



European Politics and Society: Václav Havel Joint Master Programme

Examining Collaborative Dynamics in French Migrant Integration Policies: from National to Local Levels

Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

Student: Charlotte Gagnaire

Email adress: charlotte.gagnaire01@estudiant.upf.edu

Supervisor: Prof. Juan Carlos Triviño-Salazar

Wordcount: 13187

June 2024



**CHARLES
UNIVERSITY**



**Universiteit
Leiden**



**JAGIELLONIAN
UNIVERSITY
IN KRAKÓW**



**Universitat
Pompeu Fabra
Barcelona**

Table of Content

Abstract	3
Introduction	4
Literature Overview	5
<i>Beyond national models of integration</i>	5
<i>Incorporating the local turn within multilevel governance</i>	5
<i>Local turn and the vertical dimension of multilevel governance</i>	6
<i>Local turn and the horizontal dimension of multilevel governance</i>	7
<i>Uncovering the gaps in the literature on local migration policy-making</i>	9
Theoretical Framework	10
Background and Case-selection	14
Methodology	16
Results	18
<i>a. National Policy Settings</i>	18
<i>b. Paris</i>	21
<i>c. Marseille</i>	24
Discussion and Conclusion	27
Bibliography	30
Appendix	45
Retranscription of the interviews	45
1. <i>Adoma Marseille</i>	45
2. <i>Singa Marseille</i>	47
3. <i>J'accueille Paris</i>	49

Abstract

This research is integrated into studies at national and local levels and can be generalized to other policies, such as education or environmental policies. The primary challenge at the center of this investigation is to identify if the French and local governments collaborate in implementing integration policies for migrants and (if so) how they collaborate. This study intends to close current research gaps in multilevel governance studies by analyzing the interactions between local and national integration policies, by answering the following question: To what extent does the implementation of immigrant integration policies locally promote the collaboration between state and non-state actors? This first section follows a funnel logic. First, we look at existing literature on national models of integration in the implementation of immigrant integration policies. It then turns to academic research on a local turn in the implementation of integration policies for migrants. We trace the transition in the literature from the national to the local level regarding migrant integration policies in a multilevel context. The results provide an insight into the interplay between national directives and local initiatives, contributing to the broader discourse of migrant integration and the “local turn” within a multilevel governance framework.

Keywords: *multilevel governance, collaboration, collaborative governance, policy implementation, policy-making*

Introduction

The integration of migrants into French society has always been a complex and controversial issue, with national integration policies often failing to reflect the objectives and ideology of French citizens. Despite the implementation of numerous initiatives and strategies aimed at facilitating the integration process, the effectiveness of these policies still needs to be improved, particularly when examined in practice at the local level. The ongoing struggle for successful integration raises a critical and complex question: what is the nature of the relationship between the different levels of governance when it comes to implementing integration policies? This question is crucial to understanding the gap between national policy intentions and local policy outcomes. By studying the dynamics between national and local governance structures, we can understand why national integration policies often fail to produce the results desired by local governments and identify potential avenues for improving the implementation and effectiveness of these policies.

To answer this concern, our research focuses on the following question: To what extent does the implementation of immigrant integration policies locally promote the collaboration between state and non-state actors? We investigate this through a case study analysis of Paris and Marseille. These two cities, with their distinct urban landscapes and governance structures, provide a valuable contrast that reveals the complexities of implementing policies in a multilevel system and the challenges of integrating migrants locally.

Our study contributes to the literature on multilevel governance and migrant integration by shedding empirical light on the interactions and vertical collaboration between national directives and local government initiatives. We highlight the importance of vertical collaboration in policy implementation, contributing to the broader discourse on the “local turn” in integration policy studies. This research fills existing gaps in the literature by highlighting the need to take local contexts and governance structures into account when assessing the impact of national policies.

This paper begins by reviewing the existing literature on national and local models of integration policy implementation, focusing on the shift from a national to a local approach in the context of multilevel governance. It then presents the theoretical framework, focusing on the concepts of collaboration, collaborative governance, and collaboration in policy-making. The context and selection of the Paris and Marseille cases are then

presented, followed by an explanation of the research methodology, including data collection methods. The results detail the interactions between national and local actors in these cities and their impact on policy outcomes. The paper concludes with a discussion of the broader implications of these findings for theory and practice, as well as the limitations of this research.

Literature Overview

➤ Beyond national models of integration

The literature on migration policy-making has long claimed that a local turn exists that makes cities and towns key actors and arenas informing integration policies (Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017). Such a view represents a departure from previous studies that considered national models of integrations as the ones explaining how the institutional context informed integration trajectories. Brubaker (1990) outlines two national integration models: the French Republican model, emphasizing assimilation, and the German model, focusing on differentiation. These models are categorized as normative devices, leading to an assimilationist model (e.g., France) and a multiculturalist model (e.g., Netherlands, UK). This has influenced EU convergence towards civil integration policies, emphasizing language and societal values (Caponio & Testore, 2012). Going beyond traditional models of integration by focusing on the local turn within multilevel governance appears to be a more helpful tool in evaluating integration policies for migrants.

➤ Incorporating the local turn within multilevel governance

According to Bertossi (2015), more research on local models of integration is necessary to understand and study immigrant integration policies. That is why migration scholars have applied multilevel governance as the most accurate framework to study how other levels beyond the national one contribute to integration policy-making. This has been coined as the local turn in migration studies, where cities play a protagonist role in integration policy-making. In their 2010 research, Caponio and Borkert introduce the notion of a local migration policy arena, emphasizing how exploring the local aspects of migration policy and policy-making can aid in reevaluating established concepts and models. This involves examining policies and services executed and managed at the city level. The authors identified two streams to the study of local policy-making on migrant

integration: the pluralist approach, which highlights the involvement of immigrants and civil society, and the power approach, which aims to assess the execution of national and regional laws and policies by local authorities, examining whether state's objectives are met and to what extent (Caponio & Borkert, 2010). It is crucial for the authors that NGOs, civil servants, associations, experts, and media get involved in this local policy-making and not only governmental actors (Caponio & Borkert, 2010). We need to consider the multilevel governance of integration for migrants. This multilevel governance of integration policies within the European Union mainly concerns the vertical role of the EU, national governments, and local authorities (Piattoni, 2009). Several authors have studied this local turn at the vertical dimension.

➤ Local turn and the vertical dimension of multilevel governance

Zapata-Barrero et al. (2017) point out the scarcity of research on how the shift towards local initiatives affects the multilevel governance of migrant integration. They argue that this shift offers insights into why cities and regions may respond differently to similar challenges and how these variations can influence state-driven immigration control strategies. According to the authors, there are two dimensions of the local turn in migrant integration: the horizontal and the vertical dimensions. The horizontal dimension focuses on the dynamic between the state and the society and the interplay between cities, local governments, and regions in managing immigrant policies. The vertical dimension explores the relationship between local administration and higher levels of government, such as national and increasingly European institutions (Zapata-Barrero et al., 2017). This is supported by Caponio's 2021 research on city networks in Europe and the USA, where the author establishes a configuration of policy-making within a multilevel governance system from the vertical and horizontal dimensions of collaboration. By introducing concepts such as hierarchy, intergovernmental relations, and networked governance as other instances of policy-making co-existing in a multilevel governance system, the author built four modes of policy-making, including multilevel governance (Caponio, 2021).

In his 2018 study of the implementation of integration policies for migrants in the city of Odense (Denmark), Romana Careja started highlighting the conflict that cities faced between locally determined priorities that required resources primarily at the local level and nationally defined policy priorities, which were frequently supported by legal and

financial means. Concerning the integration of immigrants specifically, national governments typically have a significant say in defining and recognizing conditions for integration, which vary amongst nations. The study aimed to show how local governments are given authority by multilevel governance structures that emerge during implementation. This enables them to achieve both national objectives and local priorities. The study shows how national and local authorities collaborate to successfully implement migrant integration policies, even if this multilevel governance does not always guarantee success (Careja, 2018).

For Peter Scholten, in the context of active national integration policies, local integration policies frequently arise when cities are urged and assisted by higher-level governance. However, these cities are free to create their own local integration strategies, even if they lack such federal policies. Notably, large European cities are developing their integration philosophies in an entrepreneurial manner, leading to disparate approaches to immigrant integration even within the same nations. This change is justified by the fact that migrants directly experience both positive and negative aspects of diversity at the local level, which shapes the formulation of policies for localized integration. Developing structures that facilitate collaboration with local governments is becoming more common in countries like France, known for its state-centric approach. This allows for more customized and localized approaches to be implemented within the framework of national policies (Scholten et al., 2015). Furthermore, the authors claim that there is a noticeable decline in the relevance of national models of integration among researchers in the examined cases of France and the Netherlands. Anouk Flamant supports this in her study of this “local turn” in integration policies, specifically focusing on three French cities that differ in implementing integration policies for migrants and how they overcome the national model (Flamant, 2020). According to the author, the relationship with national governments, the European level through funding and peer exchanges, the ability of civil society to bring and maintain migration on the municipal agenda, and the career paths of local civil servants in charge of the municipal equality policy are the four factors that impact the design of the governance of migration. She concludes by stating that more research needs to be done on this local turn (Flamant, 2020).

➤ Local turn and the horizontal dimension of multilevel governance

Several authors have also studied this local turn by focusing on the horizontal dimension of multilevel governance. In 2014, Jan Rath and Peter Scholten studied the relationship between national and local integration policies in Europe, focusing on the crucial role of local authorities. The authors found that national integration policies for migrants were insufficient and that they occasionally failed to offer suitable solutions to the real problems associated with migrant integration, as experienced at the local level. For the authors, local immigrant integration policies are more accommodating and open to migrants because of their proximity (Rath et al., 2014).

Triviño-Salazar (2023) studied the implications that participating in migration and integration Transnational city networks (TCNs) has for the relationships between local governments and nonstate actors in the cities of Barcelona and Rotterdam. By connecting TCNs and collaborative governance, his work provides a comprehensive view of what collaboration between local governments and nonstate actors implies for local migration governance and migration scholarship. Similarly, in 2018, Peter Scholten examined the differences between national and local immigrant integration policies in the Netherlands. He found that local integration policies tend to be more practical, emphasizing problem-solving approaches and the strategic engagement of immigrant organizations. Scholten pointed out that the distinct rationales behind local and national integration policies highlight different aspects of issue framing. This underscores the need for integration policy design to balance local administrative logic with top-down ideological considerations (Scholten, 2018). Consequently, a successful integration policy for migrants should result from collaboration between national and local levels, taking into account the unique characteristics of each locality.

Other authors have developed theses and arguments to categorize this local dimension of migrant integration policies and thus no longer depend on traditional national models. This is the case, for example, of the local dimension thesis, which, according to some authors, emphasizes taking into account ethnic differences and cooperation with immigrant organizations when implementing integration policies and is supported by Borkert and Bostwick (2007) or Poppelaars and Scholten (2008). However, according to Fourot (2010), this thesis highlights exclusionary practices motivated by fear of social disruption (Dekker et al., 2015).

Dekker et al. (2015) also talk about the localist thesis, which is based on the idea that local integration policies are mainly shaped by local factors, primarily by the specific local problem and political context, and therefore independent of national policies. Finally, the national models' thesis, particularly evoked by Jørgensen (2012), suggests the influence of national policies on local integration strategies. By applying these theses through a comparative case study of three cities with different national contexts, Berlin, Malmö, and Rotterdam, Dekker et al. (2015) found that cities align with their national policy framework with a prevalence of bottom-up policy entrepreneurship alongside the national models.

➤ Uncovering the gaps in the literature on local migration policy-making

Overall, previous studies have focused on cooperation on the vertical dimension of a multilevel system, which differs from the concept of collaboration (e.g., Scholten et al., 2015). Indeed, as we shall see, collaboration refers to a relationship of equality and co-creation between the actors involved (Kallenbach et al., 2013). Traditionally, collaboration has been assumed to occur mainly in the horizontal dimension, and few studies focus on the vertical dimension. Thus, applying this logic to the vertical dimension of collaboration (between the state and cities) is pioneering.

According to the previous literature, the implementation of immigrant integration policies is greatly influenced by the collaboration between the national and local governments. This partnership indicates a movement toward more regional integration ideologies, which are especially noticeable in bigger cities where local government adopts an innovative approach to drafting policy. Local entities are empowered to align national objectives with particular local priorities through multilevel governance structures that involve the European Union, national authorities, and local authorities. However, and this is supported by Hackett (2017) and Rath and Scholten (2014), there are too few studies and information about the collaboration between national and local governments on implementing integration policies for migrants through a multilevel governance lens. By tackling the research question (To what extent does the implementation of immigrant integration policies locally promote the collaboration between state and non-state actors?), this study seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations to guide policy decisions, improve the effectiveness of immigrant integration initiatives in France, and underscore the

significance of local-level migration integration policies. The importance of this research arises from the need to understand and address the complexities of immigrant integration, a topic that is relevant not only in France but also on a global scale.

Following Zapata-Barrero's (2017) and Caponio's (2021) notion of the vertical and horizontal dimensions within a multilevel governance system, and because several authors have focused their research on the horizontal dimension, our study will focus on the vertical dimension of collaboration within a multilevel governance system. The following part of our study defines collaboration within the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance policy-making system and policy implementation, as well as the central concepts of our research.

Theoretical Framework

This section presents an analytical model to study collaboration between the national and local levels in immigrant integration policy-making. To do so, we bring the conceptualization of collaborative governance to the study of the vertical dimension in multilevel governance. The approach is quite innovative as we use an analytical device intended for the horizontal dimension (state - non-state actors relationship) to study the vertical dimension. Next, we start by defining what collaboration within collaborative governance means and what implementation in policy-making entails. From the collaborative governance research, we identify and operationalize three dimensions that will provide an entry point to answer the research question. These foundational concepts set the stage for a deeper exploration of collaboration in multilevel governance, essential for understanding the intricacies of policy implementation.

Multilevel governance policy-making is characterized by the collaboration between the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of a multilevel governance setting. This entails collaborating vertically with higher levels of government on one side and horizontally collaborating with essential stakeholders and non-governmental civil society participants on the other (Caponio, 2021). Several authors have focused their research on the horizontal dimension of multilevel governance, such as Kallenbach et al. (2013), Triviño-Salazar (2023), and Schiller (2019), among others. In the literature, “cooperation” is often used to describe studies on implementing migrant integration policies within a multilevel governance system. Here, however, we will refer to the concept of collaboration.

According to Kallenbach et al., 2013, collaboration aimed at “sustaining well-coordinated programming, support services and advocacy can create a powerful synergy, amplifying the reach of all organizations involved.” Understanding these dynamics is crucial as we transition to discussing collaborative governance, which provides a framework for analyzing how various actors work together to achieve policy goals.

To build on this, we turn to collaborative governance as conceptualized by Ansell and Gash (2008). Collaborative governance refers to a decision-making approach that involves consensus-oriented actions and engages both state and non-state actors in collective endeavors. It emphasizes horizontal relationships between these actors, where public agencies directly involve non-state stakeholders in formal, deliberative processes to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets. In this context, collaboration among state and non-state actors is vital, as also highlighted by Schiller (2019). It underscores the relational process through which these actors engage in collective actions to govern. As the desired outcome, full collaboration involves consensus-oriented and deliberative dynamics where both state and non-state actors collaborate to achieve common goals such as delivering services, promoting local development, or solving societal problems. Furthermore, scholars in the field of collaborative governance, such as Ansell and Gash (2008), identify two key aspects in identifying collaborative arrangements: 1) the level of commitment required from non-state actors to participate in a given activity; 2) the hierarchical relationship between state and non-state actors in that activity. This can also be applied to the vertical collaboration, where the two key aspects of collaborative governance are found. Indeed, the key elements would be 1) the level of commitment required from local government to participate in a given activity and 2) the hierarchical relationship between state and local governments in that activity. For instance, when a national government aims to implement a new integration policy for migrants, collaborative governance involves engaging both state and local governments in decision-making and policy implementation. Local governments must actively participate, offering their expertise and resources to achieve shared goals. The hierarchical relationship between national and local governments influences decision-making and implementation. Effective collaboration requires acknowledging and respecting each level's roles and responsibilities. This understanding of collaborative governance provides a bridge to the next section, which delves into the specifics of policy implementation and its critical role in achieving effective collaboration.

Another central aspect of our research is policy implementation, especially in integration policies. In his work, *Critical Dimensions for Policy Implementation*, Mthethwa (2012) defines policy implementation and its characteristics and dimensions. According to him, policy implementation is the process of putting policies into effect using a variety of procedures, resources, and connections. It entails carrying out, executing, fulfilling, creating, or finishing particular responsibilities outlined in an official policy. This refers to a series of activities and operations carried out by various stakeholders to achieve the policy's goals and objectives. Furthermore, policy implementation necessitates flexibility to modify tactics to satisfy the varying demands of various target demographics and service consumers nationwide Mthethwa (2012). A strategy that fits all is unlikely to help meet these diverse needs. Thus, the degree of flexibility in adjusting policy methods affects the capacity of service providers and other stakeholders to respond to local conditions or specific subgroups of the policy's target population. There are several approaches to implementation: the top-down, the bottom-up, and the centrist approaches. The top-down approach prioritizes fidelity to policymakers' intentions, often characterized by hierarchical control mechanisms. The bottom-up approach advocates for local implementers to tailor policy strategies to address specific local needs and concerns. By implementing the bottom-up approach, street-level bureaucrats seek to bridge the gap between policy-making and policy delivery, enhancing policy relevance and effectiveness. Finally, the centrist approach transcends the dichotomy of top-down versus bottom-up, focusing on how actors from diverse institutional contexts shape policy implementation. Evolution and bargaining models depict policy implementation as a continuous process of bargaining, exchange, and negotiation among stakeholders, with policy outcomes resulting from compromises and agreements. Overall, implementation involves decision-making by various stakeholders across different spheres of government. It is a complex, interactive, and ongoing process crucial for policy outcomes (Mthethwa, 2012). Understanding these implementation strategies allows us to explore how collaboration in policy-making can be effectively operationalized, which is our next focus.

In multilevel governance, collaboration in policy-making is crucial to our study. In their article, Bolívar et al. (2021) focus on collaboration between urban actors and immigrant advocacy bodies within French and German cities in light of a trend of collaborative governance. By focusing on collaborative governance, the primary study concerns are whether and to what degree urban actors engage with immigrant councils and associations,

what conditions facilitate such collaboration, and why. The authors predict that larger cities with higher proportions of immigrant and foreign-born populations will likely develop a solid partnership with immigrant advocacy bodies. Communities with a leftward political lean are anticipated to exhibit a stronger propensity for collaboration. Moreover, actors who engage in regular contact through local policy forums will likely form partnerships with organizations that support immigrants. Their findings indicate that various actors in French and German towns actively interact with immigrant councils and rights organizations, which reflects that immigrant advocacy organizations are increasingly being recognized, and policy-making is becoming more collaborative to protect their rights. This type of policy-making and implementation can be referred to as a centrist approach if we apply Mthethwa 's logic. Overall, this study shows how collaboration (here, collaborative governance) and policy implementation can relate to each other. It highlights the significance of such collaboration in effectively developing and implementing immigrant integration policies. Indeed, collaboration in this context involves building partnerships and working together to address immigrant integration issues. At the same time, policy implementation focuses on the practical execution and realization of policies developed through collaborative processes. Both collaboration and policy implementation are essential to promoting effective immigrant integration and inclusive urban governance in French and German cities (Bolíbar et al., 2021). This interplay between collaboration and policy implementation underscores the importance of establishing robust collaborative frameworks, which leads us to examine the specific conditions under which effective vertical collaboration can occur.

Building on these insights, research on collaborative governance informs the conditions for vertical collaboration by emphasizing the need for consensus, explicit responsibilities, and the involvement of non-state actors. According to these insights and by focusing on the vertical dimension of collaboration within a multilevel governance system, we point out under which conditions there is a full collaboration between the national and local governments in implementing integration policies. In this context, we state three conditions to achieve a full collaboration in the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system: 1) a consensus between actors on the implementation of policies, 2) when formal and informal responsibilities are explicit, and 3) the participation of non-state actors. If these three conditions are met, we can talk about full collaboration between the national and local governments in the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system. Otherwise,

we speak of a high, moderate, low, or no collaboration. High collaboration involves having all the conditions. Moderate collaboration involves only two conditions, and low collaboration involves only one condition. In the case of our research, interviews and content analysis methods enable us to confirm whether or not these criteria have been met.

