



DRIM
Danube Region

Information Platform for
Economic Integration of
Migrants

Methodology for country specific recommendations

Prepared by the SPF Group

Work package 5 – STRATEGY

D 5.1.4 Methodology for country specific recommendations

Key principles and aims

At the national workshop for decision-makers (November/December 2018), the identified shortcomings of existing information infrastructure in the relevant country will be discussed and presented (see deliverable National Workshop Methodology, prepared by YUCOM) and the participants of the workshop will discuss the **methods of overcoming barriers to information access** and more specifically also **the role of DANUBE COMPASS as the kick-off tool** bringing about the creation of more systematic and systemic approach to this issue.

On the basis of the workshops as well as lessons learned in **WP3** (more specifically Country specific profiles and Best practices for each individual country) and **WP4** (Pilot actions and training sessions) a concrete set of recommendations for each PP's country on **how to enhance the information infrastructure for migrants and the role that public institution play in this** will be prepared. **PLEASE, IN THIS RESPECT, WHEN PREPARING COUNTRY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, INVOLVE YOUR FINDINGS FROM ALL STAGES OF THE DRIM PROJECT, NOT ONLY THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP. HOWEVER, TRY TO INVOLVE THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP INTO ALL THE SUGGESTED CHAPTERS.**

The recommendations will be in English and local languages and sent to relevant national and transnational stakeholders in order to stimulate discussions and raise awareness of the importance of the equal access to information.

The country specific recommendations in individual states have to be compatible. It means that they must be **compatible** with **common aims of the DRIM project**, with **DRIM project activities and deliverables** as well as with Danube Transnational Programme **requirements**. For this reason, this methodology presents the key issues that need to be included in individual country-specific recommendations.

Also, a key challenge for every set of country specific recommendations is the long-term sustainability of the Danube Compass info tool, which includes several financial, technical, promotional and organizational aspects. This is why a set of questions to be addressed in country-

pecific recommendation pertains also to the possibilities for sustainability of not only the DC but also of other transnational information tools.¹

The structure of the report for country specific recommendations:

Please, try to be as concrete as possible. Remember that it is important that set of recommendations are outlined for the country level, however, focus also on the local and regional aspects, if you deem this necessary. The set of questions in the subchapters is for your orientation; however, do try to answer all the questions, if relevant for your country context. The suggested length of the report is 4-5 pages, however, do not limit your self too much. Concrete recommendations relevant for national contexts in connection with the current migration, labour market and demographic trends in the country will be appreciated. The following chapters are suggested:

- 1. The information infrastructure in each country and position of the Danube Compass in the system of informing of migrants in the individual country (linking the provision of information to national migration policies, migration, economic and other demographic trends)** – please involve findings from all stages of the projects – especially the country specific profiles, DC information gathering and national workshops (1-1.5 pages)

The main questions to be addressed here are: What are the strengths of the national information infrastructure? What are the weaknesses of the national information infrastructure? How do different institutions, stakeholders cooperate in providing information and how can both provision of information and cooperation be improved? How has such infrastructure been adapted to the current migration trends and policies (locally, regionally, nationally)?

¹ In connection with sustainability, key strengths of the product are to be mentioned:

- "Online one stop shop" – Danube Compass is a complex umbrella information about the living in 8 countries in many languages in one web portal.
- The product is prepared and is ready to use. A responsible organization has to keep the product up to date only.
- An international network for sharing information has already been created. This network can be utilized for cooperation, source of another information, capitalization etc.
- The product saves time and money of state and public institutions. It also helps NGOs to print handout or navigate the client.

2. Specific recommendations for providing information to migrants and mobile individuals
(1,5-2 pages)

In which ways does provision, use and access to information for migrants and mobile individuals differ from the 'majority population'? What are the challenges, good and bad practices in this field (locally, regionally, and nationally)? How could information access be better adapted for people who do not have access to digital communication channels and/or are computer illiterate, recommendations for improved communication/cooperation with local, regional and national bodies and institutions in the field of providing migrants and mobile individuals with information? How can better interagency cooperation be achieved?²

3. Transnational issues/info-sharing (1-1,5 pages)

What issues have arisen during the project course regarding gathering of information at the transnational level? What are the challenges, how could they be overcome? Could you provide any examples of good practices? How could better harmonisation of information at the transnational level be achieved? What could be the technical, language, etc. solutions in this respect?

4. Possibility of sustainability of DC and other information platforms (1-1,5 pages):

Please address possibilities for the sustainability of transnational information platforms, based on your experiences and activities within the DRIM project from the following main angles:

- a. organisational: which could be the responsible organisation, role of the organization in maintaining and operating the DC stakeholders, i.e. involved subjects and their role in the administration of the Danube Compass; identification of main processes which should be secured and description of these processes;
- b. institutional: regular use of info tool by different relevant institutions, ensuring a responsible institution of regular maintenance and updating the DC info tool; identification of relevant key stakeholders for long term use of the info tool, how do these stakeholders cooperate?
- c. technical sustainability
- d. central level (server, web site and editorial system?) and local level (revision, editing and actualization of the content the DC info tool, responsible institution?) could be provided.
- e. publicity (publicity and PR of the product)
- f. a communication strategy towards (i) stakeholders and (ii) target groups should be developed, to include a list of convenient communication tools and description of their use.

² Please note that this part should take a form of recommendations! For an example please see: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_White_Paper_GFC_Energy_2016_2018_Policy_Recommendations.pdf

- g. Who could be responsible for such publicity, which are the potential media partners, which communication networks and tools could be used for both public officials (stakeholders) as well as migrants?³
- h. e. financial sustainability as financial resources, and expenses (please calculate realistic costs of sustainability per year in your case)
- i. Different models can be applied in assuring financial sustainability of the DC and other info tools. What are the potential resources, how can these be secured, what are the recommendations for local/regional/national levels?
- j. Described approach and tools represent an ideal situation and progress of the Danube Compass. However, there are factors and barriers which can make the utilization of the DC difficult.

All-important barriers (e.g. unstable financing, lack of interest of key media, technical problems, instability of institutional structure...), should be identified in advance and measures for elimination of them should be proposed at the end in a concise manner. What are the main general risks in both accessing, using and maintaining Danube Compass and other similar info-tools?

5. Conclusions, any other issues, comments, suggestions? (0,5-1 page)

Other issues that you consider as important and not mentioned above.

³ All partners and stakeholders should be involved continuously in the communication action at least by:

- using their social media and other channels;
- banners on their web pages;
- hand out promotional material.

Nevertheless, other communication tools are desirable (conferences, seminars, discussion platforms, round tables, public media...). Involving foreign media in every country (e.g. Greek, Turkish, Russian, Vietnamese etc. newspapers and web information portals) is strongly recommended to be used. Social ventures and private companies could be also involved in Danube Compass publicity in the framework of their corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategies.