Importantly, participants emphasized that not all countries consider that civil society should play an active and direct role in the integration process, deeming that the lead responsibility for this should rest with the state. This position reflects the importance that such countries place on using government institutions as the principal actors in the integration process.

iv Effective communications

Many participants argued that governments must communicate effectively with representatives from civil society in order to engage their support for integration. It was suggested that only through communication could governments establish relationships of trust with civil society and engage its contributions. At the same time, it was emphasized that members of civil

society share the onus of establishing their own channels of communication with government.

Participants identified a number of complexities that characterized communication activities between government and civil society and stressed the importance of adhering to a number of fundamental principles. These principles include:

- respecting liberty of expression;
- taking voices of the collective into account, as well as the views of individuals;
- maintaining continuous dialogue to support substantive change; and
- using creative ways to connect with grassroots groups.

A caution was issued that a given group might not be truly representative of the community. Furthermore, it was noted that, in arriving in societies where civil liberties and individual rights are fundamental, immigrants share the right to define themselves in their own way. Immigrants may, as a matter of choice, not wish to be associated with any group. These factors constitute challenges in the identification of representative voices.

v Promoting involvement of individual immigrants

As noted earlier, participants stressed the importance of considering individual immigrants as part of the broader civil society, which has a role to play in integration and social cohesion. A challenge that must be confronted, it was argued, was finding ways to include individuals who feel no sense of belonging to a given community. It was suggested that there was a role here for governments and civil society to motivate new migrants to make broader contributions to society and, in so doing, to facilitate their own process of integration.

5

DIVERSITY AND SECURITY

An emerging question for many countries is what role, if any, integration can play as a means to enhance national security. All G8 states today are looking at security in new ways. Beyond introducing measures to combat terrorism that originates beyond its borders, countries are also looking inward and focusing attention on diminishing the potential for security breaches within their borders.

This discussion focused on the potential for integration and engagement with civil society to support social cohesion and, in so doing, to counter security issues such as radicalization. Participants were asked to consider integration as means of achieving enhanced security and to consider how such a strategy might work.

5.1 Context:

A specific issue related to social cohesion is the potential of individuals within a minority group to become radicalized and conduct acts of terrorism against their host societies. Since the Madrid and London bombings, and the arrests of suspected terrorists in Toronto, the fear of home-grown terrorism has come

to accompany that of terrorism strikes from outside a country's borders. In relation to this, the unrest in the suburbs of Paris, although it did not include acts of terrorism, demonstrated the fragility of the social order and the need to consider the economic and social situation of the children of immigrants, the so-called second generation.

5.2 General observations:

Diversity in and of itself was not felt to create additional security risks for a country. An overarching point stressed by many participants was that, in any discussion about security, no particular group should be considered a threat. Rather, it was emphasized, security concerns arise around specific individuals. Sometimes these individuals are part of a group, but their behaviour does not define it.

While diversity was not viewed as creating risks, lack of social cohesion from failure to manage diversity effectively was seen to involve potential security threats. In this regard, participants considered a most notable threat was the potential for marginalization and radicalization of individuals within society.

In looking at how best to link integration measures to enhanced security, participants stressed that the engagement of civil society in security matters was the single most important element of any strategy. They considered strong and effective relationships with civil society to be an important foundation upon which to build improved national security. In this regard, it was considered critical to move away from a stance of “we” and “they” and towards “us.” One participant argued “that national security is a fundamental human right and that human rights are fundamental to national security.” This reinforced the notion of holding national security as a collective priority and not one held only by the government.

In this context, it was stressed that open, consultative and ongoing dialogue about national security was necessary across a wide spectrum of communities. Participants emphasized that the starting point for such a dialogue was unclear, noting that ethnic and religious communities have not been included historically in deliberations on matters of national security. It was stressed that the landscape has now changed significantly, and in many cases diverse communities have been made part of an ongoing dialogue with government.

Despite relatively little experience with collective work on security matters by governments and civil society, participants cited many examples of positive progress. Collaborative relationships have been seen to be particularly effective when enforcement and security personnel enlist certain cultural communities to help with communications activities in relation to security-related arrests. Cultural communities have also helped promote to the enforcement community an improved awareness of

cultural characteristics and sensitivities that should be taken into account in exercising enforcement responsibilities.

