Monitoring the integration of third-country nationals

European Migration Network – OECD Joint Inform
July 2024
CONTENTS

1. KEY POINTS TO NOTE ........................................................................................................ 4
2. AIM AND SCOPE OF THE INFORM .............................................................................. 4
3. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE .......................................................................................... 4
   Monitoring integration at EU level ............................................................................. 6
4. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR MONITORING THE INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS .......................................................... 6
   Definition of integration .......................................................................................... 6
   Governance of integration monitoring .................................................................... 7
5. METHODOLOGIES TO MONITOR INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS ........................................................................ 8
   Areas of integration monitoring ............................................................................. 8
   Target groups ........................................................................................................... 8
   Methodologies .......................................................................................................... 8
   Measuring opinion on integration from third-country nationals and the wider public .......................................................... 9
   Specific integration surveys targeting third-country nationals and the wider public ......................................................... 9
   Policy impact of integration monitoring ................................................................ 9
6. CHALLENGES AND GOOD PRACTICES IN MONITORING INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS .................................................. 10
   Challenges .............................................................................................................. 10
   Good practices ........................................................................................................ 10
1. KEY POINTS TO NOTE

- Most European Migration Network (EMN) Member and Observer Countries define integration in their society in accordance with the European Union (EU) definition, meaning that integration is defined as a two-way process involving both immigrants and residents in the host country.

- Most EMN Member and Observer Countries institute integration monitoring policies and strategies at national level. Led by ministries and state agencies, integration monitoring policies focus primarily on: a) establishing the methods and actors for monitoring integration at national, regional and/or local level, and b) defining sets of indicators and processes to monitor integration. In practice, integration monitoring regularly engages regional and local actors involved in day-to-day integration management, who contribute to data collection and data-sharing with national bodies.

- Public administrations are the main providers of data used to monitor integration, with education, employment, housing, health, social benefits, national language literacy and civic participation the most frequently monitored areas. These indicators are used to monitor a variety of immigrant groups, which are defined along the lines of (EU/non-EU) nationality, region or country of origin, or international protection status.

- Nearly half of the EMN Member and Observer Countries produce surveys targeting the immigrant population and/or the wider population, often alongside the use of administrative data, with the aim of monitoring integration outcomes or informing integration strategies.

- The common structural challenges faced by public administrations and statistical institutes can impact integration monitoring. For example, EMN Member and Observer Countries have experienced challenges in using administrative data in integration monitoring, notably the completeness of foreign nationals’ records in national registries or a lack of detail in administrative records more broadly. Certain groups of foreign nationals, such as recent arrivals, are more difficult to contact for surveys, due to cultural/linguistic barriers, potentially lower trust in public institutions, and higher geographical mobility, which can lead to biased results in integration monitoring. Countries using surveys also face comparability issues where different surveys use different definitions or levels of disaggregation.

- Measures to increase engagement with foreign-born populations have been highlighted as good practices in integration monitoring. For example, the ‘one-stop shop’ model providing individuals with in-person administrative services for the purposes of integration has proven useful in providing information to researchers and policymakers on the needs of these populations and in monitoring the progress of integration policies. Some EMN Member and Observer Countries carry out integration monitoring not only for foreign-born individuals, but also their native-born descendants, who may experience similar challenges. They highlight the centralisation of integration monitoring results and indicators in public-access databases, as well as the promotion of comparative approaches to integration monitoring.

2. AIM AND SCOPE OF THE INFORM

This joint EMN-Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) inform presents an overview of policies and state-led practices designed to monitor the integration of third-country nationals and compares relevant national legislation in each EMN Member and Observer Country. It also analyses the outcomes of integration monitoring policies in EMN Member and Observer Countries and provides examples of challenges and good practices in integration monitoring. The analysis was prepared on the basis of contributions from 26 EMN Member and Observer Countries.

3. CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Approximately 24 million non-EU nationals lived in the EU in 2022, making up 5.3% of its total population. According to Eurostat, the number of immigrants coming in the EU in 2022, making up 5.3% of its total population.

1 Any person who is not a citizen of the European Union within the meaning of Article 20(1) of the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union] TFEU and who is not a person enjoying the European Union right to free movement, as defined in Article 2(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/399 (Schengen Borders Code).

