



This project is carried out with
funding from the European Union



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations (OIM)
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM)



FRAMEWORK

ACCESS peer review

**“Strengthening municipalities to work towards a more profound
involvement of migrant youth”**

**FINNISH YOUTH RESEARCH SOCIETY
FINNISH YOUTH RESEARCH NETWORK**



Table of Contents

I) THE BASIS OF THE PEER REVIEW	3
1. The goals of this peer review.....	3
2. The key concepts	3
3. Peer review method	5
II) THE PROCESS OF THE PEER REVIEW	6
STAGE I: Preparing materials for the peer reviews.....	6
STAGE II: Training	8
STAGE III: Preparing for review visits	8
STAGE IV: Review visit.....	10
STAGE V: Preliminary report on each city	11
STAGE VI: Peer review report and online self-assessment materials.....	11
III) APPENDIXES	12
1. FORMS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION	12
2. KEY FACTORS TO BE REVIEWED.....	14
3. INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER MUNICIPALITIES	15
4. SETS OF QUESTIONS	17

I) THE BASIS OF THE PEER REVIEW

1. The goals of this peer review

The goals for the Access project and the peer review component are defined in the Call for tender -document by IOM Helsinki as follows:

”The overall objective of the ACCESS project is to empower migrant youth to become politically active on the local, national and European levels and to contribute actively to migration and mainstream policy development”. Regarding the local level, the specific objective is ”to strengthen the work of municipalities in major cities across the EU towards more profound involvement of migrant youth in decision-making processes”.

In order to achieve this goal,” the project will conduct peer reviews assessing how current policies and actual practices advance or hinder the involvement of migrant youth in the various decision-making processes within the ACCESS partner municipalities”. As defined in the document, ”the ultimate goal for the peer review component is to increase (both partnering and non-project) municipalities’ awareness of the benefits and limitations of their practices, programmes and policies of involving migrant youth in decision-making processes, and as a result, enable municipalities to work towards more profound ways of engaging migrant youth”.

2. The key concepts

The title of the Access project, ”Active Citizenship: Enhancing Political Participation of Migrant Youth” embodies three key concepts of this peer review, ”political participation”, ”migrant” and ”youth”. The fourth key concept, municipality, is expressed in the specific object for the local level: ”to strengthen the work of municipalities...towards more profound involvement of migrant youth in decision-making processes”. It is obvious that they can be understood and defined in multiple ways. What do we mean by them in the framework this project, when planning and implementing the peer reviews?

Political participation

According to the Grant application form by IOM Helsinki: “In the context of this project, political participation of young migrants originating from third countries does not only include participation in electoral processes but is understood to require a more comprehensive approach of involving young migrants in decision-making processes, e.g. participation in youth councils and organisations as well as in advocacy work.”

In the tender provided by Finnish Youth Research Society and accepted by IOM it was noted: “When only certain traditional forms of participation, such as voting or joining a political party are considered, young people seem to be passive. Particularly when young people are at stake, political engagement should be understood as a multifaceted process, recognizing the wide scope of political life beyond the narrow concept of representative democracy and institutionalized forms of political engagement. Nowadays there are many other channels and forms of participation, such as internet platforms for commenting plans and topical issues and sharing own ideas, youth forums etc. which manage to activate some part of the young people to engage themselves with local politics.

Even if those platforms offer a possibility for input from below, they are often still systems operated from above. It is important to ask, whether there are initiatives and expressions of needs and demands originating among the young people on their own conditions and ways, which are not perceived and recognized as political participation by the decision makers (e.g. rap music, graffiti, lifestyle as a political statement and commitment).”

It is evident that political participation is to be understood as a very wide range of activities aiming at exerting direct or indirect influence on political decision-making processes concerning issues of interest to young actors. (See *Appendix: Forms of political participation*)

Migrant

The word migrant has many meanings depending on the person speaking and the institution producing data. It can be used to refer to foreign nationals or persons born abroad. It is not unusual that it is used even for persons, who are born in the country, but whose parents, or one parent has immigrated to the country. Statistics related to immigration are usually based on citizenship, country of birth or mother tongue. Sometimes skin colour, ethnicity or religion play a role in who is considered to belong to migrants irrespectively of the actual citizenship or identity of those persons.

In this project "migrant youth" refers to young persons, who have immigrated themselves or who are second generation migrants.

However, it is essential to ask, what are the real categories of belonging and identity in the cities reviewed? and how they are perceived by the interviewees. It is also most important to respect young persons' own identification and the name they call themselves and the group/s they belong to.

The population of the cities participating in this project are very different with each other when it comes to the percentage and background of migrant population. Exact information on that is to be found in the background information of each city.

Youth

In different contexts the age categories referred to when speaking about youth and young people vary a lot, ranging from about 12 years to 29 years. It is obvious that the everyday life, circumstances, abilities and aspirations are very different at early teenage and at settled adulthood.

