RES-MOVE

Resources On The Move

WORK PACKAGE 2 – Research

T2.7 Data Collection and Reporting – Field research

LOCAL REPORT

Prepared by Sebastiano Ceschi (CeSPI ETS) and Luca Lendaro (Refugees Welcome Italia)

DECEMBER 2024

1. The context of the research

Rome is the biggest city in Italy with 2.754.719 residents at 1st of January 2024 (Istat), while the "metropolitan city", the former province, reaches 4.230.292.

Population numbers show a mid-term decreasing trend with a very recent dynamic of stabilisation in the last two years. On the other hand, considering inhabitants not formally resident, commuters, students and temporary presences, the city is estimated having around 3,5 million of people.

All the interviews have been conducted in the city of Rome to migrants living within the urban territory (10) and to coworking also all based in urban areas (10). About half of the interviews were carried out in person, the rest through online platforms or via telephone. Migrant respondents have been selected both through *Refugees Welcome Italia*'s contacts and network and thanks to the indications given by the operators of a public desk for helping migrants and refugees in the recognition of their titles and qualifications and in the search of job and training. Even if a part of them lived in reception centers in the (sometimes recent) past, at present all of them are trying to pursue individual paths of integration and are living in private homes.

Coworking and collaborative spaces have been chosen within a short list of spaces supposed to be sensible to social issues and not solely the expression of business projects. If some of them didn't show an interest to reply and collaborate with the project, probably for the residual or not existing relevance of the presence of migrants and refugees population in their space, the majority showed a relative availability and attention for the project's objectives, and in more than a few cases, a concrete desire of future collaborations.

1.1 Migrants and migrant communities in the field and in the labour market

Rome is from the beginning of the Italian immigration phenomenon a major pole of attraction for foreign and migrant population and the city with the higher numbers of foreign residents. Foreign population is more than half a million (520.242) if we consider the metropolitan area, and 352.433 in the urban area (Istat), equal to 13.7% of the total population - against a national average of 8.7% - composed for 53,1% by females and 46,9 by males (Idos 2024). The increase of foreign residents have partially compensated for the decrease of Italians and the population aging trend with an average age of 39.8 years compared to 46.6 years of the overall population and a higher percentage incidence of minors (Idos 2023).

42% of foreign residents come from the European continent (of which about three quarters from EU countries), 34.9% from Asia and only 12.3% from Africa and 10.5% from America. Main nationalities are Romanian (22% of foreign population), Philippines (10,6%), Bangladeshi (8,9%), Chinese (5,0%) Ukrainians (4,0%) Peruvians and Indians (3,3%), and then Egyptians, Polish, Sri Lankans, Albanians and Moldovans (around 2% each).

In the city 1267 refugees are hosted in the SAI system managed by the city's municipality, while other 3460 (data referred to the entire province of Rome) are in the Ministry of Interior circuit of reception (CAS). Foreign students are increasing in the Lazio region as well as in

the capital area, with 3600 new registrations in the 2021-22. The first countries of origin of the foreign university students are Iran, India, Tunisia, Kazakhstan, Turkey and Greece.

If historically the employment rates of migrant population in Italy were higher than those of native population, unlike other European countries, the post-pandemics period has led to a reversal of positions, seeing the ones concerning Italians to a 60,1%, against 59,2% of non UE-foreigners, equally to 2.4 million people (Italian Ministry of Labour Report 2024). In the Rome metropolitan area, as well, the increase of migrant employment in 2022 has been significantly lower than that recorded for Italians (Idos 2023). In general, the roman context tends to reproduce the characteristics of the "subordinated inclusion" of migrants in the national labour market, with pronounced phenomena of placement in the lowest strata and in manual and less paid jobs of the labour market, deskilling and segregation in ethnic niches in which only workers with certain origins can be found. In the Italian capital, where foreign workers represent 12,8% of the entire workforce, the tertiary sector is much more important than agriculture and industry if compared to other areas. Commerce, hotels and restaurants, transportation and warehousing and business services employ around a third of migrant workers, while domestic and care workers represent another third of them, construction 12%, education, health and social assistance 7,4%, industry and craftsmanship 4,4%, agriculture 2,7% (Idos 2023). An important field of integration in the labour market for the migrant population is entrepreneurship. There were almost 7,000 businesses managed by foreign-born owners in 2023, of which 18,4% owned by Bangladeshi and 15,7% by Romanians, followed by Chinese, Egyptians and Moroccans. If Romanians concentrate in the construction sector, commerce is prevalent for Chinese, Moroccans and Bangladeshi, but also restaurant-hotel activities, tourism and business services are relevant for Bangladeshi, Chinese and Egyptians.

The spread of informal jobs among immigrant workers is also relevant, even if much more difficult to quantify. Migrants also have to face important housing problems, with few and often expensive opportunities to get decent accommodation.

1.2 CWCS in the Roman area

In the city there are several typologies of "coworking", ranging from collective offices for corporate personnel and companies, to social and inclusive (private and public, sometimes informal) spaces dedicated also to coworking activities. Excluding multinational companies such as Regus and similar national actors which simply offer common offices for freelancers, other companies and nomad workers, we concentrated on less commercial coworking spaces. The type of coworking most intercepted by the research is that of private common work spaces for individual workers, enriched by economic-entrepreneurial, technological, social and cultural activities and services. So, not merely a place where one can find individual working facilities, but something more orientated to create a community, common values and interest, a relational network, and not rarely a shared production and use of social and cultural contents. These features have been, even if differently, found both in some international (Impact Hub) and national (Talent Garden) coworking networks, and in single cases born from individuals, small groups or associations and, in one case, financed by public funds and housed in a publicly owned facility.

According to the interactive mapping of co-working spaces in the ten countries involved in Res Move project produced by ECA (https://resmove.org/) such spaces in Italy are very numerous (around 160), of which 21 in Rome, a number that is surely not exhaustive, given that some of the co-working interviewed in the field research were not included in it.

For the purpose of the research, we partially used that list of CWCS based in Rome, to which we added some other spaces discovered on the ground or escaping the formal classification of "co-working space".

2. Results from the Field Research

2.1 Migrant' population and the CWCS

2.1.1 Characteristics and experiences of migrants and refugees interviewed

In our field research, we interviewed 10 people with migration backgrounds, most of them aged between 26 and 35 (6 people), while to a lesser extent aged between 36 and 45 (3 people) and with only 1 person aged between 18 and 25. Among them, 6 identified themselves as females, 4 as males.

Almost half of the interviewees are political refugees holding international protection (4), while 2 are temporary protection beneficiaries, 2 are asylum seekers (one of whom previously had a permit for medical treatment), and the remaining two have work and study permits, respectively.

From the point of view of the education level, the respondents present highly schooled and trained profiles in most cases, with 4 people holding a bachelor's degree and 2 a master's degree. 2 others have completed secondary high school, and the remaining 2 hold a professional degree and received vocational or technical training, respectively. Half of the interviewees are still pursuing education in Rome, some being enrolled in university and some completing high school in Italian. All the people interviewed have attended or are attending an Italian language course, knowledge of which is remarkable in a good number of cases.

Taken all together, respondents have been living in Italy for a relatively long time (3 years and a few months), with a minimum of one year and a maximum of eight. From the perspective of the country of origin, the only one represented by two respondents is Ukraine. The other people are 3 from the Middle East/West Asia, 2 from East Africa, 1 from West Africa, and 2 from South America.

Only one of the respondents has no work experience in Italy, being a full-time university student. All the other 9 are currently working or at least have worked in Rome, and 3 of them already had a profession in their home country, one as a journalist, one in academia, and one as a lawyer. At least three people also reported that they are currently engaged in projects and areas outside of work, mainly as cultural and social activists.

Only one person states that she is satisfied with her current job and the prospects she sees ahead, thanks to her background, to a good network of contacts and to a strong personal determination not to accept "jobs that had nothing to do with my area of expertise."

Most respondents believe that they have a decent job that allows them to cope with basic needs. In some cases, this work is both contractualized and stable, but nonetheless dictated by necessity and not aligned with personal expectations, so much so that many have expressed a desire to change jobs or fields of work, and about half of the respondents are studying to open up more satisfying job prospects.

Dissatisfaction with regard to one's working condition is exacerbated in cases of those who perceive a strong degradation with respect to their professionalism and, above all, in cases of those who work or have worked in the absence of a contract or under conditions of real exploitation. We cite one quote among others: "In my country I was working in engineering and automation, while here I found myself doing anything else, working even 10 hours a day for a salary of 40 euros a day without a contract."

Along with the difficulty of finding a regular, adequately paid job in line with one's job title, many people reported the problem of finding affordable housing solutions.

Several respondents noted that the labour market makes especially lower-level, lower-paid, and more exploitative occupations accessible to people of foreign origin. Considering all of the answers, there emerges a strong awareness of the many reasons, often systemic and structural, behind the challenges faced by foreign-born people within the Italian (and Roman) labour market: from undocumented status ("People exploit foreigners without documents") to the difficulty of recognizing one's degree, from language barriers to cultural differences, from the absence of a network of personal contacts to racial discrimination. "Here in Italy, I had to take many paths to overcome the many barriers I encountered: language, culture, prejudices and stereotypes, and outright discrimination."

2.1.2 Migrants' interaction and expectations of CWCS

Among the respondents, 6 people said they were unfamiliar with the very idea of CWCS, 2 said they had in mind what they were but had never experienced them first-hand, while only 2 people were actually familiar with coworking and collaborative spaces: one because she used to frequent them when she lived in Dubai, one who actually actively frequents them in Rome as well. Even where familiarity has been expressed, therefore, it is mostly an abstract or very episodic one.

After learning more about CWCS, all reactions have been largely positive, but most respondents say they know of no such space in Rome. One quote, among many of similar tenor, sums up this openness and interest well: "That sounds like an interesting idea. If I knew such a place that I liked, I think I could go there."

In addition to not knowing that such spaces exist or where, about half of the respondents raised doubts about whether they would actually attend a CWCS, either for time reasons ("If I had more time off from salaried work I would go. But now I work even 12 hours a day") or for economic reasons ("But I wouldn't pay for that, I can't afford other expenses now").

The idea of sharing work space with other people in a dedicated and equipped facility was highly appreciated by the people interviewed. The main motivation for joining a CWCS, highlighted in almost all responses, is not to work alone and to be able to meet other people and thus develop one's own network of contacts. If the main attractive reasons are to meet people who work in the same field and have interests in common with one's own, or more simply to meet new people from whom to draw inspiration or with whom to develop a human connection, the "social" motivation is generally intertwined with the one of personal self-realization and the idea that one reinforces the other. Two interviewees in particular declined this very motivation from the perspective of team working, valuing the importance of developing and processing project ideas together with other people (viewing a CWCS "as an incubator for new projects").

Secondly, half of the respondents highlighted the importance of finding a place where they can focus and have their own work space as an additional motivation for joining a CWCS.

Last but not least, about one-third of the respondents expressed interest in CWCS from the point of view of the formative dimension, assuming that they would be able to take advantage of courses, workshops or events where they could learn new things, as well as practice or learn Italian, and - finally - find information and job opportunities.

2.3 Conditions for getting involved

Given the limited familiarity and almost total inexperience with CWCS that characterizes the interviewees, the projects and ideas expressed were often developed on the spot, making the interview itself an opportunity for self-reflection and development regarding their career path.

About one third of the interviewees stated that they have no idea yet and cannot imagine what they would do within a CWCS, while the remaining two thirds are divided between those who don't have a specific project but expect to find insights and opportunities to deepen their knowledge in certain areas (e.g. "I would go there to become more familiar and trained with computer programs and applications") and those who already have a specific project in mind, more or less defined. In the latter case, for most interviewees (4 people), these projects are related to something they have already done or are currently working on, while only one person has a completely new project to carry out. Significantly, many of the projects outlined are related to the condition of migrant people in Italy.

From the perspective of support required to implement the project, in one case, it involves specific technical equipment ("I would like to develop an editorial project of podcasts and digital video editing [...] I would certainly need a soundproof room, with adequate lighting and equipped with video cameras and microphones."), while for all, it is about receiving some form of training or involving other people who are already experts in the field they want to work in.

There is not a single interviewee who has not expressed a positive view of having a mentor. Four people understood this figure as personalized support in the development and elaboration of a project

idea or a specific career path. Two interviewees, on the other hand, saw the mentor as a more technical figure, competent and specialized in a specific field.

One interviewee carefully explained the difference between the concept of mentoring and facilitation, hoping that resources could be available for the former, while stressing the absolute centrality of the latter. "It is crucial that there are facilitators, who would stand as equals and help especially in the collective and collaborative dynamics. A mentor would be useful because he or she could follow people one by one, but so it takes a lot of funds and resources to be able to follow so many people."

Last but not least, one interviewee suggested that one day they might become a mentor themselves.

Of the nine interviewees who showed openness to the idea of attending a CWCS in their free time, some said they would do it to have moments of personal relaxation ("Yes I could spend some free time in such a space... reading and relaxing, why not?"), while others mentioned it as a place to participate in activities or events to socialize with others. Sometimes, both aspects were present in the same response: "Yes, I would go there both to meet other people outside of work, but also to find some quiet time and maybe read a book, a newspaper, and have some time with myself. I would also like if there were workshops or trainings or socializing events, but I would like to be able to choose whether to attend or to be by myself for a while."
If one interviewee stated that he currently has no free time to spend in a CWCS outside of a professional and work-related context, all the others welcomed the possibility, although often the positive responses came after being prompted by the interviewer and were expressed vaguely and abstractly.

Only two interviewees expressed no interest in the possibility of working in a co-working space outside the urban area, as they felt more comfortable in the city and, above all, because the urban environment offers more opportunities for social interaction. All the other interviewees, on the other hand, showed interest in this perspective, dividing into two groups: one half would work in a co-working space in rural areas only for a limited time (from a few days to a few months, no longer), while the other half would be willing to relocate permanently outside the city, "if my job were significantly better." The main reasons for the willingness to attend a CWCS in a rural area, either temporarily or permanently, are to break the routine, meet new people, the interest in having "residencies" focused on specific themes or projects, the opportunity to enjoy some inner peace, and to concentrate better.

As for the benefits of a space or services dedicated to childcare within a CWCS, half of the interviewees responded positively (usually for principled reasons or because the idea seemed interesting, and in one case, because this service would meet a personal need), while the other half expressed no interest (mainly because they do not have this need at the moment).

Those who expressed interest emphasized the need for any potential childcare space to include at least one adult, trained reference person, who could guide and monitor the children's activities.

During the interviews with migrant and refugee individuals, many elements emerged that make up the picture of what could make a CWCS truly inclusive and welcoming. As stated by one of the interviewees, the aspects to consider are particularly the membership of the CWCS

and the services or features that characterize it: "A CWCS is welcoming to me if it meets my needs in terms of available space, services offered, and people involved. It is mostly people that make a place good or bad, so the quality and inclusiveness of the space is determined first and foremost by the people."

From the perspective of membership, many responses highlighted the basic need for those who attend the CWCS to be kind, honest, and especially respectful of others, aware of the cooperative purpose of co-working, and guided by management that can enforce rules of conduct. In at least two cases, it was mentioned that it would be helpful if these rules were written and explicitly shared by everyone ("Maybe there should be a set of rules or a code of conduct that sets out the principles of behaviour that everyone should follow"). It is this mutual respect, combined with a collaborative and mutualistic approach, that makes a CWCS a "safe space." Secondly, many responses emphasized that another condition for feeling comfortable in a co-working context "is the fact that you see so much diversity around you," meaning that the space should be frequented by people from diverse backgrounds (not just migrant ones).

From the perspective of the services and features that must define a CWCS in order to be welcoming and inclusive, interviewees particularly highlighted the physical characteristics of the co-working space (having a kitchen, offering large and bright rooms, providing workstations that ensure a minimum of privacy), the absence of rigid accessibility criteria ("The CW should be a place accessible to all, with no criteria of any kind for accessing it"), and other aspects related to the management of the space (presence of welcoming and guiding support; management's effort to speak languages other than Italian; spaces and times for socialization as well as work; room for self-management).

Finally, about half of the interviewees emphasized an additional condition for determining the inclusivity of a CWCS. This involves the centrality of the promotion and of the "storytelling" of the space, meaning communicating both the existence of the CWCS and the opportunities it offers. To be inclusive from this perspective, interviewees pointed out that it is necessary to avoid using a narrative frame that gives the impression of doing something "for refugees," as this label is experienced as reductive and stigmatizing by many. Instead, the story should be told as "not a 'coworking space for refugees,' but a coworking space open to everyone," where people with a migrant background are given the opportunity – in a way that is neither assistive nor paternalistic – to take the lead and give voice to their story, on equal footing with everyone else.

2.2 CWCS and migrant population

2.2.1 Characteristics and experiences with migrant users

All the co-working spaces contacted during the field research were located in urban areas, and the same applies to the ten interviewed. All of these spaces were co-working, with a strong tendency to also be collaborative, and less frequently, though not insignificantly, incubators. None of them were specifically focused on artisanal or manual activities, although a significant number of them engage in other types of activities.

In general, apart from providing co-working space, almost all of these establishments have attempted to develop complementary or parallel activities, aiming to go beyond the sole function of a shared workspace. As a result, they have diversified their offerings: creating collaborative spaces and dynamics (e.g., meeting rooms, member exchanges, common projects, and training sessions); offering specific services, sometimes more technical (e.g., advice, classes, training, spaces for crafts, etc.), and other times more social, inclusive, and culturally oriented; and organizing spaces and opportunities for socializing, recreation, and consumption (e.g., social events, bars and bistros, gastronomic encounters, etc.). As one manager of a Roman co-working space said: "It is now clear that co-working alone does not guarantee sustainability; we need to develop other initiatives that support it and better cover costs."

While only a few spaces have a large number of users/members (particularly Talent Garden, with hundreds of workstations), the majority can rely on a smaller number of daily users, typically between 10 and 20. This forces them to find ways to attract more people and diversify their income sources.

Gender balance is usually fairly equal, with a slight predominance of males. The average age of users is around 40. As agreed by some of the managers, the costs for a private, fixed workstation are affordable if you are already established in the job market with a decent salary. The most common users are freelancers, self-employed individuals, and entrepreneurs in fields such as graphic design, communication, architecture, engineering, social sustainability, IT and computer development, economics and marketing, and real estate. Students are less common. In summary, these are people with strong educational backgrounds or technical and creative personal skills.

Only in co-working spaces with an inclusive mandate (such as Circolo Arci Stonehead and Officina Municipale) or sensitivity (such as Millepiani and Industrie Fluviali) we do also find unemployed users, and in the latter case, even individuals with various types of disabilities.

In general, the presence of migrant and refugee populations in the spaces we contacted is very rare and not significant. Some entities have never activated specific initiatives aimed at the immigrant and refugee population. Even though they answered "yes" when asked about contact with migrants and refugees, their presence was very occasional and fleeting, with individuals sometimes coming from medium-high income countries, and other times from medium-low income ones (Asia and South America). In one case, they were part of a solidarity network of co-working spaces mobilizing in favour of Ukrainian refugee

professionals in 2022. Other co-working spaces, in the past or currently, have initiated collaborations, partnerships, and reception agreements aimed at promoting contact with migrant communities, associations, or individuals (e.g., agreements with private or public entities for work training within the co-working space; close partnerships with local entities promoting migrant entrepreneurship; participation in European projects focused on economic integration activities; courses on digital literacy and skills assessment funded externally). However, these experiences did not result in regular attendance or daily presence at these spaces.

Only Stonehead, a social and community-based club that, among other services for migrant populations, also activated a morning co-working space, and Officina Municipale, a public initiative focused on inclusivity that operates a co-working space in a popular, peripheral area in the east of the city, have shown a real presence of migrant users. The case of Latte Creative is somewhat in between, as its location naturally brought them into direct contact with a Kurdish association sharing the same place.

To improve migrant inclusion, they suggest organizing activities and pathways for migrants and refugees through the involvement of relevant associations and organizations, providing support for entrepreneurial ideas, as well as (multi)cultural events and social hybridity. However, many of the interviewees stated that they do not have the time, skills, or contacts to organize this on their own, and that they would need to rely on an organization in the sector

On the other hand, a dedicated and trained operator is what is missing in almost all the spaces considered in our research. The co-working spaces stated that they lack the appropriate staff to engage more intensively with the migrant population. In the case of technical mentorship (e.g., start-ups, digital innovation, etc.), they have skilled professionals, but when it comes to broader and more relational forms of mentorship, they have no one on their staff who is truly prepared for this role.
Conversely, in places such as Officina Municipale and Stonehead, we observe the presence of a counter and a dedicated operator who could take on the role of a mentor, even though this role has not yet been formally defined or activated.

2.2.2 Perceptions and perspectives for a future engagement

In general, respondents have emphasized benefits far more than risks. The latter are seen as both generic and specific. While "encounters always carry the risk of conflict, especially when they involve people with extremely different histories, backgrounds, and living conditions," the actual presence of significant groups of migrants in the space could disturb others and lead to the loss of some users. This is risky from a management perspective, as the sustainability of the space relies on maintaining a certain number of workstations occupied by people who regularly work and pay. Another risk is the potential dispersion of energy if the co-working team must organize activities on their own, without the support of other organizations.
Benefits, on the other hand, are related to both the internal and external domains. The increased multicultural aspects of the space and the exchange of diversity among members are seen as assets, something that would be appreciated by the users themselves. At the same

time, a more multicultural environment would have a positive social impact and improve the public image of the space, helping it reposition itself on sensitive social issues.

The biggest part of co-working seems to have established contacts and networks with (above all local) public and private actors, in some cases directly involved in migrants and refugees integration (organizations, NGOs, associations), in others engaged in specific tasks both at administrative level (municipality's departments and district administration) and technical one (incubators, agencies, companies). In few cases they appear to be without useful connections to implement initiatives in favour of migrant and refugees' inclusivity and integration.

Anyway, they all would need new partnerships and need to enlarge their collaborations.

Concerning the interaction with our initiative, some organizations stated that they expect from the ResMove Project results such as learning opportunities, ideas, and stimuli to help them better address the issues of migrant and refugee inclusion, and to build processing capacities and power. In this regard, "we are interested in the guidelines you will develop as part of the project, and we await the call for proposals to assume our participation."

They provided suggestions on how to improve their participation, such as the multicultural animation of the space through more structured programming of events, meetings, and workshops; professional courses; empowerment pathways; initiatives for minors or second-generation migrants; mentoring; and more generally, actions that could strengthen the self-management and autonomy of the migrant population.

They expressed their personal expectations of expanding the services they provide to the migrant population and strengthening those already in place, such as an accelerator program one of them had previously, as well as thematic and discussion events focused on diversity and migration. Additionally, most of them hope to participate in European and national projects involving migrants and refugees and to establish connections with individuals or small groups of migrant professionals, who could become regular members in the near future.

3. Reflections and strategic considerations

Co-working spaces and the migrant/refugee population remain distant and are rarely connected. For several reasons, migrants are not included in the primary and regular target group for co-working activities, and only very few of them have entered or are even aware of the existence of these spaces. Nevertheless, while the supply and demand have not yet brought the two realities closer, and a spontaneous encounter has not yet occurred, the research offers some positive elements and potential opportunities for their convergence. A few, but significant, efforts towards inclusivity and exchange with the migrant population have been undertaken by some spaces (Millepiani, Industrie Fluviali, and, to a lesser extent, Impact Hub and Latte Creative), while social and public organizations such as Stonehead and Officina Municipale have dedicated part of their inclusive actions to co-working initiatives.

Good practices seem to work especially when CWCS benefit from a wide network of local partners and are themselves large spaces, capable of offering a diverse and varied range of services internally. This enables them to maintain both a cultural engagement dimension (through exhibitions, events, etc.) for people with a migratory background, and a dimension for job placement or even employment within their own network.

Our impression is that the dynamic of bringing CWCS and the migrant-origin population together, as envisioned by our project, cannot happen spontaneously. Rather, it needs to be induced and guided, requiring the involvement of several factors. First and foremost, project inputs are necessary, as well as, ideally, institutional support and coverage to steer and direct the efforts that each actor must then put in place. It is also important that CWCS are not the sole actors involved, but rather one of the "nodes" in a broader network that immediately involves other public or private entities (ranging from employment centers to job agencies, from Italian language schools to foreign communities, from certain production or commercial realities to socio-cultural associations, etc.). Only in this way can a CWCS best fulfill its specific function as a catalyst or incubator of projects and collaborations.

Our research indicates that, as of now, only a few CWCS in Rome have the capacity, both in terms of size and positioning within local networks, to serve as an attractive and generative hub capable of engaging people with a migratory background and providing real support and concrete perspectives for their needs and projects. No CWCS can do it alone, and most find themselves lacking the adequate resources to implement such good practices.

From the interviews conducted with migrant individuals, it emerged that, except in the rare cases where the person already has a project or a minimally structured idea in mind and, therefore, is aware of his/her skills and is looking for a place and support to express them, a CWCS could be a possible place for the "coagulation" or "incubation" of a project that is still in its early stages, confused, so embryonic and elusive that it is not yet recognized as such. In order to emerge and take shape, together with an awareness of one's desires and resources, an idea or project requires the person to be in a condition where he/she can both focus and have time for him/herself, as well as benefit from exchange and confrontation with others. In this sense, a CWCS can prove to be a potential place of synthesis that creates the conditions for thinking through and then making feasible improvements to one's condition, giving form and substance to projects that are still vague, confused, and unclear, first and foremost to the individual themselves.

These potentials are, however, confronted with the lack of staff and resources within CWCS dedicated to this type of one-to-one work, which is not immediately "productive" for the CWCS itself.

To address such an impasse, perhaps the suggestions provided by some migrant and refugee individuals come to the rescue. They highlighted the importance and effectiveness - in terms of self-awareness and empowerment - that peer-to-peer workshops and labs, led by individuals with a migratory background or trained to facilitate groups of people from diverse backgrounds, could have.

In terms of support and guidance for potential members with a migratory background, three "levels" can be identified that it would be ideal for every CWCS to ensure in order to be truly inclusive and meet the needs expressed by individuals. The first level consists of welcoming and a sort of "relational" introduction to the CWCS and its members. The second level, which we could define as "general mentoring," involves individualized support for the person in developing their project and designing the process of its realization. The third level, finally, consists of "technical mentoring," which can only be provided by an expert and skilled individual in a specific field of work.

What is generally missing within CWCS, as we have observed, are exactly the professional figures and resources dedicated to the first two levels of support, which, in most cases, are the most necessary.

As described above, CWCS involved in the research present very different situations in terms of the degree and quality of their networks related to migration and inclusion. These range from well-established and robust partnerships to the complete absence of direct contacts and expertise. In some cases, networks are already in place (such as the one at Millepiani) that can be implemented and reactivated; in others, it is necessary to bring together various stakeholders around specific goals within a broader network of connections (see Stonehead and Officina Municipale); and in some cases, it is essential to create operational chains - either by rebuilding former partnerships or establishing new ones - that can focus on developing specific tasks aimed at migrant integration (see the cases of Industrie Fluviali and Impact Hub).

The RES-MOVE project will address this diverse scenario. However, to maximize its impact, it should promote and catalyze a broader dynamic within the territory, involving the Roman municipality and district administrations, along with key players from civil society and the private sector. This collaboration should aim to launch a more extensive mobilization of coworking spaces within a local policy project designed to enhance inclusion opportunities in the context of immigrant and coworking relationship

REFERENCES

IDOS, 2024. *Dossier statistico immigrazione*, Idos Edizioni, Roma.

IDOS, 2024, *Osservatorio romano sulle migrazioni*, Idos Edizioni, Roma

IDOS, 2023, *Osservatorio romano sulle migrazioni*, Idos Edizioni, Roma.

ISTAT (https://demo.istat.it/app/?i=POS&l=it)

Italian Ministry of Labour, 2024. *Gli stranieri nel mercato del lavoro in Italia*, XIV Rapporto (https://www.lavoro.gov.it/documenti/xiv-rapporto-gli-stranieri-nel-mercato-del-lavoro-italia-2024)