

The social and employment dimensions of the EU's Lisbon strategy for growth and jobs

What are the opportunities for monitoring and improving the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities?



european network against racism

Author: Mary-Anne Kate, Migration Policy Group



Published by the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) in Brussels, in November 2009, with the financial support of the European Commission (DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities).



ENAR reserves the right not to be responsible for the accuracy, completeness or quality of the information provided in this report. Liability claims regarding damage caused by the use of any information provided, including any information which is incomplete or incorrect, will therefore be rejected.

Layout and printing by Crossmark.

Table of contents

Summary of key recommendations	2
Introduction	3
1. The EU Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs.....	5
1.1. The Lisbon Strategy.....	5
1.2. The Lisbon framework	5
1.3. The Lisbon OMC	6
1.4. Inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities	7
1.5. Monitoring progress in implementing the Lisbon Strategy	8
1.6. Conclusions and recommendations.....	12
2. Data options for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities	13
2.1. Migration data.....	13
2.2. Ethnic, religious and racial minorities	17
2.3. EU guidance on reporting on the national social situation of migrants and ethnic minorities	18
2.4. Conclusions and recommendations.....	19
3. The European Employment Strategy	20
3.1. The framework for cooperation	20
3.2. Monitoring in the EES	20
3.3. What opportunities exist for better monitoring?	22
3.4. National Reform Programmes	25
3.5. Proposal to the broad consultation on the Lisbon post-2010 strategy	26
3.6. Conclusions and recommendations.....	26
4. The Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy	28
4.1 European framework for cooperation on social inclusion	28
4.2 Migrants and ethnic minorities as a target group.....	29
4.3. Monitoring progress in the Social OMC.....	29
4.4 Options for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities	30
4.5. National Action Plans on Social Inclusion.....	32
4.6. Conclusions and recommendations.....	32
Annex A: The inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Reform Programmes.....	34
Annex B: The inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Action Plans on Social Inclusion	38
Selected bibliography	41

Summary of key recommendations

The purpose of this publication is to examine the social and employment dimensions of the Lisbon Strategy in order to establish the extent to which the situation of migrants, ethnic minorities and others vulnerable to racism is taken into account in European and national strategies, with a view to identifying advocacy strategies for anti-racist civil society organisations to ensure that this issue is given the attention it requires.

The publication confirms that monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is one of the most effective ways for ensuring that the Lisbon strategy improves the socio-economic life of migrants and ethnic minorities. The Lisbon strategy uses indicators, targets and benchmarks to focus the attention of Member States and to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy. To a limited degree there are indicators to monitor the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. The publication assesses whether existing monitoring, particularly in relation to migrants and ethnic minorities, is effective and suggests options for addressing the limitations identified. A number of recommendations are made to ensure the Lisbon Strategy addresses the situation of ethnic minorities, which are summarised below.

Lisbon Strategy

With regard to the Lisbon Strategy as a whole, there appears to be a disconnection between the economic pillar and the social pillar in their respective approaches to migrants and ethnic minorities. In the economic pillar the attention is on future labour migrants, who are presented as the panacea to labour market shortages and skills gaps. Yet migrants and ethnic minorities residing in Member States are targeted in the context of them being a disadvantaged group with little or no recognition given to their skills and attributes and aspirations. In addition, there also appears to be a disconnection between the Integrated Guidelines, which refer to migrants and ethnic minorities, and the development of structural indicators and targets to implement these. None of the structural indicators used for monitoring the implementation of the Lisbon strategy capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities.

- Relevant headline indicators, such as the employment rate, educational attainment and the at-risk-of-poverty rate should be disaggregated on migration-related grounds.

- Social policies and outcomes should be benchmarked against countries with high levels of equality and social cohesion rather than ‘the world’s greatest economies’.
- The LIME Assessment Framework should be used as a tool for assessing the economic impact of migration and integration. The information it provides has the potential to put migration and integration firmly on national and EU agendas as it demonstrates the importance of sound migration policies and the need for comprehensive efforts to increase labour market and educational outcomes for migrants.

Data options for monitoring the socio-economic situation of migrants and ethnic minorities

The lack of data being collected directly about migrants and ethnic minorities makes monitoring their socio-economic situation difficult. This is an issue that needs to be addressed at the EU level.

- The 2008 Labour Force Survey ad hoc module should be used to the fullest extent to examine the socio-economic outcomes of migrants and their descendants. Member States should also be encouraged to retain the questions used in this ad hoc module in their annual surveys.
- In monitoring the implementation of Lisbon, the annual Labour Force Survey and the EU-SILC should be used to examine the situation of newcomers, long-term residents, migrants who have naturalised and the children of migrants. The idea of using country of birth as a proxy for examining ethnic, racial and religious background should also be explored further.
- Member States that collect similar national data on migrants and ethnic minorities (for example on the Roma) should be encouraged to share information in an effort to engage in mutual learning and identify best practice.

European Employment Strategy (EES)

The Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs are the single most important instrument in influencing policy developments in Member States. There also appears to be a high correlation between the priorities and work of Member States and EES targets and the ‘European Benchmarks’ in

education and training. However, with the exception of a few Member States, indicators appear to have little or no impact on priority setting or monitoring.

- Relevant targets and indicators, including those measuring progress against the European Benchmarks 2020, should be disaggregated on migration-related grounds and data that is already available, including from the LFS ad hoc module and the LIME Analytical Framework, should be used.
- Member States should secure the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in the relevant Guidelines to ensure Lisbon is responsive to their situation. For example, given the work being done on migrant and ethnic entrepreneurship at the national level, this should be included as a strategy in implementing Guideline 17.
- The issue of ethnic entrepreneurship, undocumented migrants in the informal economy, and the need to reduce early school leaving should be included in the revised Integrated Guidelines, as a review of the current National Reform Programmes indicates they are clearly important issues at the national level.
- If evidence can be collected to demonstrate the effectiveness of particular strategies, input and performance indicators should be used to assist other Member States implement best practice.
- Member States should be encouraged by anti-racist civil society organisations to collect data for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. If this information is not being collected or reported by national governments, a national or EU shadow report should be produced in its absence.

Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy (Social OMC)

The Commission has made significant efforts to encourage Member States to address migrants and ethnic minorities as a matter of urgency in the Social OMC. However, while some Member States take a comprehensive approach to the various dimensions of social inclusion (participation in the labour market and access to housing but also in social, cultural and political life) and focus on involving both immigrants and the host society, the non-prioritisation of the issue and absence of details in most National Action Plans on Social Inclusion comes across as a potentially serious omission.

- Member States should reflect on the fact that the social integration of migrants needs to be given more attention in selecting key objectives.
- Anti-racist civil society organisations should advocate to Member States that migrants and ethnic minorities be included in National Action Plans on Social Inclusion as a specific target group.
- If Member States agree to proposals to introduce target-setting into the Social OMC, they should ensure that targets are disaggregated, where possible, to examine the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities.
- The Social OMC should give consideration to a number of data sources that have been identified in this publication that can provide a better understanding of the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities, and which provide the potential for a wider range of indicators that can be disaggregated on migration-related grounds, or which directly capture migration-related dimensions.

Introduction

The Lisbon strategy is the most important driver of EU socio-economic policy, and heavily influences the policy priorities of Member States. It is **important for actors in the racial equality and migration fields to understand the Lisbon Strategy in order to capitalise on the opportunities it presents for improving the situation of people vulnerable to racism.**

Which people are vulnerable to racism? ENAR has defined the following communities in Europe as being vulnerable to racism: Roma, Sinti and Travellers; migrants including EU nationals and third country nationals, particularly undocumented migrants and asylum seekers; the Jewish

community; the Muslim community; long-standing ethnic minority communities; national minorities; more recent migrants; and EU citizens in the context of intra-EU migration. While there appears to be a correlation between a community's vulnerability to racism and its socio-economic standing, there are exceptions. For example, many Jewish communities do not experience widespread socio-economic disadvantage despite the long-standing racism they have encountered.

The target group for this research is **'migrants and ethnic minorities'**, a term which broadly encompasses most of the communities vulnerable to racism and reflects the target

group of the Lisbon strategy (which does not explicitly include religious communities). Despite focusing on ‘migrants and ethnic minorities’, this paper includes the relevant information found on religious groups and national minorities, albeit very limited.

The purpose of this publication is to examine the social and employment dimensions of the Lisbon Strategy in order to establish the extent to which the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities and others vulnerable to racism is taken into account in European and national strategies with a view to **identifying advocacy strategies for anti-racist civil society organisations** to ensure that this issue is given the attention it requires.

Monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is one of the most effective ways for ensuring that the Lisbon strategy improves the socio-economic life of migrant and ethnic minorities. Statistics can reveal inequalities as well as measure the impact of strategies put in place to overcome these inequalities. Statistics point to the fact that there is a problem, and that something (more) needs to be done so that all people in European societies are able to realise their full potential. The Lisbon strategy uses indicators, targets and benchmarks to focus the attention of Member States and to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy. To a limited degree there are indicators to monitor the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. This publication provides commentary on whether existing monitoring, particularly in relation to migrants and ethnic minorities, is effective and suggests options for addressing the limitations identified.

Chapter one provides an overview of the **overarching Lisbon Open Method of Coordination (OMC)**. It examines its framework and policy priorities as outlined in the Integrated Guidelines on Growth and Jobs, which directs the work of the European Employment Strategy and the Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy. The Lisbon OMC’s monitoring framework is examined, including use of indicators, targets, benchmarking and its newly devised analytical tool (LIME assessment framework), which measures the impact of migration and integration.

Chapter two examines the **data options for monitoring the socio-economic situation of migrants and ethnic minorities**. It looks at the available data sources that allow for comparability across EU states and notes the limitations of migration-related data and the absence of data on ethnic background, race and religion. It looks at the strengths and weakness of using data on country of birth and nationality as ‘proxy variables’ for capturing migrant status and provides suggestions for examining the situation of different categories of migrants and ethnic minorities using EU data. It highlights the value of the 2008 ‘Labour Force Survey ad hoc module on the labour market

situation of migrants and their immediate descendants’ in better understanding the situation of different types of migrants and concludes with a brief examination of work being done by the Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy to improve data on migrants and ethnic minorities at the national level.

Chapter three focuses on the **inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities within the European Employment Strategy (EES)**. It looks at monitoring at the European level through the use of indicators, and the limited use of targets and benchmarking. Shortcomings in current monitoring at the EU level are highlighted and a number of opportunities for better monitoring are presented. The chapter then looks at the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy at the national level through National Reform Programmes by identifying strategies being used to improve the labour market and educational outcomes of migrants and ethnic minorities as well as the use of target setting and indicators.

Chapter four focuses on **the social inclusion strand of the Social Inclusion and Social Protection strategy** (the Social OMC). It provides an overview of the OMC framework and then outlines the extent to which migrants and ethnic minority groups are targeted. The chapter explains how the Social OMC monitors progress at the European level through the use of indicators (it does not use targets or benchmarking at the EU level). It looks at the limited monitoring being done on the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities at the EU level and presents a number of options for improvement. The focus then turns to the national level.

In each chapter **strategies are presented that are aimed at making the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities a policy priority of the Lisbon strategy**, both in its implementation at the EU and national levels. Racial equality and migration actors can use this information to inform their advocacy strategies as well as their own data collection and analysis on the socio-economic situation of migrants and ethnic minorities.

This publication is **supplemented by two synthesis reports on activities at the national level**. Annex A identifies the extent to which migrants and ethnic minorities are targeted in National Reform Programmes, including the strategies that are used to overcome labour market and educational barriers, and the indicators that are being used by the few Member States which monitor progress at the national level. Annex B looks at the range of migrants and ethnic minorities being targeted in National Action Plans on Social Inclusion and provides an overview of the strategies being used by Member States to achieve greater social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities, and the types of targets and indicators being used to monitor progress at the national level.

1. The EU Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs

This chapter provides an overview of the Lisbon Strategy. It examines the framework of cooperation between the EU and Member States through the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). It looks closely at the Integrated Guidelines on Growth and Jobs, which guide work at the EU and national level. It defines the terms 'benchmarking' and 'indicators' to provide the context for examining the Lisbon OMC's monitoring framework. It looks at the use of indicators to monitor the implementation of the Lisbon strategy and its relevance for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities, and highlights the limited nature of benchmarking and target setting. It concludes with an overview of the Lisbon OMC's newly devised analytical tool, which measures the impact of migration and integration.

1.1. The Lisbon Strategy

At the March 2000 European Council in Lisbon, the Heads of State or Government set a strategic goal for the next decade: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion¹. The 'Lisbon Strategy', which was developed at subsequent meetings of the European Council, rests on three pillars:

- An **economic pillar** preparing the ground for the transition to a competitive, dynamic, knowledge-based economy. Emphasis is placed on the need to adapt constantly to changes in the information society and to boost research and development.
- A **social pillar** designed to modernise the European social model by investing in human resources and combating social exclusion. The Member States are expected to invest in education and training, and to conduct an active policy for employment, making it easier to move to a knowledge economy.
- An environmental pillar, which was added in 2001, draws attention to the fact that economic growth must be decoupled from the use of natural resources.

The 2005 mid-term review of the Lisbon strategy revealed a failure to deliver on its targets, particularly related to growth, unemployment and investment in research and development. As a result, the strategy was re-oriented

towards growth and jobs as a precondition for delivering the other elements². The 2006 Spring European Council agreed four priority areas as the pillars of the renewed strategy: knowledge and innovation, unlocking business potential, investing in people and modernising labour markets, energy/climate change³.

There will be a broad consultation on the Lisbon post-2010 strategy in autumn 2009. It is expected that the Commission will present a strategy in early 2010 and the Council will make a decision in the spring during the Spanish presidency of the EU.

1.2 The Lisbon framework

The Lisbon strategy is implemented through the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). This **framework for cooperation between the Member States** enables national policies to be directed towards common European objectives. Member States are evaluated by one another with the Commission's role being limited to surveillance. The European Parliament plays virtually no part in the OMC process. The OMC involves so-called "**soft law**" measures which are binding on the Member States in varying degrees but which never take the form of directives, regulations or decisions. The OMC method is based principally on jointly identifying and defining objectives to be achieved, which are adopted by the Council; jointly established measuring instruments (statistics, indicators, guidelines); benchmarking, i.e. comparison of the Member States' performance and exchange of best practices, which is monitored by the Commission⁴.

The OMC process is used to implement Lisbon objectives in a wide range of areas including: **employment, social inclusion, pension reform, health care, education and training**, environmental technologies, the European Research Area, information society and **enterprise promotion**. The focus of this publication is on the implementation of the Lisbon strategy through the OMCs in **employment** - the European Employment Strategy (EES)

¹ European Council (2000) 'Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000: Presidency Conclusions', Brussels.

² European Commission (2005) 'Communication to the Spring European Council on working together for growth and jobs: a new start for the Lisbon Strategy', COM/2005/24.

³ European Council (2006) 'Brussels European Council 23/24 March 2006 Presidency Conclusions', 7775/1/06, Brussels.

⁴ The description of the OMC process is based on that found in the Europa Glossary: http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/open_method_coordination_en.htm.

and **social inclusion** - the Social Protection and Social Inclusion OMC (Social OMC).

It is important to note that, while the OMC involves soft law, hard law measures support the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy in particular policy areas. For example, the implementation of the Directive on Services in the Internal Market is a key action of the Lisbon Strategy; and in relation to the socio-economic dimension, the full implementation of the Gender Equality Directives, Racial Equality Directive, and the Employment Equality Directive are key actions to combat discrimination.

The work of the **EES and the Social OMC is intended to be mutually reinforcing**, i.e. the EES should contribute to the achievement of greater social cohesion and the Social OMC should contribute to growth and jobs.⁵ The synergy between the two processes has been referred to as **'feeding in and feeding out'**. However, research conducted in 2007⁶ revealed that 'feeding-in and feeding-out' between the two OMCs has been limited due to the separate governance processes and the extent to which it has occurred at the national level varied significantly across Member States. Overall it was found that there was "a disturbing lack of common ground" and even when the two processes were integrated, it tended to be in selected areas only, and that the social inclusion of vulnerable groups such as migrants and ethnic minorities was largely overlooked. The EES and the Social OMC are explored in detail in Chapters three and four.

1.3 The Lisbon OMC

It is not possible to examine the EES and Social OMC without understanding the framework and policy priorities of **the overarching Lisbon OMC** as it **dictates the strategy for the EES and heavily influences the work of the Social OMC**. The monitoring framework of the Lisbon OMC (which is separate to, but overlaps with, the monitoring framework for the EES and Social OMC) is the most visible and comprehensive and its recent developments include a monitoring and analytical tool relating to migration and integration.

The **Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs**, which are agreed by Member States, are the principal policy instrument for developing and implementing the Lisbon Strategy. The current Guidelines are summarised in the table opposite.

⁵ Employment Committee and Social Protection Committee (2005) 'Joint Opinion of the Employment Committee and the Social Protection Committee on the Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs (2005-2008)', Brussels.

⁶ See the report commissioned by the Network of Independent Social Inclusion Experts: Begg, I. and Martier, E. (2007) 'Feeding in and 'Feeding out', and Integrating Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities. Synthesis Report,' European Commission, Brussels.

INTEGRATED GUIDELINES FOR GROWTH AND JOBS (2008-2010)⁷

Macroeconomic guidelines

1. To secure economic stability for sustainable growth.
2. To safeguard economic and financial sustainability as a basis for increased employment.
3. To promote a growth and employment orientated efficient allocation of resources.
4. To ensure that wage developments contribute to macroeconomic stability and growth.
5. To promote greater coherence between macroeconomic, structural and employment policies.
6. To contribute to a dynamic and well-functioning EMU.

Microeconomic guidelines

7. To increase and improve investment in R&D, in particular by private business.
8. To facilitate all forms of innovation.
9. To facilitate the spread and effective use of information and communication technologies (ICT) and build a fully inclusive information society.
10. To strengthen the competitive advantages of its industrial base.
11. To encourage the sustainable use of resources and strengthen the synergies between environmental protection and growth.
12. To extend and deepen the internal market.
13. To ensure open and competitive markets inside and outside Europe and to reap the benefits of globalisation.
14. To create a more competitive business environment and encourage private initiative through better regulation.
15. **To promote a more entrepreneurial culture and create a supportive environment for Small and Medium Enterprises.**
16. To expand, improve and link up European infrastructure and complete priority cross-border projects.

Employment guidelines

17. Implement employment policies aimed at **achieving full employment, improving quality and productivity at work**, and strengthening social and territorial cohesion.
18. Promote a **lifecycle approach** to work.
19. **Ensure inclusive labour markets, enhance work attractiveness, and make work pay for job seekers, including disadvantaged people and the inactive.**
20. **Improve matching of labour market needs.**
21. Promote flexibility combined with employment security and **reduce labour market segmentation**, having due regard to the role of the social partners.
22. Ensure employment-friendly labour cost developments and wage setting mechanisms.
23. **Expand and improve investment in human capital**
24. **Adapt education and training systems in response to new competence requirements.**

⁷ European Commission (2007) 'Communication on Integrated Guidelines For Growth And Jobs (2008-2010)', COM/2007/803 final, Brussels. Note: the Commission's mid-term review called for a single Lisbon report at EU level and one at national level to simplify the myriad of reports. As a result, the Integrated Guidelines on Jobs and Growth were introduced in 2006, which include the Broad Economy Policy Guidelines (the Macroeconomic Guidelines and Microeconomic Guidelines) and the Employment Guidelines.

The Integrated Guidelines guide action at:

- the national level through the **National Reform Programme** of each Member State;
- the EU level through the **Community Lisbon Programme** which funds key measures to support European level reform.

The Integrated Guidelines, the National Reform Programmes and Community Lisbon Programme span a three year period, i.e. 2005-2008, 2008-2010. The Integrated Guidelines for 2008-2010 remain unchanged from 2005-2008, but explanatory text places a stronger emphasis on the social dimension. Each year, Member States produce reports on the implementation of their National Reform Programmes. The Commission assesses the content and implementation of National Reform Programmes of each Member State and produces a Strategic Annual Progress Report. This Strategic Report forms the basis of a proposal from the Commission for Council agreed Country-specific Recommendations addressed to the Member States, which set out priority areas for reform. Member States take these Recommendations and develop Action Plans to address them within their National Reform Programmes. Each year the Commission also produces an implementation report for the Community Lisbon Programme.

1.4. Inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities

The situation of migrants and ethnic minorities was largely overlooked at the 2000 Lisbon Council meeting⁸, but has steadily been gaining attention. Migrants and ethnic minorities (referred to as immigrants, third-country nationals and ethnic minorities) are generally targeted in the context of them forming a vulnerable or disadvantaged group who require assistance, and motivation, to enter the labour market. This section examines the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in the economic pillar (specifically the Integrated Guidelines and Country-specific Recommendations); and in the social pillar (the Social Agenda).

1.4.1 Integrated Guidelines

The Integrated Guidelines 2008-2010 assert that “**combating discrimination**, promoting access to employment for disabled people and **integrating immigrants and minorities** are particularly essential”. Member States are also reminded that actions must take into account common social objectives⁹. The Integrated Guidelines state that particular attention is to be paid to significantly reducing employment gaps for

people at a disadvantage, including disabled people, as well as between third-country nationals and EU citizens (in line with any national targets); and Member States should aim towards active social integration of all through promotion of labour force participation and fight poverty and exclusion of those groups who are most marginalised in society. The use of broad definitions (i.e. ‘immigrants’, ‘minorities’, ‘groups who are most marginalised in society’) means that ENAR’s wider target group falls within the scope of the Integrated Guidelines.

The Integrated Guidelines focus on labour market entry. No attention is given to helping migrants and ethnic minorities who are underemployed find a job that fully utilises their skills and knowledge, i.e. Lisbon’s promise of “more and better jobs”. The Integrated Guidelines outline the need to **improve labour market access to migrants**. Guideline 18 on promoting a lifecycle approach to work highlights the importance of **integrating immigrants and minorities**; and Guideline 19 on “ensuring inclusive labour markets, enhancing work attractiveness, and making work pay for job seekers, including disadvantaged people and the inactive” **targets non-EU nationals as a specific disadvantaged group**.

The role that future labour migrants can play in meeting Lisbon objectives by addressing labour shortages and filling skills gaps is gaining prominence. Hence, Lisbon views future migrants as an opportunity to be capitalised upon, whereas current migrants are viewed more as a problem to be addressed. The detailed guidance accompanying Guideline 19 stresses that national labour markets must give full consideration to the potential additional labour supply resulting from immigration of non-EU nationals, and one of the four strategies for implementing Guideline 20 on improving matching of labour market needs is through appropriate management of economic migration.

The Integrated Guidelines are not prescriptive. Aside from in the broadest sense (“combating discrimination and promoting access to employment”), they offer no insight into the specific barriers migrants and ethnic minorities face or strategies to overcome these. No recognition is given to the wide range of issues impacting on social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities, including their low rates of participation in the labour market and in education and training.

There are four Guidelines where it could be expected that migrants and ethnic minorities would feature, but do not.

From the microeconomic guidelines:

- Guideline 17 on **promoting a more entrepreneurial culture and create a supportive environment for Small and Medium Enterprises**. This Guideline is relevant to business start up and expansion for ethnic entrepreneurs.

⁸ Only one broad reference is made to ‘minority groups’ in the context of them being an example of specific target groups for actions promoting social inclusion.

⁹ See Annex A ‘Guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States: promoting the European Social Model’.

From the employment guidelines:

- Guideline 21 on ‘promoting flexibility combined with employment security and reduce labour market segmentation, having due regard to the role of the social partners’, has two strategies that have particular relevance to migrants and ethnic minorities. These are **combating undeclared work**, which is of relevance to undocumented migrants working in the informal economy; and **labour market segmentation**, which is relevant as migrants and ethnic minorities are over-represented in sectors that use unskilled and low-skilled labour.
- Guideline 23 on expanding and improving investment in human capital. This is relevant due to the need to improve retention and attainment of migrants and ethnic minorities in upper secondary, as well as their representation in higher education, training and lifelong learning.
- Guideline 24 on adapting education and training systems in response to new competence requirements. This is relevant as intercultural competence is an emerging area.

The issues of ethnic entrepreneurship, undeclared work, labour market segmentation and education and training are discussed further in Chapters three and four.

1.4.2 Country specific recommendations relating to migrants and ethnic minorities

There are country-specific recommendations currently in force regarding integrating migrants into the labour market and economic migration¹⁰. These apply to:

- Denmark: increasing labour supply and hours worked over the medium term, including further initiatives to work and additional steps to integrate older workers, immigrants and their descendants into the labour market.
- Ireland: further developing the policy framework for the labour market and social integration of migrants.
- Spain: continuing current efforts to integrate immigrants into the labour market.
- Sweden: raising the employment rate of immigrants.
- Finland: taking into account the contribution economic migration can make.

There are no country-specific recommendations in relation to ethnic minorities, including the Roma.

1.4.3 The Social Agenda

The re-launched Lisbon Strategy was heavily criticised by social NGOs, socialist and green MEPs, trade unions and environmental groups for putting the **emphasis too much on economic growth and competitiveness and therefore neglecting the social (and environmental) dimension of Lisbon**.

¹⁰ Council Recommendation of 14 May 2008 on the 2008 update of the broad guidelines for the economic policies of the Member States and the Community and on the implementation of Member States’ employment policies (2008/399/EC).

Demonstrating its commitment to the social dimension, the Commission launched its **new Social Agenda** for modernising Europe’s social model in February 2005¹¹, which focuses on providing jobs and equal opportunities for all and ensuring that the benefits of the EU’s growth and jobs drive reach everyone in society. The new social agenda highlights the need to ensure equality and non-discrimination, with specific reference to the Roma. Migrants are only addressed in the context of the role migration, particularly economic migration, can play in addressing demographic challenges. In the Communication the Commission affirms that “the new social agenda is an integral part of the Lisbon Strategy”, a commitment which is reaffirmed in the Commission’s 2008 Communication on the renewed social agenda¹².

The 2008 Communication puts a strong emphasis on the need to **tackle both overt and indirect discrimination and fight racism and xenophobia**, particularly in the context of creating opportunities so that each person is able to develop their own potential while respecting Europe’s diversity. The goal of enabling each person to develop their own potential regardless of their situation and background goes far beyond those expressed in the Integrated Guidelines which focuses simply on vulnerable and excluded groups entering into (any) employment. The tone of the Communication in regard to migrants is also very positive - it presents **migrants and migration as an asset to European societies** rather than a problem to be addressed (in contrast to the view expressed in the Integrated Guidelines that migrants form a vulnerable group excluded from the labour market). It notes that immigration is making a significant contribution to employment, growth and prosperity in the EU; and that the demand for migrants, particularly those with specific skills, is likely to increase over the coming years due to demographic change and labour market shortages in certain sectors and regions. It asserts that, to realise the potential of immigration, it must be accompanied from the start by **efforts to facilitate successful integration, including by host country language learning**.

1.5 Monitoring progress in implementing the Lisbon Strategy

The Lisbon Council envisioned that the new OMC would establish, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks against the best in the world¹³. Progress in implementing the Lisbon Strategy is monitored using benchmarking; target setting; indicators; and analytical tools (the LIME Assessment Framework).

¹¹ European Commission (2005) ‘Communication on the Social Agenda’, COM/2005/33 final.

¹² European Commission (2008) Communication on the renewed social agenda: Opportunities, access and solidarity in 21st century Europe. COM/2008/412 final, Brussels.

¹³ European Council (2000) Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000 Presidency Conclusions, Brussels.

BENCHMARKING AND INDICATORS

What is benchmarking?

Benchmarking is setting high standards and identifying and learning from best practice. It emerged in the private sector and migrated to the public sector as a strategic management tool to systematically and continuously improve methods, standards and the quality of goods and services. Businesses, but also governmental and non-governmental actors, can strive for higher performance by comparing themselves to and learning from one another.

A benchmark is a standard to aspire to and a reference against which performance can be measured. There are quantitative and qualitative benchmarks and ideally they are developed and agreed upon by as many as possible stakeholders. This means that a variety of stakeholders, covering various dimensions of integration, can draw up benchmarks which they consider relevant and helpful for their work.

What are indicators?

An indicator is a focused and referential summary in qualitative or in quantitative terms of what often is a complicated situation or process.

Indicators enable policy-makers and practitioners to describe, analyse and compare situations over time and between contexts. They are therefore invaluable tools for monitoring, formulating policy goals, setting of targets, implementing and improving policies through review, benchmarking and evaluation.

Indicators can be categorised on the basis of their use. Context indicators summarise social and political situations, for example, the number of immigrants as percentage of the overall population. Input indicators summarise policy measures, financial resources and other actions, for example, the amount of funding provided to equality bodies. Performance indicators summarise efficiency and effectiveness, e.g. the number of Roma entering into employment as a result of a specific labour market activation policy. Output and outcome indicators summarise products, impact and sustainability, e.g. the number of persons naturalising.

Indicators	Context	Input	Performance	Output and outcomes
Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping • Priority setting • Policy design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy measures • resourcing • Actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency • Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Products • Impact • Sustainability
Monitoring and review				
Reporting - audits - exchanges of good practice - peer reviews - evaluation				

1.5.1 Benchmarking

In the context of the Lisbon strategy, benchmarking and peer pressure for policy monitoring and co-ordination are put forward as instruments to help identify shortcomings and strengths in structural performance at EU and national levels. The Lisbon Council saw that **progress in meeting its strategic objectives would be “benchmarked” against the performance of “the best in the world”**. In 2000 the Commission noted that data availability would very often limit the actual choice of benchmarks to the best EU Member States or the US¹⁴. In 2003 Council

suggested it would be desirable to have a more extensive use of indicators, focusing on the performance of the EU compared to other countries “such as the United States and Japan”.¹⁶ The 2004 **Kok report**, which highlighted the poor mid-term progress Member States had made in implementing Lisbon, was critical of the choice of the US as a benchmark. It warned that the EU should not try to emulate the US economy as “Lisbon is about achieving Europe’s vision of what it wants to be and what it wants to keep in the light of increasing global competition, an ageing population and the enlargement. It has the broad ambition of solidarity with the needy, now and in the future.”¹⁷

14 Information is sourced Niessen, J. (2009) ‘Integration indicators, monitors and benchmarks’ Migration Policy Group, Brussels. For further guidance on benchmarking and the use of indicators see: Niessen, J. and Huddleston, T. with Verbruggen, N. and Kate, M. (2007) ‘Setting up a system of benchmarking to measure the success of integration policies in Europe’, European Parliament.

15 European Commission (2000) Communication on Structural indicators, COM/2000/594 final, Brussels.

16 European Council (2003) Draft Council Conclusions on Structural Indicators, 24 November 2003, 15196/03, Brussels.

17 High Level Group (2004) Facing the challenge The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment: Report from the High Level Group chaired by Wim Kok, November 2004, Brussels.

Considering the warning given in the Kok report, **benchmarking the social dimension** of Lisbon against the world's greatest economies is unlikely to be appropriate. If social policies and outcomes are to be benchmarked at the EU level, this could be done against countries with **high levels of equality and social cohesion**. In addition, Member States could choose to benchmark the socio-economic outcomes of migrants and ethnic minorities against countries that have a similar migration history and/or a similar composition of ethnic minorities (most notably the Roma) who have made the greatest progress in achieving racial equality.

The Kok report also observes that Member States have displayed a general reluctance to engage in transparent benchmarking for fear of being exposed as underperformers and/or on the basis that that they do not consider it appropriate to compare their performance against Member States whose economies and governance structures are vastly different from their own; and that this reluctance to compare performance has hampered attempts to identify and learn from best practice. It asserts that "if Member States do not enter the spirit of mutual benchmarking, little or nothing happens."

Benchmarking is used to differing degrees across the various OMCs that are responsible for the implementation of the Lisbon objectives. It is **not prominent in the EES** (see Chapter 3) and is **not used at all in the Social OMC** (see Chapter 4). Benchmarking is used in the **Education and Training OMC** (whose work is cross-cutting for both the EES and the Social OMC), although the Education Council only agreed to establish 'reference levels' (targets) for European average performance, which is 'benchmarked' against the EU average; an average of the three best performing EU countries; and the US and Japan (which was a poor choice given statistics to measure performance of Japan and the US were not available for two out of the five benchmarks).¹⁸

The Economic Policy Committee has expressed a **preference for performance indicators** (which it also refers to interchangeably as 'output indicators') for monitoring the progress in implementing the Lisbon Strategy despite the important information that can be elicited from input indicators (which it refers to as 'policy indicators'). It states that, due to the diversity of the economies of Member States, "the use of policy indicators increases the risk of delivering misleading policy messages" and as such 'policy indicators' are only to be used when "reliable ways of capturing outcomes across the Member States are not available."¹⁹

1.5.2 Target setting

By 2004 there was a plethora of different targets and reporting mechanisms with few synergies between the different strands. The 2004 Kok report concluded that too many of the targets would be seriously missed and as a result, Lisbon risks becoming a "synonym for missed objectives and failed promises"²⁰. When the Lisbon Strategy was re-launched in 2005 the Commission "simplified the process" to include **only two headline targets** for 2010:

- total (public and private) investment of 3% of Europe's GDP in research and development;
- an employment rate of 70% (the proportion of Europe's working age population in employment).

1.5.3 Indicators

In 2000 the Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs devised a set of **structural indicators to measure progress towards the implementation of the Lisbon strategy** across all dimensions: general economic background, employment, innovation and research, economic reform, social cohesion, and the environment.

In 2003 the Commission proposed that the list be reduced to a **shortlist of 14 'headline' indicators**, which include:

- in regard to employment: employment rate, and employment rate of older workers
- in regard to innovation and research: educational attainment of 20-24 year olds
- in regard to social cohesion: at-risk-of-poverty rate, dispersion of regional employment rates, and long-term unemployment

The short list of 14 headline indicators was approved by the Council in 2003, on the basis of the contributions of the Social Protection Committee, the Economic Policy Committee, the Employment Committee and the Working Party on Environment. One of the roles of the 'headline indicators' was to make progress in implementing the Lisbon strategy more visible to the public. The Kok report had recommended that the "European Commission should deliver to the Spring European Council in the most public manner possible an annual league table of Member State progress towards achieving the 14 key indicators and targets. Countries that have performed well should be praised, those that have done badly castigated." This recommendation was at odds with the view of the Council that Member States should not be ranked on the basis of performance²¹. The Kok report also highlighted the fact that "not all Member States start from the same position, especially those who

18 European Commission (2002) Communication on European benchmarks in education and training: follow-up to the Lisbon European Council, COM/2002/0629 final, Brussels.

19 Economic Policy Committee (2006) Report on Structural indicators. ECFIN/EPC REP/55713 final.

20 High Level Group (2004) Facing the challenge The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment Report from the High Level Group chaired by Wim Kok, November 2004, Brussels.

21 European Council ECOFIN/EPSCO (2003) 'Draft Council Conclusions on Structural Indicators', 24 November 2003 15196/03, Brussels.

have recently joined. For them the message needs to be more nuanced and calibrated, recognising the economic reality that they started from a very low base. Even if the statistical target remains distant, if they have made significant progress they should nonetheless be praised". This view was shared by the Council who recommended the Commission **focus both on current performance as well as on the progress made by the Member States** when using and interpreting the indicators.

In 2003 the Council recommended that the full set of structural indicators (see below) should be used to underpin the Commission's analysis for preparing the Strategic Annual Progress Report²², however, the Strategic Annual Progress Report did not make extensive use of the headline indicators or the full set of indicators in 2005 or 2006. In the 2007 and 2008 reports the headline indicators are presented separately for each Member State - the recommendations of the Kok report were not taken up and the presentation of Member States' performance against the indicators does not lend itself to ready comparisons.

The full set of indicators is stored on the **Eurostat Structural Indicators Database**, which is accessible online to the public. Amongst other indicators, the list includes:

- in regard to **employment**: employment rate; employment rate of older workers; average exit age from the labour force; gender pay gap in unadjusted form; tax wedge on labour cost; tax rate on low wage earners by marginal effective tax rates on employment incomes; implicit tax rate on labour; life-long learning by gender; serious accidents at work; fatal accidents at work; and unemployment rate by gender;
- in regard to **social cohesion**: inequality of income distribution; at-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers; at-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers; at-persistent-risk-of-poverty rate; dispersion of regional employment rates; early school leavers; long-term unemployment rate; jobless households - children; jobless households; and formal child care by duration and age group;
- in regard to **innovation and research**, inter alia: youth education attainment level; and science and technology graduates;
- in regard to general economic conditions, inter alia: employment growth by gender.

Indicators cover a wide range of areas relevant to the employment and social inclusion agendas. However, no **indicators are currently disaggregated on grounds relating to migration or ethnic background**.

22 European Commission (2003) Communication on Structural indicators, COM/2003/0585 final, Brussels.

1.5.4 Analytical tool: the LIME Assessment Framework

The LIME Assessment Framework was developed by the Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs working together with national authorities in the Economic Policy Committee's Lisbon Methodology Working Group (LIME), and in close collaboration with the Employment Committee.