There are certain age limits which have weight when thinking of the possibilities for political participation, most evidently the voting age in municipal elections.

When doing interviews, it's important to make clear what age groups we want to talk about, if it matters. It is also good to check what age groups the interviewee has in mind, when talking about young people.

Municipality

Even if municipality as a concept is quite clear, municipalities have various mandates, powers and duties in different countries. When we want to evaluate participation and involvement at local level it is essential to be aware of and take into account this fact. It also has an effect on which stakeholders and departments are being interviewed during peer review visits in partner cities.

Furthermore, it has to be noticed and kept in mind that one of the partners is a district of a city, whereas others are cities.

The goal of the peer review is to assess how current policies and actual practices advance or hinder the involvement of migrant youth in the *various decision-making processes* within the ACCESS partner municipalities. Various decision-making processes can refer to, for example:

formal political system; involvement as voters, candidates, elected members
administration; involvement as respondents, initiators
youth councils, forums etc.; involvement as elected members, participants
schools: learning & practicing democracy; involvement as pupils, members

services: leisure, employment etc.; involvement as clients
city planning, community development; involvement as residents, stakeholders

It has to be clear before each review visit, which sectors can and shall be included in the review.

Even if we concentrate on involvement and participation at local level, it is important to notice that conceptions of citizenship at national level have an impact on attitudes concerning inclusion and entitlement at local level, too.

3. Peer review method

The model of this peer review is developed specifically for the Access project. In contrast to some versions of peer review, the review does not take self-assessment as a starting point, for two reasons. Firstly, when a project partner makes a self-assessment in the beginning of the project, it might be difficult to accept a divergent assessment of the project partners following the review. More importantly, taking self-assessment report as a starting point of the peer review and reviewing only issues that arise from it narrows the perspective of the review unnecessarily. This model aims at a more open version of peer review: a version which allows the project partners to take any kind of findings and comments without an eventual feeling of contradiction with their own evaluation, and a version in which the interviews are conducted by asking open questions about topics, which are important in the context of the Access project.

The fact that the review is carried out by peers is evident in all phases of the review. The project partners are peers to each other and have agreed on the aims of the whole project, including the review. They produce a background information document on their municipality. They identify the parties and persons to be interviewed during the visits. They interview their peers, among others, in participating cities. They perform analysis of the interviews. They compare and discuss their findings in order to draw conclusions. They comment the drafts produced by the consultant at various stages of the project, including final report. And in the end, they make use of the results of the review for assessing and developing their own practices.

Ideal model will not be used as a methodological basis for the review. However, the key factors which were to be reviewed imply ideals concerning active participation of migrant youth. (*See Appendix: Key factors to be reviewed*) In this model, ideals reflecting the goals of Access project are used as indicators in the checklist for initial analysis of the interviews.

II) THE PROCESS OF THE PEER REVIEW

STAGE I: Preparing materials for the peer reviews

Background material

by partners with local IOM office

The first task of the partners is to collect and present information about their municipality, about the young residents and migrants in the municipality and, most importantly, about the existing participation structures. (See *Appendix: Structure of the Background information document*.) The background material is necessary for the project partners for preparing themselves for the peer visits.

The preparing of background material is also a preliminary phase of the review process itself. The background information document is a collection of facts, which can be presented without needing to interview the actors and stakeholders. Compiling factual material before making interviews is beneficial in two ways. Firstly, it is not probable that the interviewees are able to give exact numerical information, for example, during the interview. Secondly, it is not necessary to use the scarce interview time for collecting facts, when the time is better used for letting the interviewees to describe the issues reviewed and discussing their views on them.

List of interviewees

by partners with local IOM office

Defining the group of persons to be interviewed is a crucial point of the review, because it delimits the information that can be gathered through interviews. It is important to find interviewees who know the substance well. As important is to interview persons who have different roles in the field reviewed and therefore probably diverse points of view to the topics discussed.

The selection of the interviewees is led by the following guidelines given by the consultant:

Relevant actors and stakeholders and their representatives to be interviewed in your city/district are:

-all parties which have a formal position in representational systems (either generally for all residents, or youth council and other systems specifically for young people or migrants) where young people with migrant background are, or could be participating

-all NGOs, communities, groups and possibly even individuals who have in fact been actively involved in municipal processes and disputes

-all persons or associations etc., who are representing, educating or having influence in young persons with migrant background, specifically in their capability and motivation (or lack of motivation) to be active politically

-politicians and officials in key positions regarding municipal decision making, and having impact on or responsibility for enhancing the participation of residents in general, or young person's / persons with migrant background in particular

- active, influential and knowledgeable individuals, who should therefore be interviewed even if they do not represent any organisation

- young persons, who are not participating actively, in order to understand better the obstacles that keep them from it
- actors involved in the case*

*In order to be able to evaluate impact it is necessary to concentrate on some actual cases (1-2 cases per city). In the context of this review, a case means a process, which has actually taken place, which has a beginning and end, in which some young persons with migrant background were actively involved, and which could be seen as an example of political participation, keeping in mind all forms of political participation (See Appendix). A good example is a revealing one; it might have gone well or badly from the point of successful participating. A case should preferably present an action, which was initiated by young people, or a process in which an opinion or statement etc. by young people has been processed. A project led by municipal authorities or an NGO in which young people were a target group is not a good case. Apart from interviews, materials and documentation about the case can be collected.

Interview questions

by consultant and the partners conducting the interviews

The interview questions are based to the goals of the Access project: What do we need to find out in order to evaluate the situation and practices concerning the participation of young migrants in local planning and decision making processes? At a more detailed level they are derived from the key factors and indicators discussed in the steering committee meeting in June.

Different sets of questions are prepared for different target groups, i.e. young persons, NGOs and communities, politicians and administrative officials.

The peers conducting the interviews have to choose the right set of questions to each interviewee and apply them accordingly. They can also formulate additional questions themselves.

The aim of the interview questions is not to get a short, precise answer to each question, but at getting the interviewee to talk as much as possible about the topics. Therefore, the questions on the list are to be complemented with follow-up questions depending on what the reply of the interviewee.

Sheets for initial and comparative analysis

by consultant

The interviewers together with their note keeper (forming a working pair) are to make initial analysis immediately after each interview. This is carried out with the help of analysis sheet prepared by the consultant. The substance of the initial analysis sheet reflects the ideals implicated by the goals of the project. By filling in the sheet, the account by the interviewee is summarized and assessed systematically. The analysis is structured according to the most important aspects of the review: participation, impact, motivation and inclusion, capability and knowledge, as well as strategy.

The comparative analysis sheet serves for systematic comparing of information given by interviewees. After having completed all interviews during a review visit, the working pairs collect the information from their initial analysis sheets to one comparative analysis sheet. Through this procedure, agreements, disagreements and contradictions between the persons interviewed are recognized and documented systematically.

Guidance for conducting the interviews

by consultant

The consultant prepares a guidance for conducting the interviews manual, which explains in detail how the peers shall prepare themselves for the interviews and how they are expected to conduct them. It also gives guidance on documenting the interviews and filling in the initial and comparative analysis sheets.

STAGE II: Training

led by the consultant, accomplished by the peers, practical arrangements by IOM Helsinki

All peers will participate in training, which will take place in Brussels on September 1st-2nd. A training is indispensable to ensure that all peers understand the goals of the review and are capable of conducting the interviews successfully. The training serves also as a meeting point allowing discussion aiming at common understanding and agreement on the execution of review visits.

The training consists of following modules:

- introducing the participants
- sharing understanding of goals and key concepts
- getting to know the field of the review visit: background material and list of interviewees (the first city to be visited can be used as an example)
- digesting the interview manual including the sets of questions
- making interviewing and note taking exercises
- digesting the initiative and comparative analysis sheets
- making analysis exercises
- evaluation and lessons learnt session

Issues to be discussed during the training include:

- comparing the lists of the parties to be interviewed in different cities
- discussing the cases to be reviewed in different cities
- agreeing on the practical arrangements of the review visits

STAGE III: Preparing for review visits

The review visits require a lot of preparation. The tasks are listed below sorted by the party responsible for its execution.

The IOM Helsinki together with the consultant shall:

- write a presentation of the project and the review visit for interviewees; it is important that all interviewees get similar information about the project they are involved in; however, the presentation can be translated to local languages when contacting the interviewees
- plan the timetable for the review visits.

The local IOM office shall:

- identify the persons to be interviewed on the basis of the list of the parties to be interviewed
- together with partners; the peer advisors (possibly also the young persons from their thematic groups) should be consulted on possible interviewees, especially when looking for young persons, active and passive, which will be interviewed.

The persons should, as a rule, be able to give the interview in English. However, if there is some specifically important person to be interviewed, who is not fluent enough in English, it is possible to hire an interpreter. The need and costs must be discussed *with IOM Helsinki*. Please do consider, too, whether IOM staff would be available for interpreting.

