

## Guidelines on the research methodology and timeframe of the baseline creation

17/1/2017

### 1. Timeframe for baseline creation

Overall research period: 1 December 2016 – 31 May 2017

- Deadline for submitting legal indicators: **28 February 2017**  
(in case the online questionnaire is not operational as of this date, please upload until 3 March 2017)
- Deadline for submitting policy and administrative input indicators: **31 March 2017**
- Deadline for submitting financial and outcome indicators, as well as additional information: **31 May 2017**

For the attribution of the indicators to these types of indicators see below point 7. Please contact MPG for a bilateral discussion if you anticipate that in your country budgets on actual spending in 2016 will be available at a later date.

### 2. Your responsibility as national coordinator

It is the responsibility of the national coordinators to submit a consolidated questionnaire that is duly completed, valid and filled out on all strands.

As the national coordinator, you are not expected to have the knowledge on all strands, but you are in charge of organizing the research process to obtain all the answers. This will on the one hand involve desk research. To answer the questions, you can use publicly available texts, like laws, policy documents, official reports on implementation. On the other hand, where you do not have direct expertise, you will need to contact other researchers, professionals working e.g. in NGOs, government officials or other experts. We suggest that in this case you do not send the whole indicator with the answer options to the contacted person, but just send the specific question to the chosen contact. Then you decide which answer option in the questionnaire fits best the reply received from the outside expert(s). Please keep in mind that the indicators must remain confidential in this first research phase. You also are responsible to verify the reliability and validity of the answers. This can be done for example by desk research or by contacting another expert or a different source (for example NGOs).

Members of the NIEM national coalitions can be excellent expert sources to ask for the research; conversely involvement in the research process can be a way to commit experts to the national coalition process. You are encouraged to design the two project strands in a way that they mutually reinforce each other.

MPG is responsible for a coherency check of the data and the European comparative analysis. As such, MPG is also responsible for harmonizing the data and making sure that the indicators are comparable.

### 3. General objectives and underlying concept of the indicators

The indicators were developed with the assumption that the integration of beneficiaries of international protection is a public task, where the central government/state has the core responsibility to provide the legal, policy, administrative and financial framework for refugee integration. The indicators measure the transition from the moment of recognition to equal opportunities for beneficiaries of international protection. They try to identify the most important challenges along this process and anticipate where specific, targeted measures are necessary to finally achieve equal access to mainstream services available for all citizens. They follow the logic of “mainstreaming where possible, targeting when necessary”. They are indicators designed to measure the quality of the legal, policy, administrative and financial framework in a meaningful way and do not aim to provide an overall mapping of the different areas. As parsimonious as possible, they are nevertheless selected to match the complexity of the issues at hand.

This frame has important consequences for the interpretation of the indicators, presented in sections 4 and 5 below.

### 4. Assessed types of measures

#### a. Publicly financed measures vs. civil society initiatives

**Civil society initiatives** are recognized to be crucial, but complementary to state action. If not otherwise indicated, the indicators inquire about the existence of publicly financed measures, and not voluntary initiatives. State attempts to completely outsource its responsibilities for integration to NGOs and civil society should not be included, as this goes against the underlying idea of building the indicators on the highest possible standards. When we specifically ask about **voluntary initiatives**, they need to be interpreted as a complementary action to publicly financed measures.

*Example: Language learning and social orientation, 1. indicator: Even though there are many NGOs who organize, on their own initiative, free language classes for beneficiaries without receiving public subsidies, the number of people enrolled in these classes should not be included when you fill out the indicator. Should you come across additional information about the number of beneficiaries enrolled in classes provided by NGOs, but not financed by the state, please include these under “Any other comments, references”.*

#### b. Measuring the highest possible standards

The indicators measure the availability of the highest possible standards. We are looking for legal and policy norms that are stably in place (i.e. fulfil the requirements of rule of law and legal security) and that are, according to your assessment, efficient in addressing the specific challenges of beneficiaries of international protection in the context of your country. Whenever you have doubts about the meaning of words like “relevant”, “adequate”, “systematic” or “regular”, or expressions like “integration perspectives”, please interpret them in this light.

In principle, we refer with...

...“adequate” to such policies, laws, measures or budgets which have sufficient scope and scale to significantly impact on the integration of beneficiaries present in the country;

“*relevant*” to such institutions, authorities, policy areas or subfields which represent the state’s key responsibilities for the integration of beneficiaries (as also reflected in the NIEM dimensions);  
“*systematic*” to a deliberate, planned course of action with the intention to reach as many beneficiaries as possible with a policy, law or measure;  
“*regular*” to repeated efforts (as opposed to one-off activities) in an interval that is sufficient to answer in an efficient and effective way to the dynamics and changing challenges of humanitarian immigration and refugee integration;  
“*integration perspectives*” (e.g. in a certain area) to the prospect of an integration pathway offering a real and timely chance to find, in particular, employment, needs-based schooling for children, decent and affordable housing as well as participation in society.

In case of any doubt, please provide information in the comment box and explain the chosen answer option.

*Example: Mainstreaming, 3. indicator: Based on desk research and/or consultation with experts, your reply should reflect if in your country’s context the monitoring and review mechanism is assessed to be regular enough, and if all stakeholders, who are considered to be relevant in your country’s context, participate in the coordination process.*

### c. National/regional/local level

There are a few specific questions on the **local/regional level** in relationship to the national level. Please answer every other question based on what is available at **national level**. When there is a specific issue which is not a national competence in your country, but mapping is available about the range/average across the country, please provide your answer on the basis of this mapping. When the issue is a regional competence and there is no such nation-wide mapping available, please reply on the basis of the practice of the three administrative regions (e.g. Länder in Germany) with the largest absolute numbers of beneficiaries of international protection and note in the comment box the share of your country’s beneficiaries of international protection living in these regions.

### d. Mainstream vs. targeted measures

Indicators measuring the level of access to **mainstream** measures and services are designed to assess the degree of equal treatment with the rest of the citizens. Therefore, these measures need to be interpreted as support measures and policies or public services generally open to any citizen in the country who fulfil the required conditions. **Targeted** measures are specifically designed for beneficiaries to address the unique, specific challenges that they face during the integration process. All questions inquiring about the availability of targeted measures seek to know if such specific measures are in place. Therefore, in principle, measures generally designed for third country nationals and/or persons with immigrant background are excluded.

However, should there be any kind of more general programme or policy in place in your country designed for third country nationals and/or persons with an immigrant background which significantly improve the situation and the integration perspectives of beneficiaries of international protection, and you deem them to be important to mention, please provide information in the comment box and make a suggestion for the answer option, so that we can assess its eventual inclusion.

*Example: Vocational training, indicators 2 and 8: While indicator 2 seeks to know if beneficiaries have the legal right to access vocational training courses open to every citizen, indicator 8 inquires about vocational training courses that were specifically designed for beneficiaries (and do not represent a simply increased number of mainstream trainings on offer).*

e. Temporary vs. long-term measures

Some indicators inquire about the availability of **temporary/long-term** measures. Temporary measures are considered to be those that offer support in case of a brief or momentary situation of distress for a limited, shorter period of time or that are one-off. Long-term measures, on the other hand, are aiming to provide durable solutions for structural issues.

We would ask you to rely mainly on the differentiation according to your country's legal/policy framework and start from the assumption of what is considered to be temporary/long-term in your context. Please provide a short explanation in the comment box.

In case of any doubt, please provide information in the comment box and make a suggestion for the answer option.

*Example: Housing, indicators 8 and 9: Targeted, temporary housing support can be offered for example as a one-off cash support, to help beneficiaries pay the guarantee when they rent their first apartment, or it can be the possibility to stay in the asylum reception center a few more months after recognition. Long-term targeted housing support can be for example social housing specifically reserved for beneficiaries, or regular and stable cash support that they receive to be able to find and maintain quality housing, while at the same time they are still looking for a stable employment.*

f. In cash vs. in-kind measures

We would ask you to rely on the differentiation according to your country's legal/policy framework also in the case of the differentiation between **in-cash** and **in-kind** measures. Please start from the assumption of what is considered to be in-cash/in-kind in your context. Please provide a short explanation in the comment box.

In case of any doubt, please provide information in the comment box and make a suggestion for the answer option.

*Example: Housing, 19. indicator: The question on targeted in-cash housing support refers to the amount of any financial support that is given specifically to beneficiaries (and not generally to all citizens) by the state, with the purpose to help them find and maintain adequate housing. Housing, 8. indicator: The question on targeted temporary housing support also refers to in-kind support, which in the housing sector typically refers to the provision of dedicated accommodation for beneficiaries and/or access to social housing.*

g. Specific indication for filling out indicators on Residency

This indication is relevant for countries which maintain a more favourable national permanent residence system next to the EU long-term residence status for answering questions under the chapter Residency. Please first make an assessment which status is overall more favourable specifically for beneficiaries of international protection (easier to fulfil the conditions, gives more legal stability, offer more rights etc.). Your answers should be based on this status throughout the whole chapter.

## 5. Assessed protection groups

The indicators assess the situation of the following protection groups:

- Refugees: As defined in Article 2(d) of the recast Qualification Directive 2011/95/EU.
- Beneficiaries of subsidiary protection: As defined in Article 2(f) of the recast Qualification Directive 2011/95/EU.
- Resettled refugees: Meaning refugees resettled in your country, not refugees waiting to be resettled from your country.
- Persons under temporary protection: As defined in Article 2(a) of the Temporary Protection Directive.
- Persons under humanitarian protection: This category includes any other protection status given under national law and not harmonized under EU legislation.
- Asylum seekers: As defined in Article 2(d) of the recast Qualification Directive 2011/95/EU.

Note that asylum seekers (as defined in Article 2(i) of the recast Qualification Directive) are included in the questions only when the reception phase can have a significant impact on the integration of beneficiaries. The purpose of the indicators is not to give a complete evaluation of the reception conditions, which only would duplicate work already done e.g. by ECRE. Additionally, we decided not to include them in statistical questions where Eurostat data is available.

*Example:*

*Housing, 2. indicator: Asylum seekers are not included in this indicator as their accommodation is part of the material reception conditions, where states' obligations are significantly different from states' obligations towards beneficiaries. By definition, housing provided during the reception phase is designed to be temporary, while the indicators are trying to evaluate measures that are designed to lead to long-term solutions.*

## 6. Filling in your answers

- Please read the whole indicator carefully, especially the precise wording of the question and the “To do” box. Fill in the answer accordingly (e.g. put one X in the option that best fits your country's situation, or provide the number or percentage that is required). Make sure you fill out all dimensions of the indicator for all assessed protection groups. The answer options might not seem to be intuitive at first (for example, for questions that are perceived to be simple yes- or no-questions). However, they are arranged in this way as they reflect the scoring system, and answering to composed questions (e.g. “a, b and c apply”) is your contribution to the coding and evaluation of the answers.
- Please note that following your feedback at the kick-off meeting in Warsaw, an additional line was added to legal and policy indicators to enable us to identify the latest trends in the integration of beneficiaries. You should indicate here firstly, if there has been any change in law or policy since 2014 (Yes/No). Secondly, if your answer is yes, please let us know what was in force before 2014, by indicating which answer option matched best the situation before 2014.

- Please provide any additional comments or references that help MPG to interpret your answer in the box provided for this purpose. We would also ask you to use this box to provide information when you do not find answers completely corresponding to the questions. *Example: Citizenship, 13. Indicator: if you cannot find the official statistics on the acceptance rate for naturalization of beneficiaries of international protection, please provide us nevertheless with any kind of other relevant information that you come across, such as the general naturalization rate for third country nationals. When possible, please let us know if there are any kind of proxies that could be used to obtain an answer that is the most precise possible in your context.*
- We would like to know what are the laws and policies in place in your country as of 1 January 2017. Questions inquiring about the last calendar year refer to 2016.
- When your answer requires conversion to euro, please use the [Commission's monthly accounting rate](#) of the euro (leveling out day-to-day fluctuations) as of January 2017.
- Please indicate your specific source(s) in the "Data source" box. For example, please provide the name of the law and its specific paragraph(s) which are relevant. When available, please include a weblink to the source.
- Please note that the lines "*Where might you find this answer?/What type of expertise is needed?/What area of expertise is needed?*" are there to give you some hints and support in organizing the research phase, but they do not need to be filled out and strictly followed. *Example: Housing, 7. Indicator: if there is no annual reporting in your country on the integration of beneficiaries of international protection, you can use other types of publicly available sources to fill out this indicator.*
- At the end of every chapter, you will find a question asking for additional information and specific challenges. Please reply to these at the very end of the research process, and give your reasoned assessment, based on all the information that you gathered throughout the research phase. Be brief and concise, but clearly state the challenges and their relevance (one paragraph per challenge will be sufficient in most cases).

## 7. Types of indicators

### a. Legal and policy indicators

These indicators aim to verify if laws and policies are in place to implement integration principles.

Your answers should be based on laws/policies that are passed. When a law/policy was passed but has not yet come into effect, please note this in the comment box. When there is a legal proposal/government initiative to change the law/policy, please note this in the comment box.

Your answers should also be based on law/policy on books. Please provide notes on the implementation/practice in the comment box in case of noteworthy discrepancies, but cite authoritative evidence like research or government reports.

*Legal indicators* (submission deadline: 28 February 2017)

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline	3
Mainstreaming	/
Residency	1-5
Family unity and reunification	1-13, 19-21
Citizenship	1-10
Housing	1-2, 4
Employment	3-4, 8, 10-11
Vocational training	2
Health	1-4
Social security	1-2
Education	3
Language learning and social orientation	3, 13
Building bridges	/
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>

*Policy indicators* (submission deadline: 31 March 2017)

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline	/
Mainstreaming	1
Residency	6
Family unity and reunification	16
Citizenship	/
Housing	3, 5-14
Employment	5-7, 9, 12-13
Vocational training	3-5, 6-7
Health	5-9
Social security	3-5
Education	4-9
Language learning and social orientation	4-7, 14-16
Building bridges	1-2
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>

*b. Administrative input indicators* (submission deadline: 31 March 2017)

These indicators aim to verify if the government has invested in the infrastructure to implement policies and services in partnership with all relevant stakeholders. They seek to know if laws and policies are regularly monitored and updated in a meaningful cooperation with both other relevant ministerial actors and other stakeholders such as regional/local authorities, social partners and NGOs. For example, a purely procedural consultation process, where the results are not taken on board for the development of the strategy, are not considered to qualify as meaningful cooperation.

Your answers should be based on laws/policies that are passed. This may mean national laws passed by Parliament, but could in this case also refer to e.g. ministerial decrees or formalized agreements among ministries, NGOs etc. When a law/policy was passed but has not yet come into effect, please note this in the comment box. When there is a legal proposal/government initiative to change the law/policy, please note this in the comment box.

Your answers should also be based on law/policy on books. Please provide notes on the implementation/practice in the comment box in case of noteworthy discrepancies, but cite authoritative evidence like research or government reports.

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline	/
Mainstreaming	2-3
Residency	/
Family unity and reunification	/
Citizenship	/
Housing	12-14
Employment	14-16
Vocational training	8-10
Health	10-12
Social security	6-8
Education	10-12
Language learning and social orientation	/
Building bridges	3-4, 7-9
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

c. Financial input indicators (submission deadline: 31 May 2017)

These indicators aim to verify if the government commits sufficient national resources and effectively use EU financial support for the integration of beneficiaries of international protection.

Following your feedback at the kick-off meeting in Warsaw, these questions were re-designed to ease the burden that their answering might potentially require. Please provide the budget that was actually spent; or the number of full-time equivalent staff that was actually employed and which was specifically tagged as budget or staff for the specific goal of integration of persons seeking or benefiting from international protection.

One purpose of these questions is to see whether such data is officially available on a national level. Hence, we would ask you to fill out the fields when you are able to retrieve such data, either from officially published statistics or through freedom of information requests. Please do not forget to indicate the specific data source in the requested field.

When such data is unavailable, please provide in the comment box any kind of other relevant data, estimations that you come across throughout the research phase (desk research, parliamentary inquiries, assessment based on structured interviews with practitioners, online survey etc.), be it generally for all third-country nationals, beneficiaries or for specific protection groups.

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline	/
Mainstreaming	/
Residency	8
Family unity and reunification	18
Citizenship	/
Housing	15
Employment	17
Vocational training	12
Health	13
Social security	/



Education	14-15
Language learning and social orientation	8-9, 17-18
Building bridges	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>

d. Outcome indicators (submission deadline: 31 May 2017)

These indicators aim to verify if beneficiaries of international protection eventually enjoy greater participation and well-being in society resulting from a country’s legal, policy, administrative and financial framework for refugee integration.

*Statistics and evaluation*

Statistical indicators can refer to statistics released both by national statistical offices or other government authorities (administrative data). Evaluation indicators mainly refer to quantitative assessments or specifications stemming e.g. from annual policy reporting. One purpose of these questions is to see whether data is officially available on a national level. Hence, we would ask you to answer these questions when you are able to retrieve such data, either from officially published statistics or through freedom of information requests. Please do not forget to indicate the specific data source in the requested field.

When such data is unavailable, please provide in the comment box any kind of other relevant data, estimations that you come across throughout the research phase (desk research, parliamentary inquiries, assessment based on structured interviews with practitioners, online survey etc.), be it generally for all third-country nationals, beneficiaries or for specific protection groups.

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline questions and the impact of reception on integration	Baseline questions 1-2, 1-2
Mainstreaming	/
Residency	7, 9-10,
Family unity and reunification	14-15,17, 22-23
Citizenship	11-14
Housing	17-20
Employment	1-2, 18
Vocational training	1
Health	/
Social security	/
Education	1-2, 13
Language learning and social orientation	1-2, 10, 12
Building bridges	5-6, 12
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>

NB: For the purpose of organizing the research, even though they are not outcome indicators, baseline questions were added here

*Assessment based on structured interviews with practitioners or online survey*

After the feedback we received from you at the kick-off meeting, focus group questions were either dropped or re-designed into questions requiring either structured (group) interviews with practitioners or an online survey with practitioners (depending on your country’s specific context). A document with specific guidance on how to organise this part of the research is provided separately. In the meantime, please try to identify which method would be the most suitable in your country’s context to obtain reliable representative data: structured interviews with practitioners conducted by a moderator or an online survey directed at practitioners. Please try to already identify the group of practitioners that you could contact to participate in such an interview/online survey.

Chapter	Indicator number
Baseline	/
Mainstreaming	/
Residency	/
Family unity and reunification	/
Citizenship	/
Housing	16, 21
Employment	19
Vocational training	/
Health	14
Social security	9
Education	/
Language learning and social orientation	11, 19
Building bridges	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>

## 8. Glossary

### a. General

Whenever there is a doubt about the interpretation of a specific technical term, please consult the *European Migration Network Glossary and Thesaurus* available [here](#).

### b. Additional clarifications requested in your feedback:

**Beneficiaries who have been recognized for x years:** Persons who were recognized to be eligible for international protection x years ago and still live legally in your country, regardless of their current legal residency status (as beneficiaries, as permanent/long-term residents, as naturalised citizens)

**Costs:** Any other expense than administrative fees, that beneficiaries need to cover to obtain a certain documentation (i.e. if an official translation is required of the original birth certificate to apply for citizenship, the average amount of such a translation; if there is a language requirement to obtain a long-term residence permit, the price of the obligatory language test – the price of preparatory language classes should only be counted, when they are obligatory).

**Family tracing procedure:** A process whereby separated family members are located with the purpose to reunite them.

**Fees:** Administrative charges.

**First generation adult beneficiaries of international protection:** Adult beneficiaries of international protection born outside of the host country.

**Liberal professions:** According to the ECJ interpretation in Case C-267/99, liberal professions “(...) are of a marked intellectual character, require a highlevel qualification and are usually subject to clear and strict professional regulation. In the exercise of such an activity, the personal element is of special importance and such exercise always involves a large measure of independence in the accomplishment of the professional activities.” This typically includes lawyers, dentists, doctors, engineers, architects.

**Predominantly urban/rural/intermediate regions:** For this baseline indicator, please refer to the [classification of your country's NUTS 3 regions](#) according to the [urban-rural typology](#) currently used by Eurostat.