



# **Case Study on Diversity Policy in Employment and Service Provision**

## **Budapest, Hungary**



Author:

Prof. Heinz Fassmann  
Peter Görgl  
Austrian Academy of Sciences  
Postgasse 7/4/2  
A-1010 Vienna

© 2008 European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions  
Wyattville Road, Loughlinstown, Dublin 18, Ireland  
Telephone: + 353 1 2043100, Fax: + 353 1 2826456

# Table of Content

<b>1</b>	<b>The country: Setting the city and its diversity policies in context .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Brief history of migration to the country and its characteristics of migrants and..... people with migration background.....	4
1.2	National policy context: law and policy on diversity in employment and service ..... provision.....	5
<b>2</b>	<b>The City .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Brief description of the city: location, history.....	6
2.2	City’s migrant population, its history and characteristics .....	6
2.3	The city authority: tier of government, responsibilities, structure .....	9
<b>3</b>	<b>The city’s approach to diversity.....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Historical background .....	9
3.2	Objectives of the policy/approach.....	9
3.3	Responsibility: elected representatives and officials .....	9
3.4	Collaboration with social partners and non governmental organisations in policy .... development and implementation .....	10
3.5	Policy and practice on monitoring progress.....	10
3.6	Key challenges faced in implementation and broad lessons learnt.....	10
3.7	Potential future development .....	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Employment: policy, practice and outcomes .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Profile of city employees.....	11
4.2	Employment diversity policy .....	11
4.3	Challenges and tensions in development and implementation policy.....	11
4.4	Recruitment, training and promotion .....	11
4.5	Equal pay and working conditions .....	11
4.6	Harassment .....	11
4.7	Accommodation of cultural and religious needs.....	11
4.8	Health and safety .....	11
4.9	Induction of language tuition .....	11

4.10	Recognition of qualifications .....	11
4.11	Complaints .....	12
4.12	Special initiatives .....	12
4.13	Monitoring.....	12
4.14	Impact of policy and lessons learnt.....	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Diversity in service provision .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Services provided and contracted out.....	12
5.2	Diversity policy in services .....	12
5.3	Employment profile of service providers.....	13
5.4	Access to services.....	13
5.5	Monitoring of success and outcomes identified.....	13
5.6	Cultural awareness of staff.....	13
5.7	Discrimination against service users .....	13
5.8	Special initiatives .....	13
5.9	Impact of policy on access to and quality of services and lessons learnt.....	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion: Key challenges, lessons and learning for CLIP .....</b>	<b>14</b>

# 1 The country: Setting the city and its diversity policies in context

## 1.1 Brief history of migration to the country and its characteristics of migrants and people with migration background

Going back to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and comparing statistical data of that time with today, it becomes obvious that in Hungary some minorities do have a long tradition of living in the country. Even if their share in total population rapidly declined after the revision of the borders by the end of World War I, members of these minority groups grew up with a kind of double identity: Hungarian (dominating in cultural and language aspects) and their literal origin as well. As a consequence of this, the Hungarian government listed thirteen national and ethnic minorities as “constituent components of the state” (Office for National and Ethnic Minorities, Budapest 2005): Since 1993, members of Bulgarian, Roma, Greek, Croatian, Polish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian and Ukrainian groups have the status as ‘National or Ethnic Minority’. According to census data of 2001, 314.000 members of National Minorities had been counted, whereof the Roma group is by far the biggest one (190.000).

*Table 1: Population nationality and sex*

Nationality	Total	Male	Female
Total population	10 198 315	4 850 650	5 347 665
Hungarian	9 416 045	4 457 641	4 958 404
African	187	147	40
Arab	1 396	1 059	337
Bulgarian	1 358	686	672
Gipsy, Romany, Bea	189 984	96 273	93 711
Greek	2 509	1 241	1 268
Croatian	15 597	7 231	8 366
Chinese	2 275	1 271	1 004
Polish	2 962	1 123	1 839
Modern Hebrew (Ivrit)	701	405	296
German	62 105	29 896	32 209
Armenian	620	334	286
Rumanian	7 995	3 963	4 032
Ruthenian	1 098	396	702
Serbian	3 816	1 994	1 822
Slovakian	17 693	7 739	9 954
Slovenian	3 025	1 377	1 648
Ukrainian	5 070	2 054	3 016
No answer	543 317	272 903	270 414
Unknown	27 220	13 788	13 432

Source: Hungarian Statistical Office 2003

Table 1 shows the population by nationality and sex, obviously people of Hungarian origin are in the vast majority (94%), and even Roma people as the largest minority (2%) don't have significant share in total population.

Obviously the Hungarian population is the vast majority (94%), Gipsy groups officially counted nearly 190.000 members, so the Roma population is significantly the biggest minority group in Hungary (about 2% of total population). There are several reasons why statistical data do not represent the actual number of people belonging to ethnical minority groups: first of all, nobody is obliged to declare one's affiliation to a certain minority. Secondly, the number of illegally immigrated persons is sometimes very high, a fact that may be the case mainly concerning Chinese people. Because of this some estimation assume that the share of people with minority/migration background is **twice as high** as official census data describes. Concerning mobility immigrants from China seem to use Hungary (especially Budapest) as a kind of 'stopover'-destination on their way to their actual migration destination (in most of the cases United Kingdom) whereas immigrants belonging to a national minority make efforts to stay permanently in Hungary.

## **1.2 National policy context: law and policy on diversity in employment and service provision**

Until the early 1990's, maximum assimilation of foreigners had been the guideline of national policy in socialist Hungary. After the fall of the Iron Curtain integration and minority policy changed fundamentally towards integration-based approaches and the strengthening of diverse cultural and ethnical identities. The minority act (Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities) can be seen as legal basis of that. It ensures several individual and collective minority rights like self-government, use of language, public education and culture.

Compared to some other Eastern European countries, the institutional framework is relatively well developed: First of all, there is the Standing Committee for Human Rights, Minority and Religious Affairs, an institution of parliamentary commissioners including an ombudsman who is concerned with protection of rights and interests of minority groups.

The Office for National and Ethnic Minorities is assigned to coordinate the implementation of the governmental minority policy issues. Besides that the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities is constantly evaluating and analysing the situation of minority groups and is acting as a communication-interface between minority organisations and the government.

In consideration of the special situation of the Roma, a Roma Political State Secretariat had been founded in 2002 as well as a consultative institution called 'Council for Roma Issues' whose main task is promoting the social integration of the biggest minority group.

Local minority self-governments do represent minority interests on a local level. These self-governmental structures shall result in full responsibility concerning specific, minority-orientated local educational and cultural institutions. The number of self-governments increased from 822 in 1995 to 2045 (out of this 1118 Roma self-governments, 378 German) in the year 2006, with some 8.000 elected representatives.

Integration policy also includes aspects of minority education and strengthening cultural life. The vital use of the mother language and dealing with specific thematic issues (in school as well as in media) shall be ensured in different ways, for example in a new kind of complementary minority education.

Up to now no laws or concrete diversity policy on diversity have been developed or passed. But the above mentioned implementation of the Minority Act can be seen as a kind of diversity policy, too, by strengthening the position of members of national minorities within the Hungarian society.

## 2 The City

### 2.1 Brief description of the city: location, history

The city structure of Budapest as we know it today is the outcome of the administrative establishment in 1873 and a large incorporation of neighbouring municipalities in 1950. The city's administrative territory tripled and this had been the basis for large satellite-towns. Budapest, the capital of Hungary, is by far the country's biggest city and is not only the political but also the economical and cultural centre of the nation. Some simple statistical data illustrate this geographical situation: About 17% of the country's total population lives in Budapest (1.695.814 inhabitants), the performance value of investments of enterprises amounts 944.1 billion HUF which is about 45% of the total performances in Hungary. More than 60% of all foreign investments are executed in Budapest.

Some aspects that can be called 'typical' for the transformation of post-socialist cities in the last ten years also took influence on Budapest's urban development: so a significant decline of the secondary (industrial) sector and the rise of the tertiary (service) sector with great influence on the inner-city development can be observed as well as suburbanization and intensified social segregation within the city on district or block-level. In the past ten years the gap between rich and poor, or one could also say, between 'traditional prosperous and favoured' (e.g. 2<sup>nd</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup>) and 'traditional poor and unpopular' (e.g. 8<sup>th</sup>) districts became wider.

### 2.2 City's migrant population, its history and characteristics

Concerning history of migration (more or less) detailed statistical data for Budapest is available for the past 70 years. Thinking of diversity and diversity policy today, it may be worth to mention that Budapest, despite of its function as the capital of the Hungarian Kingdom and the important role within the Danube Monarchy, hasn't had distinct 'multicultural' structures or traditions at any time. Nevertheless there are some clear changes in the composition of the city's minority population: While people with German as mother tongue were the biggest majority in 1930, their number diminished drastically (mainly by expulsion) after World War II. The number of Gypsy/Roma people developed vice versa and since the Fall of the Iron Curtain this group is the numerical majority (see table 3) of minority groups.

Particularly in regard to immigration and minority issues, statistical data cannot represent the actual number of people belonging to a specific group that lives in a country or city. As mentioned, there aren't any obligations for respondents to give this information as well as one has to face a number of illegal immigrants whose number can only be estimated. But clear tendencies can be derived from the census data: According to this it is obvious for example that the ratio of minority groups within Budapest is almost equal to the national proportion.

*Table 4: Population Budapest by national/ethnic groups and districts*

Persons belonging to the national/ethnic group on the basis of nationality and/or affinity with cultural values, traditions and/or mother tongue, and/or the language spoken with family members or friends

Area	Total pop.	people of minority in Hungary	Hungarian	Africans	Arabic	Bulgarian	Gypsy	Greek	Croatian	Chinese	Polish	Hebrew, Jewish	German	Armenian	Rumanian	Ruthene	Serbian	Slovakian	Slovenian	Ukrainian
1st district	25 914	834	24 117	3	9	35	53	37	41	8	45	25	415	16	31	3	41	79	14	24
2nd district	92 520	3 429	84 194	12	35	65	151	160	98	42	141	149	1 934	60	141	35	174	311	36	123
3rd district	131 605	3 214	120 589	11	54	112	343	224	73	97	175	55	1 366	32	160	44	116	360	43	166
4th district	103 492	2 787	95 763	9	54	56	782	196	82	86	119	43	698	21	138	48	61	432	22	132
5th district	28 948	1 598	26 728	1	61	33	361	86	51	30	68	102	555	29	155	38	83	72	11	56
6th district	44 137	1 661	39 422	13	44	24	380	124	48	50	58	73	492	26	100	34	135	156	19	65
7th district	64 137	2 661	58 718	11	61	54	1 157	126	95	85	80	117	540	28	113	28	210	102	32	96
8th district	81 787	4 627	73 388	30	112	51	2 771	167	56	443	99	63	659	31	223	48	104	249	41	128
9th district	62 995	2 530	58 618	14	64	59	1 070	225	60	66	44	51	530	29	93	33	65	208	28	86
10th district	80 852	2 271	73 016	14	80	41	812	194	65	504	114	24	484	47	131	33	39	166	36	109
11th district	144 441	3 935	132 041	19	266	115	233	259	145	144	171	62	1 794	80	183	60	175	476	51	193
12th district	61 763	1 926	56 380	6	21	44	81	105	85	45	81	74	1 086	47	55	31	80	154	24	53
13th district	114 353	3 532	103 997	13	93	48	864	267	114	215	132	157	1 074	55	226	86	181	294	61	130
14th district	123 510	4 036	113 581	8	91	119	964	369	181	155	128	75	1 202	43	193	41	138	464	50	144
15th district	85 232	2 046	79 955	1	51	28	755	164	42	68	99	21	492	14	112	25	44	184	21	66
16th district	71 028	1 211	66 553	2	36	42	193	63	44	66	64	24	502	11	69	19	22	92	27	63
17th district	79 989	1 417	73 894	4	20	29	255	89	41	17	86	19	573	3	57	13	27	171	19	54
18th district	96 353	2 124	88 325	–	46	54	491	176	37	50	107	23	627	21	79	33	28	363	24	84
19th district	63 810	1 482	58 173	8	30	30	408	115	51	49	73	6	455	25	85	23	34	89	20	74
20th district	65 295	1 885	59 912	1	38	36	877	59	24	34	48	13	514	10	91	25	26	100	23	52
21st district	80 982	1 860	74 844	5	23	88	578	109	38	24	51	8	590	13	103	20	35	149	19	67
22nd district	52 548	1 533	49 240	7	17	33	185	69	48	10	45	13	774	14	67	12	28	170	15	73
23rd district	20 697	1 047	18 150	–	4	9	155	19	5	1	16	2	706	–	29	3	3	81	6	15
District not defined	1 533	161	1 445	–	2	2	100	8	1	–	–	–	35	–	3	–	2	7	1	2
Capital total	1 777 921	53 807	1 631 043	192	1 312	1 207	14 019	3 410	1 525	2 289	2 044	1 199	18 097	655	2 637	735	1 851	4 929	643	2 055

Source: Hungarian Statistical Office, 2003

The integration level differs strongly from group to group. While migrants with Hungarian background or members of the German minority are relatively well integrated in the city's civil-society, African, Chinese and Roma people are often 'at the bottom' of it.

In spite of being not many by number, black **African** migrants/asylum seekers seem to be not integrated at all in Budapest; most of them are constantly confronted with a great number of prejudices. Most of Africans living in Budapest are single male persons; there are neither official programs nor some ethnic networks that would make it easier for them to find jobs or housing; to that effect among all minorities in Budapest their socioeconomic situation is maybe the worst.

Unlike Africans, **Chinese** people had been able to gain ground (in socioeconomic matters) in Budapest over the last 13 or 14 years. As a result of a bilateral agreement between Hungary and China in 1992, Chinese could profit from eased immigration rules for some years and for many of them Hungary seemed to be a promising country. In the aftermath the number of Chinese immigrating to Hungary had been unexpectedly high and so the immigration had been restricted again some years later. Today the estimated number of Chinese living in Budapest is between 25.000 and 60.000. That clearly shows that census data is not reliable in that case and the high number of Chinese that came unofficially into the country. Just like Africans, Chinese are not integrated in the Hungarian society in Budapest – but over the years they have established an all-embracing network, in economic manners as well as in every-day life. Import and retail of (cheap or faked) textiles or other cheap goods from the Far East is fully dominated by Chinese immigrants for example and has become an important economic factor in the meantime: in 1994/95, Chinese founded nearly 7.000 companies in the city! Economic activities of Chinese are concentrated around the so-called 'Four-Tiger-Market' in the 10<sup>th</sup> district, where estimated 5.000 Chinese retailers have their (sometimes more or less legal) business. Besides that, eight Chinese newspapers are published in the Hungarian capital, there is a kind of parallel Chinese health care system as well as own travel agencies, supermarkets, bookstores and so on. As a consequence of this only few Chinese speak Hungarian fluently, for the majority of them it is simply not necessary to learn the language.

Public authorities are facing some severe problems that can't be solved easily, like organized crime within the Chinese community, smuggling or simply the high number of illegal immigrants. In spite of that Chinese are much more popular than Africans or Roma people because many people in Budapest with low income are provided with affordable goods by the Chinese retailers.

Some new challenges for Hungary as a whole and especially Budapest as the main target of migration may arise from Romania's accession to the EU in 2007. In combination with bilateral agreements which guarantee easier travelling between the both countries, the number of 'commuting migrants' will rise – they often have basic knowledge of the Hungarian language and will enlarge the range of cheap manpower on the Hungarian labour market. Hand in hand with this an increase of illegal employment is expected.

Attitudes towards immigrants or ethnic minorities in broader public are often negative and disliking, which makes integration difficult. So there may be no mentionable differences between discourse about integration in Budapest and on the national discourse. Since the city cannot or is sometimes not willing to take effective influence, for example on the housing market for immigrants or on other relevant fields, migrant integration urban policies are focusing on rather soft and only seldom institutionalized measures like promoting cultural *diversity* (Gypsy theatre festivals etc.).

### **2.3 The city authority: tier of government, responsibilities, structure**

In his capacity as a representative of the state the mayor of Budapest decides on issues of public administration, there are several deputies to the mayor who are elected by the General Assembly upon the mayor's recommendation.

Besides them the Chief Clerk of the city (appointed by the General Assembly) is responsible for the operational tasks within the municipality.

The General Assembly is the governing body of Budapest, directly elected by the citizens.

Besides the municipality of Budapest which is responsible for issues concerning the whole city or more than one district, there are 23 autonomous districts with own administration structures, funds and decision-making authority, which shows the highly decentralized structure of urban government. Concerning many questions of urban development, the districts play a very important role since nearly all initiatives intervening in urban development need authorization and support of the district administration.

## **3 The city's approach to diversity**

### **3.1 Historical background**

**First of all it is important to point out that ,diversity' as an elaborated political concept or ,diversity management' as a concrete implementation of it doesn't exist yet. Within the municipality's mission statement 'diversity' as a concrete term is still also lacking. As a consequence of this, neither an office/department can be found that would be responsible or deal with 'diversity' issues, nor any implemented measures directly concerning that issue. Even on national level, diversity policy isn't picked out as a central theme yet.**

In fact, integration/migration are treated as political issues of a certain importance; as a kind of 'implicit consequence', diversity is sometimes discussed in that context, but as mentioned above there aren't any concrete measures or special departments dealing directly on that issue.

So, as a matter of fact, there is not that much information available – as many other cities of Eastern Europe, Budapest, including all its political and administrative bodies, is in a very initial stage concerning the development of diversity policies or their implementation or even of an increased awareness of the issue per se.

### **3.2 Objectives of the policy/approach**

Since no policy approach on diversity exists yet, there isn't any information available.

### **3.3 Responsibility: elected representatives and officials**

There aren't any elected representatives or officials for diversity issues yet.

### **3.4 Collaboration with social partners and non governmental organisations in policy development and implementation**

Concerning policy development (see 3.7), there is a cooperation with the head of 'Menedék', the Hungarian Association for Migrants, one of the most important NGO's in this field.

### **3.5 Policy and practice on monitoring progress**

No monitoring until now.

### **3.6 Key challenges faced in implementation and broad lessons learnt**

The stage of implementation is not reached yet.

### **3.7 Potential future development**

Even on national level no elaborated diversity approach exists, but since four or five years, the national government has intensified its work on immigration issues. In conjunction with that sooner or later 'diversity' will become an important aspect.

But strategies or measures concerning concrete problems are not developed on that level, i.e. implementation of adequate measures will be transferred to local level anyway.

As a consequence of that and facing the increasing migration to Budapest, a paper is currently prepared by some employees of the municipality that will point out that the City of Budapest is in need of a modern and flexible integration and diversity policy that takes the special situation of the capital into account.

Some aims that are formulated in the (still not officially published) draft are the strengthening of social cohesion (decreasing ethnic segregation, harmonizing everyday-life and reducing discrimination) and a qualitative development of diversity (restructuring or simplifying labour market procedures, strengthening of ethnic entrepreneurship, introducing tools that promote cultural diversity).

The intention of that approach is a very pragmatic one acting on the assumption that the better integration and diversity work, the less money has to be spent for problems that stick close with migration issues.

Some concrete project initiatives have already been conceived, for example the concept of a multicultural centre as an institute for migrants and emigrants, planned as a general meeting point with cultural and diversity related functions. The concept provides basic education for immigrants there and social workers on location are planned to support migrants in administrative and bureaucratic questions.

The project of a multicultural centre as well as the paper promoting 'integration' and 'diversity' as important issues in the municipality are still in a not official stage and should be understood as a first step to create an increased awareness within the municipality.

## **4 Employment: policy, practice and outcomes**

### **4.1 Profile of city employees**

1.300 people are employed at the mayor's office; data for the whole city administration were not available until now.

### **4.2 Employment diversity policy**

As mentioned above, there isn't any concrete employment diversity policy (only gender equality is regulated in the bylaws of the municipality), but basically, within the municipality every vacant job (including leading positions) is open to people with migration background. Employment policy is focused on the professional qualification of the applicants, regardless of potential migration backgrounds.

### **4.3 Challenges and tensions in development and implementation policy**

About the topic of challenges and tensions no official information was gathered by the municipality.

### **4.4 Recruitment, training and promotion**

No special programmes for employees concerning diversity issues.

### **4.5 Equal pay and working conditions**

Salary and working conditions do not depend on migration/national background of employees but is based on collective labour agreements for public services

### **4.6 Harassment**

No incidents are known or would have been announced where employees were discriminated because of their migration background.

### **4.7 Accommodation of cultural and religious needs**

No such measures planned or required by employees of different cultural or religious backgrounds.

### **4.8 Health and safety**

No information available.

### **4.9 Induction of language tuition**

There is no language tuition among the employees of the municipality.

### **4.10 Recognition of qualifications**

The Department for Human Resources and Labour is concerned with all employment issues and is providing the complete back office work on employment (contracting, administration etc.). Initiatives or recommendations of certain the applicants (including those with migration background) come from the different departments, but the ultimate decision is made by the HR & L department.

In general, qualifications of applicants that were gained abroad are checked in individual case by the HR & L department, it doesn't depend on the applicants' nationality. In the case of civil servants a legal relation can only be established with a Hungarian citizen, to get other administrative jobs in the Budapest municipality, applicants must be able to speak the Hungarian language in a sufficient level and/or come from countries that guarantee free movement and free residency or from a country that is listed in the European Social Charta. The municipality offers an office-customer service where all Hungarians or migrants can get information they need concerning recognition of diplomas, legal standards and procedures.

#### **4.11 Complaints**

Nothing was reported about complaints in the context of diversity or minority issues.

#### **4.12 Special initiatives**

There aren't any special initiatives from the municipality side concerning diversity issues. Migration or diversity related topics appeared on the agendas of an international Human Rights Conference which was held in Budapest in 2005 or in the EQUAL meeting in 2007. But up to now, all considerations or concepts for concrete initiatives etc. are still in an informal stage.

#### **4.13 Monitoring**

Until now no special monitoring system exists that would focus on the situation of employees with migration background.

#### **4.14 Impact of policy and lessons learnt**

Since no diversity policy exists nothing can be said about its impacts.

## **5 Diversity in service provision**

### **5.1 Services provided and contracted out**

Since no diversity management exists in the field of service provision, there aren't any services that could be contracted out. But if required informal support is given to NGO's dealing with diversity or integration issues. In this context it may be of interest that some NGO's (for example the Hungarian Association for Migrants – MENEDEK) are supporting migrants by providing information or by helping to acquire documents that are needed etc. The Hungarian Trade Unions don't have any special diversity programmes or initiatives, no special services for migrants are offered by them.

The municipality itself doesn't provide any special information material for migrants or on diversity issues. There are only some publications containing information about EU or the rights of EU citizens, migrants are mainly supported by private institutions or NGO's.

### **5.2 Diversity policy in services**

As mentioned several times an elaborated diversity concept or policy is not implemented yet. Therefore nothing can be said about diversity policy in services.

### **5.3 Employment profile of service providers**

No information available, because data sources normally do not specify migration backgrounds.

### **5.4 Access to services**

The target sections of the populations are not differentiated anyway. If migrants possess long-term or permanent residence permits they are treated equally to a citizen of Hungary (or the EU) in the field of services provisions. Concerning the accessibility of services, access is ensured by the legal order of Hungary and by Standards of quality of services.

### **5.5 Monitoring of success and outcomes identified**

Monitoring of success or the identification of outcomes does not exist.

### **5.6 Cultural awareness of staff**

No specific trainings or seminars concerning this issue.

### **5.7 Discrimination against service users**

No information available.

### **5.8 Special initiatives**

There are no initiatives monitored.

### **5.9 Impact of policy on access to and quality of services and lessons learnt**

No information available.

## 6 Conclusion: Key challenges, lessons and learning for CLIP

Even if there might be no strong demographical, political or intellectual pressure at the moment concerning the development or implementation of diversity approaches as we know it from Western or Middle European cities, there are various activities and approaches dealing with national minorities which can be seen as a special form of diversity policy. These measures have to be set in context with the socio-cultural situation and the history of migration in Eastern European countries. One of the most important steps forward is the concept for the integration of the Roma minority which is developed at this stage.

Despite the fact that not all groups of migrants profit from these measures (and because of this one could raise the objection that policies like this tend to result in an unbalanced integration progress) the approach to integrate national minorities can be seen as an important first step to an open and more diverse society.

One of the key challenges for Budapest surely is to create an increased awareness concerning diversity as an important political and administrative issue on all levels of the municipality. The mentioned draft (3.7) is a promising step in that context. But for the near future concrete approaches to a diversity policy as we know it from Middle or Western European cities can't be expected. Concerning the implementation of a 'diversity approach' neither national nor the local legal frameworks are very progressive at the moment.

There may be not much what other cities could 'learn' out of the Budapest case. But the other way round, if there is the will to anchor 'diversity' in the political and administrative awareness, Eastern European cities can profit from long-year experiences and research results of other CLIP cities.

## Appendix

The following persons in the municipality were contacted directly; the meeting took place on 11. – 12.07.2007

Zoltán Markocsány – Municipality of the City of Budapest, Deputy Mayor's Office for Urban Development, Management and Social Affairs