- contact the persons to be interviewed and fix an interview date with them
- send the presentation of the project and review visit [together with the interview questions] to the interviewees in advance
- pair the interviewees with the interviewers (avoiding overlapping interview dates)
- write a short presentation of the interviewees for the interviewers:
 - a) who they are (name and title)
 - b) whom/which party they represent (if any)
 - c) why they have been chosen to be interviewed
 - d) (i.e. what is their role and specific area of expertise)
- make imperative modifications of the timetable for the review visit (*in agreement with IOM Helsinki and the consultant*)

The IOM Helsinki together with local IOM office(s) shall:

- make practical arrangements for the review visit including travel, accommodation, meals, refreshments, rooms needed for the review, equipment needed for interviews

The peer reviewers individually and with their working pair shall:

- a) familiarize themselves with the background material of the city to be visited
- b) familiarize themselves with the presentations of the persons they are going to interview
- c) adjust the questions for each interviewee making use of different sets of questions
- d) making interview & note taking exercises (important especially for the young resource persons)

STAGE IV: Review visit

The review visits will take place according to the schedule agreed on in the Steering Committee meeting in Marseille 18.6.2014:

- 1) 20.-22.10.2014 in the City of Helsinki, Finland
- 2) 26.-28.11.2014 in the City of Barcelona, Spain
- 3) 15.-17.12.2014 in the City of Marseille, France
- 4) 14.-16.01.2015 in the City Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- 5) 09.-11.02.2015 in the Municipality District 14, Prague, Czech Republic

In the beginning of a review visit there is a joint session for discussing any questions arising from the background material and checking practicalities concerning the interviewees, questions, notes and analysis sheets.

There can be a welcoming and introductory session by the city visited before or after this joint session. It is recommended that the peer advisors (possibly together with young persons from their thematic groups) would be involved in planning and carrying out this session. They could, for instance, give a presentation on how the city works from their perspective, or make a performance of current issues important for them in the city. The form of the presentation would be up to them.

During the first day there has to be (at least) one time slot for interviews. During the second day 3-4 interviews and during the third day 1-2 interviews will be made by each pair, so that each working pair conduct six interviews during a review visit, and altogether 24 interviews will be completed. For each interview two hours must be reserved; one for the interview and one for initial analysis immediately after the interview. If translation is needed, the interview takes twice the time.

It is advantageous for keeping to the timetable that most of the interviews can be done in the same place. The place should ideally be "in the field", for example in the youth center or city youth office or alike, instead of a hotel or IOM office. It is also possible and worthwhile considering that one day, or half a day would be spent doing interviews in another part of the city, e.g. in an area, where a lot of young people with migrant background live. Furthermore, if there are some important persons to be interviewed who request that they be interviewed at their place, we have to be flexible and some working pair must have time to go there.

The interviews will be conducted by working pairs formed of a partner (municipal officer) and a peer advisor from each city. They will share the interviews so that each of them is interviewing three times and making notes three times. Whenever possible, they interview their peer, which means that officers interview officers and peer advisors interview young persons. With other interviewees, such as politicians and representatives of NGOs or ethnic communities they have to decide, whom it fits better to act as an interviewer.

In addition to written notes, all interviews are recorded. This serves mainly as a backup for the person making notes. (The consultant can eventually use the recordings for quality checking and improvement purposes.) Immediately after each interview the working pair fills together the initial analysis sheet.

In the end of each working day a joint session is organized to check, whether the interviews have worked out well, to share experiences and discuss eventual problems, questions and comments.

During the last day, after having completed all interviews, working pairs compare their interviews with each other and fill in the comparative analysis sheet.

After that the review visit findings of the working pairs are compared with each other and discussed together, shared findings are noted, conclusions are drawn.

The review visit ends with an evaluation and lessons learnt session for feedback and evaluation of the review visit, results, eventual shortcomings and necessary adjustments. This is also an opportunity for short information exchange concerning next review visit, if necessary.

All interview notes together with recordings, analysis sheets and findings notes are collected by IOM Helsinki and the consultant for comparative analysis to be accomplished (*by the consultant together with IOM Helsinki*) after all review visits have been completed.

STAGE V: Preliminary report on each city

by local IOM / IOM Helsinki or by migrant youth resource persons (guidance by the consultant will follow)

After each review visit a local report for the city visited is compiled on the basis of initial and comparative analysis sheets, shared findings and conclusions noted during the peer review visit. This report is of preliminary nature, since substantial results and recommendations will be made only after all review visits have been completed.

However, a preliminary local report could serve as useful material for discussions on the local level. Especially, the thematic youth groups led by the peer advisors could analyze and/or comment the findings, and make suggestions on how to combat the shortcomings found out. These discussions, in turn, would provide interesting additional material for final peer review report and self-assessment materials.

STAGE VI: Peer review report and online self-assessment materials

On the basis of material and findings produced during peer review visits a final peer review report will be produced (*by the consultant in cooperation with IOM Helsinki* in April 2015). The partners and young migrant resource persons will have an opportunity to discuss and comment the draft report.

The report will include:

- a) analysis of primary and secondary data from peer reviews
- b) assessment of the municipalities' approach on involving youth and particularly migrant youth in decision making
- c) recommendations for further development and provide concrete advice to policy makers and practitioners

Furthermore, online self-assessment materials will be developed *by the consultant* (in Feb-May 2015). The materials will help non-project municipalities to involve migrant youth in decision making and to assess their resources and structures that enhance or prevent political and civic participation, and present good examples that may be replicated. Participants should also document events where young people participate in planning or decision making processes and their own actions and initiatives, as well as events organized by Access project by photographing, videotaping, audiotaping, drawing pictures, maps and graphs etc. This would be valuable material for online self-assessment tool. It would be an interesting activity for some young people as a group or individually. If there is any such events in your city during the review visit, it would be encouraged that project partners could go and follow them. That would be interesting and important information about how the participation of the young people works in practice, in addition to interviews.

III) APPENDIXES

1. FORMS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

DIMENSIONS OF PARTICIPATION

- a) participation: having an impact, activism
- b) involvement: socialization, integration
- c) formal / informal arenas of politics
- d) based on law / agreement / practice
- e) various forums, channels, fields
- f) general, for all residents or citizens / specifically for young people
- g) young peoples' independent fields and ways of expressing themselves
- h) collective / individual forms of action
- i) top-down/ from below
- j) reactive / proactive
- k) participation on invitation / own initiative
- l) dependence / independence, authenticity

FORMS OF PARTICIPATION

- a) representative: elected members to bodies
- b) attendance: presence in adult decision making bodies
- c) advocacy based: adults representing young people
- d) project-based: consultation or involvement in planning or development project
- e) open/ direct: opinion of anybody interested
- f) deliberative: structured dialogues
- g) activism: self-organised mobilisation

1. **representative participation**

- elected members to different bodies
- municipal elections: voting, being candidate, campaigning
- youth bodies: voting, being candidate, campaigning
- institutionalised, with long-term focus

2. **participation through attendance**

- presence in adult decision making bodies
- e.g. representatives of youth council being entitled to participate in municipal councils or committees meetings

3. **advocacy based participation**

- adults representing young people
- e.g. Ombudsman for Children, Advisory Council for Youth Affairs

4. **project-based participation**

- consultation or involvement in planning or implementing a time-limited project, e.g. designing schoolyards
- structured by the planning authority

5. **open/ direct participation**

- all stakeholders or anybody interested are consulted via internet, in forums, roundtables, hearings etc.

6. **deliberative participation**

- structured dialogues between decision makers and young people
- better decisions through broad debate and consideration
- collective formation of the decision
- activism: self-organised mobilisation

7. **activism**

- self-organised direct democracy outside formal institutions, e.g. occupy camps, theatre, music, graffiti
- responsible consumerism: sustainable, fair production, boycotts
- expert activism: analysis, appeals, political statements
- mobilising protests, e.g. demonstrations, mass protests

2. KEY FACTORS TO BE REVIEWED

1. Participation

- What kind of opportunities are offered for young people for political and civic participation by municipal authorities ?
- What kind of opportunities are offered for migrants' engagement?
- Have young migrants participated so far?
- Who has participated, who has not?
- What kind of participation? In which role?
- What kind of processes, in which phase of the process?
- On which topics?
- What kind of activism on their own?
- Are the young peoples' own initiatives noticed, are their own ways of expressing needs and demands understood?

2. Impact

- Decision making:
- Did participants have an impact on the decision making process, where their arguments heard and taken seriously, or was their participation mainly cosmetic?
- Institutions:
- development of structures and practices
- Participants:
- practical learning by the participating individual and groups (organising events, doing mediawork, doing advocacy work etc.)
- better knowledge of political culture → cultural capital
- co-operation, new networks → social capital
 - ➔ empowerment and inclusion

3. Motivation and trust & belonging

- Do politicians or authorities really want young migrants to participate? Who does? Who doesn't?
- For what reason? What is their motivation for that?
- Do the politicians trust the young migrants? Do they take them seriously as citizens?
- How are young migrants encouraged to participate in municipal processes ?
- Do young migrants want to participate? Who does? Who does not?
- What motivates them for that? What discourages them?
- Do the young migrants trust the politicians?
- Do young migrants feel themselves citizens?
- What is their attitude towards society? Do they feel themselves included? Do they feel secure?
- How do young migrants from diverse countries understand politics?

4. Capability and knowledge

- Are politicians or authorities capable of mobilising young migrants to participate? What is needed for that?
- Do they have knowledge about young people and migrants, information channels, contacts, discussion forums?
- Are young migrants capable of participating? What is needed for that?
- Do they have knowledge about the political system, information channels, contacts, ability to participate and act politically in different ways?
- How are young people, and especially young migrants informed about opportunities to participate?
- Is there any training for young migrants? Or politicians?

5. Strategy

- Does the municipality have a strategy / plan / projects for engaging young migrants (or young people / migrants)?
- Does it take into account gender aspects?
- How was the strategy created, by whom, were any young migrants involved in it?
- What resources there are for implementing the strategy?
- Who is in charge for implementing the strategy or monitoring its implementation? Leadership? Engagement? Disinterest?
- Co-operation between administrative sectors / mainstreaming?
- Monitoring, follow-up, feedback, revision?
- Does the municipality have policy for recruiting staff with migrant background?

3. INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER MUNICIPALITIES

1. Basic figures of the municipality

- number of inhabitants
- percentage of young people
- percentage of migrant population
- biggest ethnic (and/or nationality / language / religion) groups

2. Short review of the relevant legislation concerning political rights

- please cite the relevant articles of the acts and/or explain briefly
- legislation concerning citizenship
- criteria for becoming a citizen
- significance of citizenship for civic and political rights, as well as rights connected to residence, education and working (if any)
- legislation (and other important regulation) concerning
- participation rights at municipal level
- duties of municipalities to inform and consult residents about planning and decision making
- duties of municipalities to integrate and involve the young people and ethnic minorities / migrant communities in participation

3. Information about migrant youth

- Please share whatever information you have available on migrant youth in your municipality? (e.g. education, employment etc.)
- What sources do you have? Who produces information on migrant youth?
- What kind of information does not exist, which would be necessary for you in your work?
- Is there any gender specific information?

4. The structure of political decision making in the municipality

- Who are the key persons in the organization (of politicians and office holders)?
- What political parties are having power on local level currently?
- In which ways / through which channels can a resident of your municipality participate in political decision making and planning?
- Do you have specific participation forums for young people? (committees, councils, seminars, internet-based systems etc.)
- What resources does the youth council (or equivalent) have? What is the yearly budget?

5. Information on political participation of young persons with migrant background, young persons in general, persons with migrant background in general

- Is there any gender specific information?
- Please check and summarize existing research

6. Which ways and contacts there are for informing and listening to young residents?

7. Which sectors and departments are important for the youth in your opinion?

- Which ones are connected to specific “youth affairs” or “youth policy”?
- Which ones are otherwise specifically important for young people?
- Which ones are possibly interesting for young people?
- Are there some departments, which do not have anything with young people to do?

8. Information about the city’s strategy for involving young people with migrant background, or (if there is no such specific strategy) young people in general and persons with migration background / ethnic minorities, in decision making and planning

- Who was involved in making the strategy? was any consulting or participatory mechanism used?
- What resources exist for making and implementing the strategy? is there a specific budget?
- Is there a monitoring mechanism of the strategy? If yes, who is involved in monitoring, how and when is the monitoring conducted?
- Please share relevant documents as attachment (if in English, otherwise summarize their content)

9. Please provide information about recruiting of persons with migrant background by the municipality

- Are there any guidelines for this?
- Is there any quantitative information about this?

4. SETS OF QUESTIONS

- a) for young persons (active/passive) (yng)
- b) for persons involved with #youth council# (ycl)
- c) for persons involved with the case (cas)
- d) for youth organisations (ngo)
- e) for migrant ngos / communities (mco)
- f) for politicians (pol)
- g) for municipal officers (ofc)

Choose an appropriate set of questions when interviewing different types of interviewees. Copy that part of this document into a separate file, save it for the note keeper and print it for the interviewer. Prepare a separate file and print for each interview you are going to do. Remember that when using the other sets than the one for young people (e.g. for persons connected with the case, or representing a youth organisation or migration community) you can add questions from the set for young persons, if the person you are going to interview is young. You can also add some own questions, if you want to. In some questions below, follow-up questions are already suggested. Do make additional follow-up questions in the run of the interview!

NOTE: Words marked with # have to be replaced with the correct name in each city and #local# has to be replaced with the word meaning a person living in that place in the local language (e.g. helsinkiläinen / Barceloní / Barcelonina/ Marseillais/ cluj... / Pražák). It is possible that the person interviewed cannot answer every question, because it is beyond her/his own experience and expertise. This is not a problem, you can just leave the question unanswered. But don't make your own suppositions about the interviewee's ability to answer in advance! Ask all questions and see, if they are relevant for the interviewee.

a) FOR YOUNG PERSONS (active/passive) (YNG)

1. How do you like #CITY# as a place to live?
2. What services of the city are most important for you personally?
3. What about young people in general, which services most of them find important, what do you believe?
4. Do you get information about issues that are currently planned or prepared for decision making in the city?
 - If yes: How do you get that information? Is it extensive enough?
 - If no: Would you like to get more information? Who should be responsible for giving information?
5. Have you ever tried to express your opinion when decisions are made about matters important for you?
 - If no: Why haven't you?
 - If yes: How did you do it? Do you feel that your opinion was taken seriously? What kind of decision was made? Did you find it good?
6. Would you say that you are politically active?
 - If yes: In what ways? Please tell more about your activism! What are the most effective ways of having an impact in your opinion? What gives you motivation to be politically active?
 - If no: What do you mean by not being politically active? Would you say that you are active in the society? Are there some specific reasons for not being active?
7. What gives you personally motivation to get involved?
8. Can you name some factors that have helped you or other young people to become interested and capable of getting involved?
9. What opportunities there exist for the residents to participate in planning and have an impact on decision making?
10. What about young people, are there any arrangements specifically for you?
 - If yes: Do you have experience of them? Do they function well, in your opinion?
11. Are young people heard by city officers responsible for planning and preparing matters for decision making?
12. Can you tell some examples of practices of the city administration that are functioning well for young people?
13. Can you tell examples of bad practices? Or lack of necessary practices?
14. Do you think that the municipal decision makers (local politicians) are interested in listening to young peoples' opinions?
15. Do you believe that they know about young residents' needs and demands?