2 AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LU, LV, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK and ME, RS.

3 Some of the monitoring instruments covered by the initiatives and instruments reported in this inform may include foreign-born people or descendants of foreign-born people who have either host-country nationality or nationality of an EU country.


their integration outcomes often lag well behind those of EU and host-country nationals. As a result, the integration of third-country nationals remains at the top of the political agenda at both national and supranational levels, and its importance has been acknowledged through various EU policy documents.

While competences related to migrant integration lie primarily with the Member States, the EU can establish measures to incentivise and support Member States to enhance the integration of third-country nationals residing legally in their territories. In 2004, the Council of the European Union issued the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU, stressing the integration of migrants as a critical aspect of migration management. The Common Basic Principles also defined the EU’s interest in contributing to maintaining and developing EU Member State societies defined by a spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation, in which newcomers feel welcome. A similar sentiment was repeated in the European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in 2011, which emphasised the EU’s commitment to continue enhancing integration measures to maximise migrants’ contribution to economic growth and the cultural richness of the EU. The European Agenda on Migration (2015) then reiterated the need for effective integration policies for third-country nationals in the EU. Accordingly, the European Commission prepared two Action Plans on the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, in 2016 and in 2020, designed to support actions by national governments, local authorities, and civil society engaged in the process of fostering migrant integration in the EU.

The EU has no legislative competence in the area of integration, thus Member States’ own migratory contexts and policies continue to shape their assumptions (e.g., what does integration mean and who should be integrated) and strategy on the integration of third-country nationals.

Nevertheless, the EU legislative framework provides safeguards in the areas of access to employment, education, and social assistance, promoting equal treatment and benefiting integration into European society. A recent Special Eurobarometer looking at EU Member States’ integration measures found that Europeans have contrasting views on the success of integration in their countries. While 42% perceive integration to be successful, 47% consider it unsuccessful. However, as this Special Eurobarometer and the recent joint OECD-EU report show, perceptions – notably on the evolution of outcomes – are often at odds with actual developments in integration.

The EMN has investigated the topic of integration in several studies and informs over the past five years. The 2019 EMN study on the labour market integration of third-country nationals in EU Member States found that many national integration policies “have a two-fold objective: on the one hand, to manage the effects of migration, on the other, to welcome newly arrived third-country nationals and provide for their smooth transition into the host society.” The 2020 EMN study on the integration of migrant women reiterated that in the majority of EU Member States, competences are shared between national, regional and local levels, highlighting the importance of involving municipalities, regions, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the implementation of integration policies.

Nevertheless, the EMN has not carried out research that specifically focuses on whether and how EMN Member and Observer Countries define, benchmark and monitor the integration of third-country nationals. As reflected in the Action Plan on Integration and Inclusion 2021–2027, there is a need for comparability between Member States on their integration policies. Under this objective, the 2010 Zaragoza Declaration has provided a common set of indicators for monitoring the results of integration.
policies in four areas: employment, education, social inclusion, and active citizenship.19

Monitoring integration at EU level

This joint inform complements related work by the European Commission and the OECD on integration monitoring: the Special Eurobarometer survey on the integration of immigrants in the EU examined public opinion on the integration of immigrants in the EU and established findings on the perception of the effectiveness of the integration process, its necessity, and the role of government.20 Eurostat uses the set of indicators in the Zaragoza Declaration and has also identified and established further indicators, accessible in its dedicated database on migrant integration21 and outlined in the 2013 report, ‘Using EU indicators of immigrant integration’.22 That report considers the characteristics of the immigrant population, the general context in the country and national integration policies in relation to social integration outcomes in areas covered by the Zaragoza indicators, such as employment rate, educational attainment, net income, and naturalisation rate, which are grouped into four policy areas (i.e. employment, education, social inclusion, active citizenship). Such contextual information is also considered in the joint OECD-EU ‘Settling In’ report, which provides for regular monitoring of characteristics and integration outcomes of third-country nationals across all EU countries and non-EU European OECD countries.23 A third joint edition was published in June 2023, following previous editions in 2018 and 2015. Current characteristics and outcomes are presented, as well as their evolution over time, together with an interactive data portal.24 Alongside its database on integration, Eurostat is actively working with similar indicators for the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) and the EU Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), both of which deal with policy issues aligned with those under migrant integration.