The LIME Assessment Framework (LAF) systematically **compares GDP performance**, both level and change, of all 27 EU Member States, and when available some OECD and candidate countries, across 20 policy areas affecting growth (of which **migration and integration** is one) **relative to a benchmark**. The LIME group discussed the choice of benchmarks on several occasions. Although some Member States felt that it was not ambitious enough, it was agreed to use the EU15 weighted average. In addition, at the request of LIME members, a feature in the LAF database has been introduced which allows alternative benchmarks to be used. These include the Euro area 16, EU27, EU15, best performing 5 EU countries, EU 12 and the US. Several LIME members have argued that the US could provide a good benchmark due to its similar size and level of development to the EU, but the differences in social preferences (and conceptual problems of per capita GDP as a measure of economic well-being) reduced the relevance of US policies to be applied in the European context.²³

The **methodology for establishing the impact of migration and integration on economic growth** is outlined in detail in the documentation on the framework²⁴. The indicators used to assess whether or not migration and integration is positively associated with growth have a high reliability. Indicators are divided into two lists: the narrow list and the wide list. The indicators on the narrow list are weighted to **provide an aggregate score for migration and integration which is interpreted as 'above', 'neutral' or 'under performance'**. (+) and (-) indicates whether the indicator is associated with positive or negative economic growth.

Narrow list:

- Share of employed foreign-born population over total population (birthplace criterion) (+)
- **Employment rate gap between non-EU and EU nationals** (-)
- Employment rate gap between EU born and non-EU born (-)

23 DG Economic and Financial Affairs (2009) User Guide of the Lisbon Assessment Framework (LAF) Database, Brussels.

24 See pages 109-116 of Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs and The Economic Policy Committee (2008) "The LIME assessment framework (LAF): A methodological tool to compare, in the context of the Lisbon Strategy, the performance of EU Member States in terms of GDP and in terms of twenty policy areas affecting growth", European Economy Occasional papers 41.

- **Employment rate of foreign-born** (% foreign-born population) (+)
- Proportion of foreign-born population with **primary education** (% total foreign-born population) (-)
- Proportion of foreign-born population with **tertiary education** (% total foreign-born population) (+)

Wider list:

- Difference between **unemployment rates** of nationals and non-EU nationals (-)
- Difference between nationals and non-EU25 nationals **participation rates** (+)
- Difference between foreigners and nationals in the share of those with less than **upper secondary education** (+)
- Share of foreign population over total population (citizenship criterion) (+)
- Crude rate of net migration (including corrections) (+)
- Share of foreign-born population over total population (birth place criterion) (+)
- Difference between native-born and foreign-born of the share of those with **primary education** (-)

The database was intended for use by the Member States involved in LIME, the Economic Policy Committee and the Employment Committee. However, DG Economic and Financial Affairs have made the database publicly available. The data files and the User Guide are available on DG Economic and Financial Affairs' website²⁵.

1.6 Conclusions and recommendations

There appears to be a **disconnection between the economic pillar and the social pillar in their respective approaches to migrants and ethnic minorities**. In the economic pillar the attention is on future labour migrants, who are presented as the panacea to labour market shortages and skills gaps. Yet migrants and ethnic minorities residing in Member States are targeted in the context of them being a disadvantaged group with **little or no recognition given to their skills and attributes and aspirations**. For example, Guideline 17 on promoting a more entrepreneurial culture has overlooked the importance of ethnic entrepreneurs. This contrasts sharply with the view expressed in the renewed social agenda that immigration is making a significant contribution to employment, growth and prosperity in the EU.

In addition, there also appears to be a disconnection between the Integrated Guidelines, which refer to migrants and ethnic minorities, and the development of structural indicators and targets to implement these. None of the structural

indicators used for monitoring the implementation of the Lisbon strategy capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. Given that the 14 'headline indicators' are the only of the structural indicators to be included in Lisbon's Strategic Annual Progress Report, **consideration could be given to disaggregating relevant headline indicators, such as the employment rate, educational attainment and the at-risk-of-poverty rate, on migration-related grounds** (see Chapter 2 for advice on disaggregating indicators on migration-related grounds).

If Member States choose to engage in benchmarking and target setting in the post-2010 Lisbon strategy, it will be important to heed the warning of the Kok report in regard to the choice of country/ies to be used as a benchmark. **Social policies and outcomes should be benchmarked against countries with high levels of equality and social cohesion rather than 'the world's greatest economies'**.

The LIME Assessment Framework provides a valuable tool for assessing the economic impact of migration and integration. The information it provides has the potential to put migration and integration firmly on national and EU agendas as **it demonstrates the importance of sound migration policies and the need for comprehensive efforts to increase labour market and educational outcomes for migrants**. The danger, however, is that migration policies become focused too heavily on the economic dimension with less attention given to facilitating entry and stay of family members and persons in need of protection. Although the aim of LAF is to analyse the components of economic growth, this should not deter **policy actors in the racial equality and migration fields** from using the database for **independent analysis** as it contains a raft of indicators that are extremely valuable in capturing the situation of migrants in different Member States and in examining their inclusion in the labour market and in education.

²⁵ The User Guide and Data Files can be downloaded from: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/db_indicators/db_indicators14998_en.htm.

2. Data options for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities

This chapter seeks to identify data sources that capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. It also highlights the possibilities and pitfalls of various data options, and exposes gaps in data collection for ENAR's target group of communities vulnerable to racism.

In regard to the implementation of Lisbon, **indicators that capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities are required** in order to **monitor implementation** of the Integrated Guidelines, and engage in **peer learning** and identify **best practice**. Indicators that capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities also provide valuable insights and information to a range of actors at the national and European levels, including anti-racist civil society organisations, which can be used to inform the development of policy interventions and/or to influence the policy making process.

2.1. Migration data

There is currently no regularly collected EU level data source that examines the socio-economic situation of migrants.

In 2005 the **Commission** proposed a regulation to the European Parliament and the Council on community statistics on migration and international protection.²⁶ It **proposed the collection of data that would have been extremely valuable in understanding the socio-economic situation of different categories of migrants**. This included data on:

- **Immigrants** moving to the territory of the Member State, emigrants moving from the territory of the Member State; persons having their usual residence in the Member State; and persons having acquired the citizenship of the Member State, which would be broken down by **employment status, occupation, industry, level of education and training**.
- **Residence permits** (all valid permits, those issued for the first time, changes of status) and **long-term residents**, which would be broken down by **occupation and economic activity**.
- The number of **asylum seekers** with requests, decisions and transfers under the Dublin II regulation, which would be disaggregated by **occupation and economic activity**.

26 European Commission (2005) 'Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection', COM/2005/0375 final, Brussels.

In June 2006 the Council proposed that all socio-economic disaggregation be deleted from the proposed regulation.²⁷ The following rationale was given: A collection and transmission of data concerning education and training would be desirable in the future. However, these data are currently not available in (most of) the Member States. Few data sources would have to be opened and utilised. Nevertheless, this regulation should lead to a harmonisation of already existing data sources and data. With regard to different - not only purely technical - factors other data should be collected on a European level in the next step. As many Member States expressed severe concerns on the availability of the additional data requested.

The Council consulted the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) on the proposed regulation. The EESC produced its opinion in August 2006²⁸, which stated that "statistical data, especially on the social and educational background of immigrants, could further assist EU citizens to help integrate these immigrants. Hence, the Committee encourages the Commission regarding the adoption of the importance of social and educational data". It suggested that data on language spoken also be collected, and asserted that "reliable statistical information and surveys on the characteristics of illegal immigrants would help the EU Member States to analyse the underlying causes of irregular immigration and that such data could include the socio-economic background of these immigrants, their skills base, their aspirations and their reasons for emigrating."

The EESC's arguments did not sway the Council or the Parliament. The Council's proposal to delete the socio-economic disaggregation (as well as any data collection on 'illegal migrants'²⁹) was approved by the European Parliament in October 2006³⁰ and hence is not included

27 European Council (2006) 'Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection', 10993/06, Brussels.

28 European Economic and Social Committee (2006) 'Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection', 2006/C 185/06, Brussels.

29 Note: The Commission's original proposal had sought to include statistics (age, sex and citizenship) on third-country nationals refused entry at a Member State's border as well as 'illegal migrants' present in the Member State, but Council did not agree, commenting: "it is in the nature of illegal residences that there are no scientifically founded statistical collections available. Statistic estimations are also not feasible. Therefore, these relevant unsecured data should not be included in the community statistics."

30 European Council (2006) 'Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection (Discussion of proposed EP amendments)', 14698/06, Brussels.

in the resulting 2007 regulation on migration statistics³¹. The 2007 regulation does, however, state in its preamble that there is “an increasing need for statistical information regarding the profession, education, qualifications and type of activity of migrants”, which indicates that further developments in this area could be expected (and should be encouraged).

2.1.1 The EU Labour Force Survey ad hoc module

The European Union Labour Force Survey (EU LFS) is a quarterly sample survey covering the population in private households that provides annual and quarterly results on labour participation of people aged 15 and over as well as persons outside the labour force. In addition, each year there is a different ‘ad hoc module’ that seeks to examine a particular subject area through the inclusion of an extra set of questions. The **2008 ad hoc module was on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants**³². Eurostat has indicated that provisional data from this ad hoc module should be available in the second half of 2009. National data has already been made available by some Member States, including Cyprus, Slovenia and the UK.

The LFS ad hoc module will provide an incredibly important insight into the socio-economic situation of migrants. As it is a ‘one-off’ survey, its results cannot be used to monitor the implementation of the Lisbon strategy. It will, however, provide Member States, the EU and other actors with valuable information on the current situation in regard to employment and education, including on the uptake of services to enhance employment and educational opportunities.

The LFS ad hoc module will provide information on:

- In addition to information on country of birth, nationality and length of residence; **the year citizenship was acquired**, whether the person was a national at birth (or since the creation of the country/redefinition of borders), and the mother and father’s country of birth.
- **Main reason the person had for migrating**. Reasons include: employment or intra-corporate transfer; employment - job before migrating/no job found before migrating; study; international protection; accompanying family/family reunification; family formation; and other.
- Whether the **duration of the current residence permit/visa/certificate** is limited (this question is optional for France).

- Whether current legal access to the **labour market is restricted**, e.g. access restricted to: employment for specific employers; self-employment; or not allowing self-employment.
- Whether they have made use of facilities for **establishing what their highest qualification equates to** in the host country system.
- Whether they **need to improve host country language skills to get an appropriate job**.
- **Main help received** in the host country in finding the current job or setting up own business (e.g. relatives/friends; public employment office; private employment agencies; migrant or ethnic organisation).
- Whether they have used **services for labour market integration** in the two years following the last arrival (e.g. contact with an adviser for job guidance/counselling or job search assistance; participation in labour market training/programmes or participation in host country language tuition).

The survey enables the examination of the situation of:

- migrants (born abroad) who have not naturalised;
- migrants (born abroad) who have naturalised;
- children of migrants;
- persons born in another EU country exercising their right to mobility;
- persons born in an accession country exercising their right to mobility;
- migrants from specific countries or regions.

It also allows for a breakdown according to the **reason for migration** (economic, family and humanitarian), which has a significant bearing on socio-economic outcomes.³³

Data can also be broken down by migration stage. The journey of a migrant begins when they leave their country of origin or country of residence and ends when they are able to participate fully in all aspects of life in the receiving society. For many, the journey may be completed, not by themselves, but by their children, or grandchildren. At each stage of the journey the migrant faces different challenges. Therefore, it is useful to make a distinction between different migration stages, i.e. newcomers (the focus is on establishment), long-term residents (the focus is on socio-economic inclusion), migrants who have naturalised and children of migrants (the focus is on anti-discrimination and diversity). This would require a definition of ‘newcomer’ and ‘long term resident’.

31 European Parliament and European Council (2007) ‘Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers’, Brussels.

32 European Commission (2007) ‘Commission Regulation (EC) No 102/2007 of 2 February 2007 adopting the specifications of the 2008 ad hoc module on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants, as provided for by Council Regulation (EC) No 577/98 and amending Regulation (EC) No 430/2005’, Brussels.

33 For example, the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia shows stark differences in the socio-economic outcomes of migrants depending on which migration category they arrived under, i.e. Preferential Family (mainly spouses, fiancés and parent), Concessional Family (relatives), Business Skills and Employer Nomination Scheme, Independent (skilled migrants), and Humanitarian. For more details see VandenHeuvel, A. & Wooden, M. (1999) ‘New settlers have their say - How immigrants fare over the early years of settlement’, Commonwealth of Australia; and Richardson, S; Robertson, F & Ilsley, D (2001) ‘The Labour Force Experience of New Migrants’, Commonwealth of Australia.

When does a person begin/cease being a newcomer? A migrant is technically a newcomer as soon as they arrive in the host country, but this is not necessarily a useful definition for statistical purposes as the newcomers' category would then include all persons intending only a short stay (the majority of whom would not be a specific target of employment and social inclusion measures). The United Nations view is that it takes 12 months for the host country to effectively become the international migrant's country of usual residence³⁴. Hence a person could be included in statistical analysis when they have been resident for longer than 12 months. This distinction would tally well with the LFS (ad hoc module and annual survey), which only records length of residence if it is over 12 months. One would expect that a migrant would cease being a newcomer when they become a 'long-term resident'. According to the Long-Term Residents Directive³⁵ a person becomes a 'long-term resident' after 5 years (of continuous legal residence). Hence the long-term residents' category could include migrants who are resident for five or more years. On this basis, a newcomer could be identified as a being resident for between one and five years. In Chapter 3 it will be seen that one of the LFS indicators for analysing Guideline 19 (employment/activity of recent immigrants to and within the EU) looks specifically at non-nationals resident 5 years and less.

2.1.2 Country of birth and nationality: proxy variables for migrant status

As the ad hoc LFS module does not provide longitudinal data, it is important to identify an EU level data source that is collected regularly and is able to provide useful information on the socio-economic situation of migrants. The annual European Union Labour Force Survey (**EU LFS**) and the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (**EU-SILC**), which provides data on income, poverty, social exclusion and living conditions³⁶, collect information on **country of birth** and **nationality**. These, however, **are only proxy variables for capturing migrant status** as:

- the 'born outside the Member State/EU' category includes nationals born abroad who are not part of the target group and excludes the descendents of migrants;
- the 'non-national/non-EU' category often excludes migrants (and their descendents) who have naturalised;
- Despite these limitations, country of birth and nationality are the main variables for examining the situation of migrants.

34 United Nations (1998) 'Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1', Series: M, No.58/Rev.1, New York.

35 See Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third -country nationals who are long-term residents.

36 The EU SILC collects cross-sectional data pertaining to a given time or a certain time period and longitudinal data pertaining to individual-level changes over time, observed periodically over, typically, a four year period.

There are three issues that need to be considered when statistics are disaggregated on the basis of nationals/non-nationals:

1. Impact of different citizenship laws

When analysing statistics regarding migrants and children of migrants on the basis of citizenship (not country of birth), it should be borne in mind that citizenship laws of Member States differ greatly. Restrictive citizenship laws, for example where the right to citizenship derives from the nationality of the parents (known as 'Jus Sanguinis' or the 'the right of blood'), will mean that the 'non-nationals' category will also contain second generation migrants. More liberal citizenship laws, for example where the right to citizenship is based on 'Jus Solis' (law of ground) and on length of residence, will mean that first and second generation migrants will be included in the 'nationals' category³⁷. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) on access to nationality would be a useful context indicator in this regard, for example it shows that in 2007 over half the European countries included in the Index provided unfavourable access to nationality³⁸.

2. Rules on dual nationality

Dual nationality is permitted by certain countries (both countries of origin and host countries) and not by others. A migrant may be reluctant to naturalise in the host country if this would result in them foregoing their original citizenship (due to rules applied by the host country and/or the country of origin).

3. Data collection on dual nationality

Current guidance on data coding in the LFS reveals that there is no facility to record dual nationality (interviewers are asked to record the nationality that the respondent specifies first)³⁹, whereas the EU-SILC records both citizenships if the respondent is a dual national⁴⁰. Data on dual nationality provides the potential for examining the situation of second generation migrants (who would be invisible in the survey if they (only) report host country citizenship). In addition, it enables a greater distinction between migrants born abroad who have naturalised and host country nationals who are born abroad (although it would not exclude host-country nationals who acquired citizenship of their country of birth).

37 Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee (2004) 'Overview of third level indicators used in the NAP/inclusion relating to the social inclusion of 'foreigners, immigrants and ethnic minorities', Document ISG2004/16.09.2004/2 prepared by the Indicators Sub-Group secretariat for the 16/09/04 meeting of the Indicators Sub-Group, European Commission, Brussels.

38 Niessen, J; Huddleston, T; and Citron, L (2007) 'Migrant Integration Policy Index', British Council & MPG, Brussels.

39 Nationality and country of birth are recorded and coded according to ISO (International Organization for Standardization) guidance. See Commission Regulation (EC) No 377/2008 of 25 April 2008 for further details.

40 Eurostat (2009) "Description of target variables: Cross-sectional and Longitudinal - 2010 operation" Ref: EU-SILC 065 (2010 operation).

2.1.3 What proxy variable does the EU use to examine the situation of migrants?

The EU uses both country of birth and nationality. While potentially a wide range of groups could be analysed, results will not be reliable where the sample size is too small. To ensure reliability, it has been recommended by the Economic Policy Committee's Lisbon Methodology Working Group (LIME) and the Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee that **country of birth is the most appropriate proxy of migrant status** as it provides the largest sample size and is not dependent upon citizenship laws⁴¹.

It should be remembered that this is a broad guideline. The **sample size required to achieve reliable results will vary depending upon the socio-economic dimension that is being examined and the size of the target population**. As a rule, Member States with a smaller migrant population are prone to reliability issues and this problem is magnified when the target population of the research is also small. However, even with limited reliability, indicators can provide an insight into the situation of migrants living in countries with low numbers of migrants, and most importantly, the results for countries with higher numbers of migrants should be reliable and these countries taken as a whole contain the overwhelming proportion of migrants residing in the EU. Furthermore, if sharing best practice is the aim (rather than only monitoring the implementation of Lisbon) it is not necessary to have (reliable) data for each Member State, but for those who wish to engage in peer learning and identify best practice.

2.1.4 Options for examining the situation of migrants using the LFS and EU-SILC

The data collected by the LFS and the EU-SILC⁴² on country of birth and nationality potentially provides a number of options for disaggregation on migration-related grounds. The LFS also records information on **length of residence** in the host country (the EU-SILC does not). This enables an analysis of labour market participation and social inclusion by migration stage, which can be broken down by EU/non-EU country of birth or nationality (with consideration being given to the limitations of each category).

- **Newcomers:** Using the LFS data it could include those resident for less than five years. The proxy could be either country of birth (which would include nationals born abroad) or nationality. This would exclude migrants who have naturalised (if they report their host nationality first),

but due to the fact that in many Member States migrants would not be eligible for citizenship before five years residence, it is only likely to exclude a small portion of migrants from the sample).

