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Concluding remarks
Introduction

The increasing constellation of languages in urban settings can be considered a key indicator of sweeping processes of social and political change. The heightened relevance and attention to cultural differences, of which languages are a central feature, is deeply reshaping the social fabric of citizens across the globe. This is reflected in the new patterns of mobility and migration, which lead to renewed forms of identities, political mobilizations, new forms of participation, new urban labor markets and, of course, new languages – an exogenous multilingualism – that are added to the old, traditional ones – endogenous multilingualism.

Despite this rapid social changes, languages have been left out of the mainstream politics and policies on the international Urban Agenda. As we shall see throughout this paper, politics have tended to overlook languages in the configuration and implementation of urban policies. Linguistic diversity is celebrated, cherished and supported as an “intangible asset”, without any systematic or consistent policy action accompanying the official goodwill rhetoric.

The absence of language issues in urban politics stands in contrast with the research agenda on urban multilingualism, which has experienced an upward trend over the past decades, with a range of issues - mainly tackled from a sociolinguistic perspective – that are currently being discussed in academia.

This report aims to provide a bird’s-eye view on how linguistic diversity has been incorporated into the realm of urban politics and policies, to identify the main debates and to explore how policies are related – or non-related, as we shall see below – to the current international research agenda. The report is
organized around four inter-related topics, identified as key dimensions of current discussions of city and multilingualism: a) the current population trends b) the importance of cities as units of analysis c) the role of languages in today’s Urban Agenda d) the widening gap between policies and academia on urban multilingualism.

The reports notes that there is an increasing tendency in the international arena to reify languages that is, to consider them as “intangible assets” to be preserved, maintained or cherished. This tendency is detrimental to the consideration of linguistic diversity as a central theme in the current political or policy debates, including the Sustainable Development Goals and the Urban Agenda. When we lose sight of the people who speak them, of the communities of citizens living in cities and speaking a language different that the official ones, it becomes easy to consider languages as a soft issue, as a secondary element, nonexistent in mainstream politics on urban issues.
Key findings at a snapshot

1. The fastest growing urban centres are the small and medium cities with less than one million inhabitants and between 1 to 5 million, which account for 75 per cent of the world’s urban population...Despite the demographic importance and potential role of such cities, urban planning efforts in developing countries have focused disproportionately on the problems of large metropolitan areas, thereby contributing to urban primacy.

2. Today, cities generate 80 percent of global GDP, but at the same time, they are also responsible for as much as 70 percent of global energy consumption and 70 percent of global carbon emissions. They are home to extreme poverty, unemployment and socio-economic disparities, unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, and are key contributors to climate change and environmental degradation. And yet, cities also accommodate most of the world’s businesses and informal enterprises, provide markets for industry and employment, foster technological innovations, and support high-density habitation and efficient land use.

3. The current patterns of urban development have relied on a model that is unsustainable economically, politically, socially, culturally and environmentally in many respects. Environmentally, the current model of urbanization is contributing dangerously to climate change. Socially, it generates multiple forms of inequality, lack of participation and deprivation. Economically, the model of urbanization is unsustainable due to widespread unemployment especially among the youth and the existence of unstable and low-paying jobs and informal income-generating activities, which create economic hardship, unequal access to urban services and amenities and poor quality of life for many.
4. Cities are increasingly becoming an international priority and are taking a more important role in global politics. Cities are now related directly to international global instruments, have their own voice in many aspects and often bypass states in a number of policy issues.

5. There is a growing relevance of international cooperation mechanisms for local governments. Cities show an increasing dynamism as non-state actors and are sharing and transferring technical know-how and expertise, making synergies through the creation of networks. In other words, we are witnessing growing numbers of formal and institutionalized governance structures built from below (cities themselves) aimed putting city-networks at the core of the political debates.

6. From a policy perspective, multilingualism/linguistic diversity has tended to be overlooked or downplayed. Although institutional responses to the ethnic composition of cities are discussed at length in the various city networks and policies analyzed, the linguistic composition of cities is rarely mentioned. When mentioned, it is done rather cursorily either as a complex problem or as something to be celebrated.

7. In the cultural diversity-Urban Agenda binomial, no systematic reference to linguistic diversity is found. Reference to languages is only found to describe the reality of urban areas but languages are overlooked from the mainstream policies and politics. A clear evidence of this is the fact that neither the Agenda21 for Culture nor the different policy documents drafted to position cultural diversity in the Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals contain a specific chapter or policy line dedicated to language issues.
8. Research interest into multilingualism linked to urban context has significantly increased since the turn of the century.

9. The Urban Agenda makes hardly any reference to the role of languages in an urban context. This approach stands in sharp contrast with research trends, which have placed increasing importance on urban multilingualism. The scarcity of the language debates at the political agenda stands in sharp contrast with the abundance of research networks and projects related specifically to urban linguistic diversity.

10. There is a tendency in the international arena to *reify* languages – that is, to consider them as “intangible assets” to be preserved, maintained or cherished. This tendency is detrimental to the consideration of linguistic diversity as a central theme in the current political or policy debates, including the Sustainable Development Goals and the Urban Agenda. When we lose sight of the people who speak them, of the communities of citizens living in cities and speaking a language different that the official ones, it becomes easy to consider languages as a soft issue, as a secondary element, nonexistent in mainstream politics on the Urban Agenda.
1. An increasingly urban world. Current population trends

“Managing urban areas has become one of the most important development challenges of the 21st century. Our success or failure in building sustainable cities will be a major factor in the success of the post-2015 UN development agenda,”¹ said John Wilmoth, Director of UN Department of Economic and Social Affair’s (DESA) Population Division.

The world has experienced an increased inflow of people into urban areas since the last two decades of the 20th century. As pointed out by UN Habitat, this trend is not new, but has been marked by a remarkable increase in the absolute numbers – from a yearly average of 57 million people between 1990-2000 to 77 million between 2010 and 2015. In 1990, 43 per cent (2.3 billion) of the world’s population lived in urban areas; by 2015, this figure had grown to 54 per cent (4 billion). The UN’s population division estimates that this figure will increase to almost 70% by 2050².

Another major theme that ranks high on the urban agenda is the emergence of large and megacities. Large cities are defined as having between 5 and 10 million inhabitants and megacities as having 10 million or more inhabitants. In both cases, there have been remarkable increases over the last two decades. As indicated in the latest report on the World Urbanization Prospects, published in May 2018, in 1995, there were 22 large cities, and 14 megacities; by 2015, both categories of cities had doubled as there were 44 large cities, and 29 megacities. It is worth noting that most megacities are growing in developing countries, a trend that will continue over the decades to come, especially in several large cities in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

Megacities and large cities have a direct impact and strong weight in the global economy. Figures provided by the report Urban World: Mapping the economic power of cities indicate that “the top 600 cities with a fifth of the world's population that generate 60 per cent of global GDP consist mainly of cities in developed countries. By 2025, the contribution of the top 600 cities is expected to remain the same, but the composition will change; as there will be many more cities from China, India and Latin America— an indication that the centre of gravity of the urban world is moving to developing countries, particularly towards Southeast Asia”.

While it is true that during the decades of the 80’s and 90's witnessed a high interest in the number of debates and publications on “world cities” or “global cities” as they were called (read Friedmann & Wolff, 1982, Friedmann, 1986; King, 1990; Sassen 1991; 2001; Hannerz, 1996; Cohen, 1997, among many others), the debates revolved mainly around the economic aspects of global cities. For Sassen (2001), one of the most renowned thinkers of urban and globalization issues, for a city to be labelled as global, it had to meet several conditions:

a) It must be an essential command centre in the world economy;
b) It must be the location of high-powered service industries and centres of international finance
c) It must be a site of development and innovation in the services and finance sectors
d) It must be a market for these developments and innovations

These reflections, published in The Global City, first in 1991 and updated in 2001, had a remarkable impact across different disciplines and left an important mark on the emergent field of globalization and cities, especially from a political-economy

---

approach. One of the main criticisms to this approach, however, was strictly economic approach adopted to define a city, especially a large city. It is in the 90’s and beginning of the 21st century where the debates move beyond a narrow economic framework, defining a city in terms of a broader range of parameters.

In the subsequent decades, these debates were further complemented with a vast literature on the processes of incorporation of migrants into urban environments (see Ireland, 1994; Martiniello & Sophie-Gendrot, 2000; among many others). For Hanner (1996), world cities are not only national cities that happen to have financial connections with the rest of the world. They are cities that bring together sufficient cultural, financial and human capital. Cities are increasingly considered not only as sites of economic activity but also as interesting sites of migration. Because of the scale and consistency of the migration they receive, cities have become sites of international and cosmopolitan cultures (Block, 2001: 43).

While it is true that the first debates on cities and urban agendas concentrated almost exclusively on large cities, it is at the beginning of the 21st century that the role of medium-sized and small cities come to the forefront. Although large and mega cities have lead the processes of urbanization (and are still doing in regions such as Africa or Asia), the latest information indicated by the World Urbanization Prospects 2018, produced by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, state that big cities are not the fastest growing urban territories, nor do they represent the majority of the urban population: “The fastest growing urban centres are the small and medium cities with less than one million inhabitants and between 1 to 5 million, which account for 75 per cent of the world’s urban population. Despite the demographic importance and potential role of such cities, urban planning efforts in developing countries have focused disproportionately on the problems of large metropolitan areas, thereby contributing to urban primacy. If small and medium cities are to fulfil their potential, then they should form part of the new urban agenda”.
Figure 1 below offers a bird's-eye view of the growth of both megacities and middle-sized cities across the globe.

**Figure 1.** Global patterns of urbanization.

![Global patterns of urbanization](image)

**Source:** World Cities Report. 2016
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2. **The rapid transformation of urban spaces: cities as units of analysis**

“Cities are the arena where the newest and sharpest developments are first observed, and where there is a degree of cross-national convergence on both policy problems and policy solutions, that belies many of the differences reflected in *national ideological debates*”. This statement – written by sociologist Adrian Favel back in 2001, already highlighted back at the beginning of the 20th century the importance of cities as units of analysis in today’s complex societies. There is more and more awareness and interest on the analysis of cities and local authorities have become more visible as actors adopting and implementing policies aimed and contributing to the governance of complex societies.
Urban areas occupy a very small proportion of the global soil, between 2 and 3%\(^4\), but have a significant impact on the world’s development. The data provided by the UN’s World Cities Report (2016) clearly illustrate the strong impact of cities: They generate 80 percent of global GDP, but at the same time, they are also responsible for as much as 70 percent of global energy consumption and 70 percent of global carbon emissions. They accommodate most of the world’s businesses, provide markets for industry and employment and foster technological innovations but, at the same time, they are home to extreme poverty, unemployment and socio-economic disparities.

As acknowledged by the 2016 World Cities Report, the current patterns of urbanization have relied on a model that is unsustainable economically, politically, socially, culturally and environmentally in many respects. Environmentally, the current model of urbanization is contributing dangerously to climate change. Socially, it generates multiple forms of inequality, lack of participation and deprivation, which creates spatial inequalities and divided cities, often characterized by ghettos and gated areas. Cities face the challenge of integrating migrants and refugees into their public space so that they can equitably share their human, social, cultural and intellectual assets, and thus have a sense of belonging. From an economic perspective, the model of urbanization is unsustainable due to widespread unemployment especially among the youth and the existence of unstable and low-paying jobs and informal income-generating activities, which create economic

\(^4\) Estimates vary from less than 1 percent to 3 percent. While an analysis of NASA’s gridded population data, and estimates from the Demographia World Urban Areas project imply that urban areas cover approximately one percent of global land mass, the Global Rural-Urban Mapping Project (GRUMP) of Columbia University estimates that almost three percent of global land is urban.
hardship, unequal access to urban services and amenities and poor quality of life for many.5

In light of these figures, the international political agenda on cities has been increasingly linked first to the Millennium Development Goals (up to 2015) and from 2015 onwards to the Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030). As openly recognized in the report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons for the Post-2015 Development Agenda, “cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost.”6

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) were adopted at the 2015 United Nations General Assembly and includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a universal set of goals (17) and indicators set out quantitative objectives across the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. They will be developed in a world that is increasingly urban. Despite not focusing only on urban issues, SDG 11 recognizes the central role of urbanization in sustainable development, and calls for “mak[ing] cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”

The inclusion of the SDG into the core of the urban agenda is putting mayors and local governments at the forefront of international politics. The international community is encouraging the creation of networks and initiatives aimed at addressing the different challenges of an increasingly urban world. These initiatives include the Global Compact of Mayors Initiative, with 507 cities as signatories and

6 See also statement by UN Deputy Secretary-General https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/dsgsm1080.doc.htm
representing the largest coalition of city leaders addressing climate change, Barber’s Global Parliament of Mayors (seated in The Hague), the New Urban Agenda of the United Nations (2016), the UN’s Global Compact or the Urban Agenda for the European Union, to name only a few.

To these approaches developed from the main international bodies such as the United Nations and the European Union we must add a whole array of solid, already-existing networks with the mandate of putting the different urban issues at the forefront of the political agenda, such as the United Cities and Local Governments Network (UCLG), Eurocities, the World Federation of United Cities, METROPOLIS, or the Smarts Cities Network, to name only a few.

Two key findings derived from the analysis of the international agenda on cities:

1. Cities are increasingly becoming an international priority and are taking a more important role in global politics. Cities are now related directly to international global instruments, have their own voice in many aspects and often bypass states in a number of policy issues. A clear example of this is the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, where a remarkable number of cities have opposed the State policy, or the refugee crisis in Europe, where many cities have confronted their nation-states. This has been labelled in policy and academia as *City Diplomacy*.

---

7 For more information, please visit the website [https://www.globalcovenantofmayors.org/](https://www.globalcovenantofmayors.org/)
8 It is not the goal of this paper to provide a descriptive analysis of each and every existing network of cities. Please consult annex I below for a complete list of networks analysed to draft this report.
9 For more information on this term and its full meaning, please see City Diplomacy: the Expanding Role of Cities in International Politics. Available at [https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/20070400_cdsp_paper_pluijm.pdf](https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/20070400_cdsp_paper_pluijm.pdf) [last consulted October 25th 2018]
2. There is a growing relevance of international cooperation mechanisms for local governments. Cities show an increasing dynamism as non-state actors and are sharing and transferring technical know-how and expertise, making synergies through the creation of networks. In other words, we are witnessing growing numbers of formal and institutionalized governance structures built from below (cities themselves) aimed putting city-networks at the core of the political debates.

The analysis from the policy documents emanating from both international institutions and city-networks also indicates that it is the UN’s New Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals what clearly marks the current political agenda on cities. The policy problems are shared and succinctly summarized in the World Cities Report 2016: Cities are becoming:

i) more unequal;
ii) more prone to sprawl and unsustainable spatial forms;
iii) less productive due to lack of adequate infrastructure and persistently poor economies of agglomeration;
iv) poor living standards for larger numbers, with greater unfulfilled demand for essential services and access to public goods;
v) increasingly challenging in terms of provision of adequate infrastructure;
vi) are at high-risk from ecological and climate change impacts, with stronger energy demand and reduced potential for curbs on CO2 emissions, and
vii) difficult to govern as institutions become increasingly stretched in the face of growing demands

For these reasons, the international community agrees on the need to create conditions to support a paradigm shift towards a new model that can better respond to the challenges of our time. The New Urban Agenda contains a set of principles that reflect a new paradigm shift in strategic and policy thinking:
1. Ensuring that the new urbanization model includes mechanisms and procedures that protect and promote human rights and the rule of law

2. Ensuring equitable urban development and inclusive growth

3. Empowering civil society, expanding democratic participation and reinforcing collaboration

4. Promoting environmental sustainability

5. Promoting innovations that facilitate learning and the sharing of knowledge.

A kaleidoscopic view of the main lines of action developed within the framework of the New Urban Agenda can be seen in figure 2 below, *Key Issues in the New Urban Agenda* and figure 3 representing the EU’s approach to the Urban Agenda in the European Union.

**Figure 2.** Key issues in the United Nations’ New Urban Agenda

Figure 3: The European Union’s Urban Agenda

Source: the European Commission’s Urban Agenda. Policy priorities

3. Any place for languages in the New Urban Agenda?

In his influential work *If Mayors Rules the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities* (2013), Barber emphasizes that cities respond to complex societal challenges much more efficient than nation-states. In his constant reference to societal challenges and complex urban societies, however, we find no mention of the languages co-existing in the different societies. What emanates from policy documents is that the analysis of both the international policy documents and debates is that that from a policy perspective, multilingualism/linguistic diversity has tended to be overlooked or downplayed. Although institutional responses to the ethnic composition of cities are discussed at length, languages of cities is rarely mentioned and when mentioned. When mentioned, it is done rather cursorily either as a complex problem or as something to be celebrated.

A detailed analysis of the policy debates on the Urban Agenda shows that when languages are mentioned, they are embedded in three main categories:

3.1 Linguistic diversity as part of the cultural diversity of cities
3.2 The linguistic integration of migrants in cities
3.3 The participation of migrants in the public space (of cities)

3.1 Linguistic diversity as part of the cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue of cities

“The New Urban Agenda acknowledges that culture and cultural diversity are sources of enrichment for humankind and provide an important contribution to the sustainable development of cities, human settlements and citizens, empowering them to play an active and unique role in development initiatives. The New Urban Agenda further recognizes that culture should be taken into account in the promotion and implementation of new sustainable consumption and production patterns that contribute to the responsible use of resources and address the adverse impact of climate change”. The mentioning of cultural diversity, for the first time in 2016, in international policies on the Urban Agenda represents a milestone in the recognition of culture as a pivotal element for the achievement of SDG in cities.

International bodies such as UNESCO have published substantial reports identifying how art and cultural diversity are key to delivering the SDGs. It is worth citing the Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Development in Cities\(^\text{10}\) which proposes “a reflection on managing change in cities with culture as a lever for development as well as concrete guidelines which aim to support decision-makers at national and local levels, experts and other stakeholders involved in urban development policies and strategies”. Linguistic diversity is mentioned as a fact and described as a reality of cities, but no specific policy or line of action line is dedicated to languages in cities.

\(^{10}\) Available at [http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002459/245999e.pdf](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002459/245999e.pdf)
There is also a remarkable number of city-networks dedicated to the role of cultural diversity in cities. One of the most detailed analysis of how cultural diversity can support the SDG is the work undertaken by the World Cities Culture Forum, a network of more than 40 cities around the globe putting cultural diversity at the front of urban policies. At the time of finalizing this report (October 2018), the Forum announced the publication of the World Cities Culture Report 2018, to be published by the end of the year, which will look at “innovative programmes, approaches and responses to the challenges that city face, as well as emerging trends over the next five years”\textsuperscript{11}.

Within this framework, one of the most detailed accounts on how cultural diversity can support the aims of the SDG is the Culture Action Europe. Polis and the People. Looking into the Future of Cultural Urban Policies (2017), a comprehensive report written by leaders of different city-networks such as EUROCITIES, Agenda21 for Culture (United Cities and Local Governments, UCLG), European Culture Foundation, among many others, highlighting real city practices and providing guidelines and recommendations on how culture and cultural diversity is part of today’s urban ecosystems. Languages are only mentioned to foster “the promotion and dissemination of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and protection of traditional expressions and languages” but, again, no specific policy or line of action is dedicated to linguistic diversity. Languages are often mentioned descriptively and from a symbolic point of view. No real policy or line of action is observed.

Despite the increasing recognition of culture at a local level as key in shaping sustainable change in our societies, the city-networks working in the field of culture

openly acknowledge the unsatisfactory, little impact of culture in the international Urban Agenda. “The new Urban Agenda remains a weak document” – stated Agenda21 for Culture leader Jordi Pascual in the *Culture Action Europe* report – who identifies four main reasons:

I. There is no specific chapter dedicated to cultural issues [in the Urban Agenda]
II. Culture is not recognized as the fourth pillar of sustainable development
III. There is no mention of creativity, the arts, rituality, critical knowledge, nor the relationship between culture, access and the internet
IV. Transversal elements of urban policies, such as the relationship between culture and education, or between culture and tourism, are also missing.

To these four points elements identified as non-existent in approach on culture to the Urban Agenda we must certainly add the theme of *languages* or *linguistic diversity*. In the cultural diversity-Urban Agenda binomial, no systematic reference to linguistic diversity is found. Reference to languages or linguistic diversity is only found to describe the reality of urban areas. This fact leads us to state that languages are also overlooked from the debates on cultural diversity issues in the Urban Agenda.

A clear evidence of this is the fact that neither the Agenda21 for Culture nor the different policy documents drafted to position cultural diversity in the Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals contain a specific chapter or policy line dedicated to language issues. It can be claimed that despite the ongoing policy

---

12 For a full account of the position, role of cultural diversity in the Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, see the UCLG/Agenda21 Culture report Culture in the Sustainable Development Goals: A Guide for Local Action. Available at [http://www.agenda21culture.net/sites/default/files/culture_and_sdgs.pdf](http://www.agenda21culture.net/sites/default/files/culture_and_sdgs.pdf) [last consulted 21 October 2018]
debates celebrating ethnic diversity, the linguistic composition of cities is rarely mentioned (Mac Giolla Chríost and Thomas, 2008; Kraus, 2011: 25)

3.1.1 The Council of Europe’s Intercultural Cities Programme: any hope for languages in the urban agenda?

The Intercultural Cities Programme emerged from the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue in 2008, a key Council of Europe contribution to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue and “the most authoritative text at the European level of intercultural dialogue as a public policy concept” – as defined by the Council of Europe itself. The programme counted on the support of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe and was developed in partnership with the European Commission. It is formed by 126 cities (at time time of finalizing this paper, October 2018). It has a certain number of features that make this network of cities unique for several reasons:

a) It is a capacity-building and policy development programme that supports cities with 3 key elements: participative design, implementation and evaluation
b) Despite being called “Intercultural Cities”, it cuts across different policies, from cultural diversity, immigrant integration, participation and visibility of diversity in the public sphere, to name only a few. In other words, it has a multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach, engaging a wide range of actors in cities
c) It has a strong impact evaluation dimension (rather than mere rhetorical/discursive dimension)
d) It is long-term (not project) bases and thus enables sustainable policy changes in participating cities
e) It is supported by an international, intergovernmental organization – the Council of Europe – with a wide outreach and political commitment.
Unlike the Urban Agenda approach on cultural and linguistic diversity, more symbolic than practical – the Intercultural Cities Programme (ICC) contains a concrete mechanism to analyze and evaluate the role of languages and linguistic diversity in urban policies, the so-called Policy Index. As defined by the ICC programme itself, the ICC Index is a “complementary tool, capable of illustrating visually level of achievement of each city, progress over time, and enabling comparison with other cities. This tool contains a limited number of strong indicators which allow:

- To illustrate what intercultural integration means in practice and how it is implemented in specific cities
- To assess where the city stands in the different policy and governance areas and assess progress over time
- To realize where efforts should be concentrated in the future and identify “good practice” cities and city learning clusters
- To learn from other cities about sources of good practices in these particular areas
- To test different hypotheses about the relationship between intercultural policy and specific policy outcomes such as economic performance and safety

The ICC also contains a benchmarking tool that illustrates the city profiles "visually", highlighting the level of achievement of each city, progress over time and a comparison with other cities or the network as a whole. The tool involves a combination of:

- Facts: demographic data in particular (primarily quantitative)
- Inputs: policies, structures (primarily qualitative)
Languages rank as one of the main elements contained in the Intercultural City Index. The innovative approach is that it does not only refer to the importance of learning the local language(s) but also gives the languages of migrants a prominent role and visibility in the city policies. As claimed in the ICC itself:

“The learning of the language of the host country by migrants is key issue for integration. However there are other considerations in an intercultural approach to language. For example in cities where there are one or more national minorities (or indeed where there is indeed no clear majority group) there is significance in the extent to which there is mutual learning across language divides. Even in cities where recent migrations or trade connections have brought entirely new languages into the city, there is significance in the extent to which the majority are prepared to adopt these languages”

Not only does the ICC include this approach – the inclusion of the languages of migrants into the city policies. It also provides a set of specific questions aimed at measuring how languages are embedded into the policies of the city. These questions are the following:

a. Specific language training in the official language(s) for hard-to-reach groups (non-working mothers, unemployed, retired people etc.)
b. Learning migrant/minority languages as part of the regular curriculum at schools
c. Learning migrant/minority languages as a mother tongue course for migrant/minority kids only

---

13 For more information on the Intercultural Policy Index and the Benchmarking, please visit https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016804902dc
d. Learning migrant/minority languages as a regular language option available to everyone

e. Support for private/civil sector institutions providing language training in migrant/minority languages

f. Is the city supporting projects seeking to give positive image of migrant/minority languages (for instance day of migrant languages, readings, poetry evenings, multi-lingual cultural events etc.)?

The Intercultural Cities Network represents a quantum leap forward in the recognition and acknowledgement of languages not only from a descriptive angle but also as an asset to be actively valued and promoted as integral part of urban policies. Unlike the other city-networks and policy documents emanating from international bodies, the Intercultural Cities Network adopts not only a strictly cultural approach to the promotion of languages/linguistic diversity. It links the promotion of languages, including migrant languages, into issues related to (immigrant) integration, inclusive governance, service provision and social cohesion policies. The 126 cities participating in programme commit to reviewing their governance, policies, discourses and practices taking languages into account and measuring the progress and the evolution made over time-

The analysis shows that despite not being at the top of the international political agenda on urban issues, the Council of Europe’s Intercultural Cities programme is the network in which languages occupy a prominent position in terms of placing linguistic diversity at the core of their mandate. No other city-network or policy instrument developed within the framework of cities contains such as clear focus on the role of languages from an urban perspective.
3.2 The linguistic integration of migrants as an urban policy?

A similar approach to that of the Intercultural Cities Network is found in an increasing number of city-networks aimed at fostering migrant integration in cities. The analysis shows that there is an increasing interest for the local contexts of integration and local authorities have become more visible as actors adopting and implementing integration policies and contributing to the multilevel governance of migration and integration. As we shall see below, several projects have studied and highlighted the diversity of local experiences in European cities. This is part of a general trend in which the potential of local authorities to tackle contemporary problems have been acknowledged, politically but also academically (see Block 2006, Glaeser 2011, Barber 2013). Cities are increasingly policy makers and not only policy takers (Schultze 2003).

The vast majority of the city-networks and international policy instruments devoted to the linguistic integration of migrants focus almost exclusively on the need of migrants/refugees to learn the host language of the local population. Both networks and policy documents take for granted that there is only one language and neglect cities such as Barcelona, Cardiff, València or Donostia, to name only a few of the many cities located in officially bilingual territories. The languages of migrants, however, are rarely mentioned as part and parcel of the local policies on language.

One of the most influential city-networks that have fully incorporated the linguistic integration of migrants into their lines of actions is EUROCITIES. Created in 1986, it represents the political platform for major European cities towards the EU institutions. Unlike many of the city-networks analyzed, the engagement of EUROCITIES with the linguistic integration is not new. Back in 2004, when not many city-networks tackled the subject, EUROCITIES already developed the programme “Contribution to Good Governance concerning the integration of immigrants and
reception of asylum seekers”, a set of common principles for more cohesive and integrated cities, including the linguistic integration of migrants.

In 2006 the Integrating Cities Network was created in a joint effort between EUROCITIES and the European Commission to promote local level implementation of the EU Common Basic Principles on Integration, which included the linguistic integration of migrants. Common Basic Principle number 4 states that: “Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.”

Despite explicitly acknowledging that “Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States” (Common Basic Principle 1), the reality seems to indicate otherwise:

1) The principle assumes that there is only one language in all host societies, neglecting – as stated above – a remarkable number of cities with more than one official language in their territories

2) The two-way process of mutual accommodation does not apply to languages. Common principle 4 only refers to the need of newcomers to learn the host language for successful integration. No mention of the languages of migrants in the so-called “two-way process of mutual accommodation”

Since the adoption of the EU’s Common Principles of Integration, a regular policy dialogue between city representatives, city-networks and the European Commission
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14 For a full account of the EU’s Common Principles of Integration, see https://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/common-basic-principles_en.pdf
has been developed. It is what marks the agenda and sets the tone in the EU on issues related to the integration of migrants in Europe, including language issues.

One of the major results of this multilevel partnership between cities, city-networks and the European institutions has been the adoption of the *Eurocities Integrated Charter*. The *Charter* was launched and adopted in February 2010 by 17 European mayors at the Integrating Cities IV conference in London. This Charter was produced with co-financing by the European Commission under the European Fund for the Integration of Third Country Nationals. The cities commit to “integrating migrants and migrant communities in European cities”\(^{15}\)

The linguistic integration of migrants is explicitly included in the Charter. It is worth noting, however, that despite repeating the idea of integration as a “two-way process” – a sentence that has become the dominant EU rhetoric on immigrant integration, it is not applied to the issue of languages, as can be seen in the Charter article referring to language:

*"Integration is a two-way process, built on positive engagement by both newcomers and established residents. The process takes in all aspects of life: economic, social, cultural, civic and political, and continues a long time after arrival. Learning and speaking the official language of the city is crucial to this process and is essential to interaction. The greatest challenge we face is polarization and conflict between newcomers and established residents when integration fails"*\(^{16}\).

\(^{15}\) For more information on the annual Integrating Cities conferences, see their website at [http://www.integratingcities.eu/](http://www.integratingcities.eu/)

\(^{16}\) For a full account of the Charter, please visit [http://nws.eurocities.eu/MediaShell/media/CharterforWebFINAL.pdf](http://nws.eurocities.eu/MediaShell/media/CharterforWebFINAL.pdf)
Following this line of action, a specific toolkit on integration was produced by the MIXITIES Network (Making Integration Work in Europe’s Cities) in key areas of migrant integration, including language and cultural diversity.\(^{17}\)

The abundant number of policies from international bodies as well the city-networks devoted to immigrant integration leads us to conclude that the role of cities as first points of arrival, transit hubs and ultimate destinations is being increasingly acknowledged. When it comes to language, however, the focus is placed on the need for immigrants to learn the host society’s language, without any room or presence for the languages brought by migrants. The “two-way approach” to immigrant integration – often preconized in official rhetoric – does translate into real policies or lines of action including both the local language(s) and the languages of migrants. In language terms, the “two-way approach” becomes one way.

### 3.3 The participation of migrants in the public space (of cities)

“Local authorities have a key role in promoting civic engagement, social inclusion, participation and representation among international migrants. The policies and practices required to do so are, in many ways, a litmus test of a city’s political will to improve urban governance for the benefit of all of its citizens and for a better and more sustainable future.” These words, uttered by Anna Tibaijuka Under-Secretary-General Executive Director UN-HABITAT, succinctly summarize the general approach of both international policy documents and city-networks in the field of citizens’ participation in the shaping and making of urban policies.

There is a remarkable number of references from the main international institutions and city-networks alike (UNESCO, UN HABITAT, Council of Europe, the European

\(^{17}\) [http://www.integratingcities.eu/integrating-cities/projects/mixities](http://www.integratingcities.eu/integrating-cities/projects/mixities)
An analysis of the city-networks and organizations leads us to group the different lines of action developed into 9 main categories:

1. Civic inclusion
2. Cultural inclusion
3. Economic inclusion
4. Educational inclusion
5. Employment inclusion
6. Health inclusion
7. Political inclusion
8. Social inclusion
9. Spatial inclusion

Language does not appear as one of the core subjects highlighted. However, it is recurrently mentioned as prerequisite, sine-qua-non condition to enable immigrants to fully participate in society. “Societies must welcome immigrants and provide them with opportunities to become familiar with the host country’s language, basic values and customs, and immigrants, in turn, must show determination to become part of the receiving society” state all EU documents on immigrant integration and participation.

The same rhetoric is perceived as in the language requirements for immigrant integration highlighted above. The conditionality subsumed in this “approach of integration” paradoxically demands that foreigners demonstrate knowledge on the way of life, values, culture, history and language of the receiving society as a *sine qua non* condition for integration and participation. Despite the constant rhetoric on

---


the “two-way approach” for immigrant participation and integration and participation into the receiving society, the real approach imposes the heaviest burden of proof on immigrants’ shoulders to demonstrate their integration into a homogeneous framing – one society -official language – which ideally exists.

4. Academia and urban multilingualism: the wide gap between policy and research

Research interest into multilingualism linked to urban context has significantly increased since the turn of the century. After a period during which multilingualism in the city was hardly considered as a topic for researchers, it has attracted considerable attention. Figure 4 below shows graphically the increasing attention of urban multilingualism from a research point of view.

![Figure 4: research on Urban Multilingualism](image)

As highlighted in figure 4 above, a peak of research interest can be observed around the year 2005, following an upward trend and reaching the highest peak around the years 2014-2015. This upward trend, acknowledged also by academia (see Extra and Yagmur 2004; Yagmur and Extra 2001; Mac Giolla Chriost 2011; Kraus 2011, King and Carson 2016) seems to contradict the policy approaches to urban multilingualism, which seems absent from policy debates, as we have seen in sections above. We are able to observe a wide gap between policy and research on urban multilingualism. The following lines will serve to illustrate the current research trends on urban multilingualism.

4.1 Research networks and approaches into urban multilingualism

The analysis of the current research trends on urban multilingualism shows the existence of a wide range of different subjects areas, related mainly to sociolinguistics (Creese and Blackledge 2010; Gasquet-Cyrus, 2004; Heller, Jaworsku and Thurlow, 2014), to translation (Simon, 2010, 2012, Sulaiman, 2016), and to education (Conteh, 2006; Dulio, 2014; Garcia, Zakharia and Otcu, 2012; Cummins, 2008, 2014; Skutnabb-Janfas and Heugh, 2012; Yagmur and Extra 2011).

The main lines of research identify also bring to surface the scarcity of academic debates from other disciplines that are also key to language management in urban contexts such as urban politics, urban planning by sociologists, geographers or political scientists. As stated by King and Carson, these disciplines have tended to overlook or downplay the importance of multilingualism. As a concrete example, the Encyclopedia of Urban Studies (Hutchinson, 2010) has no entries for “multilingualism” or “language” and its references to diversity discusses the formation of diasporas and transnational neighbourhoods in global cities without referring to the role that languages play in their development (see King and Carson, 2016: 4).
The analysis conducted has led us to identify the following research networks focused on urban multilingualism:

4.1.1 LUCIDE. Languages in Urban Communities
4.1.2 EUROMEC
4.1.3 Language Rich Europe
4.1.4 The challenges of medium-sized language communities in multilingual cities
4.1.5 Multilingual Cities Project. On the Status of Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and at School
4.1.6 MIME. Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe

**4.1.1 LUCIDE. Languages in Urban Communities**

The Languages in Urban Communities Network was created as a tangible of the *Languages in Europe, Theory Policy and Practice* (LETPP) Research Group. It represents one of the most comprehensive overviews of urban multilingualism to date, as it involved 16 city partners in Europe, Australia and Canada. The Network was funded by the European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Programme from December 2011 to November 2014.

LUCIDE was created with the goal of “making better productive use of diversity as an economic resource and to strengthen social cohesion by fostering better communication and mutual understanding”. Five areas of work were identified as main lines of action within the project:

a) Education  
b) The public sphere  
c) Economic life  
d) The private sphere (activities conducted by citizens themselves)
e) Urban spaces or the “cityscape”

The findings are summarized in 18 city reports (one for each city) and 5 practical Toolkits, suggesting activities and providing best practices in Education, Health, Public Services, the Economy and Urban Landscape.\(^{20}\)

One of the novelties of this network is the expansion of their work beyond core subject areas of sociolinguistics and education to include issues related to the economy, participation in the public sphere as well as private practices and linguistic repertoires of citizens. The tangible result of the Network is the publication of the work The Multilingual City: Vitality, Conflict and Change, edited by King and Carson (2016), which provides a comprehensive analysis of multilingual cities and advocates for the need to adopt a pluridisciplinary approach to multilingualism.

4.1.2 EUROMEC. European Identity, Culture, Exchanges and Multilingualism Network

The EUROMEC Network brought together Jean Monnet Chairs in the area of European identity, culture, European citizenship and multilingualism, researchers and academics from seven European universities. The European multilingual city was the topic of one of the three main research strands of the EUROMEC Network. It set its locus in the contemporary European city and explored the extent to which diversity and in particular linguistic diversity affects identity formation in the European context.

This work represented a continuation of research carried out by previous networks – LUCIDE, Language Rich Europe – which provided data from cities across Europe and beyond.
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\(^{20}\) For a full account of the city reports, the toolkits and all the publications, visit the Lucide website, available at [http://www.urbanlanguages.eu/](http://www.urbanlanguages.eu/) [last consulted 27 October 2018]
4.1.3 Language Rich Europe

Language Rich Europe (LRE) is a study on multilingualism that was commissioned by the British Council and the Babylon Centre at Tilburg University in the Netherlands, with financial support from the European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Programme.

This network presented one main novelty: it brought together academia and more than 1200 policy makers and practitioners from 24 countries and regions in Europe to discuss and develop better policies and practices for multilingualism. It covered issues beyond urban multilingualism, namely education, economy, minority languages, migration, to name only a few.

The result was the report the Europe-wide research which was published in 19 languages in Language Rich Europe: Trends in Policies and Practices for Multilingualism in Europe.

4.1.4 The challenges of medium-sized language communities in multilingual cities

The studies collected under the Medium-sized language communities in multilingual cities represent a contribution from a group of specialists – mainly sociolinguists and legal experts – on the co-existence between minority, majority and immigrant languages in cities. It adds a new dimension that of the so-called “medium-sized language communities” to the debate. The project involved 6 European universities, led by the University of Barcelona’s Centre for Sociolinguistics (CUSC).

The project was financed by Linguamón-House of Languages – a Catalan public body aimed at promoting multilingualism – and the Spanish Ministry for Science and

### 4.1.5 The Multilingual Cities Project. On the Status of Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and at School

This Network focused back in 2004 on the increase of urban multilingualism in Europe as a consequence of processes of migration and minorisation. It offered multidisciplinary, crossnational and crosslinguistic perspectives on immigrant minority languages at home and in school in six multicultural cities across Europe. This Multilingual Cities Project was based on large-scale empirical findings and was carried out under the auspices of the European Cultural Foundation, in Amsterdam.

### 4.1.6 MIME. Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe

MIME is a research project on multilingualism in Europe, funded by the European Commission’s Seventh Framework Programme during the period 2014-2018. At the time of finalizing this report, MIME had published the *MIME Vademecum. Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe*, a practical booklet with a body of policy-relevant propositions, identifying the language policies and strategies that best combine “mobility” and “inclusion.”

The MIME consortium includes 20 universities, one independent non-profit foundation, and one SME, representing 16 different countries. The originality of this project – which does not only focus on cities – is the range of scientific and methodological backgrounds brought together, with researchers specialised in linguistics, political science, history, philosophy, sociology, geography, economics, education, translation studies, psychology, and law.
4.2 Current lines of research on multilingualism in cities

What emanates from the different studies conducted within the research networks mentioned above is a general understanding of the scope and lines of research addressed by academia in a number of feels related to multilingualism. The analysis of these networks has led to the identification of 5 main areas of interest applied to the city.

4.2.1 Languages and identity. Both EUROMEC and LUCIDE projects focus on the reconceptualization of identities in cities, where multiple identities overlap. As stated in the LUCIDE project “the image of the city in a process of continual revitalization and as an arena of language contacts in which groups, communities and individuals negotiate and embed their identities (Stoicheva 2016: 85)

4.2.2 Languages and education. Despite education being a state or regional responsibility, the high diversity experienced in cities create particular needs and demands and also it is a city, municipal and school level that educational policies are carried out (Little, 2016: 149)

4.2.3 Complex diversity/Superdiversity. As indicated by Lona & Carson (2016), the study of multilingualism in urban contexts was expanded by work on notions of superdiversity or hyperdiversity in socially complex cities. The term was coined by sociologist Stephen Vertovec and used for the first time in an issue of the journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies (2007). The term was coined to capture the ‘diversification of diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007) in the United Kingdom, including the
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21 For a thorough account of the different research strands, see the work Multilingual identities. A study of attitudes towards multilingualism in three European cities, edited by Lid King and Lorna Carson
multiple aspects in migration patterns, migrants’ legal statuses, demographic profiles and human capital.

The term *superdiversity* has become widely used in linguistic anthropology and in the field of multilingualism. In his seminal article, Vertovec specifically addresses multilingualism in Britain, describing it as ‘an under-studied field of diversity in the UK’ (ibid, p. 1032). He draws attention to some specific local configurations of language communities in London and policy responses (both positive and lacking) to these, for instance in Tower Hamlets in London where translation into Eastern European languages had, at the time of writing, outstripped the demand by the traditional population of British Bangladeshis for Sylheti/English translation.

The term hyper-diversity as used by the researchers Tasan Kok et. al (2013) further differentiates between city populations, pointing to differences not just between but within citizen groups at the level of ‘lifestyle, attitudes and activities’ (ibid., p. 5), and provides a robust framework for the study of linguistic diversity in urban contexts”(King & Carson, 2016). Another recent term to refer to the same complexity from urban environments due to the multiplicity of languages is the notion of *complex diversity* (Kraus).

### 4.2.4 Language planning and policy

The link between language policies, politics and planning in urban environments has been tackled by King and Carson (2016) or Backhaus (2012) who has examined local language policies in terms of language hierarchies in the Administration. Spolsky (2009), Boix-Fuster (ed. 2015), and many others have also examined the formation of complex multilingual urban
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22 For a full account of how the term of complex diversity is used, see the Vademecum Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe
areas and also the spread of English. Migration, tourism and trade alter the linguistic urban landscapes (see below) and the language policies are in constant change, depending on the political approach. In this respect the MIME Consortium has been at the forefront of conceiving language from a multidisciplinary perspective, putting the political analysis of language management at the core of the academic debates.

4.2.5 Linguistic urban landscapes. This is perceived as a growing field of research in recent years. It refers to “visual representations of multilingual practices, not exclusively but very often in cities, which are inescapably linked to power relations and the relative prestige and visibility of different languages” (Carson 2016: 65-72) Since 2015 a dedicated Journal on Linguistic Landscaping – Linguistic Landscape/An international journal has provided a range of relevant research articles, many of them concerning urban multilingualism and ‘anchored in a variety of disciplines’.

An earlier review, Gorter’s Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world summarizes a large number of studies, publications and research projects in the field from 2007 to 2013 (Gorter 2013). This research enables us to increase knowledge about societal multilingualism by focusing on several key components: language choices, hierarchies of languages, contact-phenomena, regulations, and aspects of literacy. Linguistic landscapes can be seen as important in monolingual contexts but the research is more revealing when dealing with multilingualism, variation, and the conflict and contact of languages. The linguistic landscape or the multilingual cityscape is a ‘multifaceted phenomenon’, and its study is related to a multitude of perspectives and disciplines. (Gorter, 2013, seen in King and Carson, 2016)
Concluding remarks

“There is a sense in which the term ‘sustainable development’ has become a fashionable but oftentimes vacuous buzzword in discussions of environmental issues. However, one understanding of it is that current patterns of consumption and production in industrialized nations are not sustainable in the long term without threatening the well-being of human habitats and the natural resources on which we all depend for our survival. The terms ‘development’ and ‘sustainability’ are difficult to reconcile if maintenance, conservation, preservation of resources means absence of change. Survival of any kind, linguistic or otherwise, has always involved change, compromises, and adaptations. To talk about the notion of sustainable development in relation to linguistic diversity is really to ask how communities around the world can sustain continued use of their languages in the future in the face of the spread of global languages like English. What role will the majority of the world’s smaller languages play?’

These reflections could very well be contemporary as the current debates on the urban agenda revolve mainly around issues related to the Sustainable Development Goals, as we have seen in this report. These words, however, were uttered by renowned scholar Suzanne Romaine within the framework of the Barcelona 2004 Forum of Cultures to highlight the urgent need to include languages in the Sustainable Development Agenda. Almost 15 years after these debates, little has been done to include linguistic diversity/languages at the core of the current political debates in the Urban Agenda or in any other major policy topic in the international debates.

23 Full access available here
Linguistic diversity is cherished, celebrated and highlighted as an important contribution to humanity and as intangible assets to be protected and promoted. The wishful thinking and goodwill statements often seen at international debates, however, do not translate into concrete, tangible policies or lines of action. A further example can help illustrate this point: at the Forum on Cultural Diversity celebrated during Donostia’s Capital of Culture in December 2016, UNESCO’s Director of Knowledge Societies Division, Communication and Information Sector underlined “the importance of language diversity for sustainable development, as well as the rapid pace of language loss seen at the moment... The adoption of Sustainable Development Agenda 2030 focused on 17 goals should lead to greater shared prosperity and peace. Thus, language and linguistic diversity should be a central theme”24. This report has shown that not only is linguistic diversity far from being a central theme. It is a theme that has simply not entered the mainstream policy actions.

In political debates and discourses, urban linguistic diversity is often problematized in terms of integration or cost when politicians and mainstream media focus on a perceived lack of proficiency in majority national languages amongst linguistic minorities or play off the acquisition of majority national languages against the maintenance of minority languages and criticize public spending on translation and interpreting (Carson and King, 2016).

The scarcity of the language debates at the political agenda stands in sharp contrast with the abundance of research networks and projects related specifically to urban linguistic diversity. Citizens’ linguistic repertoires, mixed (linguistic identities) or urban linguistic landscapes are some of the approaches taken by researchers –

mainly sociolinguists – when studying urban multilingualism. As openly admitted in academia, the multilingual aspect of city life and urbanism, in terms of intense interaction between citizens from multiple backgrounds, has not been sufficiently explored. Research on urbanism, urban politics and urban planning by sociologists, geographers and political scientists tends either to overlook multilingualism (Carson and King, 2016). It can be therefore claimed that policy and research are detached from each other without clear intricate links.

The tendency observed allows us to conclude that there is a tendency in the international arena to reify languages – that is, to consider them as “intangible assets” to be preserved, maintained or cherished. This tendency is detrimental to the consideration of linguistic diversity as a central theme in the current political or policy debates, including the Sustainable Development Goals and the Urban Agenda. When we lose sight of the people who speak them, of the communities of citizens living in cities and speaking a language different that the official ones, it becomes easy to consider languages as a soft issue, as a secondary element, nonexistent in mainstream politics on the Urban Agenda, as we have seen in the report. It is, therefore, important to link languages to issues related to central elements policy debates such as citizenship, participation, representation and governance. It is only by doing so that we will be able to insert languages where they ought to be: at the core of mainstream politics.
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ANNEX I. Policy oriented City Networks

Cities Alliance
Website: http://www.citiesalliance.org/

Cities of Migration
Website: http://citiesofmigration.ca/building-inclusive-cities/

City Development Strategies Initiative
Website: http://www.citiesalliance.org/cds

Cooperation Network of European Mid-Size Towns and Cities
Website: https://www.espon.eu/

Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR)
Website: http://www.ccre.org/

Eurocities
Website: http://www.eurocities.eu/eurocities/issues/migration-integration-issue

European Urban Knowledge Network
Website: https://www.eukn.eu/

Global Parliament of Mayors
Website: https://globalparliamentofmayors.org/

International Network for Urban Development
Website: https://inta-aivn.org/en/

Learning Cities Networks
Website: [http://lcn.pascalobservatory.org/](http://lcn.pascalobservatory.org/)

**METROPOLIS**
Website: [World Association of Major Metropolises](http://www.lcn.pascalobservatory.org/)

**MIXITIES Network**
Website: [http://www.integratingcities.eu/integrating-cities/projects/mixities](http://www.integratingcities.eu/integrating-cities/projects/mixities)

**Municipal Development Partnership**
Website: [http://www.pdm-net.org/](http://www.pdm-net.org/)

**Sister City International**
Website: [https://sistercities.org/](https://sistercities.org/)

**Unión de Ciudades Capitales Iberoamericanas (UCCI)**
Website: [http://www.munimadrid.es/ucci](http://www.munimadrid.es/ucci)

**United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)**
Website: [https://www.uclg.org/](https://www.uclg.org/)

**UNESCO. Creative Cities Network**
Website: [https://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/home](https://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/home)

**United Nations Advisory Committee of Local Authorities**
Website: [https://unhabitat.org/unacla/](https://unhabitat.org/unacla/)

**United Nations Global Compact. Cities Programme**
Website: [https://citiesprogramme.org/](https://citiesprogramme.org/)

**World Association of Cities and Local Authorities (WACLAC)**

Website: https://www.unescwa.org/world-associations-cities-and-local-authorities-coordination

World Cities Culture Forum
Website: http://www.worldcitiescultureforum.com/
Annex II. Research Networks on Urban Multilingualism

LUCIDE

Website: http://www.urbanlanguages.eu/
Co-financed by. The European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Programme from December 2011 to November 2014.


EUROMEC. European Identity, Culture, Exchanges and Multilingualism

Website: http://www.euromec.eu/
Co-financed by the European Commission’s Erasmus + programme (2014-2017)

Language Rich Europe

Website: http://www.language-rich.eu/
Co-funded by the European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Programme (2012)

The challenges of Medium-sized language communities in multilingual cities

Website: http://www.ub.edu/cusc/llenguesmitjanes/?page_id=744&lang=en
Co-financed by Linguamón-House of Languages and the Spanish Ministry for Science and Innovation
The Multilingual Cities Project. On the Status of Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and at School


Financed by the European Cultural Foundation (2004)

Outcome: Extra, G and Yagmur, K. 2004 (Eds.). Urban Multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School Bristol: Multilingual Matters

MIME. Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe

Website: http://www.mime-project.org/our_consortium/

Financed by the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme (2014-2018)

Outcome: the MIME Vademecum. Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe