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Introduction

This paper was undertaken by student researchers from Central European University’s School of Public Policy for Menedek to evaluate the Integration Evaluation Tool (IET) 2012 and provide content that would enrich Menedek’s engagement with the subsequent revision and iteration of the IET (still pending at the time of writing).

The Integration Evaluation Tool 2012

The Integration Evaluation Tool (hereafter referred to as the IET) was developed by the Migration Policy Group (MPG) for UNHCR in order to assist participating states in benchmarking their current integration programmes and making improvements where necessary for refugees and beneficiaries of international protection. Additionally, the IET aimed to build expertise in refugee integration and promote capacity building within and amongst participating countries, organizations, and NGOs. One desired outcome of the IET was that the data collection methods and internal review mechanisms used would become part of a sustainable cycle that could be used for subsequent IET surveys and by stakeholders in service provision to beneficiaries of international protection. The IET indicators (survey questions) used were developed to identify “gaps in policy, legislation and practice, provide evidence-based needs for policy decisions and inform the development and delivery of integration services and programs” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 86).

IET Methodology

The IET 2012 was comprised of 118 indicators covering five integration areas: Education, Employment, Lifelong Learning, Equal Access and Quality of Housing, and Family Reunification. Within these five areas the IET sought to assess four facets of integration: legal, socioeconomic, sociocultural, and general (used as a catch-all). Indicators fit into four types: policy indicators, administrative inputs, financial inputs, and outcomes. Policy indicators sought to measure existing laws and policies against international and EU standards. Administrative inputs sought to measure ‘buy-in’ of these policies and services on the part of government and government in partnership with NGOs. Financial inputs sought to measure government’s resource commitment and usage of EU financial support. Finally, outcome-type indicators sought to measure whether beneficiaries of international protection did indeed have access to rights and services and how this translated into their integration and well-being within society. “The selection of the indicators and answer options [was] informed by a normative framework based on international and European law, UNHCR Executive Committee Conclusions, and other UNHCR guidelines (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 17).

The IET employs a mixed-methods approach to triangulate results collected from a variety of stakeholders using different collection methods such as: self-assessments, internal audits, independent evaluations, national statistics, and other quantitative and qualitative methods. This was done, in part, because the UNHCR defines integration as “a multi-actor process – necessitat[ing] coordinated actions by numerous ministries, different levels of state administration, down to municipalities, and also non-governmental stakeholders such as NGOs, employers, trade unions, schools, language and vocational schools, health care providers, banking system, landlords, [and so on]” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013). To facilitate this a national coordination team of UNHCR staff and government staff was established in each country to facilitate the data collection process. This focal point also facilitated training and other capacity building as well as crosschecking data with focus groups and individual interviews. An online platform was created for data collection with account logins being provided to experts who only had access to relevant integration areas (such as
education). Nearly 100 people representing “refugee organizations, governmental staff, NGO workers, researchers, and independent consultants” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 16) contributed their expertise.

**Scoring & Data Representation**

To ensure comparability, all scores were provided at the national level.

Qualitative questions assessing favourability used a 3-point scale (with 1 being ‘unfavourable’, 2 being ‘less favourable’, and 3 being ‘favourable’). This 3-point scale was then converted to a 100-point scale with ‘100’ being the best score.

In converting the results from open-answer questions using a 5-point scale (0 being ‘none’, 1 being ‘few’, 2 being ‘some’, 3 being ‘most’, 4 being ‘majority’, and 5 being ‘all’). This 5-point scale was also converted to a 100-point scale using 20-point increments.

For indicators in which an exact percentage or figure is requested, such as employment statistics, the provided figures were used where possible.

For the remaining indicators, special scoring rules were developed on an ad hoc basis, based on the available data provided in the online tool and benchmarks set against the normative framework in use.

Multiple responses for each indicator were then aggregated using simple averages to create the overall score for that indicator.

In presenting findings, the report used a stoplight-style visual:

Areas in which there was missing data or insufficient data to produce a score left the circle blank and included ‘MD’ beside the circle. Detailed breakdowns of the scoring were provided in the annex of the original IET report and will not be discussed here.

**Review Methodology**

To conduct the review we used: the UNHCR’s IET report; other studies and survey tools such as MIPEX (Migrant Integration Policy Index); academic papers and sources; and interviews with (former) MPG employees, Menedek, and (former) UNHCR staff. In approaching our review we decided upon four elements: 1) level of detail, 2) validity and reliability, 3) data availability and data collection, and 4) other items of note.

**Level of Detail:** How many indicators are there? How are they grouped? Are all the identified integration areas satisfactorily addressed? What at what level (national, regional, and municipal/local) are responses provided in the report?

**Validity:** Adcock & Collier define measurement validity through the question of whether or not the measure “meaningfully capture[s] the ideas contained in the corresponding concept” (Adcock & Collier, 2001, 530). Validity relates to operationalization in that it assesses how well a concept is
converted into an indicator that subsequently measures the concept. As such, one component that can be examined when addressing validity would be the underlying concept and normative decisions made around its operationalization. (For example, whether mainstreaming or specialist assistance is seen as a preferable goal will inform whether an integration policy is seen as satisfactory.) From this standpoint we keep centre-stage the question of whether the indicator is measuring policies in paper or in practice. When thinking about validity, we must ask ourselves if any inappropriate/unnecessary components are included or excluded from current measures. We also ask ourselves how the unit of analysis (satisfaction scores, percentages, dollar values) affect the validity of the indicator.

**Reliability:** We understand reliability as the “consistency of measurement over time or stability of measurement over a variety of conditions” (Drost, 2011, 108). Reliability would mean that despite the IET being administered by different people across different countries and localities that they would still measure the same phenomenon in the same way. Reliability is made up of this equivalence in addition to stability over time as the survey is administered and internal consistency in how the survey is administered and data collected (Drost, 2011). While reliability and validity are intimately linked, you can have valid results which are unreliable and reliable results which are not valid. An important consideration for reliability would be, “Are the questions well-defined, removing ambiguity in their interpretation?”

**Data Availability and Collection:** The IET relied, in part, on data collected by agencies prior to the survey. This would present one aspect of data availability as there would, in that case, be existing data that could then be collected for the IET. Availability would be affected by what sources and stakeholders the IET had access to and their roles as gatekeepers to this information. Data availability would also be affected by what type of information was retained or was accessible from stakeholders. We also consider the extent to which the chosen unit of analysis in the survey design affected the availability and subsequent collection of the data. Collection methods, such as crosschecking data and other attempts at triangulation were also considered for the data they created as opposed to the additional effort required for collection. In formulating our analysis, we consider the process as described in interviews and the results as described in the IET report and elements from our own interviews which are discussed in the IET Process Analysis.

**Other:** In this section each researcher provides their own comments on indicators or aspects that they think are missing from the respective integration areas. They also consider whether or not the changes they propose are feasible for a revised IET. This section is informed by the researchers’ examination of broader academic resources available on the theme in question. Suggested changes to existing indicators and propositions for new indicators are provided in Appendix 1: Proposed Revisions to Indicators.
Thematic Assessments

The five sections of the IET will now be discussed. Each section will discuss the level and extent to which each area is measured. Each section will discuss the level of detail obtained by the IET and how useful the questions are in this regard. Afterwards, the validity of indicators in terms of capturing what the indicator aims to measure and indicators’ reliability in terms of the source data will be discussed. Afterwards, data availability and its implications for the IET will be discussed. Finally, the researchers will identify any aspects that they found to be missing or in need of further development.

Education

The UNHCR Executive Committee recognizes education to be a key asset to foster refugee integration into the economic life of the host country. Scholastic underachievement, early-school leaving and youth delinquency are recognized as key impediments.

With a range of factors to consider towards integration of beneficiaries of international protection, the IET indicators measure a process. The indicators are composite and mainstreaming-oriented, understood to be operationalized as degree of equal treatment and opportunities with an averaged scoring of three strands of consideration [legal, socio-legal, socio-cultural]. Mainstreaming-oriented data scoring does not relate well to the special education needs of children and necessary targeted support structures. It is helpful to assess key questions that factor into the IET’s implementation [financial and administrative resources for educational interventions, for example] and impact and outcomes [number of youth educational programs that target refugee children, for example]. Therefore, indicators questions are expected to be geared towards assessing the outreach, utility and impact of the tool, with each linked to the other and not represented as a separate element.

Level of Detail

In terms of usefulness of the level of detail, it is important to note the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment’s description of indicators to have two key characteristics, i.e. quantifying information so that its significance is apparent, and its simplification so as to improve understanding and ensuing attention by policymakers (Hammond et al, 1995, 1-2). While the indicators do fare well in this regard, several of them are also composite in nature, with several questions factored into a single indicator used to evaluate educational integration. While this contextualizes integration in a broader comprehensive sense, it is difficult to assess because results from constituent questions that are part of the indicator may be variable and significant trends of one can mask the other within the same indicator.

Validity & Reliability

In terms of validity and reliability, the indicators do well in terms of face validity, i.e. relevance to the concept [i.e. education] measured. Content and predictive validity, however, could have been improved. Policy and outcome relevance is assessed as a joined-up approach, especially addressing areas of expertise, types of expertise, different actors and types of evidence. However, targeted approaches are eclipsed from the mainstreaming-oriented focus of discussion. Given the multifaceted nature of beneficiaries’ integration, the indicators do not provide adequate two-way dimensions, i.e. refugees’ preparedness and the corresponding preparedness of educational institutions to host diverse refugee communities. The UNHCR Executive Committee (2002) has ordained this to be a crucial element in integration efforts.
Data Availability & Collection
There are 20 indicators including provisions for targeted educational services. With indicators assessed against socio-cultural integration of refugee children around three considerations (access, support and mainstreaming policies for education) there are several gaps in data availability and collection. Foremost, data on the total number of school-age children of beneficiaries is missing. This further permeates the problem of not including child beneficiaries and their families in the monitoring and evaluation process to determine the scope and effectiveness of educational interventions. Given the absence of such data, a stratified analysis of the use and access of educational services, including secondary education, is difficult to make. Secondly, with mainstreaming indicators featuring prominently, data availability and collection for determinants such as access for vulnerable groups is lacking. In this context, data drawn from outcome indicators pertinent to access is encompassing, however, data drawn from outcome indicators demonstrating the status, definition, and scope of support services is lacking or not adequately presented. Finally, data on assessing the education provider’s perceptions and awareness of the full extent of educational benefits accrued for children and their families is not available.

To conclude, while the composite indicators are helpful to provide encompassing insight into the comprehensive nature of interventions, stratified analysis that helps assess policy, administrative, financial and outcome-oriented dimensions would prove useful. Further analysis may reflect a contextualized understanding of refugee integration compared to a regional procedure-oriented integration process that has legal, economic, and socio-cultural aspects.

Employment
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes “the right to work, to free choice of employment to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 30). Furthermore, it is widely known within the field that access to employment is part of the asylum process and an important, cross-cutting factor in integration and in establishing self-sufficiency for beneficiaries of international protection (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 30). This being said, legal restrictions around entry into the labour market and access to temporary state support mean that employment may be of a later-stage importance for asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection. “The right to work is often only granted after a certain period of time within the asylum process – 12 months in Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia; six months in Poland.” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 32).

Level of Detail
The Employment section comprises 18 indicators including legal, policy, financial, and outcome indicators. Legal indicators are over-represented in part due to challenges in collecting data for other types of indicators. These indicators established that legal supports are either poor or have too much missing data, due in part to the prevalence of ‘informal labour’ and its lack of documentation. As such, there is a pronounced lack of output results although output indicators are present in the IET. Where available, data is presented at the national level. The indicators were able to identify a lack of employment opportunities and discrimination, which hinder access to the labour market.

Validity & Reliability
Validity issues are present within the IET, especially regarding outcome measurements around employment figures. It must first be acknowledged that employment holds some inherent challenges in being measured (Sarkar, 2005; Pyles, 2007; Charman et al., 2015). For example, what counts as work, what counts as formal or informal work, how a person is counted if they are engaged in both types of work, and so forth.
Validity issues are, in part, due to a lack of data collection or reliability on the part of government offices, of which the IET is currently reliant. Without more information it is hard to say with certainty what underlying causes might be influencing a lack of reliability in responses or lack of responses altogether. The IET report and related literature suggest that an unknown number of individuals are engaged in the informal wage economy. As such they would be unable to use a number of government resources and protections around employment. If this were the case, then validity issues arise if the IET is solely geared to measuring formal employment using government-based sources. A primary concern for those engaged in informal labour would be concerns over losing their job or a negative effect on their status, especially in regards to a survey tool aimed at government policy development. The benefits of incorporating a section on informal labour must therefore be balanced against logistical, political, and ethical concerns about the data, its usage, and the consequences of collection.

In examining the reliability of indicators, there is a strong focus on legislation and the responsible governmental bodies which did well to establish a legislative benchmark. While the IET illustrated that there is a split between this benchmark and the outcomes, there seemed little examination of refugees’ experiences and how they could be assisted regarding employment. The employment section would have benefitted from putting data triangulation efforts more heavily on focus groups of beneficiaries of international protection, using snowball survey methods, and in leveraging NGOs that work with refugees in this area. At this stage, it would seem that the IET is useful in establishing policy and administrative information, including usage. However, employment is one area in which there is a need to capture outcome indicators, an area in need of improvement for subsequent IETs. Otherwise, it differs little from similar surveys such as MIPEX.

Data Access & Data Collection
Difficulties in access to data and data collection have been alluded to earlier in discussing their impact on validity and reliability. In general, data availability was low or not available in the four countries under review. Notably, none had reliable figures on the number of asylum-seekers who were working legally, let alone informally. Furthermore, there were challenges on the part of the migration office and NGOs on establishing these figures. For the part of NGOs, this is likely because they would not be in a position to give national figures as the subset of beneficiaries of international protection that they served were too small to be reported. The Labour Force Survey is used to outline broader employment phenomena in each country, such as unemployment and might be used to show potential sectors in which asylum seekers might be employed, however not enough data existed to narrow this down. Additionally, there were also difficulties in accessing data around the total annual budget spent on employment services as these figures were either incomplete or unavailable. As such, there are difficulties in generating data and using what is available. A valuable point discovered through the IET survey process was that in gathering data it was found that there were few, or no, partnerships of an official or formalized nature between state and NGOs in the provision of services, access to employment services, or in reviewing employment legislation. If these relationships were fostered it is likely that data access and availability would improve.