4 LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR MONITORING THE INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS

Definition of integration

Any measurement of integration should be based on a clear definition. Most EMN Member and Observer Countries provide a definition of integration, usually set out in legal,25 policy26 or strategic27 documents at national28 and/or regional29 level. Many use definitions of integration that are aligned with the EU definition,30 i.e. integration is identified as a two-way process involving both immigrants and residents of EU Member States.31 In Cyprus,32 Italy, Luxembourg33 and the Netherlands, integration is defined as part of an overarching commitment to multiculturalism or interculturalism. Germany, Italy, Lithuania and the Netherlands all state that integration is aimed at reducing social inequality, vulnerability, exploitation, and discrimination of persons undergoing integration.

Some definitions also involve participation in social and/or civic activities within the host society.34 The Netherlands35 and the Flemish Community in Belgium36 both define integration with two separate concepts: ‘integration’ (‘integratie’) is understood as the building and maintaining of a relationship between the individual and society, where the associated rights and obligations are guaranteed and respected by all parties; and ‘civic integration’ (‘inburgering’) refers to a structured process whereby the government offers a tailored programme to certain foreigners through a contract between individual and state.37 Other EMN Member and Observer Countries have definitions of integration that go beyond the EU definition. In Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia, for example, integration

22 Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2023: Setting In | en | OECD, The OECD also proposes to its member countries short country reports on the state of immigrant integration, building on ‘Setting In’ and other data. Such studies are underway for AT, DK, DE, FI, IT, SE.
23 Interactive data portal, bit.ly/oecd-eu-integration-indicators-2023-data, last accessed on 6 April 2024.
24 Definition set out in law: AT, ES, FI, HR, LU, LV, and MS.
25 Definition set out in policy documents: BE (Flemish Community: based on a regional decree; Wallonia: based on a regional ordinance; German-speaking Community: based on a regional decree), DE, IT, LT, NL, SE.
26 Definition set out in strategic documents: BG, CZ, EE, EL, IE, SK.
27 AT, BG, CZ, DE, EE, ES, FI, HR, IT, LT, LU, NL, SE, SK, and ME, RS.
28 AT, BE, ES.
30 AT, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, IT, LT, LU, SK; other countries without legal definitions of integration have a conceptualisation of integration that is aligned with the EU definitions.
31 CY, ES.
33 AT, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, IT, LT, LU, SK; other countries without legal definitions of integration have a conceptualisation of integration that is aligned with the EU definitions.
34 The Netherlands35 and the Flemish Community in Belgium36 both define integration with two separate concepts: ‘integration’ (‘integratie’) is understood as the building and maintaining of a relationship between the individual and society, where the associated rights and obligations are guaranteed and respected by all parties; and ‘civic integration’ (‘inburgering’) refers to a structured process whereby the government offers a tailored programme to certain foreigners through a contract between individual and state.37 Other EMN Member and Observer Countries have definitions of integration that go beyond the EU definition. In Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia, for example, integration...
is understood as specifically for people in receipt of international or subsidiary protection.

The remaining eight EMN Member and Observer Countries do not set out a definition in law, but instead conceptualise integration in policy or strategic documents. In several cases, integration relates to the policy objectives laid out in national integration strategies. Although there is no legal definition of integration in France, there is a dedicated chapter on measures for integration in the French Code of entry and stay of foreign nationals and right to asylum (CESEDA). In Estonia, the Cohesive Estonia Strategy 2030 explains the concept of an integrated and cohesive society, emphasising mutual acceptance, a sense of belonging, participation, cooperation, and democratically achieving common goals for all people. While Estonian identity, language, and culture are seen as the foundation of an integrated and cohesive society, an integrated society is recognised as including all other languages, cultures, and ethnicities, and people’s treatment does not depend on their gender, age, special needs or disabilities, racial or ethnic background, sexual orientation, marital status, or place of residence.

No legal definition of integration exists in Portugal, but integration is seen as a multidimensional phenomenon. Accordingly, the ‘common integration indicators’ designed in the European context and integrated by Portuguese authorities cover four main areas: (1) employment, (2) education, (3) social inclusion, and (4) active citizenship. Portugal uses the indicators to increase comparability and validate the results of integration policies and has strategies in place to increase integration in each area. In Cyprus, integration is conceptualised as a social process based on migrants’ responsibility to respect local and European norms and values, and on the host society’s commitment to ensure access to basic needs such as employment, education, and public or private goods and services.

**Governance of integration monitoring**

Over half (16) of the responding EMN Member and Observer Countries have a policy or strategy at national level to monitor the integration of third-country nationals. National policies on monitoring integration typically relate to:

- Establishing methods (and actors) for monitoring integration at national, regional and/or local level;
- Defining sets of indicators and processes to monitor integration.

In an additional seven countries, integration monitoring is practised without an explicitly formulated policy or strategy at national level. Three countries do not have any policy or strategy to monitor the integration of third-country nationals.

In many EMN Member and Observer Countries, integration monitoring systems function under the leadership of institutions (ministries or agencies) at national level. Ministries spearheading integration monitoring are typically those in charge of integration policy, such as Ministries of the Interior (and/or Ministries for Migration), Ministries for Social Affairs or Cultural Affairs, or the prime minister/federal chancellery or a combination thereof. In 10 EMN Member and Observer Countries, national statistical institutes play a role in integration monitoring, most often in the design and implementation of surveys or in more overarching data collection or analysis. While the French and Dutch statistical institutes generate data through large survey operations, Statistics Austria and Statistics Flanders (Belgium) analyse existing data.

The integration of third-country nationals is often supported at regional and local level. In nine EMN Member and Observer Countries where regional and municipal entities are involved in national integration policy, these entities also play a role in integration monitoring by collecting and sharing data with the relevant authorities. Two EMN Member and Observer Countries have ‘horizontal’ integration monitoring structures, where monitoring is primarily conducted at regional level.

---

38 BE-Flemish Community: regional decree; BE-Wallonia: regional ordinance; BE-German-speaking Community: regional decree).
39 BG, CZ, EE, EL, IE, SK.
40 BG, CY, CZ, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, LV, NL, PT, SE and ME; EE has a national strategy in place for integration monitoring, but does not track the integration of third-country nationals, instead focusing on individuals with different nationalities and primary languages; FI integration monitoring focuses on people with migratory backgrounds (third-country/EU/European Economic Area (EEA)), irrespective of their current nationality; SE integration monitoring focuses on all foreign nationals; in LU, the integration process is a mainstream policy and applies to any foreigner within the territory, implying EU and EEA citizens as well as third-country nationals; IT lacks a unified overarching strategy, but has several multi-level national strategies for monitoring the integration of third-country nationals, such as national plans targeting different groups/sectors, regional/local observatories and periodic reports.
41 AT, BG, CY, CZ, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, LV, NL, PT, SE and ME; EE has a national strategy in place for integration monitoring, but does not track the integration of third-country nationals, instead focusing on individuals with different nationalities and primary languages; FI integration monitoring focuses on people with migratory backgrounds (third-country/EU/European Economic Area (EEA)), irrespective of their current nationality; SE integration monitoring focuses on all foreign nationals; in LU, the integration process is a mainstream policy and applies to any foreigner within the territory, implying EU and EEA citizens as well as third-country nationals; IT lacks a unified overarching strategy, but has several multi-level national strategies for monitoring the integration of third-country nationals, such as national plans targeting different groups/sectors, regional/local observatories and periodic reports.
42 AT, CY, FI, FR, IT, PT, SE.
43 AT, CY, CZ, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, PT, SI; LV does not have an explicit integration monitoring policy, but has a set of indicators formulated at national level; LT is preparing a new data management and exchange framework for legal migration and beneficiaries of international protection, which is expected to result in the significant integration of data collection and monitoring into its system.
44 DE, HR, IE, SK and RS; in BE, policies and strategies to monitor integration are set at regional level, as integration is the competence of the Communities; HR developed a set of indicators as part of the project ‘INCLuDE - Interdepartmental cooperation in the empowerment of citizens of Third countries’, co-financed by the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF).
45 LT, LU, NL, SK; in LU, ad hoc research and studies on the integration process of specific populations or to assess the integration measures are conducted at national level (financed by national or European funds).
46 AT, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FI, FR, HR, IE, IT, LT, LV, NL, PT, PL, SE, SK and ME, RS.
47 CY, CZ, EL, FR, IT and ME.
48 IE, IT, LT, NL, PL, SK.
49 EE, LV.
50 AT, DE.
51 BG, CY, FR, IE, IT.
52 AT, BG, DE, ES, FI, FR, IE, IT, LT, NL; in BE and ES, integration monitoring also involves regional statistical institutes.
53 CY, DE, ES, FR, IT, PL, PT, SE, SK.
54 IT, PT, SE.
55 BE, DE.
5. METHODOLOGIES TO MONITOR INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS

Areas of integration monitoring

EMN Member and Observer Countries monitor the integration of third-country nationals through data collected from their competent authorities. The most frequently monitored areas of integration are: (adult) education, employment/labour market, housing, health, social benefits, national language literacy, and civic participation. Estonia monitors integration on the basis of individuals’ sense of self-identification with its national identity, while three others measure the extent of discrimination against third-country nationals.

Target groups

As part of integration monitoring activities, EMN Member and Observer Countries define specific groups as the objects of data collection and policy-making. This section describes the groups and sub-groups identified by EMN Member and Observer Countries, across all types of integration monitoring activities. It includes disaggregation of statistical data collected at national or regional level, sampling decisions when using survey methodologies, or indeed the absence of such sub-groups.

Seven countries target third-country nationals as a whole, while 15 target specific groups and sub-groups for monitoring. Seven countries designate on a geographical basis: groups included in the monitoring are seen either in broad groups by geographical origin, or by the most common third-country nationalities within the country’s territory. Finally, seven countries identify people under international protection as a specific group to monitor, either for statistical reasons or because their integration monitoring systems are based on case management of individuals granted international protection. Spain and Montenegro pay special attention to certain defined ‘vulnerable groups’, including “unaccompanied women, unaccompanied children, persons with disabilities, persons who have suffered from any form of violence.” Five Member States have not determined any specific groups as the target of integration monitoring.

When interpreting the results of integration monitoring and drawing conclusions about integration outcomes, data are commonly compared with the native-born population. This means determining how the position of people with a migration background corresponds to the position of a comparable group (in terms of characteristics) from the total population or the position of people without a migration background. This approach was reported as widespread methodological practice.

Methodologies

In most EMN Member and Observer Countries, administrative data are used to monitor integration. Data are collected from various public entities, including ministries, agencies and local or regional authorities, as those typically dealing with the key aspects of integration, such as housing, education, employment, language literacy, and civic participation. Integration monitoring activities are often based on existing statistical information in these areas, with additional disaggregation to analyse data at the level of third-country nationals. These indicators are then used in comparison with the native-born population or host-country citizens to determine differences between the two groups.

Source: Information from EMN National Contact Points (EMN NCPs) in August 2023.

Figure 1: Overview of methods used by Member States in integration monitoring

Data collection method
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Source: Information from EMN National Contact Points (EMN NCPs) in August 2023.
Seven countries use data from their education systems (schools) to monitor specific education indicators, such as academic results or attainment rates (primary, secondary, or higher education) or the ethnic background of the young people enrolled.\(^75\) Six countries gather data from various public institutions on indicators related to labour participation, employment and other labour market outcomes.\(^76\)

EMN Member and Observer Countries that base their integration monitoring (at least partially) on individual case management extract data from these procedures and aggregate it to be used as statistical indicators. Personal integration plans are themselves often based on a set of indicators. Individual progress on these indicators is also collected and used at an aggregate level to measure integration in France, Italy, Poland, Montenegro and Serbia.

Surveys are a major data collection tool used for the purpose of integration monitoring, conducted at biannual, annual, or multiannual frequencies.\(^77\) They can target the general population, third-country nationals specifically, or smaller groups, such as specific nationality groups. While the majority of EMN Member and Observer Countries rely primarily on administrative data, several use these in combination with survey data, usually led by their national statistical institutes. In Ireland and Estonia, integration monitoring is based primarily on surveys.\(^78\)

**Measuring opinion on integration from third-country nationals and the wider public**

Only a minority of countries collect views from third-country nationals on their own integration process or integration at large.\(^79\) Where this occurs, it is most often through surveys\(^80\) or other consultation techniques, such as semi-structured interviews\(^81\) and/or meetings with migrant organisations for the purpose of assessing integration outcomes\(^82\) or to inform integration strategy.\(^83\)

For those countries that operate the integration monitoring process through case work (at least in part), collecting feedback from third-country nationals on the integration process is often done through the existing relationship between case workers and their clients.\(^84\)

Nearly half of the EMN Member and Observer Countries collect data on public opinion of integration of third-country nationals,\(^85\) again, primarily through surveys, although exceptions exist.\(^86\) The Estonian government runs the Public Opinion Survey of Internal Security among the wider population to gauge public views on different aspects of internal security, including future integration prospects.\(^87\)

As part of its integration indicators, Austria surveys a random sample of people born in Austria (drawn from the Central Register of Residents) about their subjective assessment of the integration process every year.

**Specific integration surveys targeting third-country nationals and the wider public**

Several countries run specific surveys for migrants.\(^88\) Finland’s *FinMonik/MoniSuomi* is a large survey consisting of questions on multiple themes under the umbrella of the health and well-being of the foreign-born population. The Netherlands’ Survey on the Integration of Migrants (SIM) gains insight into the integration of migrant groups by asking a comparison group of native Dutch people about education, work, social contacts, cultural integration, religion, representation, health, and sport.\(^89\) Estonia’s Integration Monitoring Survey analyses integration and adaptation processes in society. It targets both nationals and foreigners, and since 2017, contains a separate chapter on the adaptation of newly arrived immigrants who have lived in Estonia for up to five years. In Belgium’s Flemish Community, the Living Together Barometer, Living Together in Diversity, and the Municipality and City Monitor all gather data from migrants.

**Policy impact of integration monitoring**

Twelve EMN Member and Observer Countries reported that their monitoring activities have informed policy changes.\(^90\) In most cases, the monitoring results were used to build new or updated current programmes and strategies focused on integration.

In Germany, the integration monitoring reports of the federal states are regularly included in the consultations of the Conference of Integration Ministers. At federal and municipal level, there is often a link between integration monitoring and integration policy concepts. In Sweden, the national budgetary process is the main vector for this process, with monitoring of integration policy forming part of the national government’s yearly budget process. Several indicators are monitored and assessed – public agencies receive instructions for the monitoring of their policy area, including how and when it should be reported to the government, in their annual appropriation directives and through special assignments.

Estonia, the Netherlands and Serbia all note that the current integration strategy was significantly impacted by the results of integration monitoring in the previous

---

75 BE, HR, IE, NL, PL, PT, SE.
76 BE, FR, IT, LT, NL, SE.
77 Surveys used in AT, BE, EE, ES, FI, FR, HR, IE, NL, PT and RS.
78 IE uses national household surveys, which generate information and solicit populations relevant to integration monitoring, but are not administered solely for this purpose.
79 AT, BE, EE, FI, FR, HR, IE, NL, PT, SE.
80 AT, BE, EE, FI, FR, NL use surveys to measure the views of third-country nationals on the integration process.
81 ES, HR in HR, qualitative research was conducted using a convenience, non-probability social inclusion sample of people granted international protection, comprising 10 individuals (four women and six men). Interviews were in English and Croatian, with people under international protection from Turkey, Iraq and Syria.
82 EE, ES, IT, PT, SE.
83 EE, IE.
84 Collecting feedback from third-country nationals as part of case work is done on a systematic (FR, IT) or ad hoc (ME, RS) basis.
85 AT, BE, CZ, EE, ES, FI, NL, PT and ME, RS.
86 In RS, a press clipping service regularly analyses public opinion through media-based monitoring.
87 These metrics are measured as a percentage of people who are familiar with the rules that apply to third-country nationals to settling in EE.
88 BE, DE, EE, FI, NL.
89 In BE-Flemish Community, the ‘Survey Living Together in Diversity’ has the same purpose and a similar content.
90 BE, DE, EE, FI, FR, IE, LV, NL, PT, SE and ME, RS.
6. CHALLENGES AND GOOD PRACTICES IN MONITORING INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS

Challenges

EMN Member and Observer Countries highlight several challenges in the use of administrative and survey data to monitor integration. Estonia and Sweden have experienced difficulties with administrative data because of incomplete entries in the records of foreign nationals in their registries, which occurred more frequently than in records of nationals.94 This may lead to biases in the reporting of outcomes and characteristics. In Slovenia, problems with interoperability occur when processing a wide variety of data held in the records of various ministries and other competent authorities. In Ireland, administrative data are not detailed enough to be used to monitor integration outcomes: the lack of an official population register and the fact that non-EU migrants are only required to register after the age of 16 means that many migrants are not counted regularly. In addition to a census conducted every five years, Ireland relies primarily on survey data and estimates from civil society organisations to monitor integration. Data protection legislation has also been identified as posing issues. In Estonia and in Belgium-Flemish Community, obtaining permission from the data protection authorities to process personal data for the purpose of monitoring was reported to be time-consuming and complex.95

EMN Member and Observer Countries that monitor integration using survey data experience challenges with data availability and comparability, as well as practical challenges.96 Certain factors influence the ability of institutions conducting surveys to contact and gather data from migrant communities. The Swedish authorities note that foreign nationals, including those outside Europe, generally respond to surveys to a lower degree than people born in Sweden. This is a common challenge caused by language and cultural barriers, lower trust and higher mobility, and can lead to biased results, as groups with difficulties are less likely to be covered by the survey. In Poland, the authorities report high geographical mobility for evaluating public policy and identifying areas where intervention is most needed, as well as highlighting the importance of migration for Portugal.97 In Ireland, findings from integration monitoring are used to develop the next integration strategy, which is currently underway.

Other EMN Member and Observer Countries reported that integration monitoring results are a regular feature of meetings and discussions among political leadership.98

Good practices

Eighteen EMN Member and Observer Countries offered examples of good practices, both methodological and organisational, in various aspects of the monitoring process.98

In France, the collection of surveys specific to immigrant populations, led by the French National Statistical Institute, is considered good practice. One such survey, the Long-Term Survey on Integration of Newcomers (’Elipa’ survey) is seen as invaluable in assessing and analysing the integration pathways of newly arrived immigrants. It has had three iterations (2019, 2020 and 2022) and is based on a panel of 6,500 foreign nationals issued a first residence permit of at least one year in 2018. It gives in-depth information on their migratory pathway, progress in the French language, skill and education levels, integration into the French labour market, and physical and mental health.

In Belgium-Flemish Community, public access to the results of integration monitoring activities (specifically, the
Living Together in Diversity survey and the Barometer Living Together dashboard is seen as a good practice. These platforms evaluate the temperature of and evolutions in diversity in society. They allow policymakers to take targeted policy measures and implement evidence-based policies. In Finland, the centralisation of indicators and data collection in a single Integration Indicator Database is considered a good practice.\(^9^9\)

The Netherlands notes the importance of monitoring of integration beyond people who are foreign-born, as their children (born in the Netherlands) might also have to deal with disadvantages and discrimination and are therefore part of the monitoring of integration. Indeed, many countries, including Estonia, Germany, and Spain, include native-born direct descendants of immigrants in their monitoring. The Netherlands has a longstanding survey that allows for monitoring of changes over time.

Portugal recommends having “a dedicated and well-established team which works on a permanent basis to gather and process as much data as possible from distinct sources”. The Observatory on Migration (OM) is responsible for collecting, systematising and analysing statistical and administrative data from national and international sources, particularly indicators on integration of immigrants and refugees. This improves the collection and dissemination of official statistical data on migratory flows by consolidating data collection or complementary information not directly accessible.

