


The European benchmark for refugee integration:

A comparative analysis of the National Integration
Evaluation Mechanism in 14 EU countries



Evaluation 1: Summary Report





INSTITUTE OF
PUBLIC AFFAIRS



EUROPEAN UNION
Asylum, Migration
and Integration Fund

Safe harbour

Project co-financed from the
Polish National Programme of the Asylum,
Migration and Integration Fund



Project 'V4NIEM: Visegrad Countries National
Integration Evaluation Mechanism' is co – funded
by the International Visegrad Fund



Co - funded by a grant from the Foundation
Open Society Institute in cooperation with
the OSIFE of the Open Society Foundations

First published in Warsaw by Institute of Public Affairs, and in Brussels by
Migration Policy Group

Authors and data analysis: Alexander Wolffhardt, Carmine Conte
(Migration Policy Group)

Layout and design: Institute of Public Affairs, Warsaw

Copyright © 2020 Migration Policy Group and Institute of Public Affairs
No part of this publication may be reproduced or cited in any form or by any
means without reference to its title and authors. All rights reserved.

Cover: Ewa Brejnakowska-Jończyk

ISBN: 978-83-7689-347-1

The report may be downloaded from www.forintegration.eu

Exclusive responsibility for the expressed opinions is borne by the author,
and European Commission as well as the Polish Ministry of Interior and
Administration bear no liability for the method of use of the information
made available.

Published by:
Fundacja Instytut Spraw Publicznych
00-031 Warszawa, ul. Szpitalna 5 lok. 22
tel. 22 55 64 260, fax 22 55 64 262
e-mail: isp@isp.org.pl
www.isp.org.pl

Acknowledgements

This Summary Report is part of the “National Integration Evaluation Mechanism. Measuring and improving integration of beneficiaries of international protection” project, co-funded by the European Union through the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, the International Visegrad Fund and Foundation Open Society Institute.

NIEM is led and coordinated by IPA, the Institute of Public Affairs. MPG, the Migration Policy Group, is the coordinating research partner responsible for the development of NIEM indicators, analysis and comprehensive comparative reports. The Evaluation 1 research has been conducted in 2019 in a collaborative effort of the NIEM consortium:

- **ANTIGONE Information and Documentation Centre on Racism, Ecology, Peace and Non-Violence, Greece**
- **Center for Public Innovation, Romania**
- **CIDOB – Barcelona Centre for International Affairs, Spain**
- **Council on Refugees and Migrants, Association Multi Kulti Collective, Bulgaria**
- **Diversity Development Group, Lithuania**
- **Fondazione ISMU – Initiatives and Studies on Multi-ethnicity, Italy**
- **France Terre d’Asile, France**
- **Institute of Public Affairs, Poland**
- **Maastricht University, Netherlands**
- **Malmö University, Sweden**
- **Menedék – Hungarian Association for Migrants, Hungary**
- **Migration Policy Group, Belgium**
- **Peace Institute, Slovenia**
- **People in Need, Czechia**
- **Providus, Latvia**

The NIEM consortium has been supported by the strategic partners:

- **Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy of Poland**
- **Ministry of the Interior and Administration of Poland**
- **UNHCR Regional Representation for Central Europe in Budapest**
- **UNHCR Representation in Poland**
- **UNHCR Representation in Bulgaria**
- **University of Warsaw**

Table of Contents

1 NIEM Evaluation 1: Capturing change 2017 to 2019	5
2 Key results	7
3 Results in 12 dimensions	10
3.1 Mainstreaming	10
3.2 Residency	12
3.3 Family reunification	15
3.4 Citizenship	18
3.5 Housing	21
3.6 Employment	24
3.7 Vocational training and employment-related education	27
3.8 Health	30
3.9 Social Security	33
3.10 Education	36
3.11 Language learning and social orientation	39
3.12 Building bridges	42

1. NIEM Evaluation 1: Capturing change 2017 to 2019

The NIEM research helps governments, civil society and other stakeholders to identify gaps in the refugee integration policies of their country, take inspiration from other EU member states and improve the legal and policy framework. Following the NIEM Baseline Report based on 2017 data, NIEM Evaluation 1 analyses the situation as of 2019 and highlights key trends. Its results can serve as a roadmap towards comprehensive refugee integration policies in each of the NIEM countries.

This Summary Report presents the key data and developments in the 2017 to 2019 period, as they are reflected in the scored outcome of research conducted in the 14 participating countries. The forthcoming Comprehensive European Report details the developments in the countries included and identifies the best practices. The comparative results are intended to inform NIEM's outreach to authorities, civil society and experts and to stimulate debate on how to reform refugee integration based on evidence.

The countries included in NIEM Evaluation 1 are Bulgaria, Czechia, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. With the exception of Bulgaria, results can be compared with the previous NIEM Baseline research, thus allowing for a monitoring of recent changes.

NIEM's current analysis of national refugee integration frameworks focuses on a variety of legal and policy indicators. Other indicators measure mainstreaming, collaboration across levels of government and with NGOs, as well as efforts aimed at the participation and involvement of the receiving society. Overall, more than 150 indicators have been assessed in Evaluation 1. Results are presented in relation to the concrete steps policymakers need to take in order to establish a framework that is in line with the standards required by international and EU law: "Step: Setting the Legal Framework", "Step: Building the Policy Framework" and "Step: Implementation & Collaboration". The cross-country comparison covers twelve dimensions:

- **overall mainstreaming**
- **residency**
- **family reunification**
- **access to citizenship**
- **housing**


- employment
- vocational training and employment-related education
- health
- social security
- education
- language learning and social orientation
- building bridges

Results have been scored on a scale from 0 to 100, ranging from least favourable to most favourable provisions. Data presented in this summary report refer to both recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection (BSPs) and to the legal and other provisions in place as of April 2019.

2. Key results

- **Weak dynamics, large gaps prevail:** Few changes occurred in the refugee integration framework of the assessed countries between 2017 and 2019. Overall, refugees rarely experience fully favourable conditions to integrate in any area of life. The widest gaps remain to be in policies which would actively support integration, the mainstreaming of policies for long-term inclusion, as well as multi-level and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Most national governments do not work in partnership with civil society and local and regional authorities to develop and implement their policies. Funding the contributions of these actors is a major weakness. While countries score, on average, better in ensuring access to rights and an adequate legal framework, a narrow interpretation of the equal treatment principle often prevails over responding to specific needs and vulnerabilities.
- **Improving collaboration, driven by only a few countries:** With overall very inert frameworks that are slow to change, the only markedly positive development has taken place with regard to collaboration and implementation. On average among the 13 compared countries, NIEM indicators referring to cross-governmental and sectoral mainstreaming, multi-level implementation as well as the involvement of NGOs and the receiving society improved by more than six points, albeit from a generally disadvantageous level. On closer inspection, the drivers of this development are deliberate efforts to systematically improve refugee integration in France and Lithuania, and to a somewhat lesser extent, in Latvia and Slovenia. In most countries, however, change – if at all – came in a limited and incremental way.

Overall change 2017 to 2019



- **Gaps between recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection do not narrow:** The gap between residency, family reunification and citizenship rights for recognised refugees and BSPs remains. It narrowed somewhat only in France and Poland, while in Italy the difference in opportunities for long-term integration awarded to these two groups grew even wider. Governments and EU policymakers must consider how this inequality with regard to family unity, permanent residence and access to citizenship negatively impacts their efforts to integrate the more than one million people granted protection in the EU since 2016.
- **Few countries act, a few countries slip backwards, most countries sit idle:** Countries that have witnessed the strongest positive change across all areas include France, with improved results in ten of the twelve assessed dimensions, and Lithuania, with progress in eight dimensions; followed by Latvia (six) and Slovenia (five dimensions). Countries that saw no improvement in any dimensions are Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden. Romania

tops the list of countries with a negative dynamic, having scored worse in five dimensions. Hungary and Italy saw deterioration in three dimensions each. Absence of negative developments across all dimensions is recorded in the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden. Overall, the Netherlands and Sweden turn out to be the two countries with the steadiest frameworks between 2017 and 2019, with no change at all seen in systems on a rather high level of development.


- **Diverging integration standards persist across sectors, with gains in some dimensions offset by steps backwards in others:** The dimensions with the strongest positive dynamics between 2017 and 2019 are social security, where eight of the 13 countries improved, followed by employment, health and education with five improving countries each. Sectors which saw the highest number of countries deteriorating are residency, housing and health, where three countries each scored worse than two years earlier. Zooming in on the dimensions related to socio-economic and socio-cultural integration, health and education are still the sectors with the overall most favourable legal and policy frameworks among the assessed countries, followed by social security. In contrast, the least favourable conditions across countries are still found in housing, employment and vocational training.

3. Results in 12 dimensions

3.1 Mainstreaming

Results 2019 by country

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:


- National strategy for the integration of beneficiaries of international protection
- Commitments in the national strategy for the integration of beneficiaries of international protection
- Monitoring and review of policies for the integration of beneficiaries of international protection

Key trends 2017 to 2019

To address the specific integration needs of BIPs in a comprehensive way, governments require a national strategy to guide policies and actions implemented across all relevant policy fields. In 2017, among the assessed countries only Czechia, Italy, Romania, Spain and Sweden disposed of such a national strategy for the integration of BIPs. As of April 2019, France and Lithuania have also adopted strategies fulfilling high standards, while Romania had yet to implement its strategy with proper cross-ministerial coordination and review.


Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries



Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.2 Residency

Results 2019 by country

Step: Setting the Legal Framework

Recognised refugees

◀ less favourable


more favourable ▶



Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

◀ less favourable

more favourable ▶



Assessed indicators:

- Type and duration of residence permit upon recognition
- Renewal of residence permit
- Residency requirements for granting permanent/long-term residence
- Facilitated conditions for permanent/long-term residence
- Facilitated conditions for vulnerable persons applying for permanent/long-term residence

Step: Building the Policy Framework

Recognised refugees

◀ less favourable

more favourable ▶



Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

◀ less favourable

more favourable ▶



Assessed indicators:

- Administrative barriers to permanent/long-term residence
- Fees for obtaining permanent/long term residence


Key trends 2017 to 2019

The overall results on residency show a slight improvement of the legal protection of refugees and BSPs in 2019 in comparison with 2017 across all the 13 countries. Some legal developments took place in France, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden. The most dynamic indicators concern the type and duration of residence permit upon recognition and the facilitated conditions for BIPs and vulnerable persons to apply for a residence permit.


Policy-related indicators in the residency dimension refer to administrative barriers and fees for obtaining permanent/long term residence. No relevant improvements can be noted in relation to refugees, and conditions deteriorated for BSPs in some countries. The most significant deterioration relates to a sharp hike in fees in Italy. No changes are seen in Czechia, Greece, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Sweden and Spain.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework




Step: Building the Policy Framework



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Recognised Refugees
Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries



Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.3 Family Reunification


Results 2019 by country

Step: Setting the Legal Framework

Recognised refugees

◀ less favourable

more favourable ▶



Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

◀ less favourable


more favourable ▶



Assessed indicators:

- Definition of family unit for family reunification
- Family unity and legal status of family members (derivative status)
- Residency requirement for family reunification
- Economic resource requirement for family reunification
- Housing requirement for family reunification
- Health insurance requirement for family reunification
- Language assessment for family reunification
- Requirement to comply with integration measures for family reunification
- Time limit for facilitated requirements for family reunification
- Documents from country of origin to verify family links
- DNA/age tests to verify family links
- Facilitated conditions for vulnerable persons applying for family reunification
- Expedited length of procedure for family reunification
- Status of family members
- Autonomous residence permits for family members
- Access to services for family members

Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Family tracing services
- Fees for family reunification


Key trends 2017 to 2019

No significant changes affected the legal framework concerning family reunification across the 13 countries included both in the NIEM baseline and first evaluation. By and large, most national laws are in line with the EU Family Reunification Directive. However, restrictive provisions still affect vulnerable persons, as facilitated conditions are generally not provided in the Member States and only minors are covered by some special provisions.


Policy-related indicators related to fees and the availability of family tracing services do not show any important changes between 2017 and 2019 in most of the assessed countries. Most countries still obtain low scores as their policies do not allow a smooth implementation of the right to family reunion in practice, jeopardising the effectiveness of the provisions enshrined in their legal frameworks. In Italy, a sharp rise in fees represents a major new obstacle for refugees to unify with their family members.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework




Step: Building the Policy Framework



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Recognised Refugees
Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.4 Citizenship


Results 2019 by country

Step: Setting the Legal Framework

Recognised refugees




Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection



Assessed indicators

- Facilitated residence requirement for naturalisation
- Period of residence requirement for naturalisation
- Economic resource requirement for naturalisation
- Language assessment for naturalisation
- Integration/citizenship assessment requirement for naturalisation
- Criminal record requirement for naturalisation
- Documents from country of origin for naturalisation
- Facilitated conditions for vulnerable persons applying for naturalisation
- Naturalisation by entitlement for second generation
- Expedited length of procedure

Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicator:

- Fees for naturalisation


Key trends 2017 to 2019

The citizenship dimension appears as a very static area which has seen only few developments. While in Italy, Lithuania and Romania the legal guarantees for BIPs have been reduced on a small scale, significant decreases and increases of naturalisation fees mark citizenship policies in Italy and Romania, respectively.


Overall, insufficient legal practices still hamper the access to naturalisation in all the countries with the few exceptions of Spain and Sweden. BSPs receive in most cases a less favourable treatment when compared with recognised refugees. In most of the countries, the fees can represent an obstacle for BIPs to obtain citizenship.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework




Step: Building the Policy Framework



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Recognised Refugees
Beneficiaries of Subsidiary Protection

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.5 Housing

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Free movement and choice of residence within the country
- Access to housing and housing benefits
- Access to property rights


Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to housing for vulnerable persons
- Awareness raising about the specific challenges of beneficiaries of international protection on the housing market
- Targeted housing advice, counselling, representation
- Provision of targeted temporary housing support
- Provision of targeted long-term housing support
- Period of targeted housing support
- Administrative barriers to accessing public housing
- Housing quality assessment

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:

- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of beneficiaries of international protection into housing policies
- Coordination with regional and local authorities on housing for beneficiaries of international protection
- Partnership on housing with expert NGOs


Key trends 2017 to 2019

Most of the assessed countries, with the exception of Greece, have favourable laws to ensure access to housing for BIPs. The legal framework has not been affected by any changes in the majority of countries in the 2017 to 2019 period, with the exceptions of Hungary and Romania. On the other side, the majority of countries have deficient policy frameworks which fail to fully ensure actual provision of accommodation, with Czechia, France and Sweden having the most favourable conditions.

Policy-related indicators show rather minor developments in only six countries, with improvements in France, Greece, Lithuania and Spain. With regard to implementation and collaboration, however, some important positive developments have taken place in France and Lithuania, while Czechia and Hungary witnessed steps backwards. Overall, most of the assessed countries still lack mainstreaming, multi-level-coordination and cooperation with civil society to promote the integration of BIPs in the housing sector.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Step: Building the Policy Framework




Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline (2017) and Evaluation 1 (2019)

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step (as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.6 Employment

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to employment
- Access to self-employment
- Right to recognition of formal degrees and right to skills validation for beneficiaries of international protection
- Recognition procedures of foreign diplomas, certificates, and other evidence of formal qualifications
- Support in the recognition of foreign diplomas, certificates, and other formal qualifications

Step: Building the Policy Framework




Assessed indicators:

- Access to employment for groups of special concern
- Administrative barriers to accessing employment
- Awareness raising about the specific labour market situation of beneficiaries of international protection
- Assessment of skills
- Job-seeking counselling and positive action
- Targeted support for entrepreneurs
-

Step: Implementation & Collaboration

◀ less favourable

more favourable ▶



Assessed indicators:

- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of beneficiaries of international protection into employment policies
- Coordination with regional and local authorities on employment for beneficiaries of international protection
- Partnership on employment with expert NGOs or non-profit employment support organisations


Key trends 2017 to 2019

Across the assessed countries, there have been no major legal developments in the employment dimension. A few changes have been identified only in Romania and Spain. By contrast, policy indicators show a higher dynamic, characterised by some improvements in France, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia. A minor deterioration can be noted in Romania, while in most of the countries there has been no policy-related change.


Concerning implementation and collaboration, partly significant improvements took hold in France, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia. The general pattern that countries mostly advanced in the implementation and collaboration step in the 2017 to 2019 period thus is particularly seen in the employment dimension.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Step: Building the Policy Framework




Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step (as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.7 Vocational training and employment-related education

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to mainstream vocational training and employment-related education

Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to vocational training and employment-related education for groups of special concern
- Administrative barriers to accessing vocational training
- Raising awareness about the specific situation of beneficiaries of international protection regarding vocational training
- Accessibility of vocational training and other employment-related education measures
- Length of targeted vocational training and employment education

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:

- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of beneficiaries of international protection into vocational training and employment-related education policies
- Coordination with regional and local authorities on vocational training for beneficiaries of international protection
- Partnership on vocational training and employment-related education with expert NGOs and non-profit adult education organisation


Key trends 2017 to 2019

Legally ensured access to vocational training and employment-related education has been very stable in the 2017 and 2019 period, with no changes and countries generally providing for rather favourable provisions.

Policy-related indicators, however, still identify mostly insufficient practices in most of the assessed countries. Positive developments have taken place only in France – here on a broad front – and in Poland. Improvements with regard to implementation and collaboration are mostly driven by changes in France; Lithuania also saw some progress in the context of its “Action Plan”.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Step: Building the Policy Framework




Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step (as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.8 Health

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Inclusion in a system of health care coverage
- Extent of health coverage


Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to health care for special needs
- Information for health care providers about entitlements
- Information concerning entitlements and use of health services
- Availability of free interpretation services

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:


- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of beneficiaries of international protection into health care
- Coordination with regional and local authorities and/or health bodies on health care for beneficiaries of international protection
- Partnership on health care with expert NGOs

Key trends 2017 to 2019

Overall, only Lithuania, France, Slovenia and Poland made progress in the 2017 to 2019 period, mostly driven by improvements in the coordination and implementation step. The legal framework on access to health care has been very stable across the assessed countries, with generally high standards. Negative changes occurred, however, in Romania.


Concerning the policy-related indicators, the scores saw some improvements through developments in France, Poland, Romania and Slovenia, and negative changes in Greece and Hungary. From an overall rather low level, progress concerning mainstreaming as well as multi-level and civil society co-operation has been seen in France, Lithuania and Slovenia.

Overall change 2017 to 2019



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step (as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.9 Social Security

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Inclusion in a system of social security
- Extent of entitlement to social benefits


Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Administrative barriers to obtaining entitlement to social benefits
- Information for social welfare offices about entitlements
- Information concerning entitlements and use of social services

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:

- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of beneficiaries of international protection into social security
- Coordination with regional and local authorities and/or welfare bodies on social security for beneficiaries of international protection
- Partnership on poverty relief with expert NGOs


Key trends 2017 to 2019

The legal framework as captured by the NIEM indicators on access to social security systems and entitlements shows no development from 2017 to 2019 in the assessed countries. While France, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Slovenia and Spain ensure that the conditions for BIPs are the same as for nationals, in all other countries the law excludes BIPs from eligibility to certain benefits or requires conditions that they cannot meet as newcomers.


Overall, indicators related to policy frameworks improved slightly in comparison with 2017. Positive changes affected France, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Spain, while Greece saw steps backwards. The implementation and collaboration indicators, albeit from an overall still insufficiently low level, represent the most dynamic area, characterised by partly significant positive developments in Lithuania, France, Latvia and Slovenia.

Overall change 2017 to 2019

Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Step: Building the Policy Framework




Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step (as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.10 Education

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicator:

- Access to education


Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to education