Other
The IET report acknowledged that challenges were posed in gathering accurate employment figures as it was likely that a large, but unknown, portion of beneficiaries of international protection are engaged in some form of informal labour. Definitions on the informal economy, or shadow economy, vary as have proposed methods for measuring the informal economy. A possible method, which might fit with current IET methodology, would be to conduct a number of ‘small area censuses’ of large or otherwise key neighbourhoods with a high concentration of beneficiaries of
international protection. Alternatively, a snowball survey method could be used in accessing information directly from beneficiaries of international protection with the understanding that this method holds its own challenges in establishing reliability. For example, snowball methods could exclude certain groups that are not connected to the initial survey recipients.

However, in considering adding a section on informal labour a number of factors must be weighed against possible benefits. As informal work is often illegal in some form and runs risks for participants, government offices and workers cannot be used in collecting this data, nor can they have any access to the data collected that might place survey participants at risk. A third party or perhaps NGO may be able to conduct this research, however they too must not be put at risk in doing so. Government reactions to engagement in the informal economy would likely vary but in general governments are either inclined to curtail or ignore the informal economy. As such, their willingness to participate in the IET might be negatively impacted if a section on informal labour was added.

For the purposes of this report two examples of possible, slightly modified indicator sets have been provided in Appendix 1: Proposed Revisions to Indicators based on the work of Sarkar (2005) and of Pyles (2007).

Lifelong Learning
Lifelong learning is understood as the acquisition of skills to enhance employability via vocational training, intrinsic to the labour market. Lifelong learning is recognized to be a key element to enhance active and social inclusion as well as personal development, with competitiveness and employability (European Commission, 2006).

Level of Detail
Indicators in this section are notable in that positive correlations are well identified (e.g. inclination to participate in trainings and long-term employment prospects). However, details on negative correlations can also be developed in data analysis using current indicators (e.g. practical barriers such as language). However, indicators do not provide information on funding for vocational and employment-related education programmes, which can be an important determinant for sustaining such programmes.

Validity & Reliability
Indicators to assess comprehensive structural barriers to address access and availability of vocational trainings are discussed. While there is a detailed mention of social and economic barriers, the IET has not satisfactorily identified legal barriers regarding why countries have absent or inadequate legislative provisions for lifelong learning. The indicators discussed are mainstreaming-focused and special needs targeted practical approaches, such as interventions for vulnerable populations and ethnic minority groups, are not identified. Furthermore, institution and discipline-based differences, including interventions for specific beneficiary groups and their administering focal points, would have helped broaden analysis on the special interventions section of this domain.

Data Access & Data Collection
Indicators are geared towards mainstreaming policies and currently data is unavailable on the type of barriers faced on access to vocational training by beneficiaries of international protection. Also, there is sound evidence, demonstrated by interviews with beneficiaries, on the mismatch between needs of the labour market and provision of vocational training. However, data on why this mismatch occurs and/or its determinants is lacking. This can be attributable, in part, to the observation that there is a lack of policy-level recognition that beneficiaries of international protection have
disproportionate access to vocational training. Furthermore, indicators on the use of vocational training services are treated as key performance indicators representative of the status of employment-related training. While such data contributes to a broad perspective on vocational training available, targeted indicators that focus on the content and quality of such trainings would also provide depth to the data gathered.

In conclusion, thorough survey of implementation and policy change mechanisms to address structural barriers for integration efforts in lifelong learning and employability could be further addressed in this section. Such analysis should take the unique needs and political landscapes of participating countries into consideration, including but not limited to: ethnic minorities, disenfranchised groups, women and children, among others.

**Equal Access and Quality of Housing**

Decent housing is widely recognized as a fundamental right that is enshrined in international law as well as EU Directives pertaining to the treatment and rights of beneficiaries of international protection (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 54; *ibid*, 93). Importantly, while the 1951 Convention provides housing protection to recognized refugees, its protections do not cover subsidiary protection as it is a relatively recent status within the umbrella of beneficiaries of international protection. Article 18 of the EU Reception Conditions Directive also provides a broader minimum standard for housing. Access to housing plays an important role in integration as it provides an entry point to civil society and satisfies a basic need, allowing for efforts to be placed in other activities associated with integration.

**Level of Detail**

Within the IET access and quality of housing is assessed using 27 indicators. These indicators are able to access information at the local and regional levels as well as present aggregated information for national level phenomena and policies. For example, the IET was able to identify discrepancies between national asylum legislation and local regulations in Bulgaria and Poland (excluding Warsaw and Lubin) where local regulations involved “nationality, official registration, or previous residency requirements that beneficiaries of international protection cannot be expected to meet as newcomers and effectively bar them from equal access to housing and housing benefits” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 58). This example also illustrates how the IET is able to balance policy indicators against actual administrative inputs and subsequent outcomes for beneficiaries of international protection. The IET presents a very thorough examination of different housing situations and experiences in gaining access. Additionally, a major strength of this section is that indicators also look to outcome variables such as quality of housing and satisfaction with housing situation and choice. Consider that the IET was able to identify that “the adequacy of basic infrastructure in reception centres in terms of space, ventilation, lighting and the like seems to be missing in Romania, considering that the available space in such accommodation is not fully adequate to ensure privacy or the fulfilment of basic needs” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 62) and communicate this information to policymakers. An advantage of the current IET configuration is that it does not only look at types of housing, such as renting vs. owning, but distinguishes between short-term and long-term situations and different types of aid related to these housing situations.

**Validity & Reliability**

In looking to the validity of IET housing indicators, the questions provided capture key ideas related to housing: length of housing, type of housing, funding for housing, free movement & choice, non-government actors involvement, housing legislation, and satisfaction with housing options. The
indicators are able to capture what they intend to measure through a comprehensive set of indicators that allow information to be aggregated while still representing the complexities of housing at different levels and for different actors. Additionally, the indicators were successful in identifying areas in which housing was at risk, exposing beneficiaries of international protection to the risk of homelessness.

Yet, there are admittedly no indicators that assess usage of homeless shelters by beneficiaries of international protection. Introducing indicators in this area would not only hold difficulties in stakeholder support due to political implications around the results but there would also be measurement issues. Depending on providers of homeless shelters, or their existence at all, there might not be much utility in introducing additional indicators in this area. Furthermore, it is likely that characteristics of shelter users are not recorded or not recorded in enough detail to be meaningful for the IET. Another aspect to consider would be that similar to the Labour section, it is very hard to reliably measure an accurate number of those who do not use a service or operate outside of governmental perview. By this, we mean those who may be homeless. Any data that could be collected would have to come from organizations that work with the homeless, likely NGOs, and would only provide a partial picture.

Additionally, there are no indicators around other elements of housing such as subsidies or ability to pay utilities. The utility for policymakers in introducing measures in this area is unclear. It may be useful for policymakers if subsidies for beneficiaries of international protection were only allowed to be used for rent as a means to argue for changes to such a policy. However, there is no mention of any such policy in the IET.

Overall the 27 indicators are fairly reliable as they are able to capture data across different local and national contexts.

Data Access & Data Collection
The IET used national statistics and existing surveys such as Eurostat data to outline general population characteristics, such as a baseline of severe housing deprivation and overcrowding in the four countries being examined. Data capture is still imperfect, for example, there is missing data for Slovakia in distinguishing those able to live outside reception centres via percentage (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 57). There is also a lack of data regarding monetary allocation to housing programs. However, this should be a fairly easy area for capacity-building in future.

Other
The IET acknowledged that “none of the [four] countries takes the proximity of one’s own community and peer group members...into account” (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 62). Questions around the socio-cultural makeup of neighbourhoods are complex and hold implications for beneficiaries of international protection. The current IET does not access socio-spatial characteristics related to housing such as ethnicity, age, or number of occupants per household however it does hold two indicators related to choice of housing. The IET identified that there was a high likelihood of beneficiaries of international protection becoming concentrated in poor neighbourhoods on the outskirts of cities due to racial discrimination on the part of landowners. A push outwards may also be due to limited subsidized housing or funds for housing within more affluent neighbourhoods. It has already been mentioned how high unemployment rates, housing deprivation, and overcrowding cut across the four countries examined by the IET. These factors would also contribute to a push outwards from cities to suburban, rural, or otherwise marginalized areas. Studies on the general population have shown how poverty can lead to social isolation and have negative impacts for the poor over the life course, leading to a vicious cycle of disadvantage.
(Gallie & Jacobs, 2003). Beneficiaries of international protection therefore experience intersecting disadvantages, including socio-economic challenges, which contribute to limited housing choices (Walks & Bourne, 2006). If we were to study the impact of growing up in an ethnic enclave or a segregated place, we would either have to separate out these disadvantages or acknowledge how they work together and that any policy response must be multifaceted in response.

In using the term ‘ethnic enclave’ we mean an area of the city in which there is a high concentration of a particular ethnic or cultural group. These groups might be defined along religious, cultural, ethnic, or racial lines. Importantly, the ‘ethnic enclave’ is not necessarily a forced space in which individuals have no choice but to live in. Numerous studies have been done on the ‘ethnic enclave’ but notably began with the Chicago school and its examination of ghettos. Studies were fathered by the Chicago School which held that ethnic enclaves were stepping stones to integration but not legitimate places in and of themselves to reside (van Liempt, 2011, 3386-3387) and could become a breeding ground for crime (Werbner, 2001, 672; Shihadeh & Barranco, 2010). This attitude has not gone away as recent terrorist attacks in Europe have been perpetrated by members of minority groups who often resided in such enclaves. These neighbourhoods subsequently became securitized and further ghettoized as a response to a perceived threat originating from particular places and groups living in those places. At the time, ethnic enclaves were seen as a failure of integration as a place of isolation which posed a threat to the host-society (van Liempt, 2011; Shihadeh & Barranco, 2010). The securitization and ghettoization of these spaces becomes a natural response and has included policy responses such as: policies of pre-emptive dispersion (van Liempt, 2011), increased policing, racial profiling, and active gentrification in breaking up neighbourhoods. Some suggest that the ethnic enclave inhibits integration through systemic barriers (Danzer & Yaman, 2013). While it is fair to say that racial segregation has negative consequences, this is a highly problematic understanding of the ‘ethnic enclave’ with dangerous implications for beneficiaries of international protection which inhibits integration and further marginalizes them from the host-society.

The formation of ethnic enclaves are not ‘in and of themselves’ a bad thing. Rather, there can be a variety of positive outcomes related to ethnic enclaves. The financial implications are heavily studied with scholars such as Chan (2015) examining how an ethnic economy arises as a response to various factors that exclude migrants from the broader labour market and incentivizes them to start their own businesses or work for these businesses. Chan found that businesses benefitted from their location and clustering (density of a minority and its placement to other minority groupings) as they were able to tap into social networks that provided them with resources to sustain a business or find employment (2015, 90-91). Importantly, networks within communities are able to disperse information about governmental programs, legislation, and policies that impact the lives of residents. These networks present a large benefit as the IET has identified that governments currently struggle to make beneficiaries of international protection aware of available services.

Yet, ultimately experts are divided on the impact of the ethnic enclave on its residents regarding different aspects of integration (Werbner, 2001; Danzer & Yaman, 2013; van Liempt, 2011; Walks & Bourne, 2006). The IET identified that difficulties in accessing housing such as being pushed to poor suburban locales negatively impacted beneficiaries’ ability to secure employment or other services (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 79; ibid, 66). Academics such as van Liempt (2011) illustrate the complexities of social integration, including how and why minorities within a host-society (specifically Somali refugees in the Netherlands) may opt into ethnic enclaves contrary to the state’s integration policies of geographical dispersion. Van Liemt’s (2011) examination illustrates how an
integration policy of dispersion may not be a successful policy response for housing beneficiaries of international protection but that even beneficiaries’ perceptions of this policy were mixed.

Questions about integration with ‘society at large’ should ultimately be directed at developing a bilateral measure which addresses not only beneficiaries’ willingness to integrate but the host-society’s receptiveness to integrating in beneficiaries of international protection. This topic is further discussed in the section entitled: Measuring the Bilateral Process of Integration. The IET report’s suggestion of assessing the proximity of members from their own community or peer groups (Bürklin, Huddleston & Chindea, 2013, 93) risks issues of validity as there are a number of underlying assumptions pinned to this idea of clustering. Unless unpacked and clearly defined, any indicators could risk multiple interpretations or potentially putting beneficiaries at risk.

Family Reunification
Family reunification is defined by UNHCR as the process of bringing together families, particularly children and elderly dependents with previous care-providers, for the purpose of establishing or re-establishing long-term care (UNHCR, n.d.). It is enshrined as a right in multiple conventions, including the Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The IET 2012 has adopted this right as one of the five key-indicators of measuring integration of beneficiaries of international protection. The EU’s emphasis on the special needs of beneficiaries of international protection should give way for more favourable conditions for this category.

Level of Detail
The structure of the indicator measuring ‘Family Reunification’ is the following. The main unit of analysis is the individual requesting the family reunification and a few questions focus on the eligibility and conditions of the family member or caregivers that want to come over. The overwhelming majority of the indicators focuses on the legislative or policy side of family reunification. For example, to what resources and agencies can sponsors and their family members lay claims, what terms and conditions apply, etc. From that regard the indicator seems to capture all relevant dimensions and aspects.

Family reunification is principally measured at a national level. This is sensible to the extent that most policies are national, however much of the execution takes place at the municipal or at least sub-national level. As such, de facto indicators should also take into account that variance may occur at this level. For instance, in the Netherlands, not every city has an office where a beneficiary of international protection can apply for family reunification. Hence traveling costs and distance can form an extra barrier in the process of family reunification.