Background and Case-selection

This research seeks to address a gap by examining France's migrant integration policies, particularly focusing on the intricate collaboration between the central and local governments. This relationship requires detailed analysis as the country navigates the challenges of promoting social cohesion and inclusivity. There is a scarcity of studies on local-level integration policies for migrants in France and even fewer studies on the interplay between national and local integration policies. France is a pertinent case study for understanding the complexities of integration policies due to its historical and contemporary importance as a destination for diverse immigrant populations and its predominantly centralistic approach to policy implementation. That is why France is a significant example in determining, in a highly centralized context with an assimilationist approach, how integration policies are implemented at the local level. The assimilationist approach in migrant integration is characterized by a unidirectional process of integrating immigrants into the host society, focusing primarily on the socio-cultural aspect of their integration, and it encourages migrants to adapt to the dominant cultural norms, values, and behaviors (Dekker et al., 2015).

France's republican model's turbulent history of immigrant integration policies is grounded in a process of "sociocultural assimilation and civic virtues" alternating between nationality access, anti-discriminating, and secularism frames (Bertossi, 2015). According to Brubaker, France's historical conditions have led the country to a state-centric national building regarding immigrant integration policies (Brubaker, 1992). This French republican assimilationist model of integration relies on the idea that migrants arrive in the country of their own free will, and this model has often been criticized for being one-sided, requiring the migrant to adapt and integrate into society rather than the other way around (Caponio, 2010). However, national models of integration are not efficient tools in research whose goal is assessing the success or failure of immigrant integration policies in a country; it is more relevant to study the actors involved in immigrant integration and the local level of implementation (Bertossi, 2015).

This study will focus on the specific case of integration policies for migrants in France due to a “local shift” in implementing integration policies in Europe. Previous academic research has shown that migrant integration policies at the local level are crucial, given the proximity of localities to migrants. Their successful integration and contribution to cities is essential for residents and local authorities, who benefit from it. Furthermore, these integration strategies differ from one locality or region to another, each applying national policies according to its specificity (Scholten et al., 2015). This aligns with Penninx's theory advocating for the decentralization of integration policies (Penninx, 2009). Despite its state-centric approach, France has established specific structures to manage relations with local administrations. These systems allow local governments to implement customized regional plans within the broader national policy framework (Scholten et al., 2015).

This research presents a comparative analysis between Paris and Marseille in France. From the literature, we expect Paris and Marseille to have different levels of collaboration with the national government in implementing immigrant integration policies because of Paris' proximity to the central state and Marseille being a periphery city. This center-periphery administrative relationship is the variable for our case selection. We expect this center-periphery relationship to affect the cities' and national governments' collaboration in implementing immigrant integration policies within the vertical dimension based on Garbaye's work (2002). The author uses the center-periphery dimension to explain the political participation of immigrants in French and British localities, highlighting differences in institutional frameworks and political dynamics between central and local governments in each country. This dimension can also illustrate varying levels of collaboration in implementing migrant integration policies. In France, the division of responsibilities is more intertwined, resembling a “marble cake,” making collaboration challenging. Policies affecting migrant integration are often centrally controlled or indirectly managed by local authorities, leading to blurred lines of responsibility and potential overlap in decision-making (Garbaye, 2002). Our case study will enable us to observe whether the two cities sharing the same national context are similar in terms of collaboration with the national government despite differences in their backgrounds. Paris is the country's economic, political, and cultural capital, so given its strategic importance and potential influence on political decision-makers, it can be expected to collaborate more closely with the government. Marseille's location places the city on the periphery and out

of national political decisions. We expect its influence to be minimal and its collaboration with the national government weak.

Paris is a significant destination for migrants, whether for transit or asylum purposes, due to its centrality and well-developed infrastructure. Out of a population of 2,145,906, Paris was estimated to have 435,015 immigrants in 2020 (Insee, 2023c). Marseille, France's second-largest city, is also a significant point of entry and transit for migrants, notably due to its economic importance and location in the Mediterranean. In 2020, Marseille's 870,321 men and women population included 132,993 immigrants (Insee, 2023b). Both cities have been headed by ecologists and socialist mayors, with Mayor Anne Hidalgo in Paris since 2014 and Mayor Benoît Payan in Marseille since 2020. They are subject to a regional reception plan for asylum seekers, issued respectively by the Ile-de-France region for Paris and the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region for Marseille. Their similar political orientation and stance against the Asylum and Immigration Act of January 26, 2024, make Paris and Marseille two cities committed to welcoming and integrating migrants into society. Still, their collaboration with the national government in implementing integration policies diverges. It, therefore, seems attractive to analyze the relationship between each city and the national government to observe whether or not the implementation of immigrant integration policies favors collaboration between national and local governments. Considering our three criteria necessary for full collaboration on the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system. Namely, 1) there is consensus between actors on implementation, 2) formal and informal responsibilities are explicit, and 3) there is the participation of non-state actors. If these three conditions are met, we can talk about full collaboration between the national and local governments in the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system. This collaboration among the vertical dimension of a multilevel setting implies collaboration between higher levels of government, such as national authorities, and between lower levels, such as local authorities.

Methodology

Data collection and data analysis

This section introduces the methodology of the present study, including data collection and data analysis.

This paper presents a qualitative comparative case study between Paris and Marseille in France. The empirical analysis involves a study of the collaboration between the national government and the cities regarding implementing immigrant integration policies through the vertical dimension of multilevel governance. This implies a most different system design based on Paris and Marseille's respective socio-economic backgrounds and migration histories. The cities also differ in their relation with the central state, with Paris being the capital and Marseille the second largest city in the country. For this research, we are conducting a conventional content analysis.

Although Paris and Marseille differ in their socioeconomic backgrounds and migration histories, they share the same political orientation (socialist/ecologist) and the same percentage of migrants among the population (20,29% in Paris and 15,29% in Marseille in 2020) (Insee, 2023).

As mentioned previously and according to academic research, we should rely on something other than national models of integration when implementing and evaluating integration policies. It should be done at the local level with all involved actors to effective policies. Hence, our theoretical expectation based on these conditions is that administrative levels need all three to collaborate in implementing integration policies for migrants. We understand full collaboration between the national government and cities when three criteria are met: 1) a consensus between actors on the implementation of policies, 2) when formal and informal responsibilities are explicit, and 3) the participation of non-state actors. By looking at the collaboration between the national and local governments on the vertical dimension of multilevel governance, the study intends to understand to what extent the implementation of immigrant integration policies locally promotes the collaboration between state and non-state actors.

First, national policy settings of migration integration policies will be developed. Second, following our three criteria for full collaboration, we will evaluate the extent of collaboration between national and local governments on implementing integration policies for migrants (vertical dimension). To do this, we will differentiate between high, moderate, and low collaboration on the vertical dimension. Although we will not entirely focus on the horizontal dimension, interviews with local non-state actors will be mobilized to illustrate and confirm these locally immigrant integration policies. Questions asked during the interviews focused on the role of the organization or NGO, its relationship with

the national government and municipalities, and the state's role within the organization or NGO. Transcripts of the interviews can be found in the appendix.

Results

This section presents the findings of the analysis according to the methodology presented above, with the following table summarizing the results. To do so, we organize the findings by first establishing the French national policy framework regarding migration and integration. We will discuss the role of the regional and local levels in this framework. From here, we contrast such framework to the cases of Paris and Marseille by looking at the implementation of policies following the three conditions: 1) a consensus between actors on the implementation of policies, 2) when formal and informal responsibilities are explicit, and 3) the participation of non-state actors.

Table 1.: Summary of Results

Collaboration on the Vertical Dimension	Paris	Marseille
Conditions for Full Collaboration		
Consensus on the Implementation of Policies	Low	Limited
Formal/Informal Responsibilities	Limited/Low	Clear/High
Non-State Actors Participation	High, NGOs such as J'Accueille	High, NGOs such as Singa
Overall Collaboration	Low	Moderate

a. National Policy Settings

The focus of the empirical part is on the integration of all types of migrants: refugees, asylum seekers, and newcomers. In France, the central government is responsible for the design of integration policies. Regarding integrating newcomers, the state's role differs depending on the field. The Ministry of the Interior and its sub-directorates are responsible for obtaining French nationality. When it comes to housing, this is the state's role, even if the involvement of cities is essential. Regarding housing policies, it is generally the cities that are responsible. The Ministry of Education is responsible for areas concerning access to education for newcomers. Finally, the Ministry of Labor is responsible for employment. At the national level, the entity responsible for implementing public policy on housing since its creation in 2010 is the Interministerial Delegation for Accommodation and Access to Housing (DIHAL). The DIHAL was not explicitly designed to deal with the integration

of migrants in France, but it does have a migrant unit with several missions. In particular, it is piloting the Solidarity Cohabitations policy launched in 2019. Still in the housing and accommodation sector, this policy promotes the reception of migrants in private homes to “forge links with civil society” (Service d’Information du Gouvernement, 2024). To implement this policy, cities are launching calls for projects aimed at associations or organizations setting up initiatives for solidarity-based cohabitation or citizen accommodation.

France's immigration and integration policy is a cross-functional policy based on three pillars: managing migratory flows, successfully integrating legal immigrants, and guaranteeing the right to asylum. A legal immigrant is a person who has been granted the necessary authorization to be in France and may, therefore, be a newcomer, an asylum seeker, or a refugee (United Nations, 2016). In 2018, the French Ministry of the Interior reformed its policy for the reception and integration of migrants by creating the Interministerial Delegation for the Reception and Integration of Refugees (DiAir), whose mission is to define the policy for the reception and integration of refugees, taking into account the different actors in a system of multilevel governance. The integration policy has many objectives, including: ensuring that refugees master the French language and have access to training and employment; guaranteeing access to housing for refugees; improving access to healthcare for asylum seekers and refugees; improving access to rights; and fostering links between refugees and France (DIAIR, 2024). These objectives are intended to be implemented through horizontal collaboration between local actors and, above all, through vertical collaboration between the national government and the cities. Indeed, since 2019, to encourage immigrant integration and provide assistance to individuals who plan to remain in France, the French state has set up Territorial Contracts for the Reception and Integration of Refugees (CTAIR), directly involving local authorities, which benefit from funding of up to 300,000 euros (DIAIR, 2024). These local integration policies complement national policies, and cities launch calls for projects to support the operators, whether associations or public bodies, responsible for implementing the CTAIR missions. Thus, promoting the vertical dimension of collaboration within multilevel governance is the main aim of the CTAIR.

Several actors are involved in immigrant integration in France, all playing a defining role in the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system. The French Office of

Immigration and Integration (OFII) is in charge of designing immigration and integration policies for migrants, from their reception in the country to their settlement, which begins with the signing of a Republican Integration Contract (CIR) by the newcomer (Ministry of the Interior, 2021). This Republican Integration Contract (CIR) includes measures enabling the migrant to benefit from French language courses and civic training, reminding us of the traditional model of assimilationist integration through republican integration. Globally, the central tenets of integration policy for legal immigrants are the acquisition of French language proficiency, social engagement, career counseling, and job availability (Ministère de l'Intérieur, 2022c). According to the National Plan for the Reception and Integration of Refugees (SNADAIR), new arrivals wishing to obtain refugee status in France must submit an asylum application to the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA). Following an assessment of the 1951 Geneva Convention criteria, OFPRA decides on the application result (Ministry of the Interior, 2020). Other actors, such as local authorities and associations, welcome and integrate migrants into France. At the regional level, prefects are responsible for the reception and integration policy of migrants, following a regional scheme for asylum seekers (Ministry of the Interior, 2021).

Looking at the regional level of immigrant integration is central to our study, which aims to understand the correlation between the implementation of immigrant integration policies and the collaboration between France's national and local governments. The local governments, in particular, the prefects, are responsible for implementing the various policies defined by the central government, such as the CTAIRs via the cities, which issue calls for projects. Cities and municipalities are responsible for several tasks, including enrolling children in nursery and elementary school, responding to social housing requests, and applying for financial aid from communal or inter-communal social action centers. Although the federal government establishes general immigration laws and regulations, regional and local governments frequently have an essential role in how these laws are applied locally. In 2021, there were an estimated five immigrants per 1,000 people in France, with a more significant concentration of migrants in Paris and other cities such as Bordeaux, Lyon, and Marseille (Eurostat, 2023).

b. *Paris*

Collaboration on the vertical dimension

Paris, the capital of France, is not a signatory and is not concerned by the CTAIRs, given that the city is home to the most significant number of migrants in France and that the main aim of the CTAIRs is precisely to make metropolises attractive to migrants and avoid too great a concentration of migrants in the capital. The aim is to see the city's initiatives in response to national directives on the National Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Refugees. As well as the level of collaboration with the state in implementing these policies in different sectors, such as housing. Indeed, given a large number of migrants in the city, one of the municipality's priorities in terms of integration is the creation of social housing and shared housing initiatives. In response to national directives concerning the Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Refugees, cities are asked to implement policies to guarantee migrants' access to housing. By observing political content and various initiatives the city of Paris put in place to respond to national directives, we will analyze the degree of collaboration between the national and local levels: high, moderate, or low. To do this, we will focus on two policies/initiatives: the Paris Community Mobilization Plan for the Reception and Integration of Refugees and the National Solidarity Cohabitations policy.

Since 2015, in response to the urgent migratory crisis, the city of Paris has set up several emergency migrant reception facilities, which, in the words of Mayor Anne Hidalgo, “by their very nature fall within the remit of the state” (Ville de Paris, 2015). To say this is to assert that these arrangements are initiatives put in place by the city to deal with a lack of action on the part of the state. In the face of the emergency, Paris had to take measures to react. The mobilization plan includes many commitments, notably facilitating migrants' access to housing. However, the state is the city's leading partner in implementing this plan. Indeed, regarding access to housing, it is mainly the state that finances reception services. The opening of reception centers such as the Centre Jean Quarré in the 19th arrondissement and the Centre Coustou in the 18th have enabled several hundred migrants to be welcomed to Paris (Ville de Paris, 2015). Several associations and organizations have taken part in initiatives to integrate migrants into the city of Paris, including France Terre d'Asile and Parisians, who are strongly mobilized by the municipality, showing a high level of participation by non-state actors. In implementing this plan, the division of

responsibilities between the various actors remains unclear. Even if this plan remains an initiative of the city, the state's voice seems decisive. Indeed, in 2018, the national government did not intend to extend the opening of a first reception humanitarian center (CPA) at Porte de La Chapelle on land owned by Paris and created in 2016, which prompted the municipality to urgently create a new center to deal with the deteriorating health situation. In this respect, we can see a strong decision-making power on the part of the state and the involvement of NGOs and citizens, but there is a conflict when it comes to implementing integration policies here in the housing sector, showing an absence of consensus on the implementation of integration policies between the state and Paris. Furthermore, The Asylum and Immigration Act of January 26 has sparked much debate across the country. In February 2024, Paris passed a deliberation at the Paris Council in resistance to the law. Mayor Hidalgo deemed this new law as not respecting the rules of “humanity, dignity and respect for people” laid down by the Constitution; she asserted refusing to put into practice specific measures such as “sorting” between families and children welcomed in emergency accommodation (Doussot, 2024). As a result, the city has decided to make several initiatives available, such as creating a new day-care center or faster granting of state medical aid (Lorriaux, 2024). This deliberation by the Paris City Council enables the city to reaffirm its universalist reception values. However, these initiatives are more symbolic than real, as, in practice, the city must apply national directives and respect the law passed by the central government. According to our three criteria for achieving full collaboration, these first observations show a lack of consensus between actors, clear responsibilities, and significant participation of non-state actors.

As for national guidelines for the integration of migrants through housing, the DIHAL is in charge of the policy of Solidarity Cohabitations, which has seen the launch of calls for projects in the city of Paris. This is the case of the NGO Singa, which in 2015 set up a sister NGO, J'accueille, to promote and develop citizen accommodation in France. As part of our research, an official from the J'accueille program in Paris was interviewed about the organization's operations and relations with the actors involved. This interview illustrates the role of non-state actors in implementing policies to integrate migrants. J'accueille responded to calls for projects from Paris for its citizen housing program to meet national directives, but only partially. J'accueille responds to calls for projects and signs an agreement with the state and cities, and 25% of the budget is linked to a subsidy paid by the state according to the number of people hosted by the organization. The organization

does not depend directly on the central government. However, the various parties involved (the state, Paris, J'accueille) undertake to respect the terms of the agreement, so our second criterion on clear responsibilities on the formal and informal roles of each party in the implementation of Solidarity Cohabitations initiatives is met here. As for the existence of consultations between Paris, the state, and the organizations on the implementation of integration policies, the respondent answers that the city is very active and invested in this matter and that there are discussions and exchanges between the entities, but that it is more a question of advice to the national government. Since the state is one of the main funders of this type of scheme, it remains the final decision-maker, but it takes into account the recommendations of towns and non-state actors who are more familiar with the terrain and the needs of migrants. Thus, consensus on policy implementation is limited here. Furthermore, when asked, “What are your expectations regarding support for or closer collaboration with the French national levels to improve the effectiveness of your actions in favor of migrant integration?” the official answered that they need more funding for their work infrastructure, not just for the people they support. As part of the implementation of the Solidarity Cohabitations policy, there is an explicit agreement on the responsibilities of each party, the participation of non-state actors such as J'accueille, and a certain degree of consensus in policy implementation. Indeed, can we really speak of consensus when the state remains the final decision-maker because the NGOs and the city depend on its funding? According to the official, there is a problem with the centralization of refugee integration policy in the Ministry of the Interior, and this hypercentralization is at odds with the need for local knowledge.

To sum up, access to housing, one of the main pillars of the National Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Migrants, is a priority for Paris, even if the other pillars are not set aside. The policies implemented by the city have a universalist approach, and collaboration on the vertical dimension between local and national governments remains limited. Indeed, we need more consensus between the two governments regarding policy implementation, as the cities are involved but not entirely decision-makers; there are limited formal agreements regarding party responsibilities and a significant involvement of non-state actors. Moreover, because of its centrality in implementing these policies, Paris follows the national model, even if local initiatives are important. Paris, a city with a socialist and ecologist majority, claims to be universalist in terms of migrant integration but applies integration policies in line with national ideology. So, does collaboration

emerge between the central government and the city of Paris? Only partially. Indeed, the level of collaboration is low because only the third condition is fully met (participation of non-state actors).

c. Marseille

Collaboration on the vertical dimension

By its history and geography, Marseille, France's second-largest city, is a welcoming place for migrant populations. Indeed, its port has traditionally been a place of passage for many migrant populations, such as Armenians, Kurds, and Syrians, and since the election in 2020 of Socialist Mayor Michèle Rubirola and, more recently of Mayor Benoît Payan, the city has claimed the welcoming role of the Phocaeen city (Geisser, 2020). As we have done with Paris, the aim here is to analyze the initiatives the city of Marseille put in place to meet national directives for integrating migrants under the National Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Refugees. In this way, the level of collaboration between the city and the national government should be observed, whether high, moderate, or low. To do this, our study focuses on the positioning of Marseille regarding migrant integration and its role in hosting Reception Centers for Asylum Seekers (CADA). The second part will focus on its integration policies after signing a Territorial Contract for the Reception and Integration of Refugees (CTAIR).

Since February 2021, Marseille has been a member of the board of directors of the National Association of Welcoming Cities and Territories (ANVITA), which brings together various territories working for policies of unconditional welcome for multiple publics, including migrant populations. The association is independent of the national government and defines itself as a network of exchanges and practices whose discourse often contradicts national ideology and directives. Following its membership of ANVITA, Marseille has taken part in several initiatives to ensure its support for the unconditional reception of migrants, notably through its commitment to welcoming exiled people rescued from rescue vessels in the Mediterranean Sea and by joining the SOS Méditerranée association's platform of supportive communities in 2021 (ANVITA, 2020). The city of Marseille supports a universalist approach to the reception and integration of migrants but, in practice, has faced debates and has been refused several attempts at reception initiatives by the national government, which remains the primary decision-maker on this subject.

Indeed, on several occasions, the city's mayors have made known their willingness to authorize access to the port of Marseille for several humanitarian boats rescuing migrants. Notably, in 2018, the Aquarius rescue vessel of the NGO SOS Méditerranée asked to settle in Marseille, and the mayor approved the idea at the time. Still, the state rejected it in the name of the nearest port rule, which was not Marseille (Vinzent, 2020). Furthermore, in 2020, the ship Louise Michel had been refused access to the ports of several cities. Benoît Payan, who was deputy mayor at the time, stated that the city of Marseille would open its port to the ship if necessary, a statement which provoked a reaction from opponents of the Socialist Party, notably former mayor Jean-Claude Gaudin, who retorted that such a decision had to be taken by the state (Geisser, 2020). These observations highlight the participation of non-state actors and the lack of a complete consensus in integrating migrants between the state and Marseille.

Despite speeches against national ideology, migrants are mainly housed in CADAs run by operators such as Adoma Marseille. As part of our research, we interviewed an official from Adoma Marseille to find out how the CADAs work and the involvement of the city of Marseille, the national government, and their collaboration. Adoma is a Reception Center for Asylum Seekers (CADA) that follows the National Scheme for the Reception of Asylum Seekers and the Integration of Refugees (SNADAR). Its mission is to provide accommodation for asylum seekers and social support and guidance. Adoma operates locally, following the regional plan that is reviewed every three years. Adoma centers are set up in a city when there is a call for projects by the Ministry of the Interior, deployed locally, and provide a transitional service during the asylum application procedure by the OFPRA and the National Asylum Court (CNDA). Adoma follows a set of specifications and is financed by the state but operates at the local level. To the question, “Are there any formal partnerships between the city of Marseille and the organization to implement integration policies for migrants?” the respondent answers that there are indeed partnerships with local players and/or associations in the city of Marseille, but that Adoma does not work directly with the municipality, but with the French state. The Ministry of the Interior takes decisions concerning actions linked to the integration of migrants following the Code of Entry and Residence of Foreigners and the Right of Asylum (CESEDA). Municipalities and the state discuss the possibility of setting up CADAs in their areas. Still, the central government is the final decision-maker, highlighting the lack of consensus in setting up CADAs between the state and Marseille. Municipalities may refuse, but this is

rare. As far as the integration of migrants through housing at the local level is concerned, the state remains the primary decision-maker, and its collaboration with the city of Marseille is limited in this case and, therefore, only moderate, thanks to the participation of non-state actors.

As mentioned earlier, Marseille is part of cities signatory of the CTAIR. To ensure that the CTAIRs are effective, the French government and other stakeholders work together to define the actions to be taken about the objectives set by the National Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Refugees. Marseille has been a signatory to the CTAIR since 2021, and when signing the CTAIR, it identified housing, health, and access to rights as priorities. CTAIRs are drawn up in several stages, including consultation between the various actors on the priorities to be defined, followed by a negotiation phase in which the responsibilities of each party are established, then the implementation phase, and finally, the phase of execution and evaluation of the policies put in place (OCDE, 2022). Those measures allowed two of our conditions to be met: 1) there is a consensus between actors on implementing the policy, and 2) formal and informal responsibilities are explicit. In this way, CTAIR aims to promote vertical collaboration and overcome the difficulties of multilevel governance. As a result, Marseille can launch calls for projects in areas that underpin the integration of migrants, and it is often organizations and associations that respond and set up initiatives to apply the directives of the National Strategy for the Reception and Integration of Refugees, which confirms the participation of non-state actors. This is notably the case for Singa Marseille. As part of our study, a Singa Marseille official was interviewed about the NGO's work with the Marseille CTAIR in the migrant employment/incubation sector. This interview enabled us to confirm the implementation of CTAIRs in Marseille and to assess the collaboration between the various actors involved, particularly in the vertical dimension. Singa Marseille promotes two types of activity. First are community activities involving migrants and civil society, such as yoga, theater, French and dance classes, and employment-related activities through incubation projects. These incubation projects last six months and provide an opportunity to meet potential project leaders from the migrant community or local people with a project linked to the reception of new arrivals. Singa Marseille is an independent organization; therefore, it is not directly dependent on the state. Still, it is financed by public and private subsidies, notably from the national government, but also from the city of Marseille as part of its activities linked to integration via community projects and as part of the CTAIR. With the CTAIRs, the state

provides funding to the cities and distributes it to organizations such as Singa to set up projects. There are discussions and exchanges between the various actors involved. However, according to our source, the associations depend on funding from the cities, which in turn depend on the financing from the state within the framework of the CTAIRs.

Overall, when talking about CTAIRs, collaboration seems full even if the state provides funding for these projects; there is a consensus between the national government and the city of Marseille on the priorities and implementation of migrant integration policies within the CTAIR framework, which are defined before the contract is signed. Even though this consensus can be perceived as limited because of their ideological conflict. Non-state actors are also involved in the implementation of those policies. CTAIRs play a crucial role in strengthening accountability and transparency. Implementing initiatives that sometimes conflict with national ideology testifies to the city's commitment to migrants and its support for their unconditional integration. Its involvement with associations such as ANVITA and its mayor's willingness to open the port of Marseille to refugee ships are manifestations of its commitment via discourse. In practice, however, Marseille applies national directives for the integration of migrants, and its local autonomy remains limited by the strong presence of central government, notably through its financial involvement in the creation and implementation of integration policies. Collaboration via the CTAIRs appears to be total between the national government and Marseille, even if financial pressure forces the city to give in to national ideology. Like Paris, Marseille follows a top-down approach with a limited local dimension, but the level of collaboration between the state and the city is moderate here.

Discussion and Conclusion

Previous results highlight the complexities and variations in the implementation of national integration policies in local contexts within the vertical dimension of a multilevel governance system in the cities of Paris and Marseille. Both cities present unique challenges and differing degrees of collaboration with the national government.

Paris presents a low level of collaboration, characterized by an absence of consensus, unclear responsibilities, and the involvement of non-state actors in integration while struggling with the fact that final decision-making power lies with the state. Despite its

universalist stance and initiatives, such as the Community Mobilization Plan for the Reception and Integration of Refugees and the National Solidarity Cohabitations policy, the city's autonomy is limited, leading to conflicts with the national government. Here, the conditions for full collaboration are unmet, and the city's strategic position does not allow for greater collaboration with the national government to implement policies to integrate migrants. Only low collaboration emerges because 1) there is a lack of consensus between actors, 2) formal and informal responsibilities are not always explicit, and 3) there is significant participation of non-state actors in implementing immigrant integration policies. This dynamic illustrates a central tension between local initiatives and national control, reflecting broader centralization issues in France's migration policy.

In contrast, Marseille has a moderate level of collaboration because all conditions are met, but only partially. As an ANVITA member and a CTAIR signatory, Marseille's approach is more closely aligned with a universalist welcome policy. However, the city's attempts to implement independent initiatives often clash with national policies. CTAIRs provide a practical framework for collaboration, guaranteeing a local contribution to the integration process while maintaining national oversight through financial and political control. A study carried out by the OECD (2022) showed that CTAIRs are perceived by the majority of local players as an effective tool for aligning state objectives with those of local authorities, despite the concessions sometimes necessary on the part of local players. Moreover, even those who criticize CTAIRs acknowledge that they help to understand central government priorities (OECD, 2022). Only moderate collaboration emerges because 1) there is a limited consensus between actors, 2) formal and informal responsibilities are explicit, and 3) there is a significant participation of non-state actors in implementing immigrant integration policies.

In both cases, the involvement of non-state actors, such as NGOs, further complicates the landscape. These organizations fill the gaps between national policies and local implementation, although operations often depend on state funding and approval, which limits their autonomy. So, while Paris and Marseille demonstrate significant efforts to integrate migrants into their local contexts, their ability to exercise full autonomy remains limited by overarching national policies and financial dependencies. Therefore, the local turn in the implementation of immigrant integration policies and the collaboration within the vertical dimension is still limited.

The contribution to the literature goes beyond the specific cases of Paris and Marseille. This study demonstrates that examining the vertical dimension of collaboration in multilevel governance systems can provide valuable insights into the complexities of local implementation of national integration policies. The theoretical framework developed, including the conditions for effective collaboration (consensus, clear responsibilities, and involvement of non-state actors), provides a solid tool for analyzing integration policies in different contexts. Furthermore, using these conditions, researchers and policy-makers can assess the presence of collaboration in various policy areas, such as environmental management, public health, or education.

However, this research does have its limitations. Focusing on two French cities means the results may not be fully generalizable to other countries with different political and administrative structures. In addition, reliance on interviews and policy documents may not capture all aspects of the complex interactions between national and local actors. Future research should focus on more cities and countries to test the applicability of the theoretical framework and collaboration conditions.

In conclusion, this study contributes to the literature by providing a detailed analysis of the dynamics between national and local integration policies in a multilevel governance system. The conditions identified for effective collaboration offer a theoretical framework that can be used in different contexts. Despite the constraints and limitations identified, the results underline the importance of fostering balanced multilevel governance approaches to improve migrant integration and highlight the ongoing challenges of centralization in policy implementation.

Bibliography

Aleinikoff, T. A., & Klusmeyer, D. (2010). *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. In *Google Books*. Brookings Institution Press.

https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=IHZRDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA349&dq=To+what+extent+do+local+integration+policies+impact+the+effectiveness+of+national-level+integration+policies+in+France%3F&ots=rFilxzVgfD&sig=mwqwphBZxPBhwk0tJJBT4RPWFIO&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Alexander, M. (2003). *Host-stranger relations in Rome, Tel Aviv, Paris and Amsterdam. A comparison of local policies toward labour migrants*.

https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/3624714/33506_Thesis.pdf

Alexander, M. (2004). *Comparing local policies towards migrants: An analytical framework, a typology and preliminary survey results*. In R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, & S. Vertovec (Eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies* (pp. 57–84).

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/R-Penninx/publication/358443255_'Introduction_European_cities_and_their_new_residents'_in_R_Penninx_K_Kraal_M_Martiniello_S_Vertovec_eds_Citizenship_in_European_cities_Immigrants_local_politics_and_integration_policies_1-16_Aldersho/links/6202a24e6adc0779cd51ad2f/Introduction-European-cities-and-their-new-residents-in-R-Penninx-K-Kraal-M-Martiniello-S-Vertovec-eds-Citizenship-in-European-cities-Immigrants-local-politics-and-integration-policies-1-16-AI.pdf#page=67

Alexander, M. (2007). *Cities and Labour Immigration “Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv.”*

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781351161725/cities-labour-immigration-michael-alexander>

Alexander, M. (2017). *Cities and Labour Immigration*.

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781351161725/cities-labour-immigration-michael-alexander>

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2018). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.

<https://academic.oup.com/jpart/article/18/4/543/1090370>

ANVITA. (2020). #MARSEILLE s'engage en faveur de l'accueil des navires de sauvetage en Méditerranée. ANVITA.

<https://www.anvita.fr/fr/nos-membres/les-pratiques/view/marseille-sengage-en-faveur-de-la-ccueil-des-navires-de-sauvetage-en-mediterranee>

ANVITA. (2022). #MARSEILLE - Panorama des pratiques inspirantes collectées en 2021. ANVITA.

<https://www.anvita.fr/fr/nos-membres/les-pratiques/view/marseille-panorama-des-pratiques-2021>

Bazurli, R., & de Graauw, E. (2023). Explaining variation in city sanctuary policies: insights from American and European cities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1–22.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2023.2198811>

Belmessous, F. (2018). *Accueillir, insérer, intégrer les migrants à la ville* (E. Roche , Ed.).

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-espaces-et-societes-2018-1-page-7.htm?contenu=bibliographie>

Berthomière, W., Fromentin, J., Lessault, D., Michalon, B., & Przybyl, S. (2020). L'accueil des exilés dans les espaces ruraux en France : orientations nationales et déclinaisons locales d'une politique de dispersion. *Revue Européenne Des Migrations Internationales*, 36(2-3), 53–82. <https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.15550>

Bertossi, C. (2011). National Models of Integration in Europe. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(12), 1561–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211409560>

Bertossi, C. (2012). The performativity of colour blindness: race politics and immigrant integration in France, 1980–2012. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 46(5), 427–444.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322x.2012.718163>

Bertossi, C. (2015). *Integrating Immigrants in Europe “The Coproduction of National Models of Integration: A View from France and the Netherlands”* (J. W. Duyvendak & Peter Scholten , Eds.).

<https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/28048/1/1001946.pdf#page=67>

Bolíbar, M., Martínez-Ariño, J., & Schiller , M. (2021). *A relational approach to local immigrant policy-making: collaboration with immigrant advocacy bodies in French and German cities.*

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003142638-7/relational-approach-local-immigrant-policy-making-collaboration-immigrant-advocacy-bodies-french-german-cities-maria-schiller-julia-mart%C3%ADnez-ari%C3%B1o-mireia-bol%C3%ADbar>

Borkert, M., & Caponio, T. (2010). *The local dimension of migration policymaking.*

Google.com; Amsterdam University Press.

https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=fr&user=SJHp584AAAAJ&citation_for_view=SJHp584AAAAJ:2osOgNQ5qMEC

Brubaker, W. R. (1990). Immigration, citizenship, and the nation-state in France and Germany: A comparative historical analysis . *International Sociology*, 5(4), 379–407.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/026858090005004003>

Caponio, T. (2021). Governing Migration through Multi-Level Governance? City Networks in Europe and the United States *. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies.*

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13214>

Caponio, T., & Borkert, M. (2010). The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking. In *library.oapen.org*. Amsterdam University Press.

<https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/34851>

Caponio, T., & Jones-Correa, M. (2017). Theorising migration policy in multilevel states: the multilevel governance perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(12), 1995–2010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2017.1341705>

Caponio, T., & Testore, G. (2012). L'intégration : nouvelle frontière de l'immigration ? *Migrations Société*, N° 140(2), 285. <https://doi.org/10.3917/migra.140.0285>

Careja, R. (2018). Making good citizens: local authorities' integration measures navigate national policies and local realities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(8), 1327–1344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2018.1441613>

Carrera, S., & Vankova, Z. (2019). Human Rights Aspects of Immigrant and Refugee Integration Policies. A comparative assessment in selected Council of Europe member states at the request of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Migration and Refugees of the Council of Europe. *Lup.lub.lu.se*.
<https://lup.lub.lu.se/search/publication/f74902ab-465d-4972-9702-8edfcdebdf8>

CTAIR Marseille. (2021). Ville de Marseille.
https://www.marseille.fr/sites/default/files/pdf/presse/communiques/cp_-_signature_ctai_25.11.21-2.pdf

Czaika, M., & de Haas, H. (2011). The effectiveness of immigration policies: a conceptual review of empirical evidence. *Ora.ox.ac.uk*.
<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:3cb4af24-7a03-418a-a4f6-d84666e27ec5>

Dahdah, A. (2018). *La ville (in)hospitalière : parcours scolaire et résidentiel d'une famille syrienne à Marseille* (G. Audren & F. Bouillon, Eds.).
<https://www.cairn.info/revue-espaces-et-societes-2018-1-page-73.htm#s2n7>

Dekker, R., Emilsson, H., Krieger, B., & Scholten, P. (2015). A Local Dimension of Integration Policies? A Comparative Study of Berlin, Malmö, and Rotterdam. *International Migration Review*, 49(3), 633–658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12133>

Délégation interministérielle à l'accueil et à l'intégration des réfugiés. (2024). *CTAI, les contrats territoriaux d'accueil et d'intégration* Diarr.
<https://accueil-integration-refugies.fr/les-contrats-dintegration-ctai/>

DIAIR. (2024). *Actualités du programme CTAIR* ★ *Diair*. Diair.

<https://accueil-integration-refugies.fr/actualites-du-programme-ctair/>

La Délégation interministérielle à l'accueil et à l'intégration des réfugiés. (2018). *Une stratégie nationale* ★ *Diair*. Diair.

<https://accueil-integration-refugies.fr/une-strategie-nationale/>

Doussot , C. (2024, January 26). *Paris, “ville d'accueil et d'intégration” : la mairie ouvre ses portes ce samedi contre la loi Immigration*. Leparisien.fr.

<https://www.leparisien.fr/paris-75/paris-ville-daccueil-et-dintegration-la-mairie-ouvre-ses-portes-ce-samedi-contre-la-loi-immigration-26-01-2024-FU3Z5ZVJO5EMVLNIP4BYEIO6OA.php>

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. (2015). *CLIP*. www.eurofound.europa.eu.

<https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/en/clip-european-network-cities-local-integration-policies-migrants>

Eurostat. (2023). *EU migrant flows intensify in 2021*. ec.europa.eu.

<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/fr/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20230329-2>

Favell, A. (2016). Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain. In *Google Books*. Springer.

<https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=vs-bCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Favell>

Flamant , A. (2021a). *Nantes, “ville accueillante” pour les populations exilées*.

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-migrations-societe-2021-3-page-49.htm?contenu=article>

Flamant , A. (2021b). *The local turn in integration policies: why French cities differ*.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003142638-4/local-turn-integration-policies-french-cities-differ-anouk-flamant>

Flamant, A. (2021). *La construction négociée de l'accueil des migrants par les municipalités* (T. Lacroix , Ed.).
<https://www.cairn.info/revue-migrations-societe-2021-3-page-15.htm?contenu=plan>

Fourot, A.-C., Healy, A., & Flamant, A. (2021). French participation in transnational migration networks: understanding city (dis)involvement and “passivism.” *Local Government Studies*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1857246>

Garbaye, R. (2000). *Ethnic Minorities, Cities, and Institutions: A Comparison of the Modes of Management of Ethnic Diversity of a French and a British City*.
https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/1653/2000_EUI%20WP_RSCAS_013.pdf?sequence=1

Garbaye, R. (2002). Ethnic minority participation in British and French cities: a historical–institutionalist perspective. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), 555–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00398>

Garcés-Mascareñas, B., & Penninx, R. (2016). *IMISCOE Research Series Integration Processes and Policies in Europe* (pp. P97 chap 6).
<https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/28047/1001947.pdf?sequence=1#page=97>

Garino, A., & Geisser, V. (2021). Marseille et ses réfugiés : un changement de paradigme. *Migrations Société*, N° 185(3), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.3917/migra.185.0111>

Gaxie, D., Laborier, P., de Lassalle, M., Taiclet, A.-F., & Obradovic, I. (1999). Les politiques municipales d'intégration des populations d'origine étrangère. *Migrations Etudes. Synthèse de Travaux Sur l'Immigration et La Présence Étrangère En France*, 86.
<https://hal.science/hal-04203665/>

Geddes, A. (2020). *Policy Analysis and Europeanization: An Analysis of EU Migrant Integration Policymaking* (P. Scholten, Ed.).

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780429441653-20/policy-analysis-europeanization-analysis-eu-migrant-integration-policymaking-andrew-geddes-peter-scholten>

Geisser, V. (2020). Des municipalités plus accueillantes que les États ? *Migrations Société*, N°181(3), 3–3. <https://doi.org/10.3917/migra.181.0003>

Gibson, R. (2011). *A Primer on Collaborative Multi-Level Governance*.

https://research.library.mun.ca/310/1/primer_collaborative.pdf

Hackett, S. (2017). *Le “virage local” dans une perspective historique : deux études de cas sur des villes de Grande-Bretagne et d’Allemagne*.

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-des-sciences-administratives-2017-2-page-347.htm?contenu=resume>

Harder, N., Figueroa, L., Gillum, R. M., Hangartner, D., Laitin, D. D., & Hainmueller, J. (2018). Multidimensional measure of immigrant integration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(45), 11483–11488. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808793115>

Insee. (2019). *Étrangers - Immigrés en 2016 Marseille*. Www.insee.fr.

<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/4177160?sommaire=4177618&geo=COM-13055>

Insee. (2021). *Immigrés, étrangers*. Www.insee.fr.

<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3633212>

Insee. (2023a). *Département de la Gironde – Étrangers - Immigrés en 2020*. Www.insee.fr.

<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/7633125?sommaire=7633727&geo=DEP-33>

Insee. (2023b). *Étrangers - Immigrés en 2020 | Marseille*. Www.insee.fr.

<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/7633125?geo=COM-13055&sommaire=7633727>

Insee. (2023c). *Étrangers - Immigrés en 2020* | Paris. Wwww.insee.fr.

<https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/7633125?sommaire=7633727&geo=DEP-75>

Ireland , P. (1994). *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity “Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland.”*

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.4159/harvard.9780674498839/html>

Joppke, C. (2007). Transformation of Immigrant Integration: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany. *World Politics*, 59(2), 243–273. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.2007.0022>

Jorgensen, M. B. (2012). The Diverging Logics of Integration Policy Making at National and City Level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244–278.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2012.00886.x>

Kallenbach, S., Lee, K. S., Downs-Karkos, S., & Beaubien Taylor, M. (2013). *Theoretical Framework* . https://lines.ed.gov/publications/pdf/NINA_theoretical-framework.pdf

Kyeremeh, E., Arku, G., Mkandawire, P., Cleave, E., & Yusuf, I. (2019). What is success? Examining the concept of successful integration among African immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(3), 649–667.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2019.1639494>

La Cimade . (2016). *Schéma régional des demandeurs d’asile en région PACA*.

<https://www.lacimade.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/sch%C3%A9ma-r%C3%A9gion-PA-CA.pdf>

Le Monde. (2023, December 22). Loi “immigration” : la maire de Paris, Anne Hidalgo, refuse de “faire le tri” et saisit le Conseil constitutionnel. *Le Monde.fr*.

https://www.lemonde.fr/societe/article/2023/12/22/loi-immigration-la-maire-de-paris-anne-hidalgo-refuse-de-faire-le-tri-et-saisit-le-conseil-constitutionnel_6207341_3224.html

Lê, J., & Okba, M. (2018). *L'insertion des immigrés, de l'arrivée en France au premier emploi - Insee Première - 1717*. Wwww.insee.fr. <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3640742>

Lorriaux, A. (2024, February 5). *Paris riposte contre la loi immigration avec un paquet de mesures*. Wwww.20minutes.fr. <https://www.20minutes.fr/paris/4074223-20240205-loi-immigration-paris-riposte-paquet-mesures-surtout-symboliques#:~:text=%C2%AB%20La%20loi%20est%20tr%C3%A8s%20claire>

Manatschal, A., & Bernauer, J. (2015). Consenting to Exclude? Empirical Patterns of Democracy and Immigrant Integration Policy. *West European Politics*, 39(2), 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2015.1046669>

Martin, J.-P., & Nonn, H. (1980). La notion d'"intégration régionale". *Travaux de l'Institut Géographique de Reims*, 41(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.3406/tigr.1980.1080>

Martiniello, M., & Penninx, R. (2004). *Integration Processes and Policies: State of the Art and Lessons*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/R-Penninx/publication/358441702_'Integration_processes_and_policies_State_of_the_art_and_lessons'_in_R_Penninx_K_Kraal_M_Martiniello_S_Vertovec_edscitizenship_in_european_cities_immigrants_local_politics_and_integration_policies_139/links/6202a1980213d2287805a7ff/Integration-processes-and-policies-State-of-the-art-and-lessons-in-R-Penninx-K-Kraal-M-Martiniello-S-Vertovec-eds-Citizenship-in-European-Cities-Immigrants-local-politics-and-integration-policie.pdf#page=149

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2015). *L'hébergement des demandeurs d'asile*. <https://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Archives/Archives-sous-sites/Accueil-des-demandeurs-d-asile/Livret-d-information-des-maires/L-hebergement-des-demandeurs-d-asile>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2020). *Schéma national d'accueil des demandeurs d'asile et d'intégration des réfugiés 2021-2023*. <https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Asile/Schema-national-d-accueil-des-demandeurs-d-asile-et-d-integration-des-refugies-2021-2023>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2021). *Les acteurs de l'intégration*.

<https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Integration-et-Acces-a-la-nationalite/Les-acteurs-de-l-integration>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2022a). *AGIR, pour l'emploi et le logement des personnes réfugiées*.

<https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Integration-et-Acces-a-la-nationalite/AGIR-pour-l-emploi-et-le-logement-des-personnes-refugiees>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2022b). *L'insertion professionnelle, clé de l'intégration des primo-arrivants*.

<https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Integration-et-Acces-a-la-nationalite/Le-parcours-personnalise-d-integration-republicaine/Au-dela-du-contrat-d-integration-republicaine-CIR/L-insertion-professionnelle-cle-de-l-integration-des-primo-arrivants>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2022c). *Politique Française de l'immigration et de l'intégration*.

<https://www.ofii.fr/>

Ministère de l'Intérieur. (2023). *Infos migrations*.

<https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Info-ressources/Etudes-et-statistiques/Etudes/Etudes/Infos-migrations>

Mthethwa, R. M. (2012). *Critical dimensions for policy implementation*.

https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/20618/Mthethwa_Critical%282012%29.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Muller, P. (1992). Entre Le Local Et L'europe La Crise Du Modèle Français De Politiques Publiques. *Revue Française de Science Politique*, 42(2), 275–297.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43120617>

Musterd, S., Ostendorf, W., & Breebaart, M. (1998). Multi-Ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies. In *Google Books*. Springer Science & Business Media.

https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=G3mytWq_gZwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA11&dq=Musterd

OCDE. (2022). *Améliorer l'intégration locale des migrants* .

<https://accueil-integration-refugies.fr/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Etude-de-cas-OCDE.pdf>

Parliamentary Assembly. (2017). *Integration of refugees in times of critical pressure: learning from recent experience and examples of best practice*. Assembly.coe.int.

<https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=23966&lang=en>

Penninx, R. (2007). Integration Processes of Migrants: Research Findings and Policy

Challenges. *Migracijske I Etničke Teme*, 23(1-2), 7–32. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/clanak/22132>

Penninx, R. (2009). *Decentralising integration policies*.

[http://www.integratingcities2012.eu/documents/\(2009%20-%20Penninx\)%20Decentralising%20integration%20policies.pdf](http://www.integratingcities2012.eu/documents/(2009%20-%20Penninx)%20Decentralising%20integration%20policies.pdf)

Piattoni, S. (2009). Multi-level Governance: a Historical and Conceptual Analysis. *Journal of European Integration*, 31(2), 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036330802642755>

Rath, J., & Scholten, P. (2014). *An Introduction to immigrant incorporation studies: European perspectives*.

https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=2WM6BAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA5&dq=An+Introduction+to+immigrant+incorporation+studies:+European+perspectives+De+Jan+Rath&ots=62hZlnXwfX&sig=c_MHoOn4S9eHodA-KjbFvOS8HI&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=An%20Introduction%20to%20immigrant%20incorporation%20studies%3A%20European%20perspectives%20De%20Jan%20Rath&f=false

Rullière, S. (2021). *L'expérience de la grande métropole, Grenoble-Alpes Métropole, en matière d'insertion professionnelle des bénéficiaires de la protection internationale*.

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-realites-industrielles-2021-2-page-29.htm?contenu=resume>

Sablonnière, R., Nugier, A., Kadhim, N., Kleinlogel, E. P., Pelletier-Dumas, M., & Guimond, S. (2020). The impact of national integration policies on prejudice and

psychological well-being: The fundamental role of the clarity and coherence of integration policies. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(3), 614–633.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2647>

Schnapper, D. (2008). *Intégration nationale et intégration des migrants: un enjeu Européen*.

<https://old.robert-schuman.eu/fr/doc/questions-d-europe/qe-90-fr.pdf>

Scholten, P. (2012). *Beyond Fragmentation and Interconnectivity “Beyond National Models of integration? Rethinking interconnectedness and fragmentation in Dutch and French integration policies”*.

https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=NhrvAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA44&dq=To+what+extent+do+local+integration+policies+impact+the+effectiveness+of+national-level+integration+policies+in+France%3F&ots=kPON0Hg9XF&sig=cxOaBp9RpfFsHpoMo-ALL-W3hAk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=To%20what%20extent%20do%20local%20integration%20policies%20impact%20the%20effectiveness%20of%20national-level%20integration%20policies%20in%20France%3F&f=false

Scholten, P. (2018). *Two worlds apart? Multilevel governance and the gap between national and local integration policies*.

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781351108478-16/two-worlds-apart-peter-scholten>

Scholten, P., Entzinger, H., Penninx, R., & Verbeek, S. (2015). *IMISCOE Research Series Integrating Immigrants in Europe “European Cities in Search of Knowledge for Their Integration Policies”* (pp. 99 to 117).

<https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/28048/1/1001946.pdf#page=67>

Scholten, P., Zapata-Barrero, R., & Caponio, T. (2017). *Introduction au numéro spécial : “Théorisation du ‘virage local’ dans un cadre d’analyse fondé sur la gouvernance à niveaux multiples. Étude de cas axée sur les politiques concernant les immigrants.”*

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-des-sciences-administratives-2017-2-page-245.htm#s1n3>

Service d'Information du Gouvernement. (2024). *Piloter le dispositif "Cohabitations solidaires."* Info.gouv.fr.

<https://www.info.gouv.fr/organisation/delegation-interministerielle-a-l-hebergement-et-a-l-accus-au-logement/piloter-le-dispositif-cohabitations-solidaires>

Triviño-Salazar, J. C. (2023). Transnational City Networks on Migration and Integration and Local Collaborative Governance: Establishing the Nexus. *International Migration Review*, 019791832311545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183231154558>

United Nations. (2016, July 22). *Definitions*. Refugees and Migrants; United Nations. <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/definitions>

Van Breugel, I. (2020). Towards a typology of local migration diversity policies. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00179-0>

Vanek, J., Wrigley, H. S., Jacobson, E., & Isserlis, J. (2020). All Together Now: Supporting Immigrants and Refugees through Collaboration. *Adult Literacy Education*, 2(1), 41–47. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1249007>

Vasta, E., & Vuddamalay, V. (2006). International Migration and the Social Sciences: Confronting National Experiences in Australia, France and Germany. In *Google Books*. Springer. <https://books.google.es/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=l8SGDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Vasta>

Vertovec, S., Kraal, K., Penninx, R., & Martiniello, M. (2004). *Citizenship in European Cities Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315260228/citizenship-european-cities-steven-vertovec-karen-kraal-rinus-penninx>

Vie Publique. (2017). *Immigration : évolution de la politique pour l'intégration des immigrés* | Vie publique.fr. www.vie-Publique.fr.

<https://www.vie-publique.fr/eclairage/20189-immigration-evolution-de-la-politique-pour-lintegration-des-immigres>

Vie Publique . (2024). *Loi du 26 janvier 2024 pour contrôler l'immigration, améliorer l'intégration*. Vie-Publique.fr.

<https://www.vie-publique.fr/loi/287993-loi-immigration-integration-asile-du-26-janvier-2024>

Ville de Paris. (2015). *Mobilisation de la communauté de Paris pour l'accueil des réfugiés*. <https://cdn.paris.fr/paris/2019/07/24/856fa3619b64bcab0e7cc7378dea032a.pdf>

Ville de Paris. (2021a). *Accueil et intégration des réfugiés à Paris*. Wwww.paris.fr. <https://www.paris.fr/pages/accueil-et-hebergement-des-refugies-4279>

Ville de Paris. (2021b). *Un centre d'hébergement d'urgence pour les jeunes migrants isolés*. Wwww.paris.fr. <https://www.paris.fr/pages/un-centre-d-hebergement-d-urgence-pour-les-jeunes-migrants-isoles-16674>

Ville de Paris. (2022). *Agir pour l'intégration*. Wwww.paris.fr. <https://www.paris.fr/pages/integration-et-citoyennete-2464#:~:text=Chiffres%20cl%C3%A9s>

Ville de Paris. (2023). *Direction des Solidarités* . https://a06-v7.apps.paris.fr/a06/jsp/site/plugins/odjcp/DoDownload.jsp?id_entite=58573&id_type_entite=6

Vinzent, J. (2020, September 2). *Marseille ouvre son port aux migrants sauvés en mer : les ONG disent merci mais non merci*. Marsactu. <https://marsactu.fr/marseille-ouvre-son-port-aux-migrants-sauves-en-mer-les-ong-disent-merci-mais-non-merci/>

Zapata-Barrero, R., Caponio, T., & Scholten, P. (2017). Theorizing the “local turn” in a multi-level governance framework of analysis: a case study in immigrant policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2), 241–246.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852316688426>

Appendix

Retranscription of the interviews (April 2024)

1. Adoma Marseille

1- What is the specific role of your organization in implementing the migrant integration policies mandated by the national government in Marseille? Adoma is a reception center for asylum seekers (CADA) that follows the national reception and integration scheme for asylum seekers and refugees (SNADAR). Its mission is to:

- Accommodate asylum seekers
- Provide social support and orientation

Adoma operates locally while following a regional scheme (SRADAR) that is reviewed every three years. Adoma centers are established in a city when there is a project call by the Ministry of the Interior, deployed locally by the DDETS, to provide transitional services during the asylum application process with OFPRA and CNDA. Adoma follows a set of specifications and is funded by the State.

2- How does your organization concretely contribute to achieving the goals set by national policies on migrant integration? According to the Code of Entry and Residence of Foreigners and the Right of Asylum (CESEDA), Adoma follows a set of specifications and undertakes missions of reception, shelter, and social support for asylum seekers. Adoma manages the national asylum reception system (DNA) through various missions:

- Accommodation of asylum seekers: according to CESEDA, once refugee status is granted, rehousing must occur within six months.
- Administrative, social, and medical support
- Schooling for children and managing waiting periods
- Managing exits

3- Are there formal partnerships between the city of Marseille and these organizations to implement migrant integration policies? There are partnerships with local actors and associations in the city of Marseille. However, Adoma does not directly collaborate with the municipality but with the French State.

4- How are decisions made regarding actions and programs related to migrant integration in Marseille? For example, in your case, as an organization working on migrant housing. Decisions are made by the Ministry of the Interior and according to the Code of Entry and Residence of Foreigners and the Right of Asylum (CESEDA). Municipalities and the State discuss the possible implementation of CADA in the territory, but the State is the final decision-maker. Municipalities may refuse, but this is rare.

5- To what extent have the local authorities in Marseille and your organization discussed and agreed on how to implement migrant integration initiatives? There may be discussions and exchanges following annual management meetings between Adoma and the State, but it is the national government that decides on the opening of CADA and the

missions these centers undertake. This is done uniformly across all Adoma centers in France.

6- Is there an explicit agreement on the formal and informal roles of each party in implementing integration initiatives in housing in Marseille? It is not an explicit agreement, but once again, the State is the decision-maker. There can be exchanges between municipalities, CADA, and the State, but these are not explicit agreements.

7- Does your organization work with other non-state actors on migrant integration initiatives? Adoma works with non-state actors in the city of Marseille to create a local network with partners in sectors such as housing, food aid, and medical assistance. Partnerships can be formed with other CADA or with associations and social landlords such as the Red Cross, IPERIA, SACàDom, or with the comprehensive and individualized refugee support program (AGIR).

8- Are non-state actors, including your organization in Marseille, actively involved in discussions and initiatives led by local and national authorities regarding migrant integration through housing? Regarding Adoma's missions, decisions are made by the State, and local initiatives result from collaboration between Adoma and its local partners.

9- How does your organization measure the impact of its collaboration with the French national authorities on migrant integration through housing, and what success indicators do you use? Collaboration is direct between Adoma and the national government, and Adoma follows the directives of the Code of Entry and Residence of Foreigners and the Right of Asylum (CESEDA), without being a decision-maker.

10- What are the main challenges or obstacles you face in your work with French national institutions to promote migrant integration through housing, and how do you overcome them? Adoma may face various obstacles, particularly concerning delays in certain projects, which can be due to the housing crisis and a lack of available social landlords. Additionally, the budget set by the State for CADA, like Adoma can be insufficient for project realization. This is particularly true for the deadlines imposed for rehousing asylum seekers granted refugee status, which is set at six months by CESEDA. This period is often too short, resulting in an increased rate of undue presence of refugees in Adoma centers.

11- What are your expectations regarding support or strengthening collaboration with the national French authorities to improve the effectiveness of your actions in favor of migrant integration through housing? To address these obstacles, greater financial support from the State seems necessary, including an increase in the daily rate for CADA.

12- Do you have concrete examples of projects or initiatives where collaboration between your organization and the French national authorities has resulted in significant outcomes in terms of migrant integration through housing? Not applicable because Adoma's initiatives are governed by the national government.

2. *Singa Marseille*

1- What is the specific role of your organization in implementing the migrant integration policies mandated by the national government in Marseille? SINGA France has two main types of activities, both of which are present in Marseille:

- Community activities: changing narratives by creating connections through activities between locals and newcomers, such as dance classes, theater, yoga, and French classes.
- Incubation projects: present in Marseille for the past year.

2- How does your organization concretely contribute to achieving the goals set by national policies on migrant integration? SINGA is an independent organization and does not directly depend on the State. However, through its activities mentioned in question 1, the organization contributes to migrant integration.

3- Are there formal partnerships between the city of Marseille and your organization to implement migrant integration policies? SINGA is also funded by the city of Marseille within the framework of common law for its community-related activities and by the territorial reception and integration contracts (CTAI) for its incubation projects. SINGA is financed by both public and private grants.

4- How are decisions made regarding actions and programs related to migrant integration in Marseille? SINGA responds to project calls and is funded by the city of Marseille as part of its project calls. Additionally, there are occasional exchanges between AGIR and SINGA, but SINGA does not directly depend on government policies.

5- To what extent have the local authorities in Marseille and your organization discussed and agreed on how to implement migrant integration initiatives? During these occasional discussions.

6- Is there an explicit agreement on the formal and informal roles of each party in implementing integration initiatives in Marseille? These are not really explicit agreements but rather exchanges and discussions.

7- Does your organization work with other non-state actors on migrant integration initiatives? Yes, SINGA works with:

- Welcome Map Marseille
- Collectif AGIR
- SIMPLON
- EKO!
- Kipawa
- Refugee Food Festival
- Each One

8- Are non-state actors, including your organization in Marseille, actively involved in discussions and initiatives led by local and national authorities regarding migrant

integration? They are often funded by the city, so there are discussions and exchanges, but there remains a certain hierarchy due to the funding from Marseille.

9- How does your organization measure the impact of its collaboration with the French national authorities on migrant integration, and what success indicators do you use? Success indicators, whether with national authorities or partners, include:

Community activities:

- The number of workshops implemented
- The rate of diversity
- The satisfaction rate

Incubation projects:

- The number of participants
- The number of businesses created
- The exit rate
- The rate of resumption of studies and/or job creation

10- What are the main challenges or obstacles you face in your work with French national institutions to promote migrant integration, and how do you overcome them?

- Lack of funding
- Need to change the national narrative and deepen the reflection on the integration
- Laws are increasingly restrictive, making the work difficult, lengthy, and counterproductive

11- What are your expectations regarding support or strengthening collaboration with the national French authorities to improve the effectiveness of your actions in favor of migrant integration? To resolve the previously mentioned issues.

12- Do you have concrete examples of projects or initiatives where collaboration between your organization and the French national authorities has resulted in significant outcomes in terms of migrant integration? The incubation projects in Marseille are recent (one year), but in general, projects funded by the State have relevant results. The operation: the overall incubation project (SINGA Marseille) is submitted/proposed to the government, which finances it.

3. *J'accueille Paris*

1- What is the specific role of your organization in implementing the migrant integration policies mandated by the national government in Paris? We focus on citizen hosting with the goal of making citizen hosting a cultural norm. We implement government-mandated policies, but only partially. We are involved in the Solidarity Cohabitation policy. J'accueille responds to project calls and signs agreements with the State and cities. Twenty-five percent of the budget comes from a grant provided by the State based on the number of people hosted by the organization.

2- How does your organization concretely contribute to achieving the goals set by national policies on migrant integration? Through the budget allocated by the State dedicated to citizen hosting.

3- Are there formal partnerships between the city of Paris and your organization to implement migrant integration policies? Yes, we have a subsidy agreement with the Paris City Hall (for ten years), which allows for invitations to forums and the use of city facilities.

4- How are decisions made regarding actions and programs related to migrant integration in Paris? It depends on the specific area, but in theory, it is the State's responsibility. Housing is theoretically the responsibility of the state, but the involvement of cities is significant.

5- To what extent have the local authorities in Paris and your organization discussed and agreed on how to implement migrant integration initiatives? There are specific partnership terms following the agreements signed between the two parties. There are consultations between the city of Paris (a relevant and active city) and the organizations.

6- Is there an explicit agreement on the formal and informal roles of each party in implementing integration initiatives in Paris? Yes, through subsidy agreements with obligations that each party must fulfill.

7- Does your organization work with other non-state actors on migrant integration initiatives? We work with other partners, but J'accueille primarily collaborates with the State, the city, the departments, and other associations, but rarely with the regions.

8- Are non-state actors, including your organization in Paris, actively involved in discussions and initiatives led by local and national authorities regarding migrant integration? They are often funded by the city, so there are discussions and exchanges.

9- How does your organization measure the impact of its collaboration with the French national authorities on migrant integration through housing, and what success indicators do you use? We use indicators for entry, exit, housing, progress in French, and employment to measure the impact of the program in general. The State is a co-financer, and the success indicators for our work include:

Subjective:

- Number of people received (on both sides)
- Whether enough people found the program useful
- Satisfaction rate of participants

- Whether citizens felt their role was useful

Objective:

- Whether the hosted individuals have housing, employment, or training upon leaving the program (exit indicators)

The impact itself is difficult to measure.

10- What are the main challenges or obstacles you face in your work with French national institutions to promote migrant integration, and how do you overcome them?

- The centralization of refugee integration policy within the Ministry of the Interior
- Some ministries do not consider this policy a priority, so they need to be convinced
- Hyper-centralization, which contradicts the need for local knowledge and experience

11- What are your expectations regarding support or strengthening collaboration with the national French authorities to improve the effectiveness of your actions in favor of migrant integration? Generally, more funding for infrastructure, not just for the people we support. With J'accueille, we respond to State project calls, and the State is a co-financer, often paying based on the number of people supported, making it difficult to build infrastructure. Migration is a complex issue because the number of people hosted varies yearly. There is a need for infrastructure funding, not just individual support, to prepare for future crises.

12- Do you have concrete examples of projects or initiatives where collaboration between your organization and the French national authorities has resulted in significant outcomes in terms of migrant integration? The initiative to create a sister NGO to SINGA: J'accueille and its project of cohabitation and citizen hosting as a whole is a project that shows significant results.