16. Are young peoples' initiatives noticed and taken seriously by city officers and politicians?
17. Do politicians try to get in contact with young people? How have they done it?
18. How could they get a good connection with young people in your view? What should they do?
19. Do you know how get in contact with decision makers in #city#?
20. Have you sometimes tried to contact a politician?
 - How did you do it? Did you have success?
21. Are many young people interested in expressing their opinions and trying to make change?
 - What kind of young people are? Who are not?
22. Do you see some obstacles for the participation of young people in municipal decision making?
23. What about young people with migrant background, do they have some specific obstacles or advantages?
24. Do parents have influence on young persons' willingness or ability to be active in the society?
 - What kind of influence, how?
25. Do you feel being a citizen with full rights?
 - If not: Why not? What should change that you could feel being a citizen with full rights?
26. What rights do you consider being most important?
27. Do you feel being equal member of society?
 1. If not: Why not? What should change that you could feel being equal?
28. Is living here in #CITY# an important part of identity, do you feel yourself as a #LOCAL#?
 - If not: Are there other attachments more important for you? (e.g. French / Algerian – European / African – global etc.)
29. Do you feel yourself as an insider here in #CITY#?
 - If not: Do you rather feel as an outsider? Why is that?

b) FOR PERSONS INVOLVED WITH #YOUTH COUNCIL# (YCL)

NOTE: these interviewees can be young activists, NGO representatives, municipal officers or politicians; you can add questions from those respective sets

1. How does the #youth council# function in your view?
2. What kind of activities does it incorporate?
3. Which ones do you find most important?
4. Do you think that #youth council# has enough resources and support for its activities?
5. How would you describe the place and role of the #youth council# have in the municipal decision making?
6. How are the statements and initiatives processed in the administration and decision making?
7. Do they have impact? Can you mention good or bad examples of that?
8. Is the functioning of the #youth council# monitored and documented?
9. How can the results of the work of the #youth council# be assessed?
10. What gives you personally motivation to be active in the #youth council#?
11. What kind of young people become members of #youth council#?
12. Do the members represent some specific youth groups?
13. Are there young persons with migrant background as members of the #youth council#?
14. What kind of contacts do they have with young people living in #city#?
15. Do young people in #city# know well, how #youth council# works?
16. Is a large part of young people living in #city# interested in politics?
17. Do you think that decision makers are interested in young peoples' opinions?
18. Are young people in general heard by city officers responsible for planning and preparing matters for decision making?
19. Are young peoples' initiatives noticed and taken seriously by city officers and politicians?

c) FOR PERSONS INVOLVED WITH THE CASE (CAS)

NOTE: these interviewees can be young activists, NGO representatives, municipal officers or politicians; you can add questions from those respective sets

1. What was the aim of the action?
2. Who were the initiators?
3. Who else was involved, how did they get involved?
4. What happened? Please describe the actions / events / activities / projects?
5. Was there a strategy / plan about how to proceed and achieve the goal/s?
6. Who was thinking about the strategy / making plans?
7. Did you / they have success? Did you / they get what they wanted?
8. Were there other positive outcomes?
9. What was good in the process?
10. What went wrong? Negative experiences or results?
11. What were the reasons for success / disappointing result?
12. Were you / the actors heard during the process by city officials and/or political decision makers?
13. How were your / their suggestions taken into account?
14. Were there some persons or parties opposing the actors?
15. Were there some persons or parties supporting the actors?
16. What gives you motivation to be politically active?
17. Are young persons in general politically active?
18. Are there some obstacles for young people to be involved in local politics?
19. What about young people with migrant background, do they have some specific obstacles or advantages for being involved

d) FOR YOUTH ORGANISATIONS (NGO)

1. Are young people capable of participating in the society at the local level?
2. What kind of supporting measures for their involvement are there?
3. Would they need more support, what kind of measures would be necessary?
4. What about young people with migrant background, are they equally capable and willing to participate?
5. Would they need extra support as compared with young people without migrant background, is there some specific civic education for them?
6. How do you find the participation opportunities for young people in #city#?
7. Are young people heard by city officers responsible for planning and preparing matters for decision making?
8. Do you think that decision makers are interested in young peoples' opinions?
9. Are young peoples' initiatives noticed and taken seriously by politicians?
10. What is the role of your organisation in supporting young people with migrant background?
11. Does your organisation get resources or support from the municipality?
12. Do you get some special for supporting migrant youth activities?
13. How do you see the role of NGOs in the integration of the migrant youth in the local society?
14. Do you think that youth NGOs and young peoples' associations are adequately appreciated as actors in the society?
15. Are they regarded as potential partners in diverse projects of the city government?