Validity & Reliability
Some questions also are somewhat problematic in terms of validity, for example: “How many people of staff are working on family reunification annually?” This does not take into account that many of these people may work on family reunification in addition to a whole other array of refugee-related issues. This may, therefore, significantly reduce the amount of time they can spend on family reunification processes and as such may not be a valid indicator. Data sources for legal texts and procedures are not given but seem consistent and not indicative of reliability issues. Data collection however, as the report points out, is problematic for ¾ of the countries. Hence, the low number of applicants in Slovakia for family reunification may not be reflective of the actual number or demand, due to a lack of data registration. Most data seems to come from the respective states, though in cases where certain benefits or programmes are only provided by NGOs, data is extracted from those organisations instead.
With regards to how this policy benefits the integration of refugees, there have been a number of studies that underline the importance of family reunification. Although it may appear self-evident that beneficiaries of international protection will feel more at home and ease when reunited with their family members, the issue of family reunification for the recipient state poses questions of sovereignty and national belonging (Schweitzer, 2015). Consequentially, studies find that often the applicants for family reunification find themselves with reduced access to the service and the mechanisms that determine eligibility often suffer from legitimacy issues (ibid). As Lahav states: “Family based migration-policy provides a poignant example of the contradictions that may exist between liberal principles of universal rights, and fundamental state prerogatives upheld in almost all international legislation” (1997, 349). In that regard, the purpose of an indicator measuring family reunification should also look at how states balance these and whether the state’s current policies do not overly protect notions of national belongings vis-à-vis upholding international human rights, including the right to family life.

Another interesting point is made in a study by Ager and Strang (2008) on families constituting the ‘soft tissue’ in societies. Social connections are part of an interactive process on the side of the host-society as well, where a family can provide many more opportunities for social integration than single individuals (Ager and Strang, 2008). The creation of such opportunities is crucial as host-societies are seemingly more hostile to the reception of refugees. The interlinkages of polarisation, including geographical polarisation, with housing policies are thus of importance in assessing to what extent refugees can integrate in a given country.

In conclusion, the indicators capture the legal dimensions and to some extent also the outcomes of family reunification. However, in understanding how relevant family reunification is for integration of third-country-nationals, it is essential that indicators also focus on the fairness of the system. In other words, is the process extremely complicated, costly, and time consuming, or if it is simple or easier? Are officers finding loopholes to reject requests as a default? Crude numbers and legal documents are informative to some extent but reveal little about the process and beneficiaries’ experiences of the process. Where the process in itself is already a strong determinant of what kind of opportunities refugees are given, this is largely underexposed yet very important.

Observations & Recommendations

Measuring the Bilateral Process of Integration

One of the striking features that the IET 2012 does not cover – and for which there is no indication that it will be included in the upcoming IET – is an indicator on bilateral integration. Bilateral integration refers to the stance of the host society regarding the acceptance of immigrants. It has been identified as one of the factors that determine the success of integration, aside from the institutional environment and personal capacities of the settling population (Valtonen, 2004). Moreover, since the IET 2012 focuses on both policy and legislation dealing with integration, as well as the outcomes thereof, an understanding of the receiving society’s stance has the potential to be highly informative for policymakers. This section will briefly outline how host societies play a role in the integration process after which some suggestions on how to incorporate this factor into the IET will be made.

An influential paper by Ager and Strang (2008) develops a framework to understand how we define and measure integration. Their analysis puts forward four so-called ‘markers and means’: employment, housing, education and health. ‘Facilitators’ towards these markers are ‘language and cultural knowledge’ and ‘safety and stability’. It is important to recognise that across all of the four
markers there is opportunity for discrimination, especially when they are not governed as a public body, for example public hospitals or social housing. In other words, one’s treatment as a refugee in accessing housing, even when provided for by law, may be severely hindered by discriminating landlords. The facilitators that supposedly simplify or smooth access, are by and large determined by the attitude of the host society. The European Council on Refugees and Exiles notes that it is the responsibility of the ‘host’ society to create the conditions to enable integration (ECRE Task Force on Integration, 1999). Hence, in order to understand discrepancies between integration policies and their outcomes and the larger question of whether such policies matter at all, one cannot overlook the role of the host society.

However, the actual operationalisation of such a concept as ‘receptivity of host-society’ is difficult. One possibility could be a media analysis of major newspapers through the frequency by which they report negatively about refugees. Another way would be to look at national surveys asking questions about people’s attitude towards refugees. An indirect measure could look at support for political parties that are explicitly against immigration. An index about local activities to accommodate or support refugees could also function as an indicator for receptivity by the host society. Clearly though, all of these suggestion suffer from more and less serious validity and feasibility issues. Data is in most instances not readily available and for national surveys the questions asked may not be uniform across all countries or repeated with a high enough frequency to be useful in observing changes. In looking to support for political parties, support often fluctuates over time and the voter’s true motivation for support is impossible to determine on a large-scale basis. Moreover, countries may not even be willing to share such data or be reluctant to include this, out of fear for the possible political consequences.

However, as mentioned in the sections above, the role the host society plays matters for the integration of third-country-nationals. Hence, even if the measures are imperfect, it will still be useful to have some indication of what the stance of the host society is towards the arrival and settlement of refugees. Therefore, it is recommended that the new IET takes this into consideration and considers how it can incorporate this feature into its analysis.

**MIPEX V.S. IET: A Micro-analysis**

One of the most recognised tools in the European Union used to measure integration policies towards migrants is the MIPEX Integration Policy Index. The tool has been used in 38 states, including all EU Member States, consists of 167 indicators, and covers 8 policy domains (MIPEX, 2015). It therefore begs the question what additional value the IET can bring into the field of comparative integration analysis. The next section will provide a concise discussion of some of the similarities and differences between the two survey tools. The main purpose is to demonstrate what focus and direction the IET should maintain in order to become a relevant and value-added instrument for NGO’s and policymakers alike.

The largest similarity between MIPEX and the IET 2012 is that they both deal directly with states’ policies on integration. Similar to the IET 2012, MIPEX consults with experts, top scholars, and institutions in order to assess a certain policy in terms of its equal treatment of migrants (MIPEX, 2015). Though this does not per se happen for all indicators of the IET 2012, it is a commonality in the methodology. Importantly, the IET 2012 focusses on a specific group, beneficiaries of international protection, which is often subsumed under the ‘migrant’ umbrella. Narrowing the survey in this way provides targeted information on the situation and needs for this group in a way that they are not lost within the migrant label. It could be argued that MIPEX be altered so that it is
able to break up, as well as aggregate, different groups that fall within the ‘migrant’ definition. However, such a task is likely easier said than done.

The main benchmark of measurement for MIPEX is the point of integration through equal access and opportunities. In looking to this area, the IET 2012 has a wider scope or purpose than MIPEX which seeks to set benchmarks and show changes to those benchmarks over time. The IET does not only seek to ‘identify gaps and best practices’ so as to improve the integration of third-country nationals, but in addition wants to ‘build [the] capacity of and partnerships between various actors involved in refugee integration’ (Bürklin, Huddleston, and Chindea, 2013). Hence the IET 2012 has a secondary goal that goes beyond the mere technical production of a well-functioning instrument to measure integration. However, it is not surprising given the MIPEX survey’s wider diversity of sponsors and the IET 2012’s EU funding scheme, that this objective is formulated only within the IET’s context. Whether it actually leads to more cooperation and capacity building is not only difficult to measure, but also rather idealistic. If indeed more partnerships are established then success is clear; however if this second objective is never achieved, or if it leads to an inverse result such as increased animosity through competition, should the project be labelled as a failure? Arguably no, if the tool itself is successful at measuring integration policies and outcomes. Therefore, more effort should be put into understanding and monitoring how the IET could translate into a harmonisation between different EU Member States regarding the integration of beneficiaries of international protection.

Even though both focus on policy domains, MIPEX identifies eight areas of integration whereas the IET 2012 identifies five. In comparison to each other, the IET lacks indicators on political and/or national integration whereas MIPEX has three policy domains related to this topic: political participation, access to nationality, and anti-discrimination. Moreover, healthcare is also not covered in the IET 2012, which combined with the above named indicators, indicate a clear deficiency in the coverage of the IET. In order to gain a more comprehensive profile of the integration policies in various EU countries, topics such as political participation and healthcare are essential and should be included in a future iteration. We have already discussed how the introduction of a bilateral measurement section would benefit the IET in Measuring the Bilateral Process of Integration.

On the other hand, the IET gains significant value from its focus on both policy and outcomes. Where MIPEX also incorporates some outcome indicators, the dominant focus is on policy measures. Moreover, their methodology for these consists of quantification of extensive literature reviews on the evaluation of integration policies (MIPEX, 2015). Although these studies in themselves may be both valid and reliable, the source remains secondary, tending to become outdated, especially in the light of new policy implementation over time. The IET explicitly wants to measure both policy as well as outcomes. Although the analysis of the various indicators in this report has highlighted the need to further develop these indicators, the direct measurement of outcomes is likely to be more accurate and reliable, and therefore more useful compared to the MIPEX methodology.

**IET Process Analysis**

Part of our initial directive was to perform a type of ‘meta-analysis’ of the process of creating an international tool for the evaluation of integration. Due to the delay in launching the next iteration of the IET in 2015, it became clear quite quickly that an extensive analysis was not going to be feasible. Instead, through a number of interviews we managed to gain some insights into the previous process of developing, fielding, and analysing the IET 2012. These ‘lessons learned’, limited in the degree to which they are verified and cross-validated, they could still provide a cautionary note to the designers and stakeholders of the upcoming IET. There were three themes that surfaced in our interviews: network/capacity building, data collection, and the top-down organisation.
The first theme that popped up during the interviews was the network or capacity building aspect of the IET 2012. Chindea (2016) noted that it was difficult to keep all local partners engaged and that in some instances they formed a hindrance and would not cooperate despite earlier buy-in. Moreover, the language barriers between the IET research team and local staff presented a challenge: both for the meetings as well as for extra translation of indicators and questions. It was also noted that a majority of the local staff felt quite overwhelmed by the scope of the project. To accommodate this, the different policy domains were sometimes discussed in separate meetings to keep a clear overview of what had to be done. On the whole, the process of explaining the project, going in-depth over the indicators, finding out per country where data could be collected and by who, was an incredibly labour-intensive process. It required multiple local meetings per country with training offered to equip the local staff with a sufficient skill-set to carry out the research. In order to facilitate this process better, a standardised training might be worth investing in, in addition to streamlining expectations across the board.

The second problem that was mentioned a couple of times was that of data collection. As was pointed out, currently the data necessary to answer the questions of the indicators is not collected at an EU, comparative level and hence was one part of the project’s task. Many of the local partners were unsure if they could collect all data at the required level of detail. When alternatives or proxies were implemented the question of both internal and external validity came up. For example, how can you find comparability between two different proxies of the same indicator, or perhaps how comparable are twelve different proxies in looking at an indicator? Another aspect mentioned was that of translation. The indicators had to be translated and this in some instances also raised concerns of validity. The data also came in a variety of formats and thus had to be standardised. Finally, in some cases, there was no formal identification of certain indicators such as minority groups and special treatment with regards to integration polices. This made data collection for these type of indicators a challenge. Regarding data entry, it was noted that this was an area in need of further development as there was resistance by some stakeholders in using the online platform. Rather, they would provide written materials to the local UNHCR contact who was then required to enter the data into the online platform.

A final issue of the process revolved around the awareness raising aspect of the IET. Chindea noted that in order to achieve this goal of the IET as well, local partners have to be engaged and supported by the main administration. Although this held to some extent for the pilot version of 2012, enabling data collection across stakeholders to be successfully gathered, the current organisation of the IET is not transparent and seems chaotic, with no clear champion of the IET arising to take the necessary work of coordination and promoting broader buy-in from other partners. This affects the willingness and degree of cooperation from local partners who in turn hold the key to effective implementation of the IET data collection process. Hence, the transparency and communication of the top down to the local partners and actors should be clear and open in order to ensure that in addition to a comprehensive tool of integration, the new IET also facilitates necessary awareness raising and buy-in.

**Conclusion**

Built around the central premise of enhancing capacities and expertise of stakeholders and actors responsible for the integration of refugees, the IET 2012 examines key determinants to assess the status of integration based on education, housing, employment, lifelong learning, and family reunification. Indicators under each domain are primarily geared towards mainstreaming beneficiaries of international protection into established services. This relates to the IET’s core aim of developing
sustainable national data collection and review methods to identify gaps in current policies and promote positive developments for beneficiaries. Four main ‘lenses’ are used in the IET, i.e. general considerations, legal integration, socio-economic integration, and socio-cultural integration. The findings are meant for integration policy analysts, governments, NGOs, experts, and beneficiaries of international protection to delineate both gaps and good practices in the region.

While the IET 2012 made several gains by highlighting current gaps through establishing benchmarks within and between countries and policy areas, especially under the socio-economic and legal integration domains, key challenges came up that will need to be addressed. One challenge was to leverage local partners; acknowledged to be a labour-intensive process. Triangulating existing quantitative information and data gathered from ethnographic interviews, demographic, and issue-based data contributes to the project’s validity. However, this poses its own challenges as even within the same indicator different actors may give contradictory information as they interact with a policy or indicator at different points. Consider the discrepancies between existing policies and the outcomes experienced by beneficiaries of international protection. There is also a concern that if the IET becomes a long-term survey that action on the part of policymakers might be lost amongst efforts to collect data, examine policy, and successfully implement changes that improve outcomes. Given the multi-tiered levels of possible policy interventions and the varied hues of issues encountered in the process of beneficiaries’ integration; a prescriptive standardized set of challenges cannot be identified. The onus of policy-level change rests on inter-sectoral collaboration between different actors and stakeholders with an encompassing integration-in-all-policies approach.

In light of the above, we propose four overarching recommendations for future iterations of the IET:

**Recommendation 1:** Inclusion of a two-way indicator that measures host-society attitudes and willingness to integrate in beneficiaries of international protection. This would be coupled with indicators measuring beneficiaries’ experiences to enhance the multi-disciplinarity and cross-sectoral analysis that the tool aims to offer.

**Recommendation 2:** Gaps in data have been associated with a lack of information on the several issues of interest and offer only fragmented data to represent a complex phenomenon. For example, some indicators ask to be presented in absolute percentages or finer details such as an itemized budget for each beneficiary of international protection. This data is currently lacking because national statistical agencies do not currently collect such data. Furthermore, it may not have occurred to the relevant government agencies that they could or should collect such types of information. As such, building the capacity of national actors and municipal governance to develop and maintain quality statistical collection standards is key. Working closely with national statistical offices to ensure quality and also to expand the scope and availability of data collection tools used is essential for future IET iterations.

**Recommendation 3:** Outcome indicators play an important role in the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the European Union yet have posed significant difficulties in being collected or meaningfully measured. While an intensive range of outcome measurements is not feasible due to existing challenges in data collection, capacity and such, refining current outcome indicators and their collection is merited. This would contribute towards robust policy-oriented discussions on a national and regional level. Furthermore, shifting towards a few more outcome-based indicators will provide additional insight on what needs to be improved, determinants that require targeted integration efforts, and funding considerations for mounting an effective and sustained governmental response to integration.
**Recommendation 4:** Developing a standardised training process for stakeholders in using the platform and understanding key concepts related to their specific integration areas is needed. Related to this would be the delegation of focal point coordinator to a competent actor able to invest the time and resources into ongoing capacity building and stakeholder buy-in. Importantly this would require the translation of indicators for usage by stakeholders and training more civil society actors to participate in the collection process. Furthermore, this may provide an access point for including a broader variety of civil society actors, not just NGOs but trade unions, employers, educators, and so forth. The role of capacity building and coordination may need to go further than government, subject experts, and select NGOs.
Appendix 1: Proposed Revisions to Indicators

Satisfactory indicators have been removed, leaving only indicators to which the researchers propose changes be made.

Table 1. Indicators on Education of children of beneficiaries of international protection

Access to education for vulnerable persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must education policy take into account the specific situation of vulnerable persons receiving international protection?</th>
<th>A and B are required in law</th>
<th>Only one is required in law (please comment)</th>
<th>Neither are required in law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Is this group identified as a vulnerable group in the main education system? Are special needs children with physical and mental disabilities included? Are there special provisions in place to prepare such children before they enter schooling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Are targeted education programmes for the children of beneficiaries of international protection adapted for this group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To do: Put X in one box that best fits your country’s situation*

- A and B are required in law
- Only one is required in law (please comment)
- Neither are required in law

| Unaccompanied minors | | | |
| Victims of torture, rape, other forms of trauma | | | |
| Other groups (please comment) | | | |
| Any comments or references? | | | |
Table 2. Indicators on employment of beneficiaries of international protection

The involvement of social partners and civil society in employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the main national social partners (employers, unions) and civil society organisations in employment sector become involved in refugee integration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Have they included beneficiaries of international protection in their mission statement and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Have they undertaken capacity-building, training, partnership projects to improve how employment services are delivered to beneficiaries of international protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Have they provided support/assisted beneficiaries of international protection in accessing government programs or services?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To do: Put X in one box that best fits your country’s situation</th>
<th>All Three?</th>
<th>Two of Three? (please comment)</th>
<th>Only one (please comment)</th>
<th>None (please comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of social partners/civil society in employment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnership on employment with an NGO specialized on refugees and integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the state work in a partnership with a specialised NGO to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Review employment legislation, services, and outcomes for beneficiaries of international protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Does the state provide staff to assist beneficiaries of international protection to access employment services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Does the NGO provide staff to assist beneficiaries of international protection to access employment services?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To do: Put X in one box that best fits your country’s situation</th>
<th>All Three?</th>
<th>Two of Three? (please comment)</th>
<th>Only one (please comment)</th>
<th>None (please comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment partnership with specialised NGO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal employment rate for beneficiaries of international protection

| What per cent of beneficiaries of international protection in the last year were in formal employment? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **To do: Calculate the % for each box** | Employment Rate | Self-employment Rate | In Part-time legal employment | With a temporary work contract | With a permanent work contract |
| **...for recognised refugees** | | | | | |
| **...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?** | | | | | |
| **...for resettled refugees? (if no programme, leave blank)** | | | | | |
| **...for their reunited working-age family members?** | | | | | |

References

A mirror question could be inserted asking about Informal employment. It would include Employment rate, Self-employment rate, in part-time informal employment, in full-time informal employment. A ‘please comment’ area could also be included if the results come from focus groups or interviews with beneficiaries of international protection.
From Pyles (2007, 470)

People do different things to get by. We are interested in learning the different strategies you have used to survive financially in the past 12 months. Remember, all answers are confidential. How often have you engaged in the following activities to generate income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold something handmade by yourself to family, friends, or neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold something you purchased to family, friends, or neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a service to family, friends, or neighbours for a fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started your own small, unregistered business or home-based business such as a daycare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold recyclable items such as clothing or aluminum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swapped or exchanged foods or services with family, friends, or neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received money or goods from family, friends, or neighbours as a gift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received money or goods from family, friends or neighbours with expectations of some form of payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold plasma or blood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begged or panhandled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these are close-ended questions, follow-up questions could be asked if this is part of an interview or focus group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your present work situation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presently working in the informal economy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working in the informal economy but worked before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also works at regular, wage employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only working at regular wage employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of informal work do/did you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you first start out working informally in this line of work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you done this particular work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do/did you work for yourself or do you work through someone else?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If works for someone else, ask:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do/did you work for an organization? If yes, how many other people work in the type of arrangement you do? Are there some people who are employees and earn a wage rather than work informally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you learn about this opportunity? Did someone approach you or did you approach your employer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is/was your weekly wage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is/was this your first informal work that you have done?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are all open-ended questions to be used in interviews, focus groups, or distributed as part of a questionnaire (although the response rate for that method would likely be poor).
Table 3. Indicators on Lifelong learning for beneficiaries of international protection

Per cent of asylum seekers satisfied that vocational training improved their skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many asylum seekers in vocational training in last calendar year were satisfied that it improved their skills?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this box, if the data comes from a representative survey, please calculate the %. If the data comes from focus groups, please indicate the trend among participants (none, few, some, the majority, most, all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers’ satisfaction with training:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was the industry-based breakdown?

Access to vocational training and other employment-related education for vulnerable persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must vocational training and other employment-related education take into account the specific situation of vulnerable persons receiving international protection? A. Is this group identified as a vulnerable group in eligibility for mainstream training and education programmes? B. Is the targeted training/education for beneficiaries of international protection specifically adapted for this group?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To do: Put X in one box that best fits your country’s situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A and B are required in law</th>
<th>Only one person is required in law (please comment)</th>
<th>Neither are required in law (please comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied minors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (i.e. pregnant, single)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of torture, rape, other forms of trauma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups (please comment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What provisions are in place for such vulnerable groups?
Table 4. Indicators on housing for beneficiaries of international protection

Per cent of asylum seekers in last calendar year living in the areas of their choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What per cent of the asylum seekers last year are placed in a locality where they say they want to live in the country? (If asking asylum seekers, also ask “why did you want/not want to live in that locality?”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free movement and residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments or references?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Quality Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of these criteria do authorities have to take into account when assessing the quality of in-kind housing assistance for this group?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Security of tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Affordability of housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accessibility of key services (including transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Adequacy of basic infrastructure (i.e. space, lighting, ventilation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Availability of employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Involvement of beneficiary (him/her)self (i.e. useful needs assessment or part of decision-making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Proximity to other beneficiaries (including clustering and density along sociocultural lines) [NOTE: This change could be added here, but is not necessarily a recommended change]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To do: Put an X in one box that best fits your country’s situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All of these</th>
<th>At least one of these (please comment)</th>
<th>Are there no written criteria for a housing assessment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...for recognised refugees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for resettled refugees? (if no programme, leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments or references?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Per cent of beneficiaries of international protection in last calendar year living in the area of their choice

What per cent of beneficiaries of international protection last year were living where they want to live in the country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with housing location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any comments or references?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator could arguably be eliminated as there are flaws in converting satisfaction with housing location into a percentage. Additionally, ‘satisfaction’ can be open to problems of interpretation that affect overall validity of the measure. However, this would eliminate one of the few questions explicitly targeted at beneficiaries of international protection.

Satisfaction of beneficiaries of international protection with housing

What per cent are satisfied that their housing meets their basic needs, in terms of their employment opportunities, access to services, and family and community life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To do: For this box, if the data comes from a representative survey, please calculate the %. If the data comes from focus groups, please indicate the trend among participants (none, few, some, the majority, most, all)</th>
<th>Overall satisfaction</th>
<th>Housing meets basic needs</th>
<th>Housing enhances their employment opportunities</th>
<th>Housing facilitate access to services</th>
<th>Housing fosters family and community life</th>
<th>Housing is the area of their choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...for recognised refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments or references?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Might consider defining community life? Are we trying to assess integration into a geospatial community (whether of other beneficiaries, other people with a similar sociocultural background, or ‘society at large’?) Or, is the purpose here to have the respondent define community life?
Table 5. Indicators of family reunification for beneficiaries of international protection

Economic resource requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there an economic resource requirement for this group’s family reunification (i.e. income, employment)?</th>
<th>No requirement (please specify if there is no requirement for all TCNs or only for this group)</th>
<th>Yes, but requirement reduced for this group (please specify conditions for reduction)</th>
<th>Yes, requirement same for this group as for ordinary TCNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...for recognised refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for resettled refugees? (if no programme, leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the legal requirement of 'economic resources' also ask whether: When TCN's have to incur costs (travel, translation, phone calls) are there resources available to cover these?
### Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a language assessment requirement for this group’s family reunification?</th>
<th>No requirement (please specify if there is no requirement for all TCNs or only for this group)</th>
<th>Yes, but requirement reduced for this group (please specify)</th>
<th>Yes, requirement same for this group as for ordinary TCNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...for recognised refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for resettled refugees? (if no programme, leave blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the legal requirement for language assessments, also ask: Are documents to apply for family reunification available in the language of the applicant, or, are there sufficient translation services available to the applicant?
Family reunification staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of full-time staff in the last calendar year directly assisting refugees or beneficiaries of subsidiary protection with family reunification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of reunification staff (government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of staff working on family reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff working on processing applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff working on providing information, legal counseling, representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff working on family tracing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff working on economic, social, and cultural integration of family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># hours, on average, are spend on one client’s application for family reunification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
Outcome of family reunification *(Remove this indicator)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What per cent of beneficiaries of international protection still separated from their core family members would see reunification as important to promoting their integration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>...for recognised refugees</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...for resettled refugees? (if no programme, leave blank)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*References*

Aside from expecting high percentages throughout – how does this inform policy better if it is enshrined as a human right in any case? This seems extra, unnecessary work.
Appendix 2: Thematic Handout

Education
- Develop indicators on special education needs of children and targeted support structures.
- Include indicators that provide two-way dimensions; i.e. gauge refugee and institutional preparedness for integration.
- Include outcome indicators demonstrating the status, definition and scope of support services.
- Assessment of education provider perception and awareness of the full extent of educational benefits accrued for children and families with international protection should be included.

Housing
- While labour-intensive, current indicators are able to successfully capture a variety of data on housing.
- Capacity building is necessary regarding a lack of information on governments’ monetary allocation to housing programs.
- Some aspects of housing such as homelessness or ability to pay for utilities are not currently addressed however the utility of adding indicators for these is questionable.
- While it is possible to introduce indicators that assess the concentration of beneficiaries in certain communities, including other demographic characteristics such as their ethnicity relative to the host-society population in the neighbourhood or socioeconomic status, collection of this data may create undue stigma or risk for this group.
- In examining ‘community life’ regarding housing, we must first be clear in our definition of what that means: how do we define community, is this only regarding interactions between beneficiaries and the host society, etc.

Employment
- Encourage government offices to collect more data or incorporate data collection into service provision.
- Capacity-building by encouraging governmental & non-governmental actors to work together. Facilitating access to services is important and another access point to collect and triangulate data. As such, NGOs and other actors should collect basic data on how many people they assisted, and for what purpose.
- Including questions around the informal economy could improve the usefulness of this survey section but comes with its own set of benefits and risks. Data would have to be collected by a non-governmental actor with protections set in place for both surveyors and respondents. (NGOs might be able to collect this information via snowball surveys or a small census-style survey.)
- Issues seem to exist in accessing services. Relevant stakeholders should consider awareness-raising targeted at these communities.
• Develop indicators on negative correlations; e.g. practical barriers such as language, lack of awareness of vocational benefits for beneficiaries of international protection.
• Include indicators on the source and extent of funding for vocational and employment-related training programmes.
• Include indicators on identifying legislative provisions for lifelong learning.
• Indicators must also address inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups beyond the mainstreaming-oriented array of indicators.
• Identify industry-based differences will help assess the needs and training gap.

• Measure at the local/regional level as well as the national level, to gain more validity for the outcome indicators.
• In general, attribute more weight to the outcome indicators vis-à-vis the policy indicators. Also, to differentiate the IET from the MIPEX tool.
• Provide assistance for and make sure that participating countries have the capacity to collect the necessary data. This was a large point of concern in the pilot version of 2012.
• Simplify and condense some of the questions regarding the policy environment. Although it captures the legislative dimensions; some questions do not help to answer whether family reunification matters for integration, which is the ultimate goal of the IET.

• Consider including a bilateral measure of the host-society’s willingness to integrate as well as beneficiaries’ perceptions of acceptance or discrimination.
• Invest in standardized training for partners so that the indicators, questions, and their purpose is understood. Use clear language and better define concepts so that they are understandable to non-experts.
• Accept that there will be issues requiring translation of the IET or responses.
• Clear organizational structure of top-down, bottom-up, and lateral responsibilities regarding not only data collection but also maintaining stakeholder buy-in and supporting local focal points.
• There needs to be a clear coordinator or project lead that will be able to commit to coordination, awareness raising, and promoting buy-in of local-level contacts/focal points.
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