From enforcement to engagement: Scaling up case management as an alternative to immigration detention in Europe

Two-year Implementation Plan, 2022-23

European **Alternatives To Detention** Network

Table of contents

1 Executive Summary

Immigration detention is on the rise across Europe as a tool of migration management. Governments are curbing human rights and detaining people in often inhumane conditions, destroying the lives of individuals, their families and communities.

Detention is in no one's interest. It's harmful to people's mental and physical health, ineffective, and it's expensive for governments and authorities.

EU law states that detention should only ever be used as a last resort and in specific circumstances, yet frequently countries use detention by default. At the European Alternatives to Detention Network (EATDN), our goal is to put an end to immigration detention.

Reducing and ultimately ending detention brings human dignity, helps to resolve more cases and is cost-effective. We believe people don't need to be deprived of their liberty during the immigration process and that there are better solutions than detention.

Our community-based Alternatives to Detention pilots show that when we work together, a community-led approach results in better outcomes for everyone. We've been working in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Poland and the UK to drive down detention by collaborating with partners.

We are breaking new ground in Europe by building a holistic alternative that works. Based on well-established social work principles, our innovative approach gives people the tools they need to work through their own cases. By providing caseworkers in the community, people have access to legal assistance, healthcare, and essential support to navigate the immigration process for themselves.

We know our approach works. Our pilot evaluation showed that 97% of people remained engaged with immigration procedures through community management. People are supported and empowered to make informed decisions about their case, leading to increased engagement and resolution.

Community-based solutions are feasible and effective, and now it's time to expand and amplify our efforts.

This implementation plan will advance these pilots, working collaboratively with others to embed these solutions in migration management systems. **Our innovative approach involves putting advocacy, networks and the expertise of people with lived experience at the forefront.** The plan outlines our vision for advocacy partners, working alongside governments, local authorities and civil society, and how we will learn, monitor and evaluate our progress.

The plan details our four objectives:

› **Network building:** Strengthening our relationships and expanding our networks will help to scale up our projects. Working collaboratively with governments, authorities, legal experts, communities including leaders with lived experience and civil society will intensify our work to reach more people and contribute to resolving more cases.

› **Geographical expansion:** In the next two years, as well as establishing additional engagement in the areas we already work in, we aim to expand to several additional cities and one additional country. This way we will demonstrate to more governments that community management is the best solution.

› **Expansion beyond vulnerable groups:** We're extending our reach beyond women and families to reach those who are already in detention and those who are not identified as vulnerable.

› **Increasing numbers:** Within two years, we will increase the number of people we support with community-led management by 10-20%.

This scaling plan outlines how, by broadening and deepening our work, we are creating sustainable change now and into the future.

2 Introduction

Across Europe, there is pressure to increase the use of immigration detention as part of a push to accelerate return rates and reduce irregular migration. While EU law states that detention should only be used as a measure of last resort and in very specific circumstances defined by law, European governments rarely conduct an individual assessment before detention, to evaluate whether detention is necessary and proportionate and if the criteria for detention apply. When such criteria do apply, less coercive measures should be prioritised. However, this rarely happens in practice; detention is frequently applied as a first option before alternatives to detention (ATD) are considered, if they are considered at all. Moreover, where the term is used by governments in the region, ATD has generally been focused on 'traditional' or 'enforcement' -based approaches, which apply restrictions/conditions to control and keep track of migrants and asylum seekers. These allow governments to monitor individuals and apply sanctions for non-compliance, but fail to support people in working towards their case resolution (i.e. any temporary or permanent migration outcome) and usually involve some kind of restrictions on freedom of movement. As witnessed first-hand by the European Alternatives to Detention Network (EATDN) pilots, the conditions of enforcement-based ATD are often unrealistic and put overly harsh burdens on migrants regarding reporting and bail conditions. In contrast, ATD based on case management are more humane and effective in supporting people to work towards finding a temporary or permanent migration outcome, which can include regularisation, moving to a third country, or voluntary return.

The EATDN is a group of NGOs that aims to end immigration detention in Europe. Established in 2017, it brings together civil society organisations implementing case management-based ATD in seven European countries (Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Poland and the UK) in partnership with regional-level and international organisations. The network aims to create a shift at a systemic level from enforcement-based migration management systems that rely on detention, to promoting community-based alternatives. Ultimately, the goal of the EATDN is to reduce and eventually end the use of immigration detention. The EATDN works towards this by building evidence and momentum on rights-based approaches which are based on the principles of case management in the community, in order to demonstrate how migration management without detention can be effective. Network members implement and test case management-based approaches aimed at supporting individuals in an irregular situation to work towards a durable solution while living in the community. They also provide non-coercive, non-enforcement based ATD to support people who would or could otherwise be detained, and promote the further expansion of this model over enforcement-based ATD. The pilots are all carried out in line with the principles of the Community Assessment and Placement (CAP) model, employing case managers to work with individuals at risk of detention in order to ensure that their holistic needs are being met.

As part of working towards its goals, the EATDN sees a need to expand and amplify its pilots and take them to the next level. This 2-year implementation plan sets out how the EATDN will scale case management projects and community-based ATD for people who would otherwise be detained, with the aim being to demonstrate that migration management frameworks that do not include detention are feasible and effective.

Through this process, the EATDN has reflected on its progress thus far, taking into account internal and external achievements and set-backs, and reflecting on how it can achieve more social impact by increasing its geographical scope, fostering partnerships with new actors, influencing social and political institutions, reaching more people and resolving more cases. This scaling will be supported by a focus on advocacy, research, network-building, peer-learning and migrant-led advocacy and case management. In this implementation plan, the EATDN lays out how these different elements of its work will be organised and implemented in the next 2 years in order to promote community-based solutions as well as expanding and amplifying case management-based ATD.

3 Context analysis and relevance of the plan in Europe

Immigration detention - including of children and vulnerable people - continues to be the default approach for many European countries. In **Belgium**, for instance, despite the government's commitment to end child detention and promote alternatives, the immigration detention system continues to expand. In **Bulgaria**, meanwhile, even after a sharp reduction in the number of undocumented migrants apprehended, detention remains a key tool in the country's response to migration. Its detention centres lack appropriate health care services and fail to provide adequate access to procedural guarantees, spurring criticism from civil society organisations and international watchdogs. During the COVID-19 pandemic, detention orders were automatically renewed without hearings. In early 2020, **Cyprus** announced stringent measures including the creation of new closed centres. During COVID-19, many migrants were moved from detention centres into allegedly open centres with substandard conditions, where migrants are in situations of de facto deprivation of liberty with no time limit, weak procedural safeguards, and a lack of access to legal aid. In **Greece**, the country's immigration detention practices have been repeatedly condemned by regional and international bodies, including the lack of individualised assessment, the use of police stations for immigration detention purposes, and conditions across much of its detention estate that amount to inhuman and degrading treatment. **Italy** has seen several recent migration policy reforms aimed at reducing procedural safeguards and pathways for regularisation in the country while multiplying the number of detention centres. In **Poland**, despite the sharp drop in the numbers of people applying for asylum since 2017, anti-immigrant rhetoric dominates public discourse, migrants are viewed as security threats, and pushback is common along the border with Belarus. Poland rarely considers ATD, systematically detains families with children, and requires detainees to pay for their detention.

Furthermore, proposed reforms at the EU level would risk dramatically increasing the use of detention in the EU with a view to increasing and speeding up returns and deportations. The proposed Pact on Migration and Asylum would set up new forms of *de facto* detention, in particular at borders, in situations in which case management and community-based solutions would be very challenging to implement because of the extremely limited access to services, including those provided by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs), as well as the severe restrictions on freedom of movement.

While the current ATD pilots are making progress, at this point they remain too small to exert sufficient pressure to make structural changes at the level of governments. They also remain too small to present themselves at an EU level as a convincing example of how case management-based approaches should be applied across the board and how these can represent an effective ATD for people in or at risk of detention. Moreover, while the evidence acquired through implementation of the EATDN pilots has been presented in a number of regional and international fora

(including meetings of the European Parliament, the Council of Europe and the UN Network on Migration), policy makers have expressed a continued need for evidence demonstrating the effectiveness and scalability of case management-based ATD.

Yet the relevance of case management-based ATD remains high across Europe, and the achievements that the pilots have made in the context of challenging external conditions also demonstrate that there is potential to make significant changes and social impact if the efforts of the pilots are expanded and amplified.

Across the different countries in which the pilots operate, authorities are increasingly reaching out to EATDN members for collaboration, and often releasing detainees into the pilots. Through their work, the pilots have managed to demonstrate the effectiveness of case management, including when it comes to the number of cases resolved and the level of migrant engagement. An evaluation report of EATDN pilots in three countries shows that 97% of individuals remained engaged with immigration procedures through case management in the community. There is political momentum in some countries and also examples of increased engagement and dialogue with civil society. In **Belgium**, the Cabinet is reaching out to civil society and also to local municipalities; potential partnerships between national immigration authorities and ATD pilot implementers are being negotiated. Pilot implementers in **Cyprus** and **Poland** continue to have good access to key authorities including some collaborative work, while in **Italy** members of the EATDN are engaged in conversations with key local authorities, the Ministry of Interior and some political leaders. Network members have also highlighted the considerable added value brought by the EATDN when advocating for community-based solutions, both nationally and regionally. Their view is that advocacy and engagement with the authorities is strengthened by presenting their pilot as part of a wider European 'movement'.

Pilots, for instance in the case of **Cyprus**, have also managed to engage authorities to a level where they can facilitate the release of detainees into case management-based ATD, thus to some extent addressing the lack of knowledge and capacity at a government level to implement and coordinate ATD. Of the major structural gaps, the lack of coordination between government departments as well as the lack of access to services for migrants are prominent and call for a holistic approach towards case management and community-based solutions, including by increasing the implementation of case management-based ATD when the grounds for detention apply. On the part of the pilots, there is a strong need for increased and sustainable funding and for additional staffing and internal capacity. This was identified as one of the main challenges for pilot implementers. The approach of tailored case management requires significant human resources, which translate to financial resources. At the same time, pilots must implement a two-tiered approach to addressing the lack of access to services, where on the one hand they have to advocate for increased social services and on the other, address through their own service provision - often at significant cost - the day to day needs of migrants, for example housing and healthcare.

To be able to scale their efforts amid these challenges and build on their achievements, the implementation plan identifies specific mechanisms, of which advocacy is central, clarifies the scope/target of the efforts, clarifies the strategies for implementation, and identifies the enabling elements (the most important of which is network building) and how these will be facilitated. At the same time, the

implementation plan identifies risks and how they will be mitigated and outlines an initial Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning framework.

Building on the lessons learned over recent years, the implementation plan puts **advocacy, network building, and the expertise of leaders with lived experience** at the forefront of the approach:

The general rationale for **using advocacy as a mechanism** is that in order to end detention, it is key to create the political space to make it possible. However, there are differences in the political environments in which pilots operate and advocacy strategies must therefore be based on a deep understanding of key stakeholders and of the level at which advocacy can be undertaken most strategically. For environments in which migration regulations are particularly restrictive, e.g. Greece, it is more strategic for pilots to focus on convincing the EU so that pressure comes from the EU and trickles down to the governments. In order to do this, pilots need to increase the number of beneficiaries significantly so that they can present case management as an effective mechanism of migration management, demonstrating that detention as a first resort is avoidable. The strategy for targeting the EU in order to increase pressure on national governments has worked in certain contexts, for example Cyprus. Hence the importance of coordinating local, national and regional efforts. Conversely, in other countries such as Belgium or Italy, advocacy at the national level might be a more effective tool for the adoption and implementation of community-based ATD for people in or at risk of detention. Further, because of the complex nature of the socio-political contexts, advocacy must address the political level, as well as the social level, simultaneously and strategically.

Network building is an enabler because only through strategic and reliable partnerships can the EATDN successfully implement its plan. For instance, migrants do not have access to basic services such as healthcare, employment, food, housing, to mention a few, in most countries, as a result of punitive government policies. This is a major limitation for the success of pilots. While on the one hand pilots have to advocate for structural change, on the other they have to deal with the immediate basic needs of migrants. Building a network with relevant professionals and sectors facilitates the latter. Network building is also a cross cutting strategy towards the achievement of all the other objectives.

Last but not least, the EATDN's full understanding of the needs of immigrants who are at risk of being detained or those who have previously been detained would be incomplete if people with lived experience are only engaged with the work of EATDN members from the perspective of recipients of support. The EATDN's approach is therefore to **expand migrant-led advocacy and migrant-led case management** in order to amplify the voices of migrants, particularly those affected by immigration detention, to ensure that their perspectives are incorporated holistically and to make them visible to society in a way that demonstrates their leadership and agency.

4 Implementation Plan

Overall Goal

This 2-year Implementation Plan aims to work towards ending immigration detention by scaling up community-based solutions and case management-based ATD for people in or at risk of detention, with a specific focus on increasing implementing actors at local and national levels. This includes expanding geographically to reach more cities and countries, promoting strategic partnerships with different actors, and increasing the number of beneficiaries of case management as well as expanding the groups benefiting from this approach. This will advance the EATDN towards being able to present case management as a convincing alternative to enforcement-based migration management both at national and regional levels, thus contributing to reducing and ultimately ending detention. To achieve this, the implementation plan will focus on **2 main themes, namely, network building and extending the scope of pilots.** Specifically, the **4 objectives** of the implementation plan are:

1. Strengthening of networks among organisations working on case management at local, national, regional, and international levels;

2. Geographical expansion of case management-based ATD pilots to more cities and countries and an increase in strategic partnerships;

3. Expansion beyond vulnerable groups (widening profiles of beneficiaries i.e. beyond families and those at risk for detention to also include those already in detention and migrants who are not identified as having specific vulnerabilities);

4. Increase in the number of people benefiting from case management-based pilots, by 10 to 20 percent.

Outcomes

OBJECTIVE 1: Network building

Outcome 1: In 2 years, the EATDN will have expanded and strengthened its network of civil society, government actors and other potential actors e.g. local authorities, CSOs, UN organisations and the private sector.

Background: Network building is a core objective of the implementation plan for several reasons. Firstly, for the pilots to scale up sustainably, it is paramount that they strengthen relationships and collaboration with national authorities and government actors, including local authorities, so that community-based solutions become a solid approach that is embedded in migration governance systems under a whole of government approach. Secondly, the existence of an ATD network that spans a number of European countries has been a key factor in amplifying and strengthening the call for case management- and community-based ATD for people in or at risk of detention. Yet to move forward with this work, the EATDN will need to ensure that it is working with a wide range of allies; hence the need to form partnerships and build networks with other stakeholders including CSOs, academia, and other fields, sectors and professionals under a whole of society approach. This kind of network building also needs to incorporate systems and tools to facilitate it, such as a sustainable coordination/network infrastructure, regular meetings, a shared database among relevant stakeholders and harmonisation of data collection methods to facilitate effective MEL which will support evidence based arguments when presenting case management as a solid approach. As such, network building in this implementation plan is an objective on its own but is also an enabling element that facilitates the achievement of all the other objectives. Below we flesh out how network building will be done as an objective. After this it becomes a cross-cutting enabling element towards other objectives.

Responsible for implementation: PICUM, IDC, and the EATDN

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Further develop the EATDN through bringing in more actors, interacting with others and increasing the EATDN's capacity to operate sustainably	Foster faster online communication between network members and hold regular network meetings Collect evidence and ensure monitoring	Civil society working on migration (including people with lived experience of detention and migrant/refugee led organisations) CSOs working on other issues (child rights, human rights, women's rights, racial justice, etc.)	Innovation information and communication technologies Harmonisation of data collection methods and MEL frameworks	EATDN Other civil society organisations working on migration, child rights, service provision, etc.

	Reach out to and collaborate with relevant stakeholders and partners	Local authorities and municipalities	Organisational capacity and funding	Council of Europe
	Increase capacity and sustainability of the EATDN as an effective coordinating network	National authorities/ relevant ministries	Network building	Allies in the European Parliament
	Work closely with leaders with lived experience and grassroots movements focusing on immigration detention	Local communities	Working with leaders with lived experience	City municipalities (including Athens, Antwerp, Ghent, Nicosia, Milan, Turin).
	Establish joint projects and consortia of actors to work on holistic approaches to case management	People at risk of or already in detention	Detailed stakeholder mapping of all relevant actors at local, national and regional level	Ombuds persons and human rights bodies.
		Local, regional, national and international organisations working on case management		City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE)
		Parliamentarians (garnering cross party support)		Human rights actors
		Other sectors and professionals: Lawyers, academia, healthcare professionals, media/journalists, influencers/celebrities, donors, faith based groups, commercial/private enterprises with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) component		

Resources required: Effective and innovative Information and Communication Technology (ICT); Practical and facilitation support from partner institutions that already have good relationships with local authorities, e.g. Council of Europe/Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE); Human resources and sustainable funding for case management and technical support

OBJECTIVE 2a: Extending scope of pilots

Outcome 2: In 2 years, the EATDN will have increased the number of countries engaging with the network on case management-based approaches and will have established a pilot in one additional country.

Background: EATDN pilots are currently implemented in Belgium, Bulgaria, Poland, Cyprus, Greece and Italy, with a longer-term ATD project underway in the UK. In the next 2 years, we aim to expand EATDN engagement to several additional countries, and to have established a pilot in at least one other country – preferably of first reception. An important decision-making factor in the selection of countries to expand to is the probability for success and impact. This will be determined carefully through building on existing efforts, legal frameworks that are favourable to case management, and relevance of the countries to migration. The existence of a socio-political and legal environment conducive to reducing detention and establishing case management-based approaches to migration management, as well as the presence of organisational capacities for such an approach, are also key factors. Such considerations are important because of the stage at which community-based ATD are in Europe, where the institutional tendency is to resort to detention as a first option. As such, in order to ensure that the scaling results in demonstrable success to convince governments that case management is a solid approach, it is important for us to strategically expand to geographical areas where case management is likely to succeed.

Responsible for implementation: IDC, EATDN, new pilots

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Scope opportunities for implementing pilots in more countries, prioritising countries of first reception Connect with organisations in a range of countries to explore the possibility of setting up a pilot and explore opportunities for resource mobilisation	Setting up new pilot in one country of first reception Dialogue and outreach with new partners in different European countries Exploring enabling environments and scoping possibilities to establish new pilots/partnerships Securing necessary funding for new pilots	CSOs relevant to working on case management CSOs interested in engaging with the network and learning more about case management-based ATD Local communities and support groups Local, regional and national authorities in EATDN countries (and potential pilot countries)	Network building Politically targeted advocacy with a clear ask Socially targeted advocacy Supporting campaigning	EATDN and existing pilots Training partners and strategic allies, e.g. Council of Europe Grassroots based organisations and people with lived experience of detention

Explore opportunities for resource mobilisation Expand the network to a greater number of members in a range of European countries Developing a national network of cities/ municipalities working on ATD (see Belgium)		Vulnerable groups (see outcomes 4 and 5) Leaders with lived experience People in detention and at risk of detention Immigration authorities/ departments, border police, other authorities on the ground	Clear MEL Framework and clear definition/ standards on case management and ATD to ensure common objectives Clear communication strategy to increase visibility of the EATDN and ensure sufficient visibility for evidence Full country scopings	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) Learning networks and other training partners, including relevant CSOs and authorities (e.g. CSOs implementing the Bed-Bath-Bread approach) Schools and universities Local communes and municipalities

Resources required: Training resources and practical training for new pilots on the necessary elements for pilots to succeed; Funding for setting up new pilots; Human resources including people with lived experience of detention; Partners who can facilitate relationship building with authorities (e.g. Council of Europe)

OBJECTIVE 2b: Extending scope of pilots

Outcome 3: In 2 years, EATDN pilots will be strategically partnering with two additional cities to implement case management-based approaches.

Background: In the countries where pilots are being implemented, EATDN members are engaging strategically with a number of cities and local authorities; in Italy, for instance, the pilot is being implemented in Rome and has been engaging in an ongoing dialogue with local authorities. Discussions are in progress with Milan around the possibility of establishing an ATD pilot, subject to funding. The aim to expand geographically to key strategic countries will therefore be paired with an expansion to locations within countries where case management-based approaches are already established practice but may be confined to a certain city or region. Expanding in this way, in countries where the EATDN is already well established and has a good understanding of socio-political and legal dynamics, will mean that community-based ATD can be scaled up nationally to help strengthen the evidence base for this approach and extend intra-national networks. This expansion will specifically focus on establishing strategic partnerships with cities and relevant local authorities, following a scoping exercise to understand the opportunities for such partnerships.

Responsible for implementation: IDC, selected existing pilots, new pilots

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Implement pilots in more cities of countries in which pilots are currently being implemented. Develop and support a network of cities and municipalities working on ATD.[1]	Expanding existing pilots to or establishing new pilots in the mentioned cities through increasing the number of organisations implementing pilots. Establishing strategic partnerships with municipal authorities around service provision and resource mobilisation	CSOs relevant to work on case management, including organisations working on case management to provide holistic services (Caritas, Jesuit Refugee Service, etc.) Local communities and support groups. Local and municipal authorities. Leaders with lived experience	Network building. Politically targeted advocacy at local and regional level. Socially targeted advocacy. Supporting campaigning. Full context scoping to identify opportunities for expanding to additional cities	Existing pilots. CSOs relevant to working on case management in relevant cities and new pilots working with cities. Migrant led CSOs in relevant cities. People with lived experience of detention. Non-traditional actors, e.g. private sector, youth organisations, etc. UNHCR local offices. C-MISE and city networks

Resources required: Resources, funding and training for new pilots; Funding for translators; Human resources including people with lived experience of detention; Partners who can facilitate relationship building with authorities and other stakeholders

1   The full scope of cities to be prioritised are still to be determined. Current cities being considered are: Antwerp, Ghent, Milan and Turin.

OBJECTIVE 3: Expansion beyond vulnerable groups

Outcome 4: In 2 years, the EATDN pilots will have increased the number of beneficiaries beyond vulnerable groups. This will include people already in detention and migrants who are not identified as having specific vulnerabilities.

Responsible for implementation: existing and new pilots (with technical support from IDC)

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Expansion beyond vulnerable groups Advocate for case management-based approaches as the default approach to all migration management, rather than detention. For vulnerable groups, continue to insist that these groups should never be detained	Pilot activities going beyond families and children and include other groups Incorporating migrants (and those who have been affected by detention) in relevant HR positions to conduct migrant-led case management When scaling to other cities/countries, incorporate migrant led organisations when setting up new pilots Partner with migrant-led organisations on advocacy and also with other relevant social movements	All people in detention or at risk of detention. CSOs relevant to work on case management, e.g. Organisations working on case management to provide holistic services (Caritas, Jesuit Refugee Service, etc.) Local communities and support groups Local and municipal authorities Leaders with lived experience	Network building Key partnerships with other social movements e.g. women's rights, refugee rights, maternity rights, criminal justice reform, racial justice, etc. Working with leaders with lived experience Socially targeted advocacy Full country scoping to identify opportunities for expanding beyond vulnerable groups	EATDN Partner CSOs working on case management Migrants and people with lived experience of detention or at risk of detention Migrant-led organisations Local, regional, national and international organisations working on case management Other movements

Resources required: Additional human resources which include migrants and people with lived experience of detention or at risk of detention; Training of main actors, including migrant-led organisations and new EATDN members/pilot implementers; Training for people with lived experience of detention to understand broader issues; Funding for HR, training and setting up of new pilot implementers.

OBJECTIVE 4: Increase in beneficiaries in terms of engagement and case management

Outcome 5: In 2 years, the EATDN pilots will have increased the total number of beneficiaries in terms of engagement and case management by between 10 and 20 percent

Background: Outcomes 1-4 should lead to an increased total number of beneficiaries of case management This will contribute to evidence based arguments to demonstrate that case management is an effective ATD.

Responsible for implementation: existing and new pilots (with technical support from IDC)

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Outcomes 1-4	Outcomes 1-4	Detained people released into pilots for case management	Creating a shared database across projects for case management and harmonisation of data collection methods to facilitate effective MEL Network building	EATDN including new pilots Partner CSOs working on case management Local and municipal authorities Healthcare workers Legal professionals Housing/homelessness professionals

Resources required: Human resources to implement case management increase in case managers specifically; Transport, accommodation, and subsistence costs for beneficiaries; Resources for interpreters

4.1 ADVOCACY STRATEGY

In order to scale up sustainably, the EATDN aims to ensure - at local, national and EU levels - that case management is embedded in migration governance systems in order to normalise migration management that does not rely on detention. As such, we aim to establish more partnerships with local authorities, government actors, and other stakeholders in the cities and countries in which we already work and in which we will work in the future. There are examples of municipalities in which this type of scaling has taken off, one of which is the city of Utrecht, where the government has been funding a case management programme run by local civil society organisations. The government funding for this pilot is the result of an agreement signed in 2018 between national and municipal governments in the Netherlands, which includes a budget of almost €59 million for three years with pilots in five cities including Utrecht, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Eindhoven and Groningen.

It is our objective to increase these types of partnerships over the next 2 years, and the EATDN has already identified potential opportunities to achieve this. This will be best achieved through 'insider advocacy' with civil servants and key decision makers to make the case for case management- and community- based approaches to migration management as an alternative to enforcement, coercion and detention in enabling political contexts.

Advocacy for scaling must also target the political level in order to effectively influence those who have the power to make decisions and create an environment conducive to putting in place case management-based ATD for people in or at risk of detention. It needs to target a wide range of actors across all layers of society so as to reduce the social pressure on politicians to take coercive measures such as detention and to address harmful policies such as the lack of access to social services or legal advice. It also needs to engage with judicial bodies, in order to hold governments to account and to make detention unviable as a strategy for migration management. In doing this, it will be easier to push for community-based case management approaches to be prioritised, with detention only ever being a method of last resort.

During this 2 year period, the EATDN will also aim to support campaigning which advocates for a shift from using detention as the default approach to migration governance towards governments considering case management and community-based solutions as a first option.

Responsible for implementation: PICUM, IDC, and EATDN (existing members and new pilots)

»

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Politically targeted advocacy against immigration detention, for individual assessments, for wider use of alternatives, and for increased funding for NGOs providing case management	Targeting key decision-making processes and moments at local, regional and national government levels of relevant countries Holding governments to account on their obligations under to EU law to prioritise less coercive measures Presenting case management as an essential element of humane ATD through evidence of case resolutions and number of beneficiaries and develop a strategy to effectively show how community-based solutions are a cheaper and more effective method of managing migration. Also link with compliance rates	Relevant politicians and decision makers in pilot countries Local authorities in target countries Judicial bodies in target countries UN Network on Migration EU: members of the European Parliament, members of DG Home (European Commission), members of the European Migration Network Return Expert Group The Council of Europe and relevant bodies (particularly the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)	Network building and collaboration with other sectors (child rights, human rights, women's rights, racial justice) and local, regional, national and international actors working on case management. Harmonisation of data collection methods; creation of shared database among EATDN members for evidence production and to facilitate effective Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) National, EU and UN Legal frameworks prioritising non-coercive measures Momentum of global advocacy on ATD, including around the International Migration Review Forum (IMRF) Peer learning and ability to draw on the experiences of other comparable countries	EATDN and allies Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) Ombuds persons UNHCR Refugee Advisory Board Council of Europe and key instruments

Resources required: Funding for human resources (at regional and national level) including advocacy and communications specialists and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) staff; Funding for the EATDN coordination and advocacy activities; Funding for monitoring/evaluation tools; Funding for research; Funding for peer learning activities and cross-regional events

»

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Socially targeted advocacy	General influencing of legal and social institutions at local, regional, national and EU level and general public Advocate for service provision/firewall between immigration status and service provision Strategic communications to influence narrative change	Policymakers General public Traditional and non-traditional media	Network building and collaboration with other sectors (child rights, human rights, Women's rights, racial justice, etc.) and local, regional, national and international actors working on case management Sharing collective (peer) learning around successful messaging/communications	EATDN and Allies Media (traditional and non- traditional)

Resources required: Funding for human resources (at regional and national level), including advocacy and communications specialists

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Collective strategic litigation on immigration detention	Coordination of strategic litigation and identification of potential cases /themes	Lawyers and legal experts from different member states National and regional judicial bodies ECtHR	Favourable legal framework and existence and identification of relevant cases Engagement with the Global Strategic Litigation Council and its group on detention and due process (co-led by IDC)	EATDN members ECtHR National courts

Resources required: Staff costs; Legal costs (where relevant); Support from pro bono law firms.

»

SUPPORT FOR CAMPAIGNING

In 2 years the EATDN will have supported a campaign advocating for a shift from using detention as the default approach to migration governance towards governments considering case management and community-based solutions as a first option.

Strategy	Implementation methods	Target audience	Enabling elements	Main stakeholders
Support EU-wide campaign to advocate that EU governments shift from using detention as a standard form of migration governance towards implementing community-based solutions	Strategic communications (social media, traditional media)	Policymakers National and regional politicians General public	Network building Well prepared easily applicable communication tools Clear messages and language that that are is relatable to the public and compelling for policymakers, on benefits of engagement vs. enforcement	EATDN member and their allies Media outlets

Resources required: Human resources; Funding for developing and testing messages; Resources to work with communications agency/consultancy

4.2 RISK ANALYSIS

Area of risk	Type of risk	Strategies for mitigation
Risk to the goal of the scaling plan	Lack of resources, over working system Lack of capacity Lack of funding and challenges in sustainability as a result Multiple priorities for pilot implementers affected by lack of resources, capacity and a potential loss of initial momentum/enthusiasm especially if changes are not happening quickly	Streamline processes, increase funding/resources/personnel and engage strategically and collectively with funders Look at diverse sources of funding and explore partnerships. Attempt to secure grants from sources with higher funding (e.g. European Commission). Think creatively about resources.
	Lack of interest or differences in opinion. Lack of credibility. Unwillingness to change current system If pilot/project is unsuccessful, governments could use this as an argument for detention (and/or abandon alternatives)	Showcase how pilots have expanded successfully in other contexts and increase evidence base to support arguments Gain support from local/national, credible experts. Take a holistic approach
Network building	The bigger the network grows and the more people get involved, the bigger the risk that definitions may change or get misinterpreted or be ineffective in getting the message across There is also a risk of potential co-option of terms	Set clear definitions from the beginning and ensure key concepts are defined collectively Collect and systematise evidence and data demonstrating the efficiency of ATDs. Adapt to changes of circumstances/context and review collective positions/assumptions regularly.
	Different priorities in each group's respective fields	Work together to show how one group's cause can directly benefit another's
	Confusion over roles and responsibilities	Strengthen the network with clear leadership, clear roles and responsibilities, and sub-divisions based on tasks

Area of risk	Type of risk	Strategies for mitigation
Campaigning	Campaign isn't received well; leads to backlash and increases anti-migrant rhetoric Campaigners stay in defensive position (i.e. instead of campaigning to shrink the detention space, campaigners only try to stop it from expanding) Campaigning groups with different messages don't collaborate	Have various reputable and credible stakeholders as part of the campaign. Ensure a solid communications strategy with communications professionals Ensure strong networking and collective approach
Advocacy	Push backs and negative/regressive changes in political context. Hidden/contradictory agendas on the part of political actors. Lack of follow-through due to lack of resources and political will	Develop strategies to effectively show how community-based solutions and case management-based ATD are a cheaper and more effective method of managing migration and ensuring wellbeing of migrants. Link with rates of engagement with projects.
	Scepticism, claims of bureaucracy	Flexibility to adapt and respond to changing political context. Develop user-friendly, harmonised databases and forms; showcase how this aids efficiency.
	Advocacy with governments and authorities – and increased collaboration with them on pilots – may lead to demands being made on EATDN members that are unconscionable (e.g. sharing information when participants disengage, a focus on returns, etc.)	Ensure that any discussions with governments and authorities set out clear 'firewalls' and allow for the provision of independent case management and case resolution where CSOs and NGOs are concerned.

Area of risk	Type of risk	Strategies for mitigation
Lack of grounding of the implementation plan	Top down and unrealistic implementation plan Non collaborative development and implementation Lack of buy in from pilots Lack of involvement of leaders with lived experience and people affected by immigration detention	Co-production of implementation plan and joint implementation Involvement of leaders with lived experience and migrant led organisations at all stages of the project while noting that people with lived experience are not a homogenous group.
Working with people with lived experience of detention	Those with lived experience of detention may not necessarily have the expertise or knowledge of for example campaigning and advocacy. People with lived experiences of detention are not a homogeneous group and there can be friction between types of lived experience. This can affect the types of messages in advocacy, for example, those who have never been convicted can advocate not to be treated like criminals, without realising that this diminishes the rights of migrants with past convictions.	Capacity building of those with lived experience so that they can go beyond experience to ensure that they have a broader view of the issue and advocacy/communications messages that can potentially be harmful to others with a different type of lived experience.

4.3 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Over a 2-year period, in addition to ongoing monitoring, 3 evaluations will be conducted. The first will be an internal reflection, six months into the implementation. The purpose of this first reflection will be to critically re-visit the relevance of the implementation plan in light of any new information or developments, in order to identify any progress that may be evident already at that point and identify necessary adaptations to the implementation plan.

The second evaluation will be conducted a year into the implementation and will serve as a mid-term evaluation. It will include a brief context analysis and provide an update of the baseline indicator values. It will also reflect on the relevance of the objectives, outcomes and activities, their effectiveness, including critically reflecting on any challenges that might hinder or delay the achievement of the two year goal, the impact of the work, as well as lessons learned and recommendations for the rest of the implementation period.

The third evaluation will be an end of term evaluation whose aims are similar to those of the mid-term evaluation, however with a stronger focus on impact, lessons learned, and recommendations going forward.

The table below details the outcomes of the implementation plan, indicators, baseline indicators and values as well as the process of evaluation. In the evaluations the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the objectives, outcomes and activities should be evaluated through the lens of multiple stakeholders, including those with lived experience of detention. Further, the increase in the participation of those with lived experience is also indicated as an outcome for evaluation against which baseline data needs to be determined and monitored in addition to narratives that provide qualitative data.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning processes

Outcomes	Indicators	6-month internal reflection	Mid-term evaluation	End of term evaluation
Geographical expansion to more cities and countries	Number of new stakeholders working on and talking about community-based solutions and case management-based ATD in target country or mentioning target countries as evidenced through statements, policies, advocacy plans, presentations, articles Number of new pilots set up in European countries Number of new pilots set up in European cities	Relevance of implementation plan Progress Necessary adaptations to implementation plan	Progress towards outcomes indicated through: Update of context analysis Midline/endline evaluation of indicators- quantitative and qualitative increase in the baseline values Relevance of objectives, outcomes and activities Effectiveness Impact Agility of implementation plan- deviations and changes related to contextual shifts Lessons learned Recommendations	
Increasing embeddedness of case management in government systems, i.e. partnerships with government actors including local authorities	Number of CSOs/governments/cities exploring or implementing pilot projects in target countries Number of concept notes developed and submitted Number of CSOs approaching government/ local authorities/other potential funders (or vice versa) on community based-solutions and case management-based ATD Number of pilot projects with sustainable funding sources			
Increase in number of pilot beneficiaries	Number of beneficiaries			
Expansion beyond vulnerable groups (widening profiles of beneficiaries i.e. beyond families and those of risk for detention to also include those already in detention and without specific vulnerabilities)	New groups that were not previously benefiting from pilots Number of beneficiaries among additional groups of people			

Strengthening of networks among organisations working on case management and ATD at local, regional, national and international levels.	Feedback from Network members e.g. through qualitative confidence test, feedback questionnaires

Number of invitations to speak and presentations by Network members, including at high profile events

Number of network members articulately presenting Network's learning/messaging.

Development of shared database for joint data collection on key data accompanied by standardised relevant forms |
| Increase in the active involvement of those with lived experience of detention/ at risk of detention | Number of people with lived experience of detention involved in case management

Number of trainings conducted with people with lived experience of detention aimed towards increasing their knowledge of detention as a broader issue

Number of initiatives or projects spearheaded by people with lived experience of detention/at risk of detention |

European **Alternatives To Detention** Network

You can find out more about the European ATD Network, including contact information, here: **atdnetwork.org**