- **Long-term resident:** This category has similar, but intensified, data problems to the newcomers' category as a greater number of long-term residents would be eligible to become host-country nationals (and therefore may be excluded from the category).
- **Migrants who have naturalised:** This would include persons with a non-native/non-EU country of birth who are citizens. Using the LFS this would include nationals born abroad, but using EU-SILC this could exclude nationals born abroad (so long as they did not acquire the nationality of their country of birth).
- **Children of migrants:** This would include children born in the host-country, but who hold citizenship of a non-native/non-EU country. In the LFS it would exclude children of migrants who are dual nationals that have reported host-country citizenship first (potentially a large number of the sample) and in both the LFS and the EU-SILC it would exclude those who are not nationals of their parents' country of origin.

Data can also be disaggregated on the basis of country of birth or nationality to examine the situation of migrants from **particular countries or regions**. The LFS collects records each country separately⁴³, whereas the EU-SILC only records the country separately if the respondent is from the EU, a candidate country or an EEA country. The EU-SILC codes other countries by geographical region. These are:

- Other European Countries
- North Africa (Algeria, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, Western Sahara)
- West Africa (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Helena, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo)
- Other Africa
- United States
- Canada
- Central and South America
- Near and Middle East (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Georgia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen)
- Other Asia
- Australia and Oceania
- Other⁴⁴

41 See: "The LIME assessment framework (LAF): A methodological tool to compare, in the context of the Lisbon Strategy, the performance of EU Member States in terms of GDP and in terms of twenty policy areas affecting growth". European Economy Occasional papers 41; and Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee (2004) 'Overview of third level indicators used in the NAP/inclusion relating to the social inclusion of 'foreigners, immigrants and ethnic minorities' Document ISG2004/16.09.2004/2 prepared by the Indicators Sub-Group secretariat for the 16/09/04 meeting of the Indicators Sub-Group, European Commission, Brussels.

42 It should be noted that the EU-SILC uses smaller sample sizes than the LFS and may not produce reliable results for disaggregation if the Member State has a smaller number of migrants and / or is only using the minimum specified sample size.

43 If longitudinal analysis was to be conducted, the following changes in data coding should be noted. Up until 2007, the actual number of years' residence was only recorded if it was 10 years or less. People residing in the country for 11 years or more were coded identically. Up until 2005, for the purpose of recording country of birth and nationality, countries were coded on the basis of belonging to one of the following regions: European Union; Other EEA; Central and Eastern Europe; Other Europe; Northern Africa; Other Africa; Northern America; Central America and Caribbean; South America; Eastern Asia; Western Asia; Southern and South Eastern Asia; Australia, Oceania and Other Territories. Details of each country's grouping can be found in Annex A of the European Union Labour Force Survey - Methods and definitions 2001 (published 2003).

44 Eurostat (2009) "Description of target variables: Cross-sectional and Longitudinal - 2010 operation", Ref: EU-SILC 065 (2010 operation).

Data disaggregated on a country/region basis can be used to examine the specific situation of persons born in (or nationals of) another EU country exercising their right to mobility; an accession country exercising their right to mobility; any country outside the EU; and specific third countries or regions.

2.1.5 Benchmarking using migration-related data

If migration related data is used in benchmarking, the following two points should be considered:

1. Recognising different starting points

Chapter 1 revealed that Member States may be reluctant to engage in benchmarking due to their different starting points and for this reason there has been an emphasis on the need to highlight progress made against a Member State's starting point, rather than focusing solely on progress in relation to the benchmark. There is a parallel argument with benchmarking the socio-economic outcomes of migrants. The composition of migrants varies considerably across Europe. Some Member States may have a high proportion of migrants who are highly educated with strong host country language skills, whereas other Member States may have a high proportion of migrants who are low skilled and have limited host country language skills. Migrants, just like Member States, have very different starting points from which to build upon. For example, one would expect that a refugee from Sudan who has received very little schooling and who has experienced significant trauma will find the road to socio-economic integration far longer and more challenging than the highly-skilled Canadian IT professional on an intra-company transfer.

2. Using a broader range of indicators

Strategy documents on the implementation of Lisbon objectives tend to catalogue problems relating to disadvantaged groups (including migrants), but shy away from offering prescriptive measures to overcome these - leaving this at the discretion of Member States. It will be seen that the European Employment Strategy (and the Education and Training OMC) and the Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy focus on output indicators. This is not a surprise as it is not possible to develop input and performance indicators without consensus on what legal and policy measures are effective in securing the socio-economic participation of all members of society, including migrants. The problem with solely using output indicators is that the causality between actions taken and outcomes cannot be known with any certainty. This hampers efforts to identify best practice, which is a fundamental objective of benchmarking.

2.2. Ethnic, religious and racial minorities

Information on ethnicity, race and religion could provide valuable information for identifying and understanding the social situation of persons from different ethnic, religious and racial backgrounds and developing policy interventions to tackle disadvantage and discrimination. There is, however, no EU-wide data source that collects information on socio-economic outcomes and on race, religion or ethnicity. **Eurostat does not collect statistics with a breakdown by ethnic group or religion** as national legislation and practice in a number of Member States prevents the collection and dissemination of ethnic group or religion information in statistics.⁴⁵ The reason for this is that the **collection of data on the basis of ethnic origin and race is not considered to be acceptable in continental Europe** and as such "the possibility of using such categorisations to tackle discrimination apparently does not provide sufficient justification for the construction of ethnic categories in official statistics"⁴⁶.

The UK is the only EU country to collect information on 'ethnicity' more broadly. Other countries, such as the Netherlands, that collect information to distinguish 'ethnic minorities' do so largely on the basis of country of birth, or the parents' country of birth. In 2001 the UK also introduced a question on religious affiliation in its census, which is conducted every 10 years. Respondents could choose not to answer the question. A key reason for including the question was to provide statistics on minority religions to enable employers and public authorities to fulfil their duties under the UK's Race Relations Act. British residents are accustomed to providing information on race and ethnicity in routine dealings with government agencies. Still, unease about the question led to a campaign of nearly 400,000 people designating their religion as 'Jedi', the fictitious quasi-religion from Star Wars, in protest⁴⁷ (Jedi was also used as a protest/humorous response to questions about religious affiliations in the 2001 censuses of Australia, Canada and New Zealand). Despite this, the question revealed useful information, such as, that Muslims had the highest unemployment rate, reported the worst health, and only one in three had qualifications; that Sikhs were most likely to own their own homes; and Jews were most likely to be self-employed⁴⁸. The UK example suggests that it is both possible and useful to collect information on religion. However, the reaction to religious questions in other Member States is likely to be significantly more cautious and perhaps even hostile.

45 Eurostat (2009) 'Frequently asked questions' <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/help/faq>.

46 Jacobs, D. et al (2009) 'The challenge of measuring immigrants origin', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 10: 67-88.

47 The Guardian (2003) 'Census shows large rise in UK ethnic population' Thursday 13 February 2003, London.

48 National Statistics (2009) 'Focus on Religion'. Available at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/focuson/religion/>.

Any decision to collect data on a specific ethnic, racial or religious minority community should be taken with caution. The relevant community would need to support such efforts and care would need to be taken to prevent information which demonstrates disadvantage (poverty, unemployment, poor health) becoming ammunition for right wing parties.

2.2.1 The Roma

There is no consistent approach to identifying the Roma in the EU, which makes data collection about the situation of the Roma problematic. A recent European Parliament report⁴⁹ explains the situation: “The legal status of the Roma minority differs across Europe from country to country and from group to group: it is related, on the one hand, to the period of migration of the groups, and on the other hand recognition in each country as an ethnic or national minority. Some groups of long-established migration are citizens of the country where they live where they are considered national minorities or ethnic minorities and have full citizenship. In the same countries some other groups are considered refugees or asylum-seekers and have no residence permit; in other countries they are considered asylum-seekers/refugees, but not in the condition to obtain the status. Quite a large number of Roma are nationals of countries now members of the European Union such as Romania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic and Slovakia: they are entitled to free circulation as European citizens, but in some Member States they lack full rights as workers. In most of the countries many of the Roma have no birth certificates or identity documents and are therefore considered illegal immigrants.” The report asserts that the general lack of statistics, of qualitative data and studies, as well as comparability of the available data on the Roma groups in the European Member States makes it difficult to compare the situation on a European level.

2.2.2 National minorities

National minorities are identified by ENAR as communities vulnerable to racism. Data collection on ethnicity by Baltic and central and eastern European countries is aimed at keeping track of historical linguistic and ethnic minority groups (national minorities), rather than of recent migration-related ethnic diversity. For example Lithuania distinguishes as ethnicities Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, Belarussian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Latvian, Tatar, German, Romany and ‘other’.⁵⁰ The information collected by national governments could be used to explore the socio-economic situation of national minorities (in particular the Roma) and could be shared with countries that collect similar information to enable the identification of best practice.

49 European Parliament (2008) ‘The social situation of the Roma and their improved access to the labour market in the EU’, IP/A/EMPL/FWC/2006-05/SC4, Brussels.

50 Jacobs, D. et al (2009) ‘The challenge of measuring immigrants origin’ *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 10: 67-88.

2.2.3 Country of birth/nationality: proxy variables for race, ethnicity and religion?

Country of birth/nationality are proxy variables that could be used to explore the impact of race, ethnicity and religion, as well as other factors that impact on integration such as linguistic and cultural difference. The limitation with this approach is that countries of origin will have varying degrees of diversity within their population in terms of their race, ethnicity, religion, language and culture.⁵¹ And indeed, it is these very differences that may lead to a person seeking international protection in the EU. The degree of diversity is amplified when using ‘regions’ instead of ‘countries’ of birth (or nationality), which is an issue when using EU-SILC data that groups countries outside of the EU into geographical regions.

2.3. EU guidance on reporting on the national social situation of migrants and ethnic minorities

In May 2008 the Social Protection Committee’s Indicators Sub-Group (ISG) produced Guidelines for Reporting on the Social Aspects of Migration in the Assessment of the Social Situation to be included in the 2008 National Strategy Reports⁵². The Guidelines highlight the limitations of European and international data sources, specifically the EU-SILC and the LFS. It explains that the ISG’s work has focused on the development of indicators to monitor the specific situation of immigrants, recognising that they potentially form a sub-set population likely to be at greater risk of exclusion in different aspects of social life. In this context, immigrants are defined as people born abroad with foreign nationality at birth who came to settle in the host country. The Guidelines assert that, while the focus on ‘immigrants’ remains valid, there is a need to consider issues such as:

- the demographic, economic and social consequences of significant **emigration flows in some of the new Member States**, especially among the young active population;
- the persisting social outcome gaps between host country natives and “**second generation**” migrants;
- the social inclusion of “ethnic minorities”, noting that **not all identified ethnic minorities are migrants or foreigners** (e.g. **the Roma**); and that, depending on the countries’ approach to integration, large immigration flows do not necessarily lead to the clear identification and constitution of “ethnic minority groups” among the migrants themselves or in the host country society in general.

51 For example, country of origin used as proxy for religion in order to examine the situation of Muslim asylum-seekers in Kate, M. ‘The Provision of Protection to Asylum Seekers in Destination Countries’, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 114, UNHCR, Geneva.

52 Social Protection Committee’s Indicators Sub-Group, European Commission (2008) ‘Guidelines for Reporting on the Social Aspects of Migration in the Assessment of the Social Situation to be included in the 2008 National Strategy Reports’ 30 May 2008, Brussels.

The **Guidelines invite Member States to provide data and indicators that are used in policy making** in order to establish a diagnosis, to monitor general social outcomes or the outcomes of a specific policy measure, and to set targets, etc. It advises that the reference population should be described as precisely as possible. The following categories are suggested:

- **Migrants** (defined as people born abroad, with foreign nationality at birth and who intend to settle in the country) could be divided into the following subcategories such as: legal/illegal, reason for migration, newcomer/long-term established, country of origin (EU/non-EU, EU country with/without transitional arrangements, non-EU country by region of origin, etc), whether migrant has acquired citizenship of host country.
- **Foreigners** (defined as people who do not have the citizenship of the host country) could be divided into the following subcategories: born abroad/in host country, nationality/citizenship or other relevant categories quoted under migrants.
- **Descendants of migrants** (defined as born in the host country or who arrived as child) could be divided into the following subcategories: citizenship (host country citizen/foreigner) or country of birth of parents.
- **Ethnic minorities** (definition to be provided by Member State) could be divided into the following subcategories: citizenship (host country citizen/foreigner), country of birth/of origin, country of birth of parents, or main ethnic criteria used. Examples include nationality, country or region of origin, religion, skin colour and phenotypes.

One of the aims of the research is to “have a possibly exhaustive review of data and indicators and other monitoring tools used in the policy making at national level”. Although this review of data is being conducted to improve monitoring in the Social OMC (see Chapter 4), the results are likely to be of benefit to the EES as well as a broader range of actors at the EU and national levels. It could be expected that **Member States who collect similar data could be encouraged to engage in mutual learning and peer reviews** on the situation of specific categories of migrants/foreigners/descendants of migrants/ethnic minorities who are of mutual interest. It may also be possible to **establish a base line of data** that could be used at the EU level for further analysis.

2.4 Conclusions and recommendations

The lack of data being collected directly about migrants and ethnic minorities makes monitoring their socio-economic situation difficult. This is an issue that needs to be addressed at the EU level. The Commission has already (unsuccessfully) proposed the collection of socio-economic data on the situation of migrants; the Council expressed their opinion that “data concerning education and training would be desirable in the future” and the Regulation on Community statistics on migration and international protection (as agreed by European Parliament and Council) highlights that there is “an increasing need for statistical information regarding the profession, education, qualifications and type of activity of migrants”. **EU institutions should be reminded of their policy statements in regard to the collection of data on the socio-economic situation of migrants.**

The 2008 Labour Force Survey ad hoc module provides a rare opportunity to examine the socio-economic outcomes of migrants and their descendants and it should be used to the fullest extent. The information it should reveal about the importance of reason for migration (economic, family or humanitarian) on socio-economic outcomes may prove to be a catalyst for Member States developing policy interventions that address the different starting points of different groups of migrants. **Member States could also be encouraged to retain the questions used in this ad hoc module in their annual surveys.**

The working groups responsible for selecting indicators in implementing the Lisbon strategy consider that **country of birth is the most appropriate proxy variable for capturing migrant status** as it provides the largest sample size and, unlike nationality, is not affected by the problems resulting from the divergent citizenship laws of Member States. However, **‘nationality’ can also be an important variable in examining the situation of the children of migrants.** In monitoring the implementation of Lisbon, consideration could be given to using the annual Labour Force Survey and the EU-SILC to **examine the situation of newcomers, long-term residents, migrants who have naturalised and the children of migrants.** The idea of using country of birth as a proxy **for examining ethnic, racial and religious background** could also be explored further. Although these categories would limit the number of countries with reliable results, this would provide valuable information for those countries with larger numbers of migrants. In addition, countries that collect similar **national data on migrants and ethnic minorities** (for example on the Roma) should be encouraged to **share information in an effort to engage in mutual learning and identifying best practice.**

3. The European Employment Strategy

This chapter examines the European Employment Strategy (EES) to determine the extent to which the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is explored in monitoring at the European level through the use of targets and benchmarks. Limitations in current monitoring are highlighted and opportunities for better monitoring are presented. The second part of the Chapter examines the implementation of the EES at the national level. It identifies the extent to which migrants and ethnic minorities are targeted in National Reform Programmes, the strategies that are used to overcome labour market barriers, and the indicators that are being used at the national level to monitor progress.

3.1 The framework for cooperation

A new title on employment in the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 entrusted the European institutions with stronger roles and instruments to complement Member States, who possess the sole competence for employment policy. The subsequent European Employment Strategy (EES) operates as an Open Method of Coordination (OMC).

The aim of the EES is to **facilitate exchanges of information and joint discussions in order to find solutions or best practices** together which could help creating more and better jobs in every Member State. The strategy consists mainly of a dialogue between the Member States and the European Commission, on the basis of official documents like the Employment Guidelines (a subset of the Integrated Guidelines), country-specific recommendations and the annual joint employment report. The Employment Committee, which is formed of representatives of the Member States and the European Commission, has a key role in the coordination of the objectives and priorities at the EU level. These objectives are monitored by common indicators and measurable targets concerning employment.⁵³

The Employment Guidelines guide the work of the EES. The Commission puts forward a proposal for a Council decision on the Employment Guidelines. The European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions are also consulted. The

Employment Guidelines are set for a three year period (however, the second three year cycle of governance was launched in 2008 and runs until 2010).

The extent to which migrants and ethnic minorities are included in the Integrated Guidelines was established in Chapter 1.

3.2. Monitoring in the EES

3.2.1 Targets

The EES contains target setting and peer pressure as a driver of collaborative policy development and of sharing best practice. In the context of creating “more and better jobs for Europe”, the Lisbon Council agreed to take action to **raise the employment rate** from an average of 61% to as close as possible to 70% by 2010 (one of Lisbon’s two ‘headline targets’) and to increase the number of **women** in employment from an average of 51% to more than 60% by 2010. Recognising their different starting points, Member States were invited to set **national targets** for an increased employment rate. An employment rate of 50% for older workers (persons aged 55-64) was introduced in the 2003 Employment Guidelines, as were a number of other quantifiable objectives underpinning the main priorities structural reforms (referred to as ‘the 10 commandments’).⁵⁴

These include:

- active and preventative measures for the unemployed and inactive:
 - **new start:** that every unemployed person is offered a job, apprenticeship, additional training or other employability measure; in the case of young persons who have left school within no more than 6 months (now reduced to 4 months), and in the case of adults within no more than 12 months, by 2010.
 - **activation of long term unemployed:** that 25% of long-term unemployed should participate by 2010 in an active measure in the form of training, retraining, work practice, or other employability measure, with the aim of achieving the average of the three most advanced Member States.

⁵³ DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (2009) ‘The European Employment Strategy’, <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=101&langId=en>.

⁵⁴ Council Decision of 22 July 2003 on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States.

- promotion of adaptability and mobility, social dialogue and corporate social responsibility:
 - **transparency of vacancies:** that jobseekers throughout the EU are able to consult all job vacancies advertised through Member States' employment services.
- promotion of active ageing:
 - **postponing exit age** of labour force: an increase by five years, at EU level, of the effective average exit age from the labour market by 2010 compared to 2001.
- promotion of gender equality by reducing gender gaps:
 - **securing coverage of childcare** for at least 90% of children between 3 years old and the mandatory school age and at least 33% of children under 3 years of age by 2010.
- **integration of and combating discrimination against people at a disadvantage** on the labour market, notably early school leavers, low-skilled workers, people with disabilities, **immigrants and ethnic minorities:**
 - an EU average rate of no more than 10% **early school leavers**.
- promotion of the development of human capital, education and lifelong learning:
 - at least 85% of 22-year olds in the EU should have completed **upper secondary education** by 2010.
 - the EU average level of **participation in lifelong learning** should be at least 12.5% of the adult working-age population (25 to 64 age group).

The Employment Committee now refers to all of the quantifiable objectives presented above as “targets and benchmarks”⁵⁵. The terminology in relation to target setting in the EES, however, is changeable and ill-defined. For example, Lisbon called for a new benchmark for improved childcare provision and when the objective of securing coverage of childcare was incorporated into the 2003-2005 Employment Guidelines it was not identified as a benchmark, or even a target, but in the 2008-2010 Integrated Guidelines it is referred to as a “useful benchmark” in the context of enhancing a life cycle approach to work and to promote reconciliation between work and family life. The objective that 25% of long-term unemployed should participate in an activation measure is also now referred to as a “benchmark” in the 2008-2010 Integrated Guidelines, although this is the target and the benchmark or monitoring position is the averaged performance of the three most advanced Member States.

The fact that the terms targets, objectives and benchmarks appear to be used interchangeably begs the question: how are targets and benchmarks defined in the EES? The

Employment Committee explains that “targets are part of the governance process. They are a means of expressing a commitment to achieving agreed policy objectives and are a method of transferring policy goals onto an operational level. The concept of a benchmark means a monitoring position (or standard), against which the progress in achieving a target will be compared. They are a means of examining whether sufficient progress is being made towards the achievement of a policy goal.” However, with the exception of activation measures for the long-term unemployed, no distinction is made between the target and the benchmark or monitoring position. Therefore, it could be concluded that the quantifiable objectives, aims, targets and objectives should simply be referred to as targets.

While the Employment Guidelines establish the importance of including migrants and ethnic minorities in labour market strategies, this has not been accompanied by the setting of specific targets relating to migrants. **A target employment rate could have been set for migrants**, as was the case for three other disadvantaged groups: young people, women, and older people. As migrants are underrepresented in the labour market and in education (pre-school, upper secondary and further education), Member States will struggle to make progress against these targets and benchmarks without targeted efforts towards migrants. It is currently **not possible to set a quantifiable target for ethnic minorities** as comparable EU data is not currently available (see Chapter 2), however, Member States who do collect data on ethnic minorities could be encouraged to set national targets.

It would be **valuable for Member States to report in subheadings the progress against each target for specified disadvantaged groups, including migrants**, as this would help to foster collaborative policy development and sharing best practice.

3.2.2 Indicators

Indicators are used to assess Member States' progress in implementing the Employment Guidelines. The Employment Committee's working group on indicators annually approves a list of indicators. The criteria for selecting indicators are policy relevance, clarity, statistical availability (preferably from Community sources) and a degree of comparability between Member States. Indicators are developed on two levels: **'indicators for monitoring'** that measure progress in relation to the objectives defined in the Guidelines, and **'indicators for analysis'** that support key indicators by placing national policies and performance into perspective. The **current list of indicators**⁵⁶ **includes three with specific reference to migrants**.

⁵⁵ Employment Committee (2009) Lisbon Post-2010 - EMCO Discussion Paper Brussels, 27 May 2009 10274/09.

⁵⁶ Employment Committee (2009) 'Employment Guidelines 2008 - indicators for monitoring and analysis - endorsed by EMCO 24/06/09', Brussels.

Guideline 19 (Ensure inclusive labour markets, enhance work attractiveness, and make work pay for job-seekers, including disadvantaged people and the inactive) has **indicators for monitoring labour market gaps for disadvantaged groups** such as “the difference between the employment, unemployment and activity rates for a non-disadvantaged group in percentage points and the corresponding rates for the disadvantaged group (such as **non-EU nationals**, disabled people, ethnic minorities, immigrants, low skilled people, lone parents, etc. according to national definitions).” It should be stressed that the decision to include non-EU nationals, ethnic minorities and immigrants is made at the discretion of Member States.

Given the fact that the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities is an issue for most Member States, the **Employment Committee could give consideration to making it compulsory to report on the performance of migrants and ethnic minorities under Guideline 17** on achieving full employment (by specifying their employment rate; unemployment rate, and activity rate).

Guideline 20 (Improving matching of labour market needs through, inter alia, appropriate **management of economic migration**) has no indicators for monitoring but has three indicators for analysis - these include ‘vacancies per unemployed’ and the following two recently introduced **migration-related indicators**:

- **Recent immigrants to and within the EU:** Foreign born persons/persons with another nationality than the country of residence/ in the age group 15-64 who have been resident 5 years and less in the reporting country as a proportion of total population in the same age group.
- **Employment/Activity of recent immigrants to and within the EU:** Employed persons/Employed and unemployed persons/ in the age group 15-64 who have another nationality than the country of residence and who have been resident 5 years and less in the reporting country as a proportion of (1) total recent immigrants in the same age group and (2) total employed/active population in the same age group.

Both of these indicators are used to determine the effectiveness of economic migration in meeting the needs of the labour market, but they are also **useful indicators from an integration perspective**. The former provides important contextual information: the percentage of working age persons who are new migrants. The latter gauges the labour market integration of all new migrants of working age. It should be noted that to analyse whether or not economic migration is a successful strategy for meeting labour market needs, people who have sought international protection and family reunification

should be excluded from the analysis as they cannot be expected to have the same employment rates as labour migrants. Hence, the Employment Committee could give consideration to proposing Member States an **alternative indicator with further national data to analyse the employment rate of labour migrants** as compared to the employment rate of nationals - if economic migration is successful, the employment rate of labour migrants should be higher than (not just comparable to) the employment rate for nationals. If this is not possible, then a **context indicator** (for interpreting the indicator for analysis) is required to **reveal the proportion of labour migrants as compared to persons who have migrated for family or humanitarian reasons**.

3.3. What opportunities exist for better monitoring?

3.3.1 Making existing migration-related indicators more visible in reporting

Despite the inclusion of migration-related indicators, these are not visible in reporting. The 2008 Strategic Annual Progress Report, entitled a European Economic Recovery Plan, does not mention migrants or ethnic minorities. Its Companion Document⁵⁷ discusses migrants and ethnic minorities but does not present relevant data; and its statistical annex only includes the 14 overarching ‘headline indicators’ (discussed in Chapter 1). The Employment Committee’s indicators are not presented unless these overlap with the headline indicators.

3.3.2 Using the LIME Assessment Framework

Analysis and indicators from the LIME Assessment Framework (see Chapter 1) could be used. This would include the LAF’s aggregate score for the ‘migration and integration’ component for each Member State (which is interpreted as ‘above’, ‘neutral’ or ‘under performance’) as well as the following indicators to measure:

Labour market outcomes:

- **Employment rate gap between non-EU and EU nationals** (nationality);
- Employment rate gap between EU born and non-EU born (country of birth);
- **Employment rate of foreign-born** (country of birth);
- Difference between nationals and non-EU25 nationals **participation rates**.

⁵⁷ “Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy Structural Reforms in the context of the European Economic Recovery Plan - a more detailed overview of progress across the EU in the specific macro- and micro-economic as well as the employment areas” Brussels, COM(2009) 34/2 Volume II.

Educational outcomes:

- Proportion of foreign-born population with **primary education**; and the difference between native-born and foreign-born of the share of those with primary education;
- Difference between foreigners and nationals in the share of those with less than **upper secondary education**;
- Proportion of foreign-born population with **tertiary education**.

3.3.3 Disaggregating existing indicators to examine the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities

Existing indicators could be disaggregated to examine the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. The Labour Force Survey (LFS)⁵⁸ is the most commonly used data source in the EES. Chapter 2 provides advice on choosing a proxy variable to indicate migrant and ethnic minority status when using the LFS. The following indicators are of particular relevance:

- Transitions by employment status: the transitions between employment, unemployment and inactivity over the course of one year. Relevance: it has been demonstrated that during the **economic crisis migrants are more vulnerable to unemployment** than natives.
- Youth unemployment ratio: total unemployed young people (15-24 years) as a share of total population in the same age group. Relevance: **inactivity** rates amongst **migrant and ethnic minority youth** are a particular concern in many Member States.
- Children cared for by formal arrangements: less than 30 hours a usual week/30 hours or more a usual week as a proportion of all children of the same age group. Relevance: the **low labour participation and use of childcare by women from migrant and ethnic minority backgrounds**.
- Long-term unemployment rate: total long-term unemployed population (12 months or more) as a proportion of total active population. Relevance: **long-term unemployment of people from migrant and ethnic minority background** is a concern in a number of countries.
- Segregation in occupations/sectors: calculated as the average national share of employment for migrants and natives applied to each occupation/sector. Relevance: **migrants and ethnic minorities are over-represented in certain occupations/sectors** and under-represented in others.
- Participation in continuing vocational training: Share of employees participating in continuing vocational training. Relevance: **migrants and ethnic minorities lack access to career progression**.

58 Article 4 of the 1998 Council Regulation on the organisation of a labour force sample survey in the Community (EC) No 577/98 of 9 March 1998.

And from the **Eurostat Structural Indicators Database:**

- **Serious/fatal accidents at work**. Relevance: migrants are more likely to work in dangerous work environments and may not have access to proper health and safety equipment.

The inclusion of the indicators presented above in the framework for monitoring progress in implementing the Lisbon strategy would be dependent upon whether **sufficient sample sizes** exist in the majority of Member States.

3.3.4 Disaggregating the Education and Training OMC's benchmarks and indicators

In regard to education, the most useful and high profile indicators to use are the European Benchmarks for the Education and Training OMC, particularly as there is an overlap between EES indicators and the European Benchmark areas of youth education attainment level, early school-leavers and life-long learning. It would be highly useful to have **all five European Benchmarks for 2020**⁵⁹ (which build on the European Benchmarks for 2010⁶⁰) **disaggregated on migration-related grounds**. These are:

- Benchmark 1 - **Adult participation in lifelong learning**: By 2020, an average of at least 15% of adults should participate in lifelong learning (Source: percentage of the population aged 25-64 participating in education and training during the 4 weeks prior to the survey - Eurostat/Labour Force Survey). This benchmark follows on from Education and Training 2010 Benchmark 5, which set the benchmark for participation in lifelong learning at 12.5%.
- Benchmark 2 - **Low achievers in basic skills**: By 2020, the share of low-achieving 15-year olds in reading, mathematics and science should be less than 15% (Source: OECD/PISA). This benchmark is an expansion of Education and Training 2010 Benchmark 2, which aimed at decreasing the number of low-achieving 15-year-olds in reading literacy (mathematics and science were not included) by at least 20% compared to the year 2000.
- Benchmark 3 - **Tertiary level attainment**: By 2020, the share of 30-34 year olds with tertiary educational attainment should be at least 40% (Source: The percentage of those aged 30-34 who have successfully completed tertiary level education - EUROSTAT, UOE). This is a new benchmark area.
- Benchmark 4 - **Early leavers from education and training**: By 2020, the share of early leavers from education and training should be less than 10% (Source: The share of the population aged 18-24 with only lower secondary education

59 Council Conclusions on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training ("ET 2020") 2941th Education, Youth and Culture Council meeting Brussels, 12 May 2009.

60 Council conclusions of 5-6 May 2003 on reference levels of European average performance in education and training (Benchmarks) 8981/03.

or less and no longer in education or training - EUROSTAT/ Labour Force Survey). This benchmark is identical to Education and Training 2010 Benchmark 1 reflecting the slow progress against this benchmark.

- **Benchmark 5 - Early childhood education:** By 2020, at least 95% of children between 4 years old and the age for starting compulsory primary education should participate in early childhood education (source not specified). This is a new benchmark area.

The Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture acknowledge that immigrants and the Roma are under-represented and are under-performing in Europe's education and training systems. There are, however, no benchmarks or official indicators that disaggregate on the basis of migrant background or ethnicity. However, the staff working documents outlining progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training include data that is disaggregated on the basis of national/non-national. The 2008 report examines early school leaving (18-24 year old non-nationals with less than upper secondary education and not in education and training), which is the disaggregated equivalent of Benchmark 4 on early school leaving⁶¹. In addition, the 2007 report outlining progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training⁶² examines the completion of upper secondary education by young people aged 20-24 by nationals and non-nationals.

In interpreting the European Benchmarks, consideration could be given to **using additional indicators for analysis** (context indicators). The benchmarks on early school leaving and the completion of upper secondary education **fail to recognise that employment and/or early entry into vocational training may be a better option** for those young people (including a high number of immigrants) who, despite support, do not do well in the school system. If a Member State has relatively high **early school leaving** rates, but a low number of young people not in employment, education or training, this is a significantly more positive outcome than a Member State that has relatively high early school leaving rates and a high number of **young people not in employment, education or training who are socially excluded or at risk of social exclusion**. For this reason, consideration should be given to interpreting performance against this benchmark in conjunction with data on 18-24 year olds who are not in employment, further education or training (which should also be disaggregated on the basis of nationals/non-nationals).

61 See European Commission (2007) "Staff Working Document "Progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training - Indicators and benchmarks - 2007", Brussels. The data, however, has reliability issues. The 2008 report notes that the results for the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Romania, Finland, Iceland and Norway have limited reliability because of low numbers of non-nationals.

62 See European Commission (2008) "Staff Working Document: Progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training - Indicators and benchmarks - 2008, Brussels. Data is from the Labour force survey. It is noted that the quality of the data is affected by small sample size in Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Finland. The group of countries affected by reliability issues differs slightly from early school leavers."

The Commission's 2007 report presents a further opportunity for monitoring the situation of migrants. It includes data from PISA/OECD on average reading scores among 15-year-old non-native pupils attending schools with different densities of "non-native" pupils (over 40% and under 10%). Data on the density of non-native pupils at school was included as it is negatively correlated with the school achievement of non-native pupils i.e. a non-native pupil who goes to a school with many other non-natives is likely to do less well than a non-native pupil who goes to a school with fewer non-natives. The implication is that **'school segregation' is a problem in itself** as it reinforces low achievement. The report asserts that "thought should be given to possible initiatives for reducing the density of non-native pupils in particular schools in some countries."⁶³ While this indicator is used to demonstrate the negative effects of school segregation, it is also **highly useful for monitoring educational achievements in segregated schools** with a view to establishing best practice in educational practices in regard to language training, academic support and the personal and social development of non-native pupils.

3.3.5 Using the data collected in the EU Labour Force Survey ad hoc module

The data collected in the EU Labour Force Survey ad hoc module on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants will provide valuable information on the current situation of migrants in regard to employment and education, including on the uptake of services to enhance employment and educational opportunities (see Chapter 2).

3.3.6 Adding an indicator for analysis to interpret indicators on measuring 'undeclared work'

Guideline 21 aims to promote flexibility combined with employment security and reduce labour market segmentation, having due regard to the role of the social partners. One of the strategies for achieving this is to combat undeclared work (defined as "any paid activities that are lawful as regards their nature but not declared to public authorities", i.e. criminal activities are excluded). The corresponding indicator for analysis is the size of undeclared work in national economy as share of GDP or persons employed (data from national sources). The link between undocumented migrants and undeclared work is not mentioned in the Employment Guidelines or in relation to the list of indicators, but is addressed in other Commission documents⁶⁴, where the target group includes "illegally staying third-country nationals or citizens from

63 The effects are even more prominent in countries where 'school segregation' is commonplace, e.g. Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, Norway, Austria and Denmark. Note - data was not available for the Czech Republic, France or Ireland.

64 See for example, the 2003 Commission Communication on immigration, integration and employment, COM (2003) 336 final.

the new Member States facing temporary restrictions on free movement". The Commission notes that "for illegal residents, who tend to fall outside the social security system, undeclared work is often offered under conditions which are socially unacceptable and in breach of health and safety regulations". The policy response is to enforce sanctions against employers of undocumented migrants⁶⁵, rather than propose avenues for regularisation or safer and fairer working conditions.

A Special Eurobarometer⁶⁶ was conducted on undeclared work, but the **undeclared work conducted by undocumented migrants was not captured** well by the survey due to language and sampling difficulties and this was seen as the likely cause for the unexpectedly low figures for undeclared work observed. It also noted that **policy makers would need to treat the issue of undeclared work by undocumented migrants differently due to its specific cause** (the lack of a resident permit). As the work of undocumented migrants is difficult to capture in surveys, an estimate of the number of undocumented migrants would allow Member States to determine whether their policy response needs to address the issue of undocumented migrants working in the informal economy.

3.4. National Reform Programmes

Every Member State draws up a National Reform Programme (these were called the National Action Plans until 2005) which describes how the Integrated Guidelines, including both the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines and the Employment Guidelines, are put into practice at the national level. The National Reform Programmes present the progress achieved in the Member State over the last 12 months and the measures planned for the coming 12 months. Hence, they are **both reporting and planning documents**. In addition, the Member States need to ensure that the social inclusion and social protection as well as education and training processes feed into their response to the Integrated Guidelines.

Annex A provides a synthesis of the National Reform Programmes for 2008-2010, including the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities as a target group; the range of initiatives (these may be planned, partially achieved, or implemented) of Member States in addressing the employment and educational situation of migrants and ethnic minorities; and the use of target setting and indicators in National Reform Programmes. Key findings and analysis based on the synthesis in Annex A are outlined below.

65 Communication on stepping up the fight against undeclared work, COM(2007) 628 final.

66 European Commission (2007) Special Eurobarometer: Undeclared Work in the European Union, 284/ Wave 67.3 - TNS Opinion & Social, Brussels.

The target groups varied considerably across Member States, and included people from migrant backgrounds, ethnic minorities as well as national minorities.

3.4.1 Strategies to improve labour market and educational outcomes of migrants and ethnic minorities

The most common action reported in National Reform Programmes is the implementation of **measures to liberalise labour migration**. This is not surprising given Integrated Guidelines 19 and 20 both stress the value of economic migration.

Measures to **overcome language barriers** were the next most frequent, followed by **labour market activation strategies** to enhance the skills and knowledge of migrants and ethnic minorities. Several countries had initiatives tailored towards the labour market entry of the Roma.

Although **ethnic entrepreneurship** is overlooked in the Integrated Guidelines, it is prominent in National Reform Programmes, with assistance being given to migrants, ethnic minorities, including the Roma, to help them establish/develop their own businesses.

The issue of **migrants and ethnic minorities working in the informal economy** is also overlooked by the Integrated Guidelines. However, several countries outlined efforts to reduce the number of undocumented migrants working in the informal economy, including through new opportunities to regularise their stay.

Several countries were taking action **to prevent direct and indirect discrimination in recruitment and promotion**.

A few countries were improving the **recognition of qualifications and experience** gained in a migrant's country of origin or residence, including through pathways for converting qualifications through additional training/study.

Some initiatives were less common across Member States, for example implementing measures to secure and enforce basic work rights for migrant workers; address the situation of women from migrant and ethnic backgrounds, and improve access to public sector employment.

It appears as though Lisbon targets on increasing the employment rate have resulted in actions **focusing on labour market entry rather than career progression or change**. For this reason, it is not surprising that there is very little being done in regard to curtailing the labour market segregation of migrant and ethnic minority workers, diversity planning, or career development opportunities.

Education is recognised as the key to labour market inclusion (and social inclusion) and efforts to address disadvantage are being made from an early age. Despite the key problem of early school leaving, most initiatives relate to primary rather than secondary education. Tertiary and further education was barely addressed. Improving the educational outcome of the Roma, including through the desegregation of schools, was an objective of a number of countries.

Nine Member States highlighted the importance of **broader integration strategies**, recognising that integration into the labour market and in education does not take part in isolation.

The review of the content of the National Reform Programmes for 2008-2010 provided in Annex A demonstrates clearly that **the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in the labour market and in education is a significant issue for the majority of Member States**.

3.4.2 The use of target setting and indicators in National Reform Programmes

It is quite startling that **the overwhelming majority of Member States do not report on the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities, despite the fact that there are three migration-related indicators outlined in the Integrated Guidelines**. Bulgaria, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK are the only countries to use targets or indicators in their National Reform Programmes to monitor the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities.

Denmark has the most developed monitoring framework, which enables it to, for example, conclude that “three years ago, one in six young immigrants was dependent on social assistance or starting allowance. Today, the figure is only one in eleven” in examining the success of its labour market activation programme. This kind of data is essential in understanding the extent of the problem and the impact of policies aimed at improving the situation.

3.5. Proposal to the broad consultation on the Lisbon post-2010 strategy

There will be a broad consultation on the Lisbon post-2010 strategy in autumn 2009. It is expected that the Commission will present a strategy in January/February 2010 and the Council will make a decision in spring 2010 during the Spanish presidency.

In the Employment Committee’s “Lisbon Post-2010 Discussion Paper”, which was adopted during its meeting

on 20 May 2009, it was agreed that, while a revision of the Lisbon Strategy should not entail a radical departure from the existing one, the Lisbon Strategy post-2010 also needs to take account of new realities, including the **“urgent need to raise labour productivity and bring more people into the labour market, including migrants”** due to the decreasing labour supply resulting from demographic ageing.

In relation to targets and benchmarks, the Employment Committee explains that in order to address future strategic challenges and take account of the economic situation and the ageing of the population, revised targets must take account of the following issues:

- **EU level targets** (averages) have great visibility and send a strong political signal of a commitment to EU policy goals. However, they are not always easily translated into goals at national level.
- **Country specific targets**, agreed at the EU level, allow account to be taken of different starting positions of Member States. However, such targets would have less visibility at an EU level but peer pressure could still be good. To avoid over- or under-ambitious targets they can be relative and be complemented by minimum targets and thus triggering the necessary impetus to pursue reforms.
- Some targets are relatively easily monitored using good quality statistics. For some others, however, this task has proven to be more complex given the **difficulties in developing appropriate indicators. New indicators and statistics** may need to be developed when setting new targets particularly in **emerging policy areas**.

The Employment Committee opened the issue by discussing whether there should be quantitative targets for main policy priorities in the Lisbon post-2010 strategy, and if so what their role would be; whether EU targets should be complemented by targets that take into account the starting positions of Member States; and whether further consideration should be given to ensure measurability of targets and robust monitoring of progress.

3.6 Conclusions and recommendations

As one would expect, the **Integrated Guidelines are the single most important instrument in influencing policy developments in Member States**. There also appears to be a high correlation between the priorities and work of Member States and EES targets and the ‘European Benchmarks’ in education and training. However, with the exception of a few Member States, **indicators appear to have little or no impact on priority setting or monitoring**. It is likely

that this is because the indicators lack visibility (all but the 14 'headline indicators' are hidden). Still, **monitoring is an important aspect of policy analysis and sharing information on best practice** and efforts do need to be made to ensure the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is captured. For this reason it will be valuable for the **relevant targets and indicators**, including those measuring progress against the European Benchmarks 2020, to be **disaggregated on migration-related grounds** and to make use of the data that is already available, including from the **LFS ad hoc module** and the **LIME Analytical Framework**.

Unless Member States agree to share the results of benchmarking exercises more transparently, it appears that the most effective strategy for ensuring Lisbon is responsive to the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is to **secure the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in the relevant Guidelines**. For example, given the work being done on migrant and ethnic entrepreneurship at the national level, this could be included as a strategy in implementing Guideline 17; and **making it mandatory (instead of discretionary) to report on the situation of migrants under Guideline 19**.

The overview of the current National Reform Programmes indicates that **migrants and ethnic minorities are a key target group for the majority of Member States and that significant effort is being made to improve their labour market and educational outcomes**. However, as the majority of Member States do not have indicators to monitor their situation (or targets to aspire to), it is not known how severe the problem is or how effective the interventions to address the issues are. The monitoring conducted by a few Member States on the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities demonstrates that it is possible to **reveal the extent of labour market and educational disadvantage** as well as the success of policy interventions to overcome this disadvantage.

In chapter one it was noted that migrants and ethnic minorities did not feature in the Integrated Guidelines on encouraging entrepreneurship; reducing undeclared work and labour market segregation; investing in human capital; and expanding and adapting education training systems; despite the importance of ethnic entrepreneurs; the need to address undocumented migrants working in the informal

economy and labour market segregation of migrants and ethnic minorities; the need to improve the educational attainment and integration of migrants and ethnic minorities students. **A review of the current National Reform Programmes indicates that the issue of ethnic entrepreneurship, undocumented migrants in the informal economy, and the need to reduce early school leaving are clearly important issues at the national level and support this paper's view that they should be included in the revised Integrated Guidelines**. While labour market desegregation is an objective of Lisbon, migrants and ethnic minorities do not appear to be a focus of this activity. This is likely to be because efforts are focused first and foremost on labour market entry.

The **work being done at national level presents excellent opportunities for peer learning and identification of best practice**. If evidence can be collected to demonstrate the effectiveness of particular strategies, **input and performance indicators** could be used to assist other Member States implement best practice.

Member States could be encouraged by anti-racist civil society organisations to collect data for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. As a bare minimum, this should include the data already requested in the current EES monitoring framework, i.e. the gap in the employment, unemployment and activity rates for a non-disadvantaged group and non-EU nationals (and ethnic minorities and immigrants where data is available); as well as the employment and activity rate for migrants who have been resident for five years or less. Without this information, Member States cannot know whether or not their employment policies are improving the labour market situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. If this information is not being collected or reported by national governments, **a national or EU shadow report could be produced** in its absence.

Anti-racist civil society organisations could give consideration to **putting forward a proposal** to the broad consultation on the Lisbon Post 2010 strategy to ensure that Member States **recognise and develop the potential of migrants** and ethnic minorities (most notably the **Roma**) in meeting Lisbon objectives and that this is reflected in the Integrated Guidelines and monitoring through the use and disaggregation of appropriate indicators.

4. The Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy

This chapter examines the social inclusion strand of the Social Inclusion and Social Protection strategy (the Social OMC). It begins with a brief overview of the framework for cooperation, and then specifies the extent to which the Social OMC targets migrants and ethnic minority groups. After outlining how the Social OMC monitors progress at the European level through the use of indicators, it reveals the extent to which monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities occurs. Limitations in current monitoring are highlighted and a number of options for better monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities are presented. The chapter then focuses on the implementation of the Social Inclusion Strategy at the national level. It looks briefly at the range of migrants and ethnic minorities being targeted in National Action Plans before providing an overview of the strategies being used by Member States to achieve greater social inclusion and the targets and indicators being used to monitor progress in this regard.

4.1 European framework for cooperation on social inclusion

At the 2000 Lisbon European Council EU leaders established the Social Inclusion Process with the **central goal of eradicating poverty by 2010**.

The Social Protection Committee, a group of high-level officials, was established in 2000 to serve as a vehicle for cooperative exchange between the European Commission and the Member States about modernising and improving social protection systems. In 2001, the Social Protection Committee's work led to the application of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) process of policy exchanges and mutual learning without legal constraint.

In 2003 the Commission, along with Member States and involved NGOs, proposed a streamlined OMC with greater effectiveness, visibility and linkages with other policy fields and actors. In 2006, three strands (eradicating poverty and social exclusion; adequate and sustainable pensions; and accessible, high-quality and sustainable health and long-term care) were incorporated into a **new OMC called the Social Inclusion and Social Protection Strategy** (the Social OMC), whose time schedule was synchronised with the European Employment Strategy.

The Social OMC involves agreeing to **common objectives** which set out high-level goals to underpin the entire process. Member States translate the common objectives into **National Action Plans** for each of the three areas (**social inclusion**, pensions and health and long-term care) and these are submitted to the Commission in the form of a National Strategic Report. A set of **common indicators** is agreed to show how progress towards these goals can be measured; and the National Strategy Reports are evaluated jointly with the European Commission and the Member States (the 'Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion').

The common objectives of the Social OMC were adopted by the European Council in March 2006 and remain unchanged. The overarching objectives are to promote:

- **social cohesion**, equality between men and women and **equal opportunities for all** through adequate, accessible, financially sustainable, adaptable and efficient social protection systems and social inclusion policies;
- **effective and mutual interaction between the Lisbon objectives of greater economic growth, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion**, and with the EU's Sustainable Development Strategy;
- good governance, transparency and the **involvement of stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring of policy**.

The objective for the strand on social inclusion is to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion by ensuring:

- **access for all** to the resources, rights and services needed for participation in society, preventing and addressing exclusion, and **fighting all forms of discrimination** leading to exclusion;
- the **active social inclusion** of all, both by promoting participation in the labour market and by fighting poverty and exclusion;
- that social inclusion policies are well coordinated and involve all levels of government and relevant actors, including people experiencing poverty, that they are efficient and effective and **mainstreamed into all relevant public policies**, including economic, budgetary, education and training policies and structural fund (notably ESF) programmes.

4.2 Migrants and ethnic minorities as a target group

The EU approached social cohesion in diverse societies from the perspective of the fight against social exclusion and poverty. Each year, the Commission and Member States have used these mechanisms to direct increased attention to immigrants, who are framed as a group vulnerable to social exclusion and poverty. One of the five specified challenges is to **overcome discrimination and increase the integration** of people with disabilities, **ethnic minorities and immigrants**. The Commission advises that immigrants are defined as a vulnerable group as they exhibit lower scores on social inclusion such as employment rates, income in employment, and higher scores in school drop-out rates, homelessness, financial exclusion and criminal propensity.⁶⁷

One of the key messages in the 2008 Joint Report⁶⁸ is that **inclusion and anti-discrimination policies need to be reinforced “not least in relation to immigrants and their descendants and to ethnic minorities”**. One of the key messages of the 2009 Joint Report⁶⁹ is that sustained work is required to **“address the multiple disadvantages the Roma people are facing and their vulnerability to social exclusion and to promote the social inclusion of migrants.”**

The Commission’s current guidance to Member States in preparing their National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social inclusion 2008-2010 gives particular attention to migrants and ethnic minorities⁷⁰. It advises that:

- Member States should include **a specific section addressing the main social aspects of migration/ ethnic minorities** when preparing the Assessment of the Social Situation;
- to ensure that pension reform, health and long-term care and social inclusion policies and the Strategy for Growth and Jobs mutually reinforce each other, and to increase the potential for comparisons and mutual learning, **Member States use examples** from, inter alia, the fields of **social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities;**
- in recognition of the joint assessment of 2006-2008 National Strategy Reports, the **social integration of migrants warrants more attention;**

67 European Commission (2009) Social Protection Social Inclusion: Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/vulnerable_groups_en.htm.

68 European Commission (2008) ‘Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008: Social inclusion, pensions, healthcare and long-term care’, Luxembourg (Document drawn up on the basis of SEC (2008) 91 final and COM/2008/42 final).

69 European Council (2009) ‘Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2009’, 7503/09, Brussels.

70 European Commission (2008) ‘Guidelines on Guidance note for preparing National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social inclusion 2008-2010’, Brussels.

- Member States are recommended to reflect that the social integration of migrants needs to be given more attention in **selecting key objectives** (although it then acknowledges that the choice of key priorities depends on each Member State’s situation, on the evaluation of progress and on whether there are new emerging concerns).

No specific attention is given to the Roma.

4.3. Monitoring progress in the Social OMC⁷¹

4.3.1 Targets

The Commission highlights the importance of targets in the implementation of the social inclusion agenda, noting that targets are a significant political statement of purpose and ambition in terms of eradicating poverty and social exclusion which can lead to increased policy effort; a goal against which to measure progress and thus a means of creating a dynamic process characterised by openness and accountability; a tool for promoting awareness of the process and thus for encouraging and mobilising all actors in support of it; and a focal point around which to concentrate the efforts of policy makers and practitioners.

There are, however, **no EU level targets**. At the Barcelona European Council in spring 2002 the importance of the fight against poverty and social exclusion was highlighted and **Member States were invited to set targets in their National Action Plans for significantly reducing the number of people at risk of poverty and social exclusion by 2010**.

The Commission advises Member States that, in order to make a political impact and to contribute to awareness raising and mobilisation of actors, **a small number of headline or global targets for poverty reduction** could be used. It notes that a series of more detailed targets can be important for monitoring progress towards the more global targets and that these might cover very specific aspects of policy or **specific target groups**.

4.3.2 Benchmarks

There are **no benchmarks in the Social OMC**. However, in recognition of the importance of comparisons and the exchange of learning between Member States, the Commission suggests that **some Member States might**

71 Information on targets, benchmarks and indicators is sourced from: European Commission (2008) Supporting Appendices to the ‘Guidance Note for Preparing National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010’ Brussels.

make use of the common indicators to help them to benchmark their performance against other Member States, such as the average performance of the three best performing Member States.

4.3.3 Indicators

One of the roles of the Social OMC is to agree to a set of common indicators. In June 2006, the Social Protection Committee (SPC) adopted a set of common indicators for the social protection and social inclusion process⁷², which mainly included commonly agreed **EU indicators** that allow for comparative assessment across Member States, but also included commonly agreed **national indicators** to measure national progress that do not allow for direct cross-country comparisons.

In May 2008, the SPC agreed on a full list of indicators to monitor the health care and long-term care objectives. All but one of the 22 primary and secondary indicators proposed in the SPC's 2006 report were common EU indicators.

The only national indicator is the employment gap of immigrants, which is defined as the percentage point difference between the employment rate for non-immigrants and that for immigrants. The SPC advises Member States to present figures for both EU25 and non EU-25 migrants (it is up to each Member State to decide whether to include nationals born abroad or not); to disaggregate the indicator by gender; and to supplement the indicator with "relevant national data covering other key aspects of inclusion of immigrants".⁷³

Consideration could be given to recasting the 'employment gap of immigrants' as an EU indicator, particularly as the Commission is already using data from the EU Labour Force Survey to monitor this dimension (the gap between the employment rate of people born in the host country and the employment rate of people born outside the EU).⁷⁴

4.3.4 The future of targets, benchmarks and indicators in the Social OMC

It is possible that **the Social OMC may adopt EU level targets and/or engage in benchmarking in the future**. In its May 2008 report⁷⁵, the Network of independent national experts on social inclusion suggested that the

"enhanced use of the common indicators together with the necessary contextual information would also significantly contribute to the identification of explanations of possible differences in Member States' performances (contextualised benchmarking), to an improved analysis in individual National Action Plans on Social Inclusion, to stronger monitoring and comparison of Member States' progress towards the common objectives, to ensuring a multi-dimensional approach by Member States and to the setting of evidence-based quantified objectives (targets)."

Two months later the Commission echoed this viewpoint, stating that the introduction of targets, supported by the commonly agreed indicators, would help Member States to sustain commitment and work more concretely towards the achievement of common objectives. It suggests that targets could be set for the reduction of poverty in general as well as for specific forms of poverty, such as child poverty.⁷⁶

4.4 Options for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities

1. Disaggregating existing indicators

Existing indicators could be disaggregated to examine the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. Advice on choosing a proxy variable to indicate migrant and ethnic minority status when using the EU SILC or LFS data is provided in Chapter 2. The following 'common indicators' from the overarching portfolio objectives, which have particular relevance for migrants and ethnic minorities, could be disaggregated:

- At-risk-of-poverty rate (share of persons aged 0+ with a disposable income below 60% of the national median income. Source: EU SILC). Relevance: **migrants and ethnic minorities experience higher levels of poverty** than the general population. This is also a high profile indicator as it is one of the **Lisbon OMC's headline indicators**.
- Health inequalities - Healthy life expectancy (number of years that a person at birth, at 45, at 65 is still expected to live in a healthy condition. Source: EUROSTAT). Relevance: many **migrant and ethnic minority groups have a lower life expectancy**.
- Educational outcome and human capital formation - early school leavers (share of persons aged 18 to 24 who have only lower secondary education and have not received education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey. Source: LFS). Relevance: **young people from migrant and ethnic minority backgrounds are more**

72 European Commission (2006) "Portfolio of overarching indicators and streamlined social inclusion, pensions, and health portfolios", Brussels, 7 June 2006

73 European Commission (2008) "Portfolio of overarching indicators and streamlined social inclusion, pensions, and health portfolios - April 2008 update, Brussels.

74 See for example: European Commission (2008) "Monitoring progress towards the objectives of the European Strategy for Social Protection and Social Inclusion", Staff working document, SEC 2008, Brussels.

75 Network of independent national experts on social inclusion (2008) "Building a stronger EU Social Inclusion Process: Analysis and recommendations of the EU Network of independent national experts on social inclusion", May 2008, Brussels.

76 European Commission (2008) Communication on a renewed commitment to social Europe: Reinforcing the Open Method of Coordination for Social Protection and Social Inclusion, COM/2008/418 final, Brussels.

likely to leave school early. This indicator is also used to monitor progress against one of the 'European Benchmarks' in education and training. It should also be interpreted with caution (see Chapter 3 for discussion on these two points).

- Access to labour market - People living in jobless households (proportion of people living in jobless households, expressed as a share of all people in the same age group. Source: LFS). Relevance: **migrants and ethnic minorities are more likely to live in areas with high unemployment, including intergenerational unemployment, in which family and social networks are limited.**
- Pensions' adequacy (median income of elderly people, aged 65+, as a ratio of income of people aged 0-64. Source: EU SILC). Relevance: **non-nationals may not have the same access to pensions and social benefits.**
- Inequalities in access to health care (total self-reported unmet need for medical care due to the following reasons: financial barriers, waiting times and too far to travel. To be analysed together with care utilisation defined as the number of visits to a doctor, GP or specialist, during the last 12 months. Source: EU SILC). Relevance: **migrant and ethnic minorities face barriers in accessing health care.**
- In work poverty risk (Individuals who are classified as employed and who are at risk of poverty. Source: SILC). Relevance: **migrants and ethnic minorities are more likely to be underemployed and/or in low paid jobs.**
- Participation in labour market - activity rate (share of employed and unemployed people in total population of working age 15-64. Source: LFS). The **participation rate of many migrant and ethnic minority groups is lower than the rate for natives.**

There are three primary indicators yet to be developed that are likely to be of interest for monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. These are: **material deprivation, housing and child well-being.**

2. Establishing what data regarding the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is commonly collected by Member States

The Social Protection Committee's Indicators Sub-Group Commission is conducting a review of data and indicators and other monitoring tools used in the policy making at national level⁷⁷. When the review is complete, Member States who collect similar data could be encouraged to engage in mutual learning and peer review (see Chapter 2).

⁷⁷ Social Protection Committee's Indicators Sub-Group, European Commission (2008) 'Guidelines for Reporting on the Social Aspects of Migration in the Assessment of the Social Situation to be included in the 2008 National Strategy Reports' 30 May 2008, Brussels.

3. Using the data collected in the Labour Force Survey ad hoc module

The data collected in the Labour Force Survey ad hoc module on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants will provide valuable information on the current situation of migrants in regard to employment and education, including on the uptake of services to enhance employment and educational opportunities (see Chapter 2)

4. Using the LIME Assessment Framework

The LIME Assessment Framework (see Chapter 1) provides options for monitoring the employment and educational outcomes of migrants - these are presented in Chapter 3.

5. Migration Policy Index (MIPEX)⁷⁸

MIPEX measures policies to integrate migrants in 25 EU Member States and three non-EU countries. It uses over 140 policy indicators to create a rich, multi-dimensional picture of migrants' opportunities to participate in European societies. MIPEX covers six policy areas which shape a migrant's journey to full citizenship, including anti-discrimination, labour market access, political participation and access to family reunion, long-term residence status and nationality.

Best practice for each policy indicator is set at the highest European standard, drawn from Council of Europe Conventions or European Community Directives. Where these are only minimum standards, European-wide policy recommendations are used. Since policies are measured against the same standards across all Member States, MIPEX is a 'benchmarking' tool to compare performance.

MIPEX uses the term 'migrants' to refer to third country nationals legally residing in an EU Member State. Unless stated, it does not refer to refugees or asylum seekers, irregular migrants, EU citizens exercising their free movement rights or EU citizens with immigrant origins.

MIPEX could be used in its entirety or in relation to a specific policy area. **MIPEX indicators for anti-discrimination would be of particular value as these relate to discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, race, religion or nationality** (amongst other grounds), rather than migrant status per se. Indicators capture the scope and strength of laws to prevent discrimination, access to procedures, protection from victimisation, the power of equality bodies, and the commitment of the Member State to combat discrimination.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ MIPEX is produced by a consortium of 25 organisations and is led by Migration Policy Group (MPG) and the British Council. MIPEX data is available online at: <http://www.integrationindex.eu/>.

⁷⁹ Niessen, J; Huddleston, T; and Citron, L (2007) 'Migrant Integration Policy Index', British Council & MPG, Brussels.

Consideration could also be given to **analysing the relationship between policy inputs (using MIPEX) and outcomes (using the LIME database)**. If the analysis revealed strong relationships between particular policy inputs and outcomes this would confirm that the policy inputs identified by MIPEX as best practice do indeed facilitate successful integration.

6. Examining the potential of proposed data for monitoring the implementation of EU anti-discrimination legislation and its action programme by Eurostat

Eurostat is developing a framework for the collection of statistics on the extent and impact of discrimination with the aim of establishing a basis for monitoring the implementation of Community anti-discrimination legislation and action programmes.⁸⁰ It plans to further develop a conceptual framework for the purpose of measuring progress in combating discrimination and promoting equality and to examine the possibility of providing the data proposed by a study carried out by the Commission⁸¹ which suggests three categories of indicators: 1) factualisation of inequalities, which includes a subset focusing on discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin and race; 2) indicators for measuring the progress of anti-discrimination policies; and 3) indicators measuring the effects of anti-discrimination policies. When complete, this statistical framework may prove to be useful in monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of antidiscrimination measures.

4.5. National Action Plans on Social Inclusion

People from migrant and ethnic backgrounds, notably the Roma, were targeted in National Actions Plans on Social Inclusion. Ten Member States included a key objective of reducing disparities between immigrants and the rest of the population in relation to poverty, employment and education.

4.5.1 Strategies for enhancing the social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities

The National Actions Plans on Social Inclusion outline a range of strategies being implemented (or recently implemented) in Member States to improve the social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities. The Commission's synthesis report presents a range of examples and also identifies good practice (see Annex B for further details).

80 Eurostat (2009) 'Statistical work programme of the Commission for 2009', Luxembourg.

81 European Commission (2008) 'The fight against discrimination and the promotion of equality - How to measure progress done', Brussels.

Integration programmes were the key vehicle for securing social inclusion for persons from migrant backgrounds. A few Member States developed/implemented specific social inclusion programmes for the Roma. A number of Member States were making efforts to prevent direct and indirect discrimination, with particular attention being given to the Roma. Women from migrant and ethnic backgrounds were a target group for several countries. Other strategies included outreach programmes to improve access to government services, particularly healthcare, for migrant and ethnic minority groups. Employment was seen as an important vehicle for social inclusion with a number of Member States reporting efforts to improve education and training for youth from migrant and ethnic minority backgrounds. Participation and attainment in education - from pre-school to further education and lifelong learning - was a priority for many Member States.

4.5.2 Monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Action Plans

The Commission advises that Cyprus and the Netherlands are the only countries providing information on migrants and ethnic minorities in their National Action Plans. It also raises concerns about the lack of reliable data on the situation of Roma.

In examining the National Action Plans for 2009 the Commission notes that:

- the **lack of data on the variety of profiles of immigrants, ethnic minorities, asylum seekers and refugees** remains a problem;
- most often there is **no distinction made between first and second generations of migrants and long-established ethnic minorities**;
- breaking down social indicators by **ethnic groups or by country of origin** would help to document varying degrees of social inclusion and of vulnerability, target the specific, distinct needs of each group and assess the impact of policies on them.

4.6. Conclusions and recommendations

The Commission has made significant efforts to encourage Member States to address migrants and ethnic minorities as a matter of urgency. It expresses its opinion that, while some Member States take a comprehensive approach to the various dimensions of social inclusion (participation in the labour market and access to housing but also in social, cultural and political life) and focus on involving both immigrants and the host society, the **non-prioritisation of the issue and absence of details in most National Action Plans on Social Inclusion comes across as a potentially serious omission**.

The Commission has stated in its guidance on preparing National Action Plans that **Member States are recommended to reflect that the social integration of migrants needs to be given more attention on selecting key objectives; and has made it mandatory to report on the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Action Plans.** Therefore, it is not surprising that the **inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities is much more prominent in the National Action Plans than in the National Reform Programmes** even though there is a significant overlap between the issues identified in the National Action Plans and the National Reform Programmes, particularly in the areas of employment and the labour market.

Anti-racist civil society organisations can advocate to Member States that migrants and ethnic minorities be included in National Action Plans on Social Inclusion as a specific target group. This can include an explicit reminder of the Commission's strong views on the prioritisation of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Action Plans.

The significant amount of work being done at the national level to improve the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities provides opportunities for mutual learning, however the lack of data makes it difficult to identify best practice. The Commission has already identified examples of good practice in the 2009 National Action Plans on Social Inclusion and Member States could direct their attention to these successful initiatives to see if they have relevance for their own national situation.

Without using targets and benchmarks, the **Commission has been largely reliant upon the will of Member States to commit to improving the social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities.** If Member States agree to proposals to introduce target-setting into the Social OMC, this would be an **opportune time to ensure that targets are disaggregated, where possible, to examine the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities.**

The Commission notes that there is not only a lack of reliable data, but that **data is required that can examine the situation of different types of migrants and ethnic minorities.** In addition, it is taking active steps to try to improve the quantity and quality of information available, although its efforts are focused at the national level. The Social OMC could give consideration to a **number of data sources that have been identified in this paper that can provide a better understanding of the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities,** and which provide the **potential for a wider range of indicators that can be disaggregated on migration-related grounds, or which directly capture migration-related dimensions.** The Commission's drive for better data to capture the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities suggests they are likely to be receptive to recommendations in this area, for example, that its only national indicator 'employment gap of immigrants' be recast as an EU level indicator.

Annex A: The inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Reform Programmes

On the basis of the analysis of National Reform Programmes for 2008-2010 and Commission synthesis reports conducted by the author, this section outlines the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities as a target group, the range of initiatives (these may be planned, partially achieved, or implemented) of Member States in addressing the employment and educational situation of migrants and ethnic minorities, and the use of target setting and indicators in National Reform Programmes.⁸²

Migrants and ethnic minorities as a target group

To greater and lesser degrees migrants and ethnic minorities are a target group for policy interventions in virtually all Member States. The terminology used by Member States differs, for example, migrants, people with a migrant background, immigrants, foreigners and third country nationals, and ethnic minorities and 'other ethnic origin'. Some Member States have identified the Roma, labour migrants and young migrants as target groups. Other Member States have also identified very specific target groups, i.e. immigrants from non-western backgrounds (DK); beneficiaries of international protection (CY); second and third generation migrants (DE); national minorities (LV); non-western ethnic minorities and refugees (NL); victims of trafficking (PT); and newly arrived immigrants (SE). Three Member States (NL, IE and ES) recognise that migrants are disproportionately affected by the economic crisis and that steps will be required to address this issue.

When interpreting the information provided, it is important to note that this overview is based solely on what Member States report in their National Reform Programmes. As National Reform Programmes contain plans for all macroeconomic, microeconomic and employment measures (including education and social inclusion and social protection), it is probable that there are a greater number, and a wider range, of actions relating to migrants and ethnic minorities being taken by Member States that are not highlighted. It is also important to bear in

mind that Member States may have previously implemented some of the strategies outlined below, and as such, they would be absent in the current National Reform Programme. What this overview does is provide a snapshot of the issues currently being addressed by Member States. Strategies have been divided into three main areas: employment, education and integration. This section concludes with an overview of the use of monitoring (using targets and indicators) in National Reform Programmes.

Employment

Issues are presented in the order of frequency in which Member States reported using these strategies.

Measures liberalising labour migration

Measures to liberalise labour migration were the most common action. Most focused on the entry and stay of labour migrants from third countries (BU, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, IE, PL, SE, SV). Finland's strategy was comprehensive, looking at developing early-stage advice and guidance (induction) for immigrants, recognising and acknowledging skills, supporting employers in recruitment/improving employer links, and developing an attractiveness strategy.

Malta focused on attracting more highly skilled EU nationals and Austria focused on facilitating easier access for skilled persons from accession states. Return migration was key strategy for meeting labour market needs in new Member States (PL, SV); and in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania this was the sole strategy, with specific attention to the return of young people and qualified workers.

Overcoming language barriers

Host-country language training is one of the most widely used measures. Germany is the only country to report actions to promote job-related language skills to migrants in the language of their country of origin

Enhancing skills and knowledge through labour market programmes

Labour market programmes to enhance skills and knowledge through education and vocational training, including apprenticeship-type and work-oriented arrangements, were widespread (CY, DE, IE, FI, MT, NL, PT and SV).

82 Information on national actions is taken from individual National Action Plans of Member States for 2008-2010 (with the exception of Belgium and Luxembourg where the reports were not available in English); the European Commission (2009) "Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy Structural Reforms in the context of the European Economic Recovery Plan: Annual country assessments - a detailed overview of progress made with the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy reforms in Member States in 2008" (adopted 28 January 2009); and "Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy Structural Reforms in the context of the European Economic Recovery Plan - a more detailed overview of progress across the EU in the specific macro- and micro-economic as well as the employment areas" Brussels, COM(2009) 34/2 Volume II.

The large majority of initiatives focused on initial entry into the labour market. The Netherlands has dedicated funds for mediating learning jobs for 30,000 unqualified young people from ethnic minorities. Finland is taking steps to facilitate the flexible transfer of young immigrants from comprehensive education to vocational education or to upper secondary school. Sweden is piloting a project that will see the Swedish Public Employment Service drawing up an establishment plan for newly arrived immigrants as soon as a residence permit is granted.

Two strategies focused on career development: Spain is providing support for professional diversification and the Netherlands has initiatives to remove obstacles to advancement in the labour market for non-western ethnic minorities, particularly in the area of language and schooling, job-hunting strategies and social networks.

Sweden is providing financial incentives for municipalities that are successful in raising labour market participation or proficiency in the Swedish language, as well as reduced employers' contributions.

Supporting migrant and ethnic minority entrepreneurs

Initiatives to encourage migrants and ethnic minorities to enter into self employment and establish/develop their own business were targeted towards the foreign-born (SV); immigrants (FI, IT, PT and ES); ethnic minorities (UK and IE) the Roma (BU). Portugal has developed the 'Nucleus of Support for Entrepreneurship' to stimulate entrepreneurship among immigrants by supporting entrepreneurial initiatives, company start-up process, and improving existing financial products, specifically support in the concession of microcredit.

Initiatives tailored toward labour market entry of the Roma

Several countries are engaged in activation measures relating to the Roma (BG, CZ, EL, HU, IE, RO, SK). Initiatives include subsidised employment programmes and the appointment of Roma mediators to assist in the job search (BG) and targeting the Roma through outreach strategies, such as the 'caravan of employment' and job fairs (RO).

Reducing the number of migrants engaged in undeclared work

Although some countries had measures to reduce the number of undocumented workers, these were generally enforcement and compliance measures. Southern Italy even had a specified target (to reduce the number of irregular workers from 19.6% to 16.8% of the work force by the end of the programming cycle). There were, however, some countries extending work and residency rights for migrants in more precarious situations.

- Malta: Avenues have been created to turn undeclared work

into regular employment following on-site inspections by allowing employers to regularise the employment of the person found working illegally (once the employer has paid a fine).

- Portugal: Legislative amendments have opened new opportunities for acquiring nationality to thousands of individuals, especially children and young people who do not know any other country except Portugal or who have been resident for several years. In addition, the National Plan against People Trafficking (2007-2010) establishes a mechanism for defending and supporting victims of human trafficking in an effort to address the social exclusion and precarious situations in which many individuals find themselves and seek to bring migration policies in line with the workforce requirements of the labour market.
- Spain: The process of training and hiring migrant workers in their home countries is being regulated to create legal avenues for migration (with a view to curbing irregular migration).
- Greece: The amnesty on third country nationals who entered Greece legally before 31 December 2004, but who no longer have a work permit, has facilitated the renewal of residence permits.
- Hungary: Refugees are authorised to work without a work permit within the boundaries of the refugee shelters for a period of one year following the submission of the request for refugee status. This provides at least some access to paid employment in the first year (according to the Reception Conditions Directive, Member States must provide access to the labour market after 12 months, but can do so earlier).

Preventing direct and indirect discrimination in recruitment and promotion

Actions to tackle discrimination are being done broadly (SV); with particular reference to the workplace, for example the Netherlands has implemented an action plan to create positive preconceptions among employers and employees and combat discrimination in recruitment and selection and in the workplace, and focusing on specific target groups, notably the Roma (BG and HU) and migrants (ES and PT).

Improving the recognition of qualification and experience gained in the country of origin, including through pathways for converting qualifications through additional training/study

Ireland, Portugal and Sweden are taking steps to recognise qualifications gained abroad. In Finland pathways for converting qualifications gained abroad through further training were being created for highly educated immigrants e.g. doctors, dentists, pharmacists, nurses and other care staff.

Securing and enforcing basic work rights

Measures securing basic work rights include, proposed legislation to provide greater protection of migrant workers' rights (IE); entitling legally residing third country nationals to receive at least the national minimum wage and equal social insurance rights (EL); making the granting of resident and work permits dependent upon wages and other terms of employment being at least equivalent to Swedish collective agreements or in line with practice within the relevant trade or sector (SV).

Addressing the situation of women from migrant and ethnic backgrounds

Only two Member States had actions relating specifically to women from migrant and ethnic backgrounds. The Netherlands had set a target to have 50,000 women from ethnic minorities to take part in volunteer work over a period of three years. Ireland has a programme to assist immigrant women who are the lone parent of an Irish-born child enter into employment, training and education.

Improving access to public sector employment

Germany was taking action to enable foreign nationals to be appointed as civil servants.

Education

Early education

Austria has introduced compulsory kindergarten for children with poor language skills, and early language support for three to six year olds in childcare facilities (children with immigrant backgrounds are targets of both measures). The Netherlands are also extending pre and early school education to improve the achievement levels of children with a migrant background and have specified a target for 2011 that all children at risk of lagging behind in Dutch language acquisition take part in early childhood education. Romania is developing "summer kindergarten" to assist Roma children.

Primary education

Reforms undertaken on primary education include language screening and language teaching for children with migrant background (AT, CY, DE, DK, EE, EL, ES, FI, IE, NL, LU). Cyprus has a range of actions in this areas, which include using interpreters to develop relationships between migrant families and the school; producing an information guide for migrant students and parents regarding the educational system, study prospects and choices, pupils' rights and responsibilities; teacher training on intercultural education and teaching Greek as a second or foreign language.

Secondary education

A number of member states are making efforts to reduce early school leaving and increase attainment (including CY, DE, ES, FI, IT and LU).

Tertiary education

The Netherlands is taking steps to better career prospects for young researchers from an ethnic minority background, and performance agreements are being made with institutes of higher education to increase study achievements among students from ethnic minorities.

Lifelong learning, including higher education

In an effort to improve participation rates in lifelong learning, Finland is providing free adult education and Germany is providing funding for young people from migrant backgrounds.

Improving the educational outcomes for the Roma

To improve the quality of education, attainment levels and early school leaving amongst the Roma, Bulgaria is providing free text books and scholarship assistance and Romania and Hungary are providing special reserved places in both high school and universities. In addition Romania has programmes for remedial education and is improving access to education, including through distance learning programmes for young Roma who intend to become tutors, training programmes for teachers coming from selected school units, and a school mediators training programme; in addition its 'second chance' programme in primary and lower secondary education seeks to address early school leaving. Slovakia has a grant schemes for scholarship, and has adopted a White Paper on education of Roma children and pupils including the development of secondary school and university education to create conditions for the inclusion of members of the Roma community in the schooling and education system. The Czech Republic has adopted the 'Programme for the support of Roma students in secondary schools'. For initiatives on school segregation see the following section.

Addressing performance in segregated schools

Bulgaria, Greece and Hungary have implemented measures to combat school segregation in regard to the Roma. In Greece attendance at regular schools is made possible for Roma children who will receive a special student card, which circumvents the customary registration procedure in case their families suddenly move. While Greece is taking measures to combat school segregation in regard to the Roma, they are concurrently implementing measures that enhance segregation to support pupils with particular educational

needs. Multicultural Education Schools will provide support mechanism for repatriated and foreign pupils, including Reception Classes and Supplementary Teaching Support, and schools for minorities (with specific reference to Muslim children in Thraki) will be further supported.

Integration Programmes

Many National Reform Programmes highlighted the fact that the overarching integration programme for migrants and ethnic minorities, including the Roma, help to facilitate participation in the labour market and in education (BU, CY, CZ, DE, EE, IE, NL, PT, SI - the target group for Ireland's integration strategy was broad: people of much different culture, ethnicity, language and religion). The Netherlands stated that, given the relationship between integration and participation, by 2011 80% of the integration programmes will be 'dual programmes' that combine integration with forms of participation e.g. work, volunteer work, reintegration, education or parenting support. Sweden viewed the promotion of the preservation and development of the Roma language and the cultural activities of the Roma community as an important action for securing labour market participation.

The use of target setting and indicators in National Reform Programmes

Most National Reform Programmes do not use targets or indicators to monitor the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities. The notable exceptions are Bulgaria, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK.

Bulgaria uses **performance indicators** to monitor the success of labour market initiative targeting the Roma. These include the number of persons newly registered at the Labour Offices as a result of the Roma mediators' activity; Roma employment rate for the 15-64 age group; number of persons enrolled in training 2009; number of services provided by the Roma Business centres. All four indicators are measured annually against 2010 targets.

Denmark has a target set out in its tripartite agreements that the share of **employees** in municipalities and regions **from non-western countries** must reflect the composition in the regional workforce. The indicator for this is the percentage of persons of Western, non western and other ethnic origins in the 1) population; 2) employment in 3) counties and 4) municipalities.

It also uses output indicators to measure:

- The employment rate for non-EU citizens (16 to 64-year-olds) in Denmark (Statistics Denmark).
- Difference in the employment rate for 15 to 64-year-olds for non-EU citizens and the total employment rate, 2007 (Eurostat).
- Employment and unemployment rates for persons of Danish origin, descendants and immigrants from western countries and immigrants and descendants from non-western countries distributed according to low, medium and high qualification levels. Age group 16 to 66-year-olds (Statistics Denmark).
- Completion rates broken down by youth education programme, gender and ethnic background (Danish/non-Danish) in 2006. Includes data for General and vocational upper secondary education programmes; General upper secondary programmes; vocationally oriented upper secondary programmes; Vocational education and training programmes; VET programmes - basic courses; and VET programmes - main courses, etc (Danish Ministry of Education).
- Completion rates broken down by short-cycle higher education programmes and professional bachelor programmes, gender and ethnic background (Danish/non Danish) in 2006.

The Netherlands has two **targets**: by 2011 all children at risk of lagging behind in Dutch language acquisition take part in early childhood education starting; and to achieve a 'proportional' increase in the number of ethnic minorities in employment. The Netherlands uses **outcome indicators** to monitor the situation of 'non-western immigrants (ethnic minorities)', including:

- differences in unemployment percentages for groups with a disadvantage on the labour market;
- differences in degrees of participation for groups with a disadvantage on the labour market;
- net labour participation;
- unemployed labour force.

Sweden uses the following **output indicators**, which are also indicators for monitoring and indicators for analysis in the Integrated Guidelines:

- employment rate foreign/Swedish born ages of 15-74;
- employment/activity of recent immigrants to and within the EU (resident in Sweden 5 years or less);
- employment rate and activity rates for EU/non EU nationals.

The UK monitors the annual progress it has made in closing the gap between the employment rate of ethnic minorities and the overall rate. The data for this indicator is from the Labour Force Survey as the UK has supplementary questions collecting information on ethnicity.

Annex B: The inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Action Plans on Social Inclusion

This section examines the inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities in the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion presented by EU-27 in autumn 2008. The information presented in this section is sourced from the detailed synthesis report prepared by the Commission in 2009⁸³, which also identifies initiatives deemed to be good practice. It is important to recall that National Action Plans on Social Inclusion provide a snapshot of activities being conducted. If a Member State is not mentioned in relation to an issue, this could mean, at one end of the spectrum that it already has effective policies and programmes in place, or at the other end of the spectrum, that the issue has not been identified or addressed.

It is up to Member States to decide which immigrant and ethnic minorities they wish to include as beneficiaries of interventions. The Commission states that in ten Member States one of the key objectives was to close the gaps that persist between immigrants and the majority population as regards poverty, income, health, employment, unemployment, education and early school-leaving. As the social inclusion agenda has a needs-based approach, its beneficiaries are often the most vulnerable, for example, the Roma, undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, and unaccompanied minors.

Integration Programmes for migrants

There were a number of holistic policy measures to achieve the social inclusion of migrants. Ireland focused on three interlinked policy priorities: integration, educational supports and follow-up action arising from the 2005-2008 National Action plan against racism. In Spain the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan for citizenship and integration provides the framework for promoting, inter alia, the social inclusion of migrants into Spanish society. Denmark has committed to providing both refugees and citizens of migrant background access to the necessary resources and welfare services while making active efforts to enter the labour market and become included in the Danish society. Austria has adopted a mainstreaming approach for the social inclusion of migrants in its policy priorities, together with more specific measures for refugees and asylum seekers. The Netherlands' policy of 'social emancipation and social integration', especially for newcomers, has a strong emphasis on participation, including through voluntary work. Germany highlights the relevance of its National Integration Plan. The Commission identified the initiatives 'Integration

of Asylum Seekers into Maltese Society' (MT); and 'Education and training of foster families of foreign minors deprived of parental care' (IT), as good practice.

Social Inclusion programmes for the Roma

Portugal has created an Office to Support Roma Communities' promotion of their social inclusion. Greece is giving the issue 'increased attention'. The Czech Republic is piloting a programme in socially excluded Roma localities. In Spain the Roma Development Programme continues to finance projects and studies about the situation of the Roma in regard to both health and housing have been carried out. Hungary outlines a comprehensive approach to desegregation of the Roma in its Strategic Plan for the Decade for Roma Integration and its related action plan for 2008-2009, which specifies tasks, deadlines, resources and comprehensive monitoring. It has an anti-segregation network and a precondition for obtaining urban rehabilitation development resources is an anti-segregation development and implementation plan. The Commission notes that countries with significant recent influx of Roma do not give details of planned action to promote their inclusion.

Preventing direct and indirect discrimination

The Commission observes that increasing efforts to create synergies between social inclusion policies and anti-discrimination measures are discernible. Spain is promoting equal treatment for persons from all racial and ethnic groups in a wide range of areas: education, health, benefits, social services, housing, access to goods and services, as well as to employment, self employment, professional practice, affiliation and participation in trade union and employers' organisations, working conditions, professional promotion, vocational training and on-going training. French policies on non-discrimination are being directed towards migrants in relation to access to employment for women, social and professional integration of youth. Malta is developing its policy for ensuring the social inclusion of non-EU nationals as part of its priority to promote equal opportunities, with a specific focus on asylum seekers, refugees and irregular immigrants. Luxembourg adopts a similar approach, mainly through a suite on legislation on immigration policy.

The Commission remarks that the 2008 National Action Plans on Social Inclusion are more detailed than previously on the discrimination that Roma are facing and measures taken. Hungary is extending its Roma Anti-Discrimination Customer Service Network, which provides complainants with legal advice. The Czech Republic held educational seminars for

83 European Commission (2009) 'Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion accompanying document to the proposal for the Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2009', COM/2009/51 final, Brussels.

900 police officers on the right to equal treatment and legal aspects of social exclusion. Italy has focused on improving the governance of social inclusion and anti-discrimination policies. The UK is using the framework of the Equality Public Service Agreement to develop its policies in respect of race, ethnic minority employment and 'Gypsies, Roma and Travellers'. France is promoting anti-discrimination in access to decent housing for Travellers.

Addressing the situation of women from migrant and ethnic backgrounds

Austria, Germany, Denmark, Spain and France have designed specific measures to help immigrant women and Bulgaria proposes to improve the specific situation of Roma women.

Austria has women-specific measures in integration programmes, with language and health being prioritised. Child-minding services are provided while migrant women attend vocational guidance and qualification programmes. An inter-ministerial working group on migrant women was established in 2007 with cooperation from all ministries. It aims to develop demand-oriented measures for women with a migrant background and 30 counselling centres for migrants and women's service centres, predominantly active in counselling migrants, were funded in 2008.

Denmark launched a Women's Programme with the general purpose of helping more women with migrant backgrounds to become active citizens in Danish society. It comprises eleven specific initiatives to strengthen women's chances of finding work, getting an education and participating in sports and association life; and also aims to enhance women's ability to support their children's integration and development in the wider sense.

Access to government services

The Commission notes that several Member States have reported on initiatives that better target those who do not spontaneously claim for help (through targeted information campaigns or merging of databases), including improving an organisation's intercultural competences to enable it deal more effectively with migrants. Migrants (AT, NL) and the Roma (HU) were targets of measures to address over-indebtedness. Access to healthcare was also an issue, with Member States identifying immigrants and the Roma as vulnerable groups. The Spanish National Strategy on Equal Healthcare included advice and training in relation to the Roma and the production on a 'Guide on assisting the Roma Community in Healthcare Services' (ES). The Commission identified Ireland's 'National Intercultural Health Strategy 2007-2012' as good practice.

Labour market initiatives directed at migrants

Efforts to improve access to education and training for young people with a migrant background are being made in Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands. In Ireland, English language training is offered to migrant workers. Luxembourg and Sweden included initiatives for recognition of prior learning of migrants.

Sweden is also providing subsidised employment through step-in jobs for newly arrived immigrants. The Commission identified the initiative 'Basic vocational guidance in the mother tongue' (AT) as good practice. The project addresses the labour market integration of migrants and persons entitled to asylum with counselling on an individual basis, offering basic vocational guidance in the mother tongue, attempting to identify previous qualifications and work experience and offering information about official recognition of qualifications in Austria.

Labour market initiatives directed at the Roma

The Commission notes that the policies presented in improving labour market outcomes for the Roma stay within the limit of pilot actions or have a narrow, workfare type perspective. It recommends that Member States with a significant Roma population should increasingly consider "the important untapped potential which this category of citizens constitutes in view of labour force shortages and invest accordingly in education and training, including preparation for (and support of) legitimate forms of self-employment".

In Spain several programmes for training and access to employment were aimed at the Roma; Hungary provided various forms of subsidised temporary employment organised at local level. Ireland is expanding its 'Back to Education' initiative for senior Travellers. Bulgaria and Romania report on specialised job fairs helping the Roma enter the labour market. The Commission identified the Romanian project 'Job Fairs and Employment Caravan aimed at individuals with Roma background' as good practice.

Early education

The Commission comments that there was a clear recognition that pre-schooling can help compensate for socio-economic disadvantage and enhance the future learning capacities of children, and that it plays a particular role for children with a migrant or ethnic minority background. It notes for example, promoting early language support in kindergarten (AT).

Primary and secondary education

Children and families with a migrant or ethnic minority background receive specific attention in Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, France and Luxembourg. Austria and Denmark focus on integrating children in schools by involving parents in school activities and providing students with specific language training. France is providing newly arrived families with specific information on the rights and responsibilities of parents as part of the recently introduced integration contract. In Belgium the French community intends to facilitate enrolment in schools for irregular migrants, to improve social heterogeneity in schools and re-establish teaching of language and culture of origin. Denmark is strengthening advisory units for bilingual pupils in vocational training programmes, through mentors, optional classes and support for parental involvement. Sweden has a number of strategic initiatives for the education of migrants. Spain is focusing on developing key competences

and taking better account of the needs of students with an immigrant background. Slovakia has a new law on education, which prohibits all forms of discrimination and segregation in education and is supported by financial mechanisms.

The Commission identified the initiative 'Training addressed to Muslim children 2005-2008' (IT) as good practice. The target group is the minority student population, including those of Roma origin. The project will establish a Muslim Children Education Programme Support Centres offering language classes, creative activities for pre-school children, creative workshops for young persons, creation of mobile support centres to reach rural areas, creation of educational materials, training for teachers and psychologists including Turkish language training, counselling.

A number of National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (BG, CZ, EL, ES, IT, HU, LV, PT, RO and SI) refer to measures taken to improve access to education for Roma children. School mediators are attempting to improve the graduation rate of Roma children, as well as increase the rate of school enrolment (RO and CZ) and in Hungary a long-standing desegregation program under way, and Bulgaria has set targets for desegregation of education.

Lifelong learning, including higher education

Member States' education and training policies often address the specific needs of migrants, ethnic minorities and refugees (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EL, IE, LU, MT, NL, PT, SK, SL, SV, many of them offering language courses). The Commission identified the initiative 'Competence Centre' (AT), which provides counselling to assess prior learning and further education needs of new migrants, as good practice.

Monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities in National Actions Plans

The use of targets

The Commission, which encourages the use of outcome targets, explains that in the various rounds of National Action Plans on Social Inclusion prepared by the Member States three distinct types of targets have been used. These are:

- **outcome targets** in terms of the reduction in poverty and social exclusion in a key policy domain (i.e. unemployment, low income, poor housing/homelessness, educational disadvantage, poor health). They included targets such as achieving specified reductions in overall income poverty levels or for specific groups such as children or reducing the number of long-term unemployed;
- **'intermediate outcome targets'**, which include actions such as increasing the number of people in employment by a specified amount or reducing the number of welfare recipients, or decreasing the number of unhealthy years of life by a specified percentage;

- **input targets** which were more concerned with policy effort such as increasing the number of homeless assisted, ensuring that all immigrants can participate in a social inclusion programme, ensuring that all socially excluded people are assisted by social services within one year.⁸⁴

The Commission advises Member States that outcome targets should be the first priority although it recognises that 'intermediate outcome targets' can be an important complement. It states that when input targets measuring policy effort are used, monitoring of progress towards them should be accompanied by an assessment of their impact on social exclusion and poverty.

Lack of data

The Commission advises that at present the **Member States**, with very few exceptions (CY, NL), **provide no information on migrants and ethnic minorities in their National Action Plans on Social Inclusion** or on whether and how they distinguish the beneficiaries of their social inclusion policies. It notes that the implementation of the Regulation on Community statistics on migration and international protection (see Chapter 2) will help ensure reliable international migration statistics. However, as these statistics do not examine the socio-economic situation of the migrant surveyed they cannot provide an insight to social inclusion.

The **Commission highlights the lack of reliable data on the situation of Roma**. It explains that data on participation in education is not collected by most Member States with the exceptions of Spain (data is collected on level of education and drop-out rates - both broken down by gender) and Slovakia (level of education), and virtually no data is presented in the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion on the involvement of Roma in adult education and lifelong learning or vocational training programmes. To bridge the gap in data Romania have made some qualitative and quantitative analysis on Roma communities and questionnaires were sent to local public authorities; the Czech Republic undertook an analysis of socially segregated Roma localities (which showed that the number of such neighbourhoods has grown dramatically over the last decade); and the UNDP Report on the Living Conditions of Roma Households stressed the need for regular evaluation of the social situation of the Roma in Slovakia. Some data is being collected on health outcomes, including on life expectancy (Romania). Spain conducted its first 'National Health Survey on the Roma' to gain knowledge of their health status, lifestyles and inequalities in healthcare access; and Ireland and the UK are to report on the 'All-Ireland Traveller Health Study' which will include a census and an assessment of health status, mortality rates, and impact of health services currently provided.

⁸⁴ Information on targets, benchmarks and indicators is sourced from: European Commission (2008) Supporting Appendices to the 'Guidance Note for Preparing National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010' Brussels.

Selected bibliography

- Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs and The Economic Policy Committee (2008) "The LIME assessment framework (LAF): A methodological tool to compare, in the context of the Lisbon Strategy, the performance of EU Member States in terms of GDP and in terms of twenty policy areas affecting growth". European Economy Occasional papers 41, pp 109-116
- Employment Committee (2009) 'Employment Guidelines 2008 - indicators for monitoring and analysis - endorsed by EMCO 24/06/09', Brussels
- Employment Committee (2009) Lisbon Post-2010 - EMCO Discussion Paper, 27 May 2009 10274/09, Brussels
- European Commission (2007) 'Communication on Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs (2008-2010)', COM/2007/803 final, Brussels
- European Commission (2008) Communication on the renewed social agenda: Opportunities, access and solidarity in 21st century Europe, COM/2008/412 final, Brussels
- European Commission (2008) "Staff Working Document: Progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training - Indicators and benchmarks - 2008, Brussels
- European Commission (2008) 'Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008: Social inclusion, pensions, healthcare and long-term care', Luxembourg
- European Commission (2008) 'Guidelines on Guidance note for preparing National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social inclusion 2008-2010', Brussels
- European Commission (2008) 'Portfolio of overarching indicators and streamlined social inclusion, pensions, and health portfolios - April 2008 update, Brussels
- European Commission (2008) "Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy Structural Reforms in the context of the European Economic Recovery Plan: Annual country assessments - a detailed overview of progress made with the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy reforms in Member States in 2008" (adopted 28 January 2009)
- European Commission (2009) 'Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion accompanying document to the proposal for the Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2009', COM/2009/51 final, Brussels
- European Parliament and European Council (2007) 'Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers', Brussels
- Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee (2004) 'Overview of third level indicators used in the NAP/inclusion relating to the social inclusion of 'foreigners, immigrants and ethnic minorities' Document ISG2004/16.09.2004/2 prepared by the Indicators Sub-Group secretariat for the 16/09/04 meeting of the Indicators Sub-Group, European Commission, Brussels
- Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee (2008) 'Guidelines for Reporting on the Social Aspects of Migration in the Assessment of the Social Situation to be included in the 2008 National Strategy Reports' 30 May 2008, Brussels
- Network of independent national experts on social inclusion (2008) 'Building a stronger EU Social Inclusion Process: Analysis and recommendations of the EU Network of independent national experts on social inclusion', May 2008, Brussels
- Niessen, J. and Huddleston, T. with Verbruggen, N. and Kate, M. (2007) 'Setting up a system of benchmarking to measure the success of integration policies in Europe', European Parliament
- Niessen, J. (2009) 'Integration indicators, monitors and benchmarks', Background paper to the key-note address for the German Conference on Indicators and Experiences in Monitoring Integration Policy organised by the German Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration (Berlin, Federal Chancellery, 15-16 June 2009)

Monitoring the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is one of the most effective ways for ensuring that the Lisbon strategy improves the socio-economic life of migrants and ethnic minorities. This publication assesses whether existing monitoring, particularly in relation to migrants and ethnic minorities, is effective and suggests options for addressing the limitations identified. It aims to examine the social and employment dimensions of the Lisbon Strategy in order to establish the extent to which the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities and others vulnerable to racism is taken into account in European and national strategies, with a view to identifying advocacy strategies for anti-racist civil society organisations to ensure that this issue is given the attention it requires.

The European Network Against Racism (ENAR) consists of some 600 organisations working to combat racism in all EU member states and acts as the voice of the anti-racist movement in Europe. ENAR is determined to fight racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, to promote equality of treatment between European Union citizens and third country nationals, and to link local/regional/national initiatives with European Union initiatives.

