

Facilitating evidence-based integration policies in cities – Results of Stakeholder Meeting 2, 21 February 2018

Participants: Laurent Aujean (DG Migration and Home Affairs) ● Yves Breem (OECD) ● Laura Colini (URBACT) ● Lewis Dijkstra (DG for Regional and Urban Policy) ● Anna Hakami (JRC) ● Daphne Heijdelberg (DG Migration and Home Affairs) ● Renske Hoedemaker (City of Amsterdam) ● Anne-Linde Joki (MPG) ● Theodora Manolagos (City of Vienna) ● Fabienne Montaigne (Eurostat) ● Fabrizio Natale (JRC) ● Catarina Oliveira (ACM Portugal) ● George Sarelakos (City of Athens) ● Pasi Saukkonen (City of Helsinki) ● Salvatore Sofia (Eurocities) ● Luc Vanden Berge (City of Ghent) ● Alexander Wolffhardt (MPG) ●

Key developments: Towards wider use of EU indicators and of EU instruments for analysis of immigrant integration in cities

EU integration indicators in use: experiences, local-level aspects & perspectives

(cf. presentation of Laurent Aujean)

- The EU Indicators on Integration (also known as Zaragoza Indicators, cf. Annex 1), have been developed by the Commission (DG Home, Eurostat) with the Member States in order to serve as a common frame to monitor integration over time and compare across countries. They are used notably to :
 - Inform strategic documents on integration
 - Monitoring of AMIF
 - Monitoring, coordination and reporting in the framework of the European Semester
 - Feed into the EU Report on Immigration and Integration (previously by the Commission, now by the European Migration Network)
- With an increased emphasis also within the Commission on the local and regional levels on the topic of integration, the EU and Member States need to be able to take into account the diversity of situation also on infra-national levels (in terms of size of migrant population, concentration and differences regarding integration outcomes). In this vein, recent concrete actions at EU level include:
 - Eurostat checking feasibility of publishing (EU-LFS based) indicators at infra-national level (either NUTS 2 or level of urbanisation), as part of the Urban Agenda Partnership Action;
 - Support (by DG REGIO) to OECD study¹ and database about integration at local/regional level;
 - JRC research in particular using Census data;
 - FRA analysis about the impact of the migratory situation on local communities².

¹ https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/urban-rural-and-regional-development/the-integration-of-migrants-in-oecd-regions_fb089d9a-en;jsessionid=2snt4erm6jp2u.x-oecd-live-02

² <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/current-migration-situation-local-communities-update>

- A combination of actions and efforts are required in order to be able to collect and harmonise data at the infra-national level as there is no 'golden' solution at hand. Furthermore, efforts go beyond a replication of the Zaragoza Indicators at infra-national level, as it can be argued that the Zaragoza Indicators, as they stand, could benefit from further development in terms of scope, e.g. to reflect the EU Common Basic Principle (CBP) of integration as a 'two-way process'.
- Such developments will already be seen in the 2018 OECD-European Commission “Settling In” publication. Compared to the previous edition (2015) it will include more emphasis on social inclusion indicators (e.g. attitudes, social connections, discrimination), comparison over time, gender differences and the breakdown when possible between non-EU and intra-EU immigrants.

Results of feasibility & publication of EU integration indicators at infra-national level

(cf. presentation of Fabienne Montaigne)

- Within the framework of the Action of the Urban Agenda Partnership on Inclusion of Migrant and Refugees, Eurostat has been testing the possibility of publication, to the widest possible extent, of the existing EU integration indicators on NUTS 2 level and by 'degree of urbanisation'³. The feasibility test has concentrated on fully exploiting EU Labour Force Survey (LFS) data, notably size/share of immigrant population and integration indicators such as education and employment.
- The focus on the LFS-based indicators results from the fact that the LFS (covering the resident population in private households) is often the largest household sample in a country and has been continuously collected in a harmonised way since at least 2005. The information assembled through the LFS is of high policy relevance (e.g. labour market/education) and covers 34 countries: all 28 EU Member States, 3 EFTA countries and 3 candidate countries. Migrants can currently be identified by two variables: country of birth and country of citizenship.
- Small sample sizes, in particular in countries with small overall populations and/or low shares of immigrant population groups, represent the main obstacle for depicting indicators on infra-national level. Taking into account its reliability thresholds, Eurostat aims to publish tables with a minimum of 50% cells filled in. The first phase of the feasibility has led to the recent publication of new datasets for most classic and robust indicators as part of the Eurostat migrant integration database ([employment rate regional series](#); cf. Annex 2 of this report for an overview of the results of the feasibility test). Eurostat is now preparing two “Statistics Explained” articles based on these recently published datasets, one on labour market indicators and one on employment conditions.
- Currently, infra-national statistics for Educational Attainment and Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) rates using LFS data are under validation. While infra-national breakdowns have proven not to be possible for the “Early school leavers” indicator, testing continues for the other indicators.

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/degree-of-urbanisation/background>

- Eurostat is also reflecting on additional tables at infra-national level based on LFS data:
 - with overall population figures by labour status (i.e. to depict the share of population of migrants in the overall population)
 - with more age groups (removing when necessary the breakdown by level of education)
 - and potentially presenting more detailed breakdowns for a selection of NUTS 2 regions corresponding to cities (however as there will be a lot of data gaps, these statistics will not be able to be disseminated through the traditionally used data tree)
- Eurostat will continue to carry out feasibility testing with those EU integration indicators that are based on the EU-SILC survey. However, as sample sizes are significantly smaller than for the LFS, it seems likely that results will be limited to Degree of Urbanisation. Poverty, jobless household and material deprivation are most likely to be publishable at NUTS 2 level.

Outlook: Establishment of a common framework for European statistics relating to persons and households, based on data at individual level collected from samples

- A Draft Framework Regulation⁴ is being discussed in the European Parliament and the Council for establishing a common framework for European statistics relating to persons and households, based on data at individual level collected from samples, to specify the exact topics to be covered and the technical requirements for the data collection (e.g. sample size, quality criteria and transmission requirements). This amended European Statistical System (ESS) regulation will apply to several European social surveys, including the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the European Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC).
- The initiative aims to streamline the European social statistics collected from samples and to make the data collection process more efficient and the statistical output more relevant. Discussions are ongoing for both LFS and EU-SILC.
- For LFS, precision requirements at NUTS 2 level are defined in the draft framework regulation and additional requirement in terms of weighting (in line with population register) at NUTS 2 are planned to be included in the LFS implementing act, in order to guarantee representative data at NUTS 2 level once the new framework regulation will enter into force (expected 2021). In addition, all National Statistical Institutes (NSIs) will be asked to deliver data at NUTS 3 level (it is currently done on a voluntary basis). The LFS core will include the additional variables country of Birth of parents (every year) and the respondents' main reason for migration (every second year) which are crucial for migrant integration analysis. Therefore, the new framework regulation (planned to be implemented in 2021) will provide some key improvements to be fully exploited. On the other hand, and given the protracted nature of any change to the overall regulatory framework, realistically one cannot expect further amendments in the foreseeable future beyond those currently being negotiated.

⁴ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/HIS/?uri=CELEX%3A52016PC0551>

Urban indicators on migration

(cf. presentation of Lewis Dijkstra)

- DG Regio as well is making efforts to exploit existing data to their full potential. They build on the fairly good data availability on stocks and flows at infra-national level, including annual population, births, deaths and net-migration both on NUTS 3 and NUTS 2 levels. For example, 2011 EU-wide census data allow for the combination of country of birth with education; activity status; occupation; and period of arrival (on NUTS 2 level).
- In addition, using LFS data DG Regio is testing for results both on the geographic levels of cities and functional urban areas (FUAs; including the core city and its commuting zone sending 15% of the population to the city area). Metropolitan regions represent another potential option to focus on to produce specific immigrant integration estimates (Metro regions being NUTS 3 regions approximations to FUAs with at least 250,000 inhabitants). Currently Eurostat is exploring potentials to disaggregate data for metro regions by Country of Birth.
- Efforts however, remain focused on data on stock and flows and currently do not include any of the Zaragoza Integration indicators which are rather outcome indicators. Also, DG REGIO is working with the NSIs on the basis of voluntary data provision and therefore coverage is variable across EU-MS.
- Census data users have highlighted the need and importance of geo-referenced data in developing and evaluating policy. The strength of grid data, in comparison to other comparable spatial units, is that while regional/municipal/city boundaries may change, grid data remain the same. Grids as units of analysis allow for city/municipality boundaries to be translated into a 'square' version, which allows to create a proxy for governing area at grid level in order to monitor the situation and inform policy making.
- This has led to the introduction of geo-referenced data collection to a 1km² grid as part of the 2021 EU population and housing census data collection (released 2023/2024), which will allow for the following disaggregations:
 - Population by age and sex
 - Population by country of birth/citizenship
 - Residence 12 months earlier (unchanged, within reporting country, outside of the reporting country)

Using census data to analyse integration

(cf. presentation of Fabrizio Natale)

- Already today, JRC research draws on existing census data to produce maps covering 8 countries and 45,000 local administrative units, with a detail down to street level (grids of 100m/100m). The maps are generated by harmonising and spatially processing official 2011 census statistics collected from national institutes in France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK. The maps show residential patterns of migrant communities by their nationality or the country where they were born, at the level of neighbourhoods. From the underlying data, researchers can calculate the concentration, diversity and segregation of migrants from different countries and compare these indicators within and across cities.

- Analysis of the data shows that large migrant communities tend to be more spatially dispersed than smaller migrant communities, yet have lower exposure to their host community. Concentration may also be linked to a community's history of migration, or to intrinsic socio-cultural and economic characteristics affecting the tendency of the community to maintain cohesive groups. Findings further confirm that concentration of migrants is not just an issue of big cities but also recorded in smaller cities whereas clustering of migrant communities is recorded to be a reality more in big cities than smaller cities.
- With further investigation, these kinds of observations can help authorities to design targeted policies. The data and findings can be employed by local authorities in different ways. Examples include raising awareness (indicators) for less evident cases (specific migrants' groups in small-medium size cities and specific neighbourhoods), informing how their city compares to others, whether planning and housing policies are supporting integration, and informing the targeting of funds and social inclusion policies.
- In order to maximise this potential and foster innovative policy ideas, the JRC has launched a data challenge, inviting researchers worldwide to propose research projects connecting the dataset with their area of expertise. Preliminary results from the 24 selected projects will be presented in November 2018.

Debate among city and stakeholder representatives: Key points, experiences and expectations – preliminary conclusions on the way forward

- **Reluctance to increase sample sizes, leaving cities with data gaps**
A core problem remains to be the small samples sizes used in the EU surveys and the reluctance of Member State statistical authorities to increase the number of surveyed persons. As a result of small sample sizes of the target populations of interest, but also of the stringent rules and guidelines regarding sensitive data (i.e. so that included persons are not becoming identifiable), data users lack detailed enough information on population sub-groups of interest on infra-national level. Cities report that the data at their disposal may not allow them to identify the situation of specific vulnerable groups, which in turn hinders their ability to design target-group specific policies or services, or to apply for EU funding (e.g. ESF) by invoking meaningful data. The main reason why countries are reluctant to dedicate more funds to increase samples, is that it is often very costly. NSIs have reported that due to pressure on resources, they are restricted in implementing new activities that are not subject to a clear obligation under EU legislation. However, issues of framing data collection on immigrant minorities also play a role. For example, in France there may be more support for a proposal to oversample 'vulnerable' groups in cities (which could then be employed as a proxy for immigrant populations and their children) than that oversample immigrants as such.
- **Improved European multi-level governance in development of data gathering instruments**
To overcome this core problem, improved multi-level coordination and stronger interaction between data users and -producers in the development and implementation of EU surveys seems the most promising course of action. Cities wish to be involved and informed early on, in order to work in a complementary manner with national and EU-level data efforts. For example, Finland made use of the 2014 LFS ad hoc module by ensuring that a larger sample

completes the questions as well as added questions to the eleven variables foreseen in the module. Results now being published at national level allow data also to be used on the local level. The 2021 census could be the testing ground for such increased direct communication, for cities to be consulted in advance and be involved in preparations. This could be a common initiative among cities following an initial 'call for interest' from a body such as Eurostat, in order to discuss possibilities in terms of implementation to make results more efficient for analysis on infra-national level. In this context, local level data users could work with and through their national bodies. For instance, building on its experience with the 2014 ad hoc module, Finland could contribute through a presentation to the labour market statistics working group (LAMAS, managed by Eurostat) on plans to over-sample, to make city-level analysis possible and inspire other cities. Another model of intensified coordination can be seen in DG Regio working with NSIs to focus on Functional Urban Regions (city and commuting zones), focusing on cities with larger migrant populations.

- **Full exploitation of existing possibilities**

The possibility to use EU-wide harmonised datasets (in particular, data collected through the LFS) for a selection of larger cities already exists, a promising short-term potential to be exploited. Informing work done by DG Regio, it is a source of annually updated migrant integration data without a need for increasing sample size or over-sampling. The challenge is to capture something distributed in a very asymmetrical way in terms of space (e.g. rural/urban and between/within countries), with a need to focus specially on where most people live and on where most foreign-born live. Given the sample sizes, LFS data may provide results for large cities with more than 250.000 inhabitants, while EU-SILC data may be used at least for capital cities (however one should bear in mind that capital cities tend to be atypical for all cities in a country). The key is to determine a selection of territories with high level of coverage. However, while the overall quantitative distribution of immigrant populations and the focus on 'big cities' is an important point of departure, the 'impact' that the population of interest may have in the different regions also needs to be kept in mind. A lesson e.g. from Portugal's experience, the relative size of foreign populations in comparison to the total population in a smaller territory/city can determine the most relevant and telling cases.

- **Focus on annual data rather than sporadic ad-hoc modules**

In principle, the ad hoc modules implemented as part of the annual LFS survey represent an opportunity to gather more detailed information on immigrant integration. Up to now, the 2008 and 2014 ad hoc modules dealt with the labour market situation of migrants, resulting in rich datasets and important insights. The inherent problem with the ad hoc modules, however, lies in the long time-lag between gathering of similar data, and the fact that data become outdated. In addition, the future regulatory framework (see above) will involve less flexibility in terms of suggestions from data users for topics for ad hoc modules: There will be a list of six regular modules, repeated every eight years, with an open space for another focus only every four years. The next migrant specific module is planned to occur in 2021. As conclusion for future efforts on improved European integration data, therefore, the aim should be the full exploitation of annual data, rather than striving for improved or more frequent ad hoc modules.

- **Intensified exploitation of census and administrative data**

Another long-term trend to support is to increasingly work with EU census data and draw on administrative data sources. This will both reduce costs of surveys and the burden on respondents (as too large a burden risks causing response rates to fall, and thus data quality to deteriorate). On local and regional levels, among the participants the activities of the Portuguese Migration Observatory and the City of Vienna stand out with regard to including administrative data as much as possible.
- **Using innovation potentials in multi-level settings**

Dynamics in multi-level settings in particular seem to be prone to innovation, a lesson that can be used for further EU-wide developments. In a positive example for a deliberate multi-level approach, the Portuguese Migration Observatory implements an indicator-based monitoring system (incorporating, but also going beyond the Zaragoza indicators) where the national level is taken as a starting point, followed by more focused analyses in areas of high concentration of immigrant populations. Municipalities with local action plans have been under close focus and subject to ‘diagnosis’ reports, which entailed adjusting the existing national indicators to local indicators and relying on administrative sources. A challenge has been ‘proving’ the importance of administrative sources to characterise the residents and their situation (and pressing for improving the quality of administrative sources). Surveys are nonetheless still needed, as well as adjustments in methodology in order to amplify the sample sizes. In comparison, in Greece the absence of a coherent response on national level led Athens to develop innovative methods of data collection. With private funding, an annual field survey on integration targets beneficiaries of protection themselves and collects data through a mobile phone application. It is planned to link the new database to the EU indicators. Moreover, as Athens moves from emergency response to long-term integration, the government starts to recognise the need for an improved knowledge base. In view of the efforts of the Athens coordination centre, ELISTAT will provide technical support and ensure continuity of the efforts, based on a soon to be signed Memorandum of Understanding.
- **Existing practice of, and needs for, comparison with other cities**

At this time, none of the participating cities compares their situation to other cities in the EU on integration indicators in a systematic way. Efforts at benchmarking against other cities are rather concentrated at within-country comparisons. However, there is some motivation to develop a framework that would allow for this. The desire to be able to make meaningful comparisons is particularly present for cities in neighbouring countries (e.g. Nordic countries) or among cities in countries with similar immigration histories. Some cities are already making comparisons nationally with other big cities in their country. However, in other countries integration monitoring along specifically designed integration/diversity indicators is restricted to the capital city.
- **Need for explanations of concepts and definitions**

Diverging concepts, national systems and definitions emerge as a major stumbling block for direct cross-border comparison and data-related dialogue among city experts. Clarity and transparency of definitions across countries and datasets is needed. In addition, contextual knowledge is required for meaningful exchange, as differences between Member States may be due to policy contexts and terminological particularities. Definitions are more often ideologically linked rather than technical or scientific; and statisticians are not always the

ones expert on migration and integration policies. As example for the national embeddedness of monitoring efforts, in Portugal due to constitutional limitations regarding data collection on ethnicity and administrative necessities, data is most often available by nationality and rarely by country of birth. Sensitivities regarding the colonial past also influence what can be measured, and how. In this context, the Migration Observatory has entered discussion to include new items related to race and ethnicity in the upcoming census and has set up a working group with the institute for national statistics. Last not least, full transparency of surveys would also include access to full questionnaires and data collection details, provided through knowledge management tools (cf. the COST Action presented in Working Group meeting 1).

- **Exchange as possibility to level out needs and gaps among cities**

In spite of all practical challenges, it is apparent that more exchange would benefit cities in view of the very different experiences in data collection, analysis and monitoring. Some cities have advanced data sources (combination of data from registers, household panels, surveys, administrative data) and well-established monitoring systems and therefore do not experience a 'data problem'. Nevertheless, an overabundance of information may be accompanied by limited opportunities to influence policy decision. In other instances there is restricted access to data or a lack of infrastructure to allow for data collection and systematic integration monitoring. Furthermore, cities report that the most vulnerable inhabitants are often the ones not captured within wider data sources. In all states of play, exchange between levels of governance (vertical and horizontal) and bottom-up initiative seem essential in order to identify what the city really needs.

In the debate, some concrete topics and challenges were raised, which could inform future exchange, toolbox elements and mutual learning network activities under EU programmes (e.g. under URBACT or building from the peer-to-peer learning framework employed by EUROCITIES):

- Comprehensive process designs, bringing together data collectors, statistical practitioners, migration experts and integration policy stakeholders, in order to fully reflect the reality and needs. Guidelines on data collection and 'how to' implementation guides could be made available to other cities.
- 'Intercultural' design of surveys and relevant skills of individuals collecting data, to avoid biased outcomes. Training modules for interviewers in advance of data gathering may be developed collaboratively and shared among cities.
- Internal governance and communication, to make sure that results of statistical efforts/monitoring are feeding into decision-making, are aligned with actual demand on political level, and inform integration policies and mainstreaming efforts as they are being implemented across city administrations and services.

Presentations:

(linked to dropbox folder)

1. [EU integration indicators in use: experiences, local-level aspects & perspectives](#)
(*Laurent Aujean*)
2. [Results of feasibility and publication of EU integration indicators at infra-national level](#)
(*Fabienne Montaigne*)
3. [Portugal Migration in Figures: Myths and Facts](#)
(*Catarina Reis Oliveira*)
4. [Urban indicators on migration](#)
(*Lewis Dijkstra*)
5. [Using census data to analyse integration](#)
(*Fabrizio Natale*)
6. [Existing Survey Data at \(Infra-\)National Level](#)
(*Anne-Linde Joki*)
7. [Mapping of past initiatives, networks & potential instruments](#)
(*Alexander Wolffhardt*)
8. [URBACT programme & Arrival Cities](#)
(*Laura Colini*)

Annex 1: EU Integration Indicators

Employment (LFS)

- unemployment rate
- employment rate
- activity rate
- self-employment
- temporary employment
- part-time employment
- long-term unemployment
- youth employment

Education (LFS)

- highest educational attainment
- tertiary educational attainment (share of 30–34-year-olds)
- share of early leavers from education and training
- participation in lifelong learning
- not in education, employment or training (NEET)

Social Inclusion (EU-SILC)

- median net income
- persons at risk of poverty or social exclusion
- at-risk-of-poverty rate
- child poverty
- property ownership
- housing cost overburden
- overcrowding
- in-work poverty risk
- persistent poverty risk
- severe material deprivation rate
- people living in households with very low work intensity

Health (EU-SILC)

- unmet health needs (self-reported)
- healthy life years

Active Citizenship (administrative data)

- naturalisation rate
- share of long-term residence

Annex 2: Outcome of LFS feasibility testing by Eurostat

Indicator	Infra-national level	Age Group	Sex	Status	ISCED	Country of:	
						birth	citizenship
<i>Employment rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	
<i>Employment rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		3 cl
<i>Employment rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	
<i>Employment rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		3 cl
<i>Activity rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	3 cl
<i>Activity rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		
<i>Activity rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	
<i>Activity rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		3 cl
<i>Unemployment rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64; 15-75	Y		N	3 cl	
<i>Unemployment rate</i>	NUTS 2	15-64;20-64; 15-75	Y		N		3 cl
<i>Unemployment rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64; 15-75	Y		N	3 cl	
<i>Unemployment rate</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64; 15-75	Y		N		3 cl
<i>Part-time employment</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	
<i>Part-time employment</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		3 cl
<i>Self-employment</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y	2cl	N	3 cl	
<i>Self-employment</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y	2cl	N		3 cl
<i>Temporary employees</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl	3 cl	
<i>Temporary employees</i>	DEGURBA	15-64;20-64	Y		3 cl		3 cl