**Box 1: One-stop shops for third-country nationals**

Latvia and Portugal have implemented so-called one-stop shops where migrants obtain access to integration-related services. These one-stop-shops contribute to integration monitoring by providing information on third-country nationals’ needs, data on those assisted, and the type of services provided.

In Latvia, a one-stop shop\(^1^0^1\) provides information and access to support for third-country nationals. It offers individual face-to-face and online consultations on the admission of third-country nationals, residence conditions, social protection, employment, the tax system, education, health, housing, etc. in Latvian, English and Russian (with an interpreter if necessary). The responsibilities of the one-stop shop include the regular exchange of information with the state administration, municipalities, the private sector, universities, NGOs and other institutions and organisations involved in the integration of citizens of third countries, promoting cooperation, and improving the process of socioeconomic inclusion of third-country nationals. In this context, they help to provide information on third-country nationals’ needs, requests and other types of help, facilitating adjustments to the integration process. Portugal’s one-stop-shop, through its network of services responding to the needs of migrant citizens and refugees,\(^1^0^2\) brings together information offices specialised in employment, social responses (including victim support offices, mainly for domestic violence), documentation and regularisation, as well as counters providing essential services such as social security, tax authorities, and registrations and notaries. Local Support Centres for the Integration of Migrants (CLAIMS) continue to provide responses in an integrated way with National Support Centres for the Integration of Migrants (CNAIMS) for responses at local level. Since the establishment of AIMA in 2023, CNAIMS have become ‘AIMA shops’,\(^1^0^3\) with 34 across the Portuguese territory, including the autonomous regions of Azores and Madeira. Both CNAIMS and CLAIMS permanently collect data on the services provided and migrant citizens supported.

---

99. The Living Together in Diversity website contains the results of the Living Together in Diversity survey, by domain, such as education, social contacts and housing, and by indicator. It also provides a summary by domain and allows a comparison between 2017 and 2022 results, https://www.samenleven.be/dashboard, last accessed on 22 September 2023; the Barometer Living Together website depicts eight objectives of living together in diversity, such as labour participation, educational participation and connectedness. For each objective, it shows in the direction of evolution (positive change, negative change or no change), www.barometersamenleven.be, last accessed on 22 September 2023.

100. FI authorities highlight the extensiveness of the base of indicators, as well as the systematic nature of the data collection, https://kotoutuminen.fi/en/integration-indicators-database, last accessed on 24 February 2024.


102. Since 2004, there have been four CNAIMS and, at local level, 158 CLAIMs, created to respond to different difficulties experienced by migrants in their integration process.

For more information

EMN website: http://ec.europa.eu/emn
EMN LinkedIn page: https://www.linkedin.com/company/european-migration-network
EMN Twitter account: https://twitter.com/emnmigration
EMN YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/@EMNMigration

EMN National Contact Points

Austria www.emn.at/en/
Belgium www.emnbelgium.be/
Bulgaria www.emn-bg.com/
Croatia emn.gov.hr/
Czechia www.emnncz.eu/
Estonia www.emn.ee/
Finland emn.fi/en/
France www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/
Europe-et-International/Le-reseau-euro-
edes-migrations-REM3/Le-reseau-europ-
edes-migrations-REM2
Germany www.bamf.de/EN/Themen/EMN/emn-
node.html
Greece emn.immigration.gov.gr/en/
Hungary www.emnhungary.hu/en
Ireland www.emn.ie/
Italy www.emnitalyncp.it/
Latvia www.emn.lv
Lithuania www.emn.lt/
Luxembourg emnluxembourg.uni.lu/
Malta emn.gov.mt/
The Netherlands www.emnnetherlands.nl/
Poland www.gov.pl/web/european-migra-
tion-network
Portugal rem.sef.pt/en/
Romania www.mai.gov.ro/
Spain www.emnspain.gob.es/en/home
Slovak Republic www.emn.sk/en
Slovenia www.gov.si/
Sweden www.emnsweden.se/
european-migration-network---norway#
Georgia migration.commission.ge/
Republic of Moldova bma.gov.md/en
Ukraine dmsu.gov.ua/en-home.html
Montenegro www.gov.me/mup
Armenia migration.am/?lang=en
Serbia kirs.gov.rs/eng