



Interreg



Danube Transnational Programme

DRIM



Information Sharing Index

Improving Strategic Capacities for (Trans)National Information-Sharing for Migrants

O 5.1 Strategy for transnational infosharing

Prepared by the Lawyers' Committee for
Human Rights - YUCOM

DRIM

Danube Region
Information Platform for
Economic Integration of
Migrants

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Short Overview of the Migration Patterns in the Danube region	6
Index Methodology	10
Data Collection Process	10
Annual Assessment Forum	12
Transnational Panel	13
Data Collection Matrix.....	15
Annual Assessment Forum Guide.....	20
Scoring Scale.....	24
Check List for the Index Implementation	27

Introduction

Danube Region Information Platform for Economic Integration of Migrants (DRIM) project is aiming to enhance capacities of public authorities for creating an enabling environment for migrants' economic integration in the wider Danube region. The relevant actors have been empowered to respond to the needs of resident and newly arrived migrants through effective information sharing and thus to create sustainable mechanisms for their further integration in the community.

One of the main outputs of the project DRIM is launching a transnational information platform – Danube Compass. This tool is intended to provide various groups of migrants and mobile individuals with information on different aspects of work and life in eight countries of the Danube region (Slovenia, Serbia, Croatia, Austria, Germany, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary). Through Danube Compass, public authorities are able to communicate their country specific labour market related information with migrants in a simple and more efficient way while migrants themselves are able to find their place into different countries' labour markets and learn about related country specificities (work insurance, health system, work qualifications, educational possibilities etc.).

Lack of information is one of the critical barriers to a successful integration of migrants. One of the main challenges in collecting information is how to reflect the transnational character of migration movements and organize “the collecting phase” across several countries as well as how to continue to perform necessary changes and improvements that lead towards larger scale of informed migrants in all phases of migration (pre-migration, movement and settlement). Furthermore, regular assessment of achieved outcomes and impact regarding migrants and level of their informing is another prerequisite for a sustainable migrants' integration into local communities. This document thus details the information collection phase (Index) and the assessment forum (Annual Assessment Forum) that must inevitably use the “national” approach due to legislative, cultural and socio-economic characteristics of the countries, but then introduces the Transnational Panel where diverse stakeholders and end beneficiaries exchange data and experiences across borders in a multi-national or trans-regional capacity and provide recommendations for improvements in this area.

The proposed systematic approach in assessing the state of the information collection would provide all necessary inputs for the strategy, on one hand, and continuously, comparable data that could serve in the further communication with the local and international stakeholders related to identified issues and challenges in service provision and also policy making in general, on the other hand. Created partnerships amongst the relevant actors around the proposed Index, and specifically – partnerships to pilot and adapt the instruments, could result with potential up scaling of the project which would widen the network of involved organizations and additionally, improve capacities of public institutions.

One of the lessons learned from the project implementation was that information availability, access to stakeholders and the scale of information may vary significantly across different countries. In order to overcome this challenge, the information platform needs constant care: technical updates and new information require monitoring, updating and editing of content and the technical framework. These are necessary prerequisites for the platform sustainability after the project ends. Also, in order to provide for relevant information for the continuous advancement of the system in place, the developed Index offers clear mechanism for data collection and interpretation, and at the same time, emphasises involvement of the final beneficiary group throughout the process by providing a guide for migrants' involvement in the content creation and platform improvements' design as well as involvement of all relevant stakeholders in transferring their experiences into relevant legislation that will ensure sustainability of the implemented activities in the coming period.

The project long-term change is expected to be the construction of an effective information infrastructure for migrants throughout the Danube region with improved capacities of public institutions which ensures smoother migrants' integration in their new communities. So to provide for sustainability of this stream of project actions, the Information Sharing Index aims to provide the strategic direction and the standards that guide practitioners in enhancing quality information for resident and newly arrived migrant populations and creating prerequisites for their full integration having in mind migrants' economic, social and psychosocial wellbeing. The approach presented here can change the way decisions and planning are made by both migrants and decision makers.

This document begins with the short overview of the migration patterns in the Danube region. This section is a result of the capitalization activities between two Danube Transnational Programme's "sister" projects DRIM and YOUMIG intended to ensure the greater impact of the projects' interventions in the field of migration and integration. It then continues into a core section of this document; a guide for collecting relevant data on the effectiveness of the (trans)national information sharing mechanisms, as well its assessment, as a strategic solution for further advancement of the (trans)national information sharing system. The Index also provides means of verification, data collection methods and precise dimensions for each of the proposed category. Finally, the methodology envisages transnational consultative panel, as a next step in this cyclic approach to continuous development of the information sharing process in a transnational perspective.

The proposed set of activities regarding data collection and Annual Assessment Forum organization, have clearly envisaged involvement of final beneficiaries in development and implementation of a needs-based approach to information sharing for migrants. This will bridge the identified gaps in informing of newly arrived migrant population related to various areas they have found the most important. At the same time, continuous communication amongst the stakeholders is expected to result in improved mechanisms for a comprehensive informing of migrants. The Index focuses on evaluating established communication channels amongst the stakeholders that serve for sharing their experiences and transferring them into relevant legislation and strategic solutions. The implementation of the instrument will lead to building

more harmonious community relations in increasingly non tolerant societies in the Danube region, particularly related to migrant communities.

Short Overview of the Migration Patterns in the Danube region¹

Historical trends of migration in the Danube region², as well as their economic and demographical contexts were shaped by political and historical turning points in the past decades. These included the establishment of the Iron Curtain and its fall, followed by the accession of most countries of the region to the European Union. Economic interconnectedness, new information and communication technologies, as well as lower costs of travel and transport contribute to an increasing homogenization of the region. However, some economic and demographic indicators suggest that many differences are more than persistent.³ Demographic and economic imbalances within the region have tended to encourage the movements of workers from economies where they are in surplus to those where they are most in need. These demographic and migratory trends show very different patterns and pictures for different countries so the area can be described both as heterogeneous as well as interdependent.⁴ The changes in the political economies influenced the socio-demographic development in most of the countries of the region (especially Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania) by creating more possibilities for free movement of the population which altered the number and direction of migration flows.⁵ These historical legacies

¹ This section provides the information about the migration patterns in the Danube region, and serves as a baseline document for the joint strategy for the (trans)national migrants' integration-related information sharing, together with the baseline data collected using the Index proposed in the following sections. It has been jointly prepared by **Béla Soltész** (YOUMIG - Improving institutional capacities and fostering cooperation to tackle the impacts of transnational youth migration) and **Sanja Cukut Krilić** (DRIM), as part of the Danube Transnational Programme' Capitalization Strategy (Pole Migration and Inclusive Governance).

² 'Danube region' stands for the area where the Danube Transnational Programme is implemented (between Baden-Württemberg and Bulgaria). It is arguably a 'migration system', i.e. an area within which people usually migrate, yet its delimitations correspond to the boundaries of the implementation area of the mentioned EU programme, not to an explicit geographical pattern of migration flows.

³ Fassmann, H., Musil, E. and Gruber, K. (2013) Dynamic Historical Analysis of Longer Term Migratory, Labour Market and Human Capital Processes in the SEEMIG Region. *Synthesis Country report developed within the project 'SEEMIG - Managing Migration and Its Effects – Transnational Actions Towards Evidence Based Strategies'*: <http://www.seemig.eu/downloads/outputs/SEEMIGHistoricalAnalysisSEERegion.pdf>

⁴ Fassmann, H., Musil, E., Bauer, R., Gruber, K. & Melegh, A. (2014). [Longer-Term Demographic Dynamics in South-East Europe: Convergent, Divergent and Delayed Development Paths](#). *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 3(2), 150–172.

Melegh, A. (2012). Net Migration and Historical Development in Southeastern Europe since 1950. *Hungarian Historical Review*, 1(3-4), 415–453.

Savić, M. & Dakić, S. (2016). Demographics, Migration and Brain Drain in the Danube Region. *Economic Themes*, 54(4), 469–483.

⁵ Fassmann, H., Musil, E., Bauer, R., Gruber, K. & Melegh, A. (2014). [Longer-Term Demographic Dynamics in South-East Europe: Convergent, Divergent and Delayed Development Paths](#). *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 3(2), 150–172.

affect also current demographic, economic and political trends in countries of the Danube region. In addition, the region is one of linguistically, ethnically, religiously and culturally most diverse territories of Europe. While some countries in the region have experienced high out-migration (e.g. Serbia, Croatia), others have been considered traditionally immigration countries (Austria and Germany) while others are transitioning from emigration to also immigration countries (e.g. Slovakia, Hungary, Czech Republic).⁶In these countries, the number of international migrants has increased in the last decade and furthermore, they are experiencing an increasing diversification of migration. In this respect, the recent events related to refugees arriving to the new destination countries of, for instance, Croatia and Serbia, were no historical novelty within the region that has faced mutually interconnected migration flows for a long time (e.g. refugee flows during the wars of the former Yugoslavia, the guest worker regimes of Austria and Germany, internal migration within the former Yugoslav republics, etc.).

Annual growth of GDP per capita showed very different trajectories in the countries of the region between the mid-1980s and the mid-2000s. While Austria (as well as most Western countries) did not experience major changes in its economic growth of approximately 1-3% per year, former socialist countries suffered a sudden drop to around -10% (in Hungary and in Slovakia, 1990, or Serbia, 1998). In the early 2000s the growth rates of the region converged, and the crisis of 2008 hit the region with an average -4% change.⁷

However, while rates of GDP change converged, the gap between Eastern and Western countries did not disappear. It is especially telling if national GDP per capita data are compared to the world average⁸: while Austria has presented values ranging from 300% to 350% of the world average since 1980, Romania's GDP per capita fell from 90% to 50% of the world average between 1985 and 1995, and has remained a bit above 50% ever since. With the exception of wealthier Slovenia (moving between 200% and 250% of the world average), most ex-socialist countries of the region have a GDP per capita between 80% and 150% of the world average.

Fassmann, H., Gruber, E. & Németh, Á. (2018). *Conceptual overview of youth migration in the Danube region*. Youmig Working Papers, No. 1. Available at:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Elisabeth_Gruber4/publication/322799336_Conceptual_framework_for_the_study_of_youth_migration_in_the_Danube_region/links/5a70a062458515015e63efd3/Conceptual-framework-for-the-study-of-youth-migration-in-the-Danube-region.pdf

⁶Fassmann, H., Musil, E., Bauer, R., Gruber, K. & Melegh, A. (2014). [Longer-Term Demographic Dynamics in South-East Europe: Convergent, Divergent and Delayed Development Paths](#). *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 3(2), 150–172.

Melegh, A. (2012). Net Migration and Historical Development in Southeastern Europe since 1950. *Hungarian Historical Review*, 1(3-4), 415–453.

Savić, M. & Dakić, S. (2016). Demographics, Migration and Brain Drain in the Danube Region. *Economic Themes*, 54(4), 469–483.

⁷Fassmann et al, *ibid*.

⁸ Comparing the GDP per capita to the (moving) average of the GDP of all countries in the world has the advantage of showing the relative position of a country vis-a-vis others which are potential source or destination countries of migration. Source: Maddison historical GDP/capita database, available at <https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/historicaldevelopment/maddison/>

Country level GDP data can be further disaggregated, highlighting immense economic inequalities within countries. As a general pattern, NUTS2 regions containing the capital city of each country showed GDP levels higher than the EU27 average (even in the case of Romania), while rural areas in the Eastern part of the Danube region usually did not even reach the 50% mark.

While economic inequalities persisted, demographic trends started to converge. Total fertility rates in all countries in the region have shown a decline for most of the past half century, reaching very low levels (between 1.25 and 1.5) in all countries in the last decade. Life expectancy at birth stagnated in Eastern countries before and after the transition, leading to an increasing gap until the turn of the Millennium. However, since 2000, it grows at a similar pace in the case of all countries.⁹

All things combined, East and West share rather similar (and unfavourable) demographic profiles, while economic inequalities between (and within) countries tend to persist. This means that whenever it comes to measuring, analysing and interpreting migratory processes, it has to be stated that in rural regions of Eastern European countries a growing emigration (as a consequence of the huge and persistent economic gap with Western Europe) is coupled with a general shrinking and ageing of the population. Contrary to many migrant-sending regions where the average family size is large, and the population is young, Eastern countries and regions of the Danube region do not have a demographic surplus which could be ‘exported’ to Western Europe without serious developmental consequences.

Emigration, nonetheless, has been on the rise. While the Net Migration Rate (NMR)¹⁰ of all countries of the region was close to 0 until the 1970s, there have been significant changes ever since, effectively splitting the region into a *migrant-receiving* and a *migrant-sending* part. On the country level, Austria’s NMR moved around an average of 4 in the past three decades, while Bulgaria’s NMR, for instance, oscillated between -1 and -8, and Romania also had negative rates since the 1980s. Serbia, while registering a positive peak of 9 in the 1990-1995 period due to the inflow of forced migrants from ex-Yugoslav republics, it quickly turned into a net emigration country, with values between -3 and -6 since then. Other countries of the region (Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia) have shown an NMR slightly above zero in most of the period that followed their transition to democracy. Table 1 shows the net flow of migrants (inflow minus outflow) in selected countries of the Danube region by 5-year periods.

Table 1. Net flow of migrants in selected Danube region countries, 1990-2015

	1990-1995	1995-2000	2000-2005	2005-2010	2010-2015	SUM
Germany	+2,659,698	+695,914	+804,608	+43,087	+1,777,126	+5,980,433
Austria	+227,841	+65,082	+178,117	+153,763	+267,172	+891,975

⁹Fassmann et al, *ibid*.

¹⁰ Rate of immigration and emigration flow data per 1,000 inhabitants, 5-year periods. Source: UN World Population Prospects. Available at: <https://population.un.org/wpp/>

Slovenia	-17,461	+1,487	+14,998	+39,348	+16,571	+54,943
Slovakia	-15,108	-2,964	+1,199	-8,855	+11,346	-14,382
Hungary	+99,980	+78,562	+61,589	+25,150	+29,999	+295,280
Romania	-520,001	-610,000	-468,204	-774,651	-299,997	-2,672,853
Serbia	+178,348	-495,902	-276,331	-116,385	-99,999	-810,269
Bulgaria	-356,464	-133,824	-85,500	-83,742	-24,472	-684,002

Source: UN World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision¹¹. Table compiled by Ádám Németh (UNIVIE, YOUMIG project)

Concerning their age, migrants in the countries of the Danube region are relatively young (if flow data is observed): the age group between 15 and 34 years is overrepresented. Given the structural (economic and demographic) factors described above, this age-specific gain or loss of the local population can have significant effects on the local education, labour market, social benefit system, availability of services, and so forth. As migration patterns in the Danube region are shaped by already existing, massive and persistent economic gaps between sending and receiving areas, they create, directly or indirectly, an increasingly unequal territorial distribution of net gains and losses of population.

¹¹<http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=PopDiv&f=variableID%3a84>, <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=PopDiv&f=variableID%3A85>

Index Methodology

Information Sharing Index is a tool for annual assessing (project) countries performance/development in the area of provision of information to migrants as a precondition for their effective and comprehensive integration. Its overall goal is to track and compare progress in the area over time, as well as to provide a framework for increasing understanding of the topic among governments and the general public.

The Index entails two phases: **data collection process** and the **annual assessment forum**. Collected data are to be presented in the **annual statements/reports** which should then inform the assessment forum. The final product developed upon forum finalization is a (project) **country report** which includes the annual statement/report and the report from the forum discussion, as an explanation of the country information sharing score. All products and phases are also listed at the end of this document in the section Check-list for the Index implementation.

First year implementation of the Index serves as a baseline data collection phase and the baseline scoring process. Every other year implementation should consider the previous year as its baseline which practically means that the data collection, discussion and the scoring should be considered as an update to the previous reports/scores. This process will allow for continuous advancement of the national, but also transnational/global practices informed by the comparable reports. Finally, each (project) country will be able to track its progress and the global trends and the state in the field in the form of global Index tracking will be continuously evaluated and publicized.

Data Collection Process

Data collection process should be implemented **annually by all interested actors engaged in the migrants' integration and more specifically, information sharing processes**. This process, as a systematic framework for data collection is to result in the creation of **annual statements/reports** (based on the proposed means of verification structure), which will then be a robust source of information for the next phase – assessment of the current state, as a precondition for later (and continuous) system(s)'s continuous advancements.

In order to collect relevant data, proposed instrument offers a data collection matrix and the related methods for data collection which should be used to collect the information in the areas relevant to the information sharing systems in the (project) countries (described as dimensions per categories and topics).

The instrument (Data collection matrix) recognizes **four key categories** in data collection process:

1. Normative and regulatory framework
2. Ecosystem and relevant actors
3. Existing services

4. Cross-cutting issues

1. Normative and regulatory framework category is focusing on collecting data on the **international standards** and **national legislative** and **strategic solutions** as a policy frame of the national information sharing system. The given categories' dimensions are focusing on tracking to what extent these legislative solutions are based on the international standards on one, and on the actual and assessed migrants' needs, on the other hand. Furthermore, the dimensions also concentrate on the effectiveness and transparency of the policy processes, as well as participation of relevant actors and citizen participation in general.
2. Ecosystem category aims to track effectiveness of the policy and practical solutions within the system for information sharing, and specifically: **mandates and management structure**, including effectiveness and adaptability of the structures, **capacities of relevant actors** as well as the system for continuous performance advancement. Finally, **intersectoral cooperation** and specifically, capacities and functionality of the (trans)national cooperation between relevant institutions and organizations from different sectors (institutions, non-governmental organizations, media, academia, business) are to be tracked in each area relevant for the migrants' integration (arrival and stay, employment, labour market mobility, cultural orientation and learning local language, education, health, everyday life, protection against discrimination and violence, participation).
3. As per the existing services category, the instrument envisages a set of dimensions related to **relevance, effectiveness and availability, cost-efficiency** together with the **sustainability**, as well as **monitoring, evaluation and potentials for adaption** of the information sharing services. Thus, the instrument provides a framework for the assessment of the quality of the (trans)national information sharing services, its reach and level of client-responsiveness.
4. Due to fact that the information sharing systems should be set to target various and specific groups of beneficiaries at the same time, the cross-cutting issues category focuses on the general dimensions/issues, such as **community responsiveness and participation**—to assess the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the mechanisms for participation. Furthermore, **gender sensitiveness** of the system is specifically focused on gender analysis, but also, existence of specific information sharing services targeting women. **Age appropriateness** and **vulnerable groups' participation** dimensions focus on the capacities of the information sharing systems to adequately target and offer effective services to all age groups of migrants and also, migrants from different vulnerable groups, such as migrants with impairments, unaccompanied minors, single parents, etc.

The proposed **data collection methods** include desk research, focus group interviews with the relevant stakeholders (representatives of institutions and organizations engaged in the information sharing policy making, service provision, etc.), which should be identified in the preparatory phase of the process, as proposed by the instrument itself, in-depth interviews

with the migrants, in-depth interviews with the relevant stakeholders, on-line survey, on-line assessment, beneficiary satisfaction survey (evaluation), web analytics, cost-benefit analysis, participatory research (e.g. dotmocracy). Based on the data collection methods, the instrument identifies related means of verification which will be listed in the matrix.

Annual Assessment Forum

The objective of the forum is to develop a consensus-based rating for each category of the Index and to articulate a justification or explanation for each scoring.

Upon finalization of annual data collection process, the instrument foresees organization of an annual assessment forum that would serve to gather **up to 15 stakeholders engaged in the relevant legislation and practical solutions' development and implementation on local and national level** (representatives of: relevant ministries and institutions, engaged non-governmental organizations, local governments and migrants' communities). Forum members should be those whose work is heavily focused on policy making, advocacy and service delivery, equally. To the extent possible, they should come from the decision-making and operational structures and different local communities. Finally, a 1/4 of forum members should be representatives of migrants' communities (women and other vulnerable groups should be included). The forum should to the extent possible include an equal representation of men and women.

As a method proposed by already developed tools (such as CSO Sustainability Index and the Media Sustainability Index), if regional differences within a country are significant, implementers may want to consider holding regional panels (within a country), which would then entail additional calculations to average regional scores into the one – country score.

The Forum is envisaged as a self-evaluation facilitated event during which the stakeholders reflect upon how well the (project) countries progress towards achieving their goals in migrants' integration specifically through the information sharing processes, taking into account available annual statements/reports produced from the data collection phase.

The forum will provide a space for further discussion about the current trends in migrants' integration using the principles of design thinking in a tailor-made approach to continuous informing of migrant population. For that purpose, a series of questions has been developed in order to provide a roadmap for discussion and assessment/scoring process.

The first annual assessment forum should focus on the first-year data on the state in information sharing field, including the state of the achieved outcomes and impact of the project. Upon finalizing discussion based on the proposed questions, the forum scores each topic, averaging these together for a preliminary category score. Finally, category scores are averaged together for the overall information sharing system effectiveness. Final output of the instrument is a (project) country report produced by the organization/institution selected/chosen amongst the (project) country relevant stakeholders. The report should

include the annual statement/report from the data collection process, and the report from the forum discussion as an explanation of the final score.

Every other year Index implementation will basically provide an update to the previous year and the process should thus become an effective impact measurement system for the expected social change, as well as a pathway for continuous and sustainable advancements in the relevant stakeholders' practices and the information sharing process in general.

The **forum discussion should not last more than two hours** and should be facilitated using the Matrix, the Annual Assessment Forum Guide, and the Scoring Scale which will be presented in the next section, and the notes taken carefully to provide for the adequate report development and a relevant source of information for the consensus building at the end of the discussion.

Upon closing the discussion, each participant is to **give the scores** to each topic in each category of the matrix on the scale from 1 to 7, with the 1 indicating a very advanced state in the information sharing field, and the 7 – an underdeveloped and non-effective system of information sharing which does not guide migrants in their integration. Fractional scores to one decimal please are encouraged, as it could provide more relevant reference for the annual comparisons. Scores should be based on the brief guide provided in the Scoring Scale.

In the next phase, additional forum discussion aiming at creating consensus on the scores is facilitated and the final scores per each topic decided. To close, each category score is calculated as an average score of all topics and the same goes for the Index score for (project) country in the area of information sharing.¹²

Transnational Panel

The Transnational Panel, which should be organized upon completion of the data collection and assessments of all project countries, should serve as a platform for the exchange between diverse stakeholders, including migrants and the formulation of the recommendations for further improvements, and finally, it should promote the annual results and provide the general public with the insights about the status in the area of (trans)national information sharing, as a key precondition for successful integration of migrants in a transnational perspective. In line with the proposed national approach to information sharing, the panel should have a diverse composition of stakeholders from the analysed countries as well as representatives/delegates of transnational migration/mobility networks (e.g. EURAXESS, EURES, European Migration Network, ECRE, Odyseuss, IMISCOE, etc. in order to share information not only on individual countries, but also on transnational issues in information sharing for migrants.

The added value of the transnational panel would be in the transnational cooperation among the main stakeholders of the regional system thus approaching migration and movement as an

¹²Scoring system is based on the scoring system of the CSO Sustainability Index: <https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/democracy-human-rights-and-governance/cso-sustainability-index-methodology>.

inherently transnational process that operates beyond national borders. There are three main aspects of the transnational cooperation in information sharing that seem especially pertinent:

1. Identifying gaps in the information provision

The transnational panel would, through an analysis of the data gathered in the national frameworks, highlight the most critical bottlenecks and problems in information sharing either in a specific area of intervention or in a particular location.

2. Identification of specific groups

Identify specific groups of people who live transnationally and are especially vulnerable with regards to access to information (e.g. posted workers, specific Roma groups, asylum seekers).

3. Knowledge exchange

Exchange information, learn about good practices and prepare recommendations for the implementation of existing good practices (e.g. EURES, EURAXESS), not only in the field of migration governance but also institutional governance in general (e.g. governments' content provision for citizens).

Members of the panel therefore should: 1. Analyse country reports individually, 2. Discuss them jointly during the panel, 3. Formulate recommendations for the improvements of the transnational cooperation and approach to (trans)national migrants' integration-related information sharing, and 4. Present the results of the whole process to the general public.

Data Collection Matrix

Category		Topics	Dimension	Means of Verification	Data Collection Method
Normative and regulatory framework	1.1	International instruments	<p>1.1.1 Relevant international instruments regarding (trans)national information sharing are identified</p> <p>1.1.2 Relevant international instruments regarding (trans)national information sharing are ratified on the national level</p> <p>1.1.3 Relevant international instruments regarding information sharing are being implemented</p>	<p>1.1.1.1 List of documents segregated per source</p> <p>1.1.2.1 Official data</p> <p>1.1.3.1 Official data</p>	(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with the relevant stakeholders
	1.2	Legislative framework	<p>1.2.1 Relevant legislation (laws and bylaws) regarding (trans)national information sharing is identified</p> <p>1.2.2 Relevant legislation (laws and bylaws) regarding (trans)national information sharing is compliant with the international standards and is being implemented</p> <p>1.2.3 Relevant legislation (laws and bylaws) provides a solid basis for adequate information sharing</p> <p>1.2.4 Legislative processes are transparent and involve all relevant stakeholders, including migrants</p> <p>1.2.5 Legislative solutions (laws and bylaws) are based on the assessed needs of migrants</p>	<p>1.2.1.1 List of documents</p> <p>1.2.2.1 Official data</p> <p>1.2.2.2 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>1.2.3.1 Official data</p> <p>1.2.4.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>1.2.5.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of migrants' communities</p>	(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) In-depth interviews with the migrants

	1.3	Strategic framework	<p>1.3.1 Relevant strategic documents and related action plans regarding information sharing are identified</p> <p>1.3.2 Relevant strategic documents and related action plans regarding (trans)national information sharing are compliant with the legislative framework and are being implemented</p> <p>1.3.3 Strategic documents and related action plans regarding (trans)national information sharing provide a solid basis for continuous policy development</p> <p>1.3.4 Relevant strategic documents and related action plans provide relevant and applicable solutions for information sharing (including allocated funds for the implementation)</p> <p>1.3.5 Strategic processes are transparent and involve all relevant stakeholders, including migrants</p> <p>1.3.6 Strategic documents and related action plans are based on the assessed needs of migrants</p> <p>1.3.7 M&E system is in place and provides a solid base for constant adaptations</p>	<p>1.3.1.1 List of documents - desk review</p> <p>1.3.2.1 Official data - desk review</p> <p>1.3.3.1 Interviews' reports – decision-makers and representatives of relevant institutions</p> <p>1.3.4.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>1.3.5.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>1.3.6.1 Interviews' reports – migrants</p> <p>1.3.7.1 Desk review</p> <p>1.3.7.2 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions and the organizations</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) In-depth interviews with the migrants, (4) On-line survey</p>
Ecosystem	2.1	Mandates and management structure	<p>2.1.1 Roles and responsibilities regarding (trans)national information sharing of all engaged institutions/organizations are defined based on the actual needs and available resources, and all actors are aware of the distribution</p> <p>2.1.2 Representatives of all relevant organizations are aware of their roles within the (trans)national information sharing ecosystem</p> <p>2.1.3 Management structure is effective (and the needed resources for its functioning are allocated) and respondent to the changes in the environment</p>	<p>2.1.1.1 List of documents - desk review</p> <p>2.2.1.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>2.3.1. Assessment report - representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) On-line assessment</p>
	2.2	Capacities of relevant actors	<p>2.2.1 Capacities of all relevant actors to fulfil their roles and mandates are adequate</p> <p>2.2.2 Capacity development needs of all engaged actors are</p>	<p>2.2.1.1 Assessment report - representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p>	<p>(1) On-line assessment, (2) Focus group</p>

		<p>identified</p> <p>2.2.3 Capacity development programs based on the assessed needs are available and can build adequate competences (this dimension includes allocation of needed resources)</p>	<p>2.2.2.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>2.2.3.1 Desk review</p>	<p>interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) Desk research</p>	
	2.3	Intersectoral cooperation	<p>2.3.1. Established and fully operational mechanisms for (trans)national cooperation between relevant institutions and organizations from different sectors (government, non-governmental organizations, media, academia, business) and areas (1. Arrival and stay, 2. Employment and Labour market mobility, 3. Cultural orientation and learning local language, 4. Education, 5. Health, 6. Everyday life, 7. Protection against discrimination and violence, 8. Participation)</p> <p>2.3.2 Funds for smooth functioning of the mechanisms for (trans)national cooperation are sufficient and are being allocated continuously</p> <p>2.3.3 Opportunities for and challenges in cooperation identified continuously</p>	<p>2.3.1.1 Interviews' report - representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>2.3.1.2 Desk review</p> <p>2.3.2.1 Desk review</p> <p>2.3.3.1 Interviews' reports - representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p>	<p>(1) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (2) Desk research, (3) In-depth interview with relevant stakeholders</p>
Existing services	3.1	Relevance	<p>3.1.1 Wide range of relevant (trans)national information sharing services exists, and the services are identified</p> <p>3.1.2 All programs provided to migrants include well-incorporated (trans)national information sharing services</p> <p>3.1.3 Existing information sharing services are compliant with the relevant international standards</p> <p>3.1.4 Existing (trans)national information sharing services are compliant with the existing normative and regulatory framework</p> <p>3.1.5 Existing (trans)national information sharing services are based on the continuously assessed needs of migrants</p>	<p>3.1.1.1 List - Desk review</p> <p>3.1.2.1 List - Desk review</p> <p>3.1.2.2 Interviews' reports – representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants' communities</p> <p>3.1.3.1 Desk review</p> <p>3.1.4.1 Desk review</p> <p>3.1.4.2 Relevant international institutions' reports – Desk review</p> <p>3.1.5.1 Interviews' reports – representatives of migrants' communities</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
	3.2	Effectiveness and availability	<p>3.2.1 Quality and effectiveness of online and offline outreach mechanisms (including those integrated into provision of general services to migrants)</p>	<p>3.2.1.1 Interviews' reports – representatives of migrants' communities</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) In-depth interview with</p>

		<p>3.2.2 % of migrants reached by the information services</p> <p>3.2.3 % of migrants that use the information sharing services</p> <p>3.2.4 Information is available on all relevant languages</p> <p>3.2.5 % of migrants that report satisfaction with their integration status</p> <p>3.2.6 Existing information (per service) is evaluated as very useful by the beneficiaries</p>	<p>3.2.1.2 Desk review – analysis</p> <p>3.2.2.1 Analytics</p> <p>3.2.3.1 Beneficiaries’ feedback</p> <p>3.2.4.1 Desk review</p> <p>3.2.5.1 Evaluation report</p> <p>3.1.6.1 Evaluation reports</p>	<p>migrants, (3) Beneficiary satisfaction survey, (4) Web analytics, (5) Beneficiary satisfaction survey</p>	
	3.3	Cost-efficiency	3.3.1 Cost per beneficiary vs. (potential) benefits for the beneficiary	3.3.1.1 Report – cost-benefit analysis	(1) Cost-benefit analysis
	3.4	Sustainability	<p>3.4.1 (Trans)national Information sharing services are integrated into the system of migrants’ protection and integration</p> <p>3.4.2 Additional sustainability points are defined and agreed upon between the key stakeholders</p>	<p>3.4.1.1 Desk review</p> <p>3.4.1.2 Interviews’ reports – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>3.4.2.1 Interviews’ reports – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p>	(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders
	3.5	Monitoring, evaluation and adaptation	<p>3.5.1 Quality and effectiveness of the M&E system</p> <p>3.5.2 Flexibility and client-responsiveness of the established (trans)national information sharing services</p>	<p>3.5.1.1 Analysis and the interviews’ report - representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>3.5.2.1 Analysis – evaluation report</p>	(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) Beneficiary satisfaction survey
Cross-cutting issues	4.1	Community responsiveness and participation	<p>4.1.1 Community needs are assessed continuously and are embedded into the services targeted migrants</p> <p>4.1.2 Mechanisms for migrants’ participation are fully operational all groups of migrants participate in all relevant processes from policy making to services’ development and adaptation, etc.</p>	<p>4.1.1.1 Institution’s reports</p> <p>4.1.2.1 Reports – participatory research in local communities</p> <p>4.1.2.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.1.2.2 Interviews’ reports – representatives of migrants’ communities</p>	(1) Desk research, (2) Participatory research, (3) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders

4.2	Gender sensitiveness	<p>4.2.1 Gender analysis is being implemented throughout the policy/practice cycle – from policy making to service provision</p> <p>4.2.2 Policy solutions and services are gender sensitive</p> <p>4.2.3 Gender equality is promoted through the policy/practice cycle</p> <p>4.2.4 Specific services targeting women are being provided</p> <p>4.2.5 Women migrants evaluate services as useful for their integration</p>	<p>4.2.1.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.2.1.2 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>4.2.2.1 Analysis</p> <p>4.2.3.1 Analysis</p> <p>4.2.4.1 Desk analysis</p> <p>4.2.4.2 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions, organizations and migrants</p> <p>4.2.5.1 Evaluation report</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) Documents' analysis, (4) Beneficiary satisfaction survey</p>
4.3	Age appropriateness	<p>4.3.1 Mechanisms for proper identification and targeting of different age groups within migrant population are in place and fully operational</p> <p>4.3.2 Policy solutions and services are age appropriate</p> <p>4.3.3. Specific services targeting each age group are being provided</p> <p>4.3.4 Different age groups evaluate services as useful for their integration</p>	<p>4.3.1.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.3.2.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.3.2.2 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>4.3.3.1 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>4.3.3.2 Analysis</p> <p>4.3.4.1 Evaluation report</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) Documents' analysis, (4) Beneficiary satisfaction survey</p>
4.4	Vulnerable groups' participation	<p>4.4.1 Mechanisms for proper identification and targeting of different vulnerable groups within migrant population are in place and fully operational</p> <p>4.4.2 Policy solutions and services are sensitive to the needs of different vulnerable groups (persons with disabilities, single parents, etc.)</p> <p>4.4.3. Specific services targeting specific vulnerable groups are being provided</p> <p>4.4.4 Different vulnerable groups evaluate services as useful for their integration</p>	<p>4.4.1.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.4.2.1 Desk review</p> <p>4.4.2.2 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>4.4.3.1 Interviews’ report – representatives of relevant institutions and organizations</p> <p>4.4.3.2 Analysis</p> <p>4.4.4.1 Evaluation report</p>	<p>(1) Desk research, (2) Focus group interviews with relevant stakeholders, (3) Documents' analysis, (4) Beneficiary satisfaction survey</p>

Annual Assessment Forum Guide

Category	Questions
Normative and regulatory framework (ratified international instruments, relevant legislative solutions, relevant strategic solutions, normative and regulatory solutions operationalization - bylaws and action plans)	Are there favourable laws and strategic documents on comprehensive migrants' informing in your country and transnationally?
	Do the laws and relevant strategic documents clearly set out mechanisms for continuous and quality migrants' informing?
	Are the laws and regulations implemented consistently and in accordance with their terms?
	To what extent identified migrants' needs have been taken into consideration during relevant documents and regulations' development?
	Are there direct lines of communication or other avenues for collaborations between relevant actors and policy makers at the central and local levels during these documents development?
	Are these communication lines informal and ad hoc or institutionalized into government decision-making processes?
	What are key gaps and obstacles in establishing sustainable (trans)national collaboration among relevant actors for migrants' informing?
	Do government policies or laws require public access to government decision-making processes, including requirements to have working groups, public hearings, consulting final beneficiaries, etc.?
	Are there adequate action plans/bylaws to support implementation of relevant laws and strategic documents?
	To what extent resources have been allocated for these activities' implementation?
Ecosystem (defined mandates and management structure, capacities of relevant actors, intersectoral cooperation, allocated resources including funds and technical assistance)	Who are identified relevant actors on local, national and transnational level in charge for comprehensive migrants' informing?
	What are roles and responsibilities of identified relevant actors in charge for migrants' informing?
	What are positions in organizational structure of relevant actors' personnel in charge for migrants' informing?
	To what extent are relevant actors able to maintain permanent staff that are in charge for migrants' informing?

	How do relevant actors provide regular assessment of their staff in charge for migrants' informing?
	To what extent do relevant actors develop the competencies of their employees in charge for migrants' informing?
	Are relevant actors effective in using modern technology and information communication technologies (ICT), including social media tools to facilitate their learning and outreach operations?
	How diversified is the funding that relevant actors receive both in terms of amounts and source(e.g. grant schemes, local and national governments, etc.)?
	Do relevant actors actively seek to raise support from their communities?
	Do relevant actors use new information communication technologies (ICT) to raise funds?
	To what extent do relevant actors share information with each other or work together towards common aims?
	Are there networks or coalitions in place that facilitate such cooperation
	Is there an organization or committee through which the sector promotes its interests?
	Are there examples of relevant actors working in partnership, either formally or informally, with the private sector and the media to achieve common objectives?
	Is there awareness among the various sectors of the possibilities for and advantages of such partnerships?
	Do relevant actors enjoy media coverage at the local and national levels in traditional (print, radio, TV) and online media? To what extent is this coverage positive?
	To what extent do relevant actors develop relationships with journalists to encourage positive coverage and initiate larger availability of created services?
Existing services (relevance, effectiveness and availability, cost-efficiency, sustainability, community responsiveness, monitoring, evaluation and adaptation)	To what extent the services that relevant actors provide reflect the needs and priorities of migrants in their communities?
	To what extent these services have been effective, at either the local or national level?
	How relevant actors have determined these needs?
	How many final beneficiaries have been informed through carried out activities?

	To what extent the final beneficiaries have been satisfied with carried out activities?
	To what extent do relevant actors raise awareness about their activities or promote their public image?
	What is calculated cost per service? What is calculated cost per beneficiary?
	To what extent local population is likely to welcome migrants and assist with the adequate information?
	To what extent relevant actors (national and local) have been responsive to assist to migrants' comprehensive information?
	Does the public have a positive perception of activities carried out by relevant actors?
	How much funds and human resources local and national institutions have allocated for more comprehensive migrants' informing in the next period?
	What is a ratio regarding allocated funds for migrants' informing amongst relevant actors (local and national governments, NGOs, etc.)?
	To what extent involved partners' staff is equipped with necessary competences for providing sustainable comprehensive migrants' informing?
	Have some of the projects' outcomes become part of relevant strategic documents and law regulations?
	To what extent final beneficiaries have been involved in development of the project activities?
	Is a monitoring plan for comprehensive migrants' informing developed and implemented?
	Have evaluation activities been agreed and implemented among relevant actors in charge for migrants' informing?
	To what extent activities have been adapted based on carried out monitoring and evaluation?
	What are the most important lessons learned based on carried out evaluation?
Cross-cutting issues (gender, age, vulnerable groups, etc.)	To what extent gender approach has been mainstreamed through development and implementation of the activities that led to better migrants' informing?
	To what extent women have been satisfied with the implemented activities?
	To what extent age appropriateness has been taken into consideration through development and implementation of

	the activities that led to better migrants' informing?
	To what extent different age groups (elderly, youth, active labour force) have been satisfied with the implemented activities?
	What vulnerable groups of migrants have been identified?
	To what extent the carried-out activities have been adjusted to identify vulnerable groups?
	To what extent different vulnerable groups (e.g. unaccompanied minors, smuggled migrants, victims of trafficking, LGBTIQ+, etc.) have been satisfied with the implemented activities?

Scoring Scale

The Annual Assessment Forum (AAF) uses a seven-point scale, with 1 representing the highest and 7 the lowest level of comprehensive information sharing within key categories and topics which are important for migrants' further integration.

These levels are clustered into three general stages: Information Sharing Enhanced (1 to 3), Information Sharing Evolving (3.1 to 5), and Information Sharing Impeded (5.1 to 7). The following broad guidelines can be used in determining scores for individual indicators and dimensions:

Information Sharing Enhanced		Information Sharing Evolving		Information Sharing Impeded	
1.0 – 2.0	2.1 – 3.0	3.1 – 4.0	4.1 – 5.0	5.1 – 6.0	6.1 – 7.0

Ranking	Description
1	The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is fully enhanced by practices/policies in all followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. Relevant actors with the clear mandate for their contribution to comprehensive (trans)national information sharing are identified and are operational. The delivered services have reached to largest potential extent of newly arrived and resident migrants. These services have been tailor-made based on identified needs of final beneficiaries which have had opportunity to take part in their development. Relevant legislative solutions are based on the international standards and as well on actual and assessed migrants' needs. Policy development process is fully transparent and participatory both for local and migrant population. Key vulnerable groups of migrants have been involved in all parts of various activities' creation and delivery that have contributed to extensive migrants' informing and thus to their further integration.
2	The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is enhanced by practices/policies in most of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. Relevant actors for comprehensive (trans)national information sharing are identified on the local and national level. The delivered services have reached to large extent of newly arrived and resident migrants. Relevant legislative solutions and strategic documents which are based on the international standards have been adopted. There is a clear intention of relevant actors to continue with the implementation of these documents. Necessary resources for the planned activities' implementation are allocated.

3	<p>The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is somewhat enhanced by practices/policies in some of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. The relevant actors on local and national level are aware of necessity for further development and implementation of sustainable mechanisms for continuous (trans)national information sharing in key areas for migrants' integration. The delivered services have reached to certain extent of newly arrived and resident migrants. Relevant legislative solutions which are based on the international standards are adopted. The missing strategic and policy documents have been identified. There is a clear intention of relevant actors to continue with development and implementation of these documents. Necessary resources for the planned activities' implementation are allocated.</p>
4	<p>The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is minimally affected by practices/policies in some of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. The relevant actors on local and national level have not recognized information sharing as their priority. The delivered services in migrants' informing have been limited to the activities provided by international organizations, national authorities and local NGOs. Relevant legislative solutions which are based on the international standards are adopted. The missing strategic and policy documents haven't been identified. No resources have been allocated for any of additional activities that lead to continuous information sharing with migrants.</p>
5	<p>The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is somewhat impeded by practices/policies in some of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. The relevant actors on local and national level have not recognized their role in continuous sharing information with migrants. The delivered services are limited to humanitarian and medical assistance.</p>
6	<p>The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is impeded by practices/policies in most of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. There is an obvious lack of interest and capacities of relevant actors on local and national level to enhance information sharing that leads to further migrants integration. Relevant legislative solutions and strategic documents are not developed fully in line with the international standards. The delivered services are mostly limited to humanitarian and medical assistance provided generally by international organizations.</p>
7	<p>The comprehensive (trans)national information sharing is significantly impeded by practices/policies in most of the followed categories and topics which is proved by the tracked dimensions. There is no intention of relevant actors on local and national level to enhance information sharing that newly arrived and resident migrants have found as essential. Relevant legislative solutions and strategic documents have been mostly missing. If any, the delivered services are strictly limited to humanitarian and medical assistance provided mostly by</p>

	international organizations. The information provided do not reach target audience and are not effective.
--	---

Check List for the Index Implementation

- The resources (human, financial, technical, etc.) for data collection are allocated.
- An action plan for data collection is developed and communicated amongst the relevant actors.
- The roles and responsibilities of relevant actors are clearly defined and agreed upon.
- Monitoring plan is developed and communicated amongst the relevant actors.
- Data is collected based on the proposed matrix.
- Annual statement/report is developed and shared amongst the relevant actors.
- All relevant actors have organized various events to inform their external and internal audiences regarding migrants' informing and inclusion progress (round tables, panel discussions, conferences, campaigns, etc.)
- Annual Forum participants are identified and informed regarding Forum format and expected outputs.
- Annual statement/report is shared with the Annual Forum participants
- Annual Forum is organized.
- Annual Forum has resulted with a (project) country report which includes annual statement/report, a short narrative report on current state on migrants' as an explanation of the score per each Index category and a country score, and the recommendations on potential improvements of migrants' informing and inclusion.

- Annual Forum has resulted with potential follow up activities (e.g. project up scaling, Index promotion on global level, advocacy initiatives on national level in order to improve relevant strategic documents and introduce Index as practical tool for continuous assessment and improving of migrants' informing and inclusion, etc.)

- Transnational Panel is organized.

- Transnational Panel has resulted with a set of clear and specific recommendations for the improvements of the transnational cooperation and approach to (trans)national migrants' integration-related information sharing.

- Public presentation of the results of the whole process is organized and the results shared with the general public.