5.3 Policy and programme interventions:

Participants articulated a number of guiding principles to support engagement with civil society on matters of social cohesion, security and radicalization.

i Exercising political leadership

Participants felt that political leadership at all levels of government was important in creating a consciousness of the collective responsibility of civil society for enhanced security. Examples were cited of strong roles for both local and central governments in this regard. Many participants felt that the onus for the overall planning of security measures should rest with national governments. This level of government was also considered well placed to promote understanding of the basis for certain state actions in relation to national security. Some felt that central governments should also ensure the existence of outreach plans to engage civil society and to promote understanding of the objectives of the security and enforcement community. Although national leadership on security issues was deemed crucial, participants also saw an important role for local governments. This level of government was often best placed to establish effective links with groups within civil society, to listen to concerns and to solicit input from community groups.

One participant noted that government efforts to engage the broader community on security matters could serve to reinforce government leadership in this area. At the same time, such outreach efforts could help to reinforce collective

responsibility for security and to affirm a special role for cross-cultural communities. Such communities, it was argued, needed to be consulted to identify aspects of security policy that might have a disproportionate or unintended impact on a given societal group.

Relationship-building and ongoing two-way communication were considered necessary to establishing the high level of trust necessary to work together both in anticipating and in responding to possible threats. The communication principles discussed earlier in relation to working with civil society were felt to be particularly relevant to collaborative relationships on security matters. An important caution was issued regarding the way governments establish relationships with groups on security matters and how such relationships are communicated to the broader public. It was argued that governments must affirm, through proactive communication, that working with a given group should not be construed either by that community or by broader society as implying that the group is part of the threat.

ii Encouraging community leadership

Participants believed that communities across civil society should be encouraged to take a leadership role in relation to security matters. Many of the principles noted earlier in relation to motivating and supporting civil society on broader integration matters were felt to apply to security as well. To help communities develop the necessary leadership, governments should, it was argued, promote understanding of how governments deal with issues of security. Participants cited examples of how outreach efforts to communicate with civil society are helping in this regard.

Participants described a variety of models for outreach that were being used in their respective countries. Such community engagement on security issues, it was stressed, was a learning experience. The fact that some initiatives have had positive results and others have not provides an opportunity for learning. Regardless, the principal advantage of governments and civil society working together was that mutual knowledge and understanding was enhanced and a basis for ongoing cooperation created.

iii Continuous learning and sharing of best practices

Once again, Roundtable participants acknowledged that the high position of security among the domestic priorities of individual countries was relatively new. Similarly, application of the notion of governments and communities working together in relation to security matters was a work in progress. There have been successes in building these relationships, but mistakes have been made as well – and will continue to be made. This was considered natural in an environment where new roles are being established and where each new challenge brings new considerations with it. In this context, it was considered important to learn from experience. Once again, a climate of trust was deemed critical.

Given that community involvement in security is a new area for many countries, participants felt that much could be learned by sharing different practices that are being implemented globally. The value of ongoing international dialogue in this area was stressed.

THE UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS

Throughout the Roundtable discussion, participants repeatedly referred to the unique circumstances of the children of immigrants. They stressed the importance of paying particular attention to the needs of this group, both in the short and long term.

Participants indicated that many integration challenges confronting the children of immigrants are quite different from those faced by their parents. For example, it was noted that, in arriving in a new country, the first generation often focuses as a first priority on economic rather than social integration. The first generation, it was argued, often makes sacrifices to establish financial stability as rapidly as possible. For the children of such immigrants, the process of social integration may take place slowly. Some felt that the children of immigrants are, in fact, the first generation faced with fundamental adaptation to the new country. This process often involves a search for models that embody the values of that country, as the children seek to establish bridges between the national culture of their home country and their heritage culture. Some countries are experiencing emerging tensions in the second

generation as youths seek ways to express both their national culture and their heritage cultures and to identify their place in society.

Participants described the range and scale of challenges that countries are facing with respect to such children. In the major cities of one country, 40 to 50 percent of children have a migration history. In countries where immigrants are geographically concentrated in socio-cultural enclaves, they may have limited opportunity to integrate into the broader society. This can result in barriers to the social and economic integration of youth and younger generations. Participants from some countries noted that cultural enclaves are a particularly significant issue where immigrants do not have, or have not had for most of their residency, regularized permanent status. Immigrant families in these socio-cultural groups may not have integrated into society because they are not part of the “mainstream” socio-economic portrait. Furthermore, as noted earlier in this report, restrictions on rights can have negative effects on the children of immigrants and can weaken their societal connections. Concerns arise when a combination

of such circumstances creates a sense of disaffection with society among youth, sometimes resulting in marginalization.

The integration of past generations of immigrants is an even greater challenge when language as well as cultural barriers are at play. There are situations, for example, where children who do not feel part of the national culture also lack the language abilities to participate in society. In countries with guest worker populations that have remained permanently, children often face these multiple barriers to integration. Participants from countries with this experience feel considerable urgency in finding solutions that will support economic, social and cultural integration and foster social cohesion.

Many participants saw the education system as having great potential to address the particular needs of the children of immigrants. Participants spoke of a new focus in schools on youth programmes oriented to these special needs. One country is making efforts within its school system to adapt the curriculum to recognize that the religion of immigrant youth can often represent an important dimension of their identity. This country is examining ways to provide for broader religious expression in schools, in keeping with its constitution. This is seen as one way to support children by allowing them a fuller opportunity to express themselves in their new country.

One final insight in relation to children and youth was shared. Some participants stressed the importance of learning from history, noting that radicalization of young people is not new and that many countries have experience with marginalized and radicalized youth. One participant reinforced the importance of considering domestic

terrorism of the past and reflecting upon what, if anything, is new in the current context. Historically, relative poverty and disenfranchisement have been contributing factors. These factors continue to play a role in some instances.

7

CONCLUSIONS

Delegates articulated the many ways in which their countries are responding to the issues of diversity and integration. A mutual understanding of the opportunities and challenges across the G8 countries was established. There was affirmation that in developing immigration policies and programmes in response to changing needs, factors associated with diversity and integration must be taken into account.

While the discussion served to identify unique aspects of integration challenges in each country, it also brought to light some of the collective challenges being faced. The discussion was particularly useful in identifying key principles to be taken into account in managing diversity and integration. It also highlighted innovative measures that have been adopted in certain countries or are being contemplated. The meeting allowed participants to consider measures being used elsewhere in terms of their potential applicability in their own countries.

New relationships were established across countries, with a potential for continued bilateral and multilateral dialogue. A high level of collaboration was demonstrated at the meeting, with

discussions serving as an excellent learning opportunity and as a foundation for important continuing relationships. All delegates have expressed the wish to continue this dialogue.

Two future opportunities for exchange were noted. One participant extended an open invitation for everyone to attend a community/government meeting in Washington DC. Another invited participants to attend a special symposium in Japan on “language and other integration issues,” noting details of this event would be supplied to the Metropolis Secretariat, for sharing with all participants at the Roundtable.

This report reflects the views and the opinions expressed by the panel of experts at the meeting and not those of their respective governments.

Copies of this report are available in both English and French at www.international.metropolis.net.

ANNEX

Resolutions from July 16th G8 discussion on “Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century”⁷

St. Petersburg, July 16, 2006

1. Education is at the heart of human progress. Economic and social prosperity in the 21st century depend on the ability of nations to educate all members of their societies to be prepared to thrive in a rapidly changing world. An innovative society prepares its people to embrace change. We will promote the global innovation society by developing and integrating all three elements of the “knowledge triangle” (education, research and innovation), by investing fully in people, skills and research, and by supporting modernization of education systems to become more relevant to the needs of a global knowledge-based economy.
2. Education enriches cultures, creates mutual understanding globally, underpins democratic societies, builds respect for the rule of law. Education, the enhancement of skills, and the generation of new ideas are essential to the development of human capital and are key engines of economic growth, drivers of market productivity, and sources of cohesion for all nations.
3. Development of a global innovation society depends on the mobility and integration in all nations of people, knowledge and technologies. As science, technology, and economic progress become more global, international collaboration is indispensable to generate the talent and knowledge needed to find solutions to fundamental global challenges.
4. Knowledge-based economies require innovative education systems and reliable, transparent, and non-discriminatory legal, regulatory, and policy frameworks. These frameworks foster pro-competitive and predictable policies, offering strong protection of intellectual property rights, supporting research, development, and investment, and providing incentives that favor innovation.

5. To achieve this common vision for the Innovation Society, and noting the Moscow Declaration adopted by Ministers of Education on June 2, 2006, we will:

- actively cooperate to achieve high quality basic education, literacy and gender equality in accord with the education-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the objectives of Education for All (EFA);
- build modern, effective education systems to meet the challenges of and participate fully in the global innovation society;
- encourage educational policies and investment that foster diverse, efficient, sustainable, and high quality higher education institutions;
- promote lifelong learning based on the principles of the G-8 Cologne Summit Charter on Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning, to enable individuals to adapt to change, maximize their skills and knowledge, and contribute to their communities and work places;
- cooperate with the private sector to expand research networks to generate knowledge, encourage innovation, and move new technologies quickly from the laboratory to the marketplace;
- increase exchanges in science and technology and other fields at all levels of education, and promote better understanding of foreign qualifications and educational outcomes;
- promote high standards notably in mathematics, science, technology, and foreign languages at all levels of education, and support the engagement of highly qualified teachers in these critical areas;
- promote social and economic integration of immigrants into host countries and societies with

education being one of the effective means of doing so.

I. Developing a Global Innovation Society

6. We must generate new knowledge and nurture innovation to sustain long-term economic growth. We will collaborate on creating research networks among higher education institutions, research centers and business, and capitalize on the leading edge technology they produce. We will share best practices on knowledge-based cluster development and public-private partnerships to facilitate global knowledge dissemination and move technologies quickly from the laboratory to the marketplace.

7. We will promote investment in knowledge, research and development. We will also leverage public expenditures strategically to attract private funding in R&D, including in the education sector. In addition, we will encourage closer cooperation between universities and industry. These actions will generate innovation that improves the lives of our people, the prosperity of our nations and the well-being of the global community.

8. We will develop policies to promote the creation and dissemination of new technologies that encourage innovation and entrepreneurship. We will also make effective use of technological advances and research across businesses, education systems, and nations, while preserving the rights of innovators. We appreciate the contribution made by business and higher education leaders from our countries who met in Moscow on July 11, 2006 to discuss leveraging the resources, ideas and expertise of the public and private sectors to foster

greater innovation and meet the education and workforce needs of the 21st century.

As a follow-up to the St. Petersburg Summit, we welcome Italy's offer to organize in cooperation with UNESCO a World Forum on "Education, Innovation and Research: New Partnership for Sustainable Development".

9. Education is vital to the public interest. Our governments will cooperate with the private sector in the development of innovative, high quality higher education and research and development systems. We will ensure a reliable, transparent and non-discriminatory environment that fosters a supportive, pro-competitive and predictable policy framework, offers strong protection of intellectual property rights, provides incentives to investment, and promotes regulatory policies that encourage innovation. Our governments will promote dialogue and synergies with business, higher education and labour to develop sound higher education and human resources policies.

10. We will promote innovation alliances and increase the exchange of ideas and expertise about university-based public-private partnerships in the G-8 countries. Sharing among relevant stakeholders best practices ideas and experience about education governance, funding, modern teaching methods, as well as about recognition and transparency of qualifications could also add value. We will collaborate internationally through innovation alliances to generate the critical mass of scientific and technological talent and knowledge needed to support innovative societies.

11. We will identify points of contact in our countries that can facilitate the exchange of ideas and expertise, while

recognizing that private sector involvement in the development of these partnerships is one of the main keys to achieving an effective linkage between higher education and the needs of the global innovation society.

12. We will promote international academic mobility at all levels, significantly increasing the mobility of students, teachers and researchers. We will enhance existing programs of exchange and promote the development of linguistic and cross cultural skills. The Bologna Process aimed at creating the European higher education area is an example of one such program. We will also facilitate access to knowledge generated in other countries, taking account of the multiple factors that impede the movement of students and scholars.