e) FOR MIGRANT NGOS / COMMUNITIES (MCO)

1. Does your organisation/community try to have an impact on local decision making from time to time?
2. How does it work? Have you had success?
3. Do you get information about the topical plans of the city?
4. Are you sometimes consulted, when plans and decisions are being made in the city?
5. Are young people in your community interested in local politics?
6. Do you think that they should be?
7. Do parents have influence on young persons' willingness or ability to be active in the society?
8. What kind of influence, how?
9. Are young peoples' initiatives noticed and taken seriously by city officers and politicians?
10. Do people with migrant background have sufficient knowledge about the political system and ability to participate?
11. Do they have some specific obstacles or advantages?
12. Do they have equal rights for participation in the society?

13. Do you think that migrant communities are adequately appreciated as actors in the society?
14. Are they regarded as potential partners in diverse projects of the city government?

f) FOR POLITICIANS (POL)

1. When you think of young people living in #city#, do you think that they are politically active?
 - If yes: In which way they are? What kind of young people are?
 - If no: Do you think that they should be more active? In which ways? Why do you think that they are not active?
 - What kind of activities do you think about when we are talking about being active politically?
2. As a political decision maker, do young people take contact with you?
 - If yes: About what kind of issues? In which ways? What kind of young people?
 - If no: Can you think of any reason for that?
3. Are there some specific occasions where you meet or could meet young people?
 - If yes: Please tell more about those occasions. Are they regular? What kind of young people do attend in them?
 - If no: Do you think that meeting young people would be important? Are there some obstacles for meeting them?
4. Do you have any contacts with young people with migrant background?
 - If no: What do you think are the reasons for that? Do you feel that you should have contacts with them?
 - If yes: Make follow-up questions on the kind of contacts and young people!
5. Is there any difference in when and how they contact you compared with the young people without migrant background?
 - If yes: What kind of differences? What do you think are the reasons for that?
6. What possibilities there are for young people to participate and have impact on decision making and planning in this city?
 - Make follow-up questions on what the interviewee is telling!
7. Can young people with migrant background participate in the same way or are there some differences?
8. What would it mean for Marseille, if also non-citizen residents had voting rights in local elections?
 - Has the possibility of such extension of voting rights been discussed?
 - What would the voting right mean for non-citizen residents?
 - Would it make any change in municipal politics?
9. Do young people make initiatives of their own?
 - Can you tell examples?
10. What about young people with migrant background?

11. Do you think that young people's voices are heard by the decision makers?
12. Are there some mechanisms for processing their initiatives and views?
13. Is there training for decision makers, especially new ones, in working with #youth council# and meeting young people?
14. Are decision makers well informed about young residents' problems and desires?
15. Does the city have a strategy for integrating young people, including migrants, in municipal planning and decision making?
16. How do you evaluate the strategy?
17. Does it pay attention for possible gender differences?

g) FOR MUNICIPAL OFFICERS (OFC)

1. What possibilities there are for young people to participate and have impact on decision making and planning in this city?
 - Make follow-up questions on what the interviewee is telling!
2. How does the city inform young residents about topical issues and their opportunities for telling their views about the issues?
3. What about young residents with migrant background, are there some specific channels and manners for informing them?
4. How are young people educated about the functions of the municipality, as well as its administration and the decision making system?
5. What about young residents with migrant background, are there some specific ways for educating them?
6. Can young people with migrant background participate in the same way or are there some differences?
7. Do young people make initiatives of their own?
 - Can you tell examples?
8. What about young people with migrant background?
9. Are young peoples' initiatives noticed and taken seriously by city officers and politicians?
10. Are there some mechanisms for processing their initiatives and views?
11. Is there documentation about their initiatives and their processing?
12. Are young people in general heard by city officers responsible for planning and preparing matters for decision making?
13. Do you think that young people's voices are heard by the decision makers?
14. Is there enough knowledge available for municipal officers about young residents and their situation?
15. Is there information about young peoples' participation in municipal planning and decision making processes?

16. What about information about young migrants participation?
17. Is there training for municipal officers in how to include and inspire young people in planning processes?
18. Does the city have a strategy for integrating young people in municipal planning and decision making?
19. Does the strategy pay attention to young people with migrant background?
20. Does it pay attention to possible gender differences?
21. Who is responsible for drafting, implementing and monitoring the strategy?
22. Who was involved in drafting the strategy?
23. Who is involved in executing of the strategy?
24. Who is involved in monitoring the implementation of the strategy?
25. How do you evaluate the strategy?