13. We will share information about qualification systems in our countries to increase understanding of national academic practices and traditions. We will foster a global education environment that merges excellence and innovation with increased access, and we will encourage effective systems for the assessment and comparison of foreign qualifications in the public and private sectors.

II. Building Skills For Life and Work Through Quality Education

14. We will improve the quality of education to provide stronger opportunities for our young people and for future generations. We will promote more effective use of public resources in education at all levels and at all stages of life. We will build innovative societies that provide continuing improvement of labor force skills and creative opportunities for life-long learning.

15. We will prepare our people to embrace change through lifelong learning. We will strengthen linkages between learning, enterprise training and the labour market, including through distance education and cross-border provision of education services. We reaffirm the importance of the G-8 Cologne Summit Charter on Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning and its call for opportunities and incentives for lifelong learning to be created for all people.

16. We place a high policy priority on the importance of early childhood education to give young children a strong start and to strengthen social equity. We will also foster greater and more equitable participation in adult learning beyond secondary and tertiary education.

17. We welcome active participation of the business community and non-governmental organizations in the development of continuous education that provides the competences and skills needed by our societies and economies.

18. Our nations will focus on achieving quality, efficiency, effectiveness, and affordability in our education systems. We take note of the joint efforts by the UNESCO and OECD to develop voluntary guidelines for quality provisions in cross-border higher education. We will collaborate with the academic community and the private sector to ensure we use the best models of education governance, teaching and management.

19. We encourage our educational institutions and appropriate organisations to share information and promote understanding of our respective countries' qualifications systems, teaching methods, education management and financing.

20. We reaffirm our commitment to use information and communication technologies (ICTs) in education more effectively in accordance with the G-8 Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society and the Tunis Commitment of the World Summit on Information Society. ICTs are crucial to meeting the educational needs of a technology-intensive economy. Accessible educational resources are important tools for creating a more equitable and more efficient global information environment.

21. We will strive for high standards in particular in mathematics, science, and technology to provide strong foundational elements for the global innovation society. All primary and secondary school curricula should stimulate more intensive learning in these subject areas, as well as problem-solving skills and critical thinking. We also encourage the efforts of developing countries to improve their science, technology and mathematics education at primary and secondary levels.

22. We welcome initiatives to support the learning and mastery of foreign languages at all educational levels. The ability to communicate and to learn foreign languages is also essential in today's global environment. It involves social and international skills, intercultural knowledge and competences and the understanding and respect of the values and the history underlying cultures and societies.

23. We will encourage the development of education policies aimed at fostering a system of accessible, diverse, sustainable, and high-quality higher education institutions, both university and non-university including research institutions, community colleges, technical schools, public and private sector vocational training institutes, with the ability

to respond to new demands. Universities and other tertiary institutions have a key role in innovative societies to educate our public. They must be able to adjust rapidly to the changing demands of society and the labor market through effective and transparent governance in the framework of education policies.

24. We will work within our national systems to make teaching an attractive career choice, to develop teachers' knowledge and skills, and to retain effective teachers in schools. The teacher lies at the heart of education. Fundamental to improving student learning and achievement is the presence of highly qualified teachers in every classroom. Teachers must have good knowledge of content and instructional methods to be effective educators and mentors. Effective teachers instruct their students in critical content knowledge, and help develop the desire and ability to excel and to pursue life-long learning.

25. We encourage our relevant education authorities, the private sector and other stakeholders to share information and best practices on a wide range of issues related to modernization of education systems. Modernization of our education systems must play an important role in achieving our common strategic goals. In the new millennium, the management of knowledge strategies is as fundamental as the management of more traditional educational resources – personnel, finance and facilities. Thus, education systems should focus increasingly on developing intellectual capacity, not only in terms of the mastery of content but in processing, adapting, applying existing information, and, more importantly, in creating new knowledge. Education must also find ways to combine excellence with the widest access possible.

III. Education for All and Development

26. We will work to provide affordable, quality education and professional training accessible for all, regardless of social and economic background, age, sex, religion, ethnicity or disability. Education is a vital investment in the sustainable development of a country and its human potential. Basic education, including literacy, numeracy and life-skills training is its foundation. In addition to access, the content of student-learning and the quality of their learning outcomes are equally important.

27. We will support the educational elements that develop critical thinking, and the open exchange of knowledge, which build both democratic societies and well-functioning economies with opportunities for all. Creation of an educated population and workforce is vitally important. To achieve this strategic objective, the world community embraced the education-related MDGs which prioritized the EFA goals of universal primary completion and gender equality at all levels of education. We regret that interim targets related to eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education have not been achieved. Greater concerted action by all will be needed to fulfill these key goals by 2015. We reaffirm our commitments in this regard.

28. We welcome the resolve of the 2005 World Summit to promote the Dakar Framework for Action (Education for All) adopted at the World Education Forum in 2000 as an integral part of renewed international development efforts. We reaffirm our commitment to the EFA agenda and welcome UNESCO's efforts to finalize a Global Action Plan to

achieve the EFA goals and provide a framework for coordinated and complementary action by multilateral aid agencies in support of country-level implementation. Particular attention needs to be given to the poorest countries, including in Africa, where more than forty million children, 60 % of whom are girls, are currently excluded from the school system. We call upon UNESCO and the additional convening agencies of the Dakar Framework (UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and the World Bank) to support harmonization and alignment with national priorities, plans and targets and to utilize each organization's unique capacities to eliminate duplication of effort and increase efficiency.

29. We also support an effective implementation of the EFA Fast-Track Initiative (FTI) and reiterate our Gleneagles commitment to help FTI-endorsed countries to develop sustainable capacity and identify the resources necessary to pursue their sustainable educational strategies. We look forward to a progress report on the FTI by the World Bank at the Annual Meetings. We reiterate our commitment to support Africa in its achievement of the Education for all (EFA) agenda. This builds on the partnership that the G8 has developed with Africa, as set out in the Africa Action Plan (Kananaskis) and subsequently in the Gleneagles Declaration. In this context we confirm our commitment to work with all FTI-endorsed countries including newly endorsed ones to meet these goals.

30. We call upon developing countries to take the lead to create sound national education sector strategies, policies, and plans, to integrate them fully into national development plans, and to work with all relevant stakeholders to

provide education opportunities for all. Success in EFA can only be possible if there is a strong vision and firm commitment by developing countries themselves with national ownership and self-help based on clearly formulated Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or their equivalent and well-constructed long-term plans for the education sector as a whole. Effective governance, sound policy and institutional environment, a focus on quality, and the recognition of the value of informal and non-formal education are at the heart of healthy education systems.

31. We will work with all relevant stakeholders to promote cooperation and the sharing of good practices to achieve EFA goals. New forms of cooperation between and among developing and developed countries, including through trilateral cooperation, will play an important role in reaching EFA targets. We will encourage this, especially to improve learning outcomes and the quality of educational management, materials and teaching.

32. We are committed to attaining EFA goals and to eliminating obstacles in other sectors that narrow education opportunities. Assistance in the education sector alone will not solve the problem. We will work to support cross-sectoral approaches combining investments in education and other key areas such as poverty reduction, health and sanitation, water nutrition and infrastructure to achieve EFA goals, raising HIV/AIDS awareness in education systems.

IV. Advancing Social Cohesion and Immigrant Integration through Education

33. We will promote civic participation, as well as equality of opportunity and cross-cultural understanding to help people to maximize their individual potential and overcome barriers to their participation in society. Inclusive, respectful and equitable societies provide the most conducive conditions for acquiring skills and knowledge, promoting innovations, and driving economic and social success. We view cultural diversity and knowledge of foreign languages, openness to new talent and the mobility of the labor force as essential attributes of innovative and inclusive societies.

34. We will facilitate social, cultural and professional integration in our societies by promoting support for life-long learning, and encouraging the language competencies necessary to secure employment commensurate with levels of skill and experience. We also call for joint research and exchange of knowledge, experiences, and best practices among the G-8 countries and other stakeholders in this important area.

35. We will aim to maximize the human and social capital of all people through policies that recognize that diversity in the educational sector and in the workplace, advance innovation and stimulate creativity. Successful social cohesion policies, including education for democratic citizenship, will help to combat intolerance and discrimination. Our education systems should facilitate achievement of these fundamental goals, while taking into consideration that each country employs a range of different policies to promote acceptance and integration in its economy and society.

ANNEX

G8 Roundtable on Integration and Diversity October 4, 2006

Topics for discussion ⁸

Integration for Economic benefits

Among the reasons that states allow or even encourage migration to their territories is to gain from the skills and labour that the migrants bring with them. Low fertility rates and the effects that they are having on the domestic labour supply of most G8 countries have concentrated the attention of policy-makers not only on the most effective ways to import the required skills into the labour market, but also on how to ensure that the immigrants, especially those with high skills, are able to make their intended contributions to the domestic economy. Impediments to a full use of an immigrant's human capital include language deficits, the limited recognition of foreign credentials and experience, limited networks or social capital available to the immigrants, and domestic resistance to employing immigrants, especially in high-skilled occupations. This discussion will look at the experiences of the G8 countries and solutions that have shown success. Some time will be reserved to examine

whether the experiences of the English-speaking countries of the G8 are significantly different from those of the non-English-speaking states. For example, is it more difficult for non-English speaking countries to recruit immigrants with domestic linguistic fluency than it is for the English-speaking countries?

Diversity and Integration

Among the concerns expressed by a number of G8 members is that immigration, bringing with it a diversity of nationalities, ethnicities, races, cultural practices and religions, might erode the internal cohesion of a society and thereby endanger social order, weaken the bonds among its people and lead to economic decline. Integration is often regarded as a means by which such potential pitfalls of immigration can be avoided.

However, G8 countries do not fully share an understanding of what is meant by integration or how to go about accomplishing it effectively and justly. Nor do they share a vision of

⁸ As shared with Roundtable participants in advance of meeting.

what integration might accomplish. For some, integration includes maintaining a stable national identity; for others its purpose is to ensure that an immigration programme achieves its economic and social goals. Some have adopted an assimilationist model, others a multiculturalist model and others a republican model. From yet another perspective, integration for some means adaptation by the immigrant; for others, it is a mutual adaptation by both immigrants and the native-born population.

This discussion will allow G8 members, with their different histories of immigration, to describe their experiences with diversity, the policy framework within which they understand and attempt to bring about integration and the results of such interventions in their societies. We will attempt to determine the extent to which the integration capacity of a society is elastic and which policy instruments can effectively enlarge this capacity to accommodate the increased numbers of immigrants from diverse backgrounds who will arrive in our countries.

The Role of Civil Society in Integration

Bringing about an integrated, cohesive, and secure society is seen by more and more governments as requiring their direct intervention through specific integration policies and programmes. Diversity is now of such a magnitude that there are few governments that continue to believe that social forces alone will look after either economic or social integration. A significant question is whether and how to involve the communities themselves, whether those communities are defined in terms of their ethnicity, religion, or country of origin. A cohesive society is one, it is commonly believed, where communities work with one another towards the

achievement of common goals. Some G8 members involve ethnic, religious, and immigrant communities in their integration programming, while others do not. This session will look at the advantages, costs and effects of community involvement in government efforts to bring about integrated and secure societies, with an emphasis on service delivery and on community-based measures to enhance domestic security.

Diversity and Security

A more specific issue having to do with social cohesion is that of the potential that members of minority groups radicalize and conduct acts of terrorism against their host societies. Since the Madrid and London bombings, and the arrests of suspected terrorists in Toronto, the fear of home-grown terrorism has come to accompany that of terrorism strikes from outside a country's borders. In relation to this, the unrest in the suburbs of Paris, although it did not include acts of terrorism, demonstrated the fragility of social order and the need to consider the economic and social situation of the children of immigrants, the so-called second generation.

All G8 states have introduced measures to combat terrorism that originates beyond its borders; but there has been much less attention given to diminishing the potential for security breaches initiated within one's borders. As a result, we are less well equipped to respond to this risk. This discussion will explore the causes of "home-grown terrorism" and how we are beginning to deal with the risk that our own populations may pose to our security. We will also ask whether integration will be able to counter such dangers or whether, in fact, radicals are immune to our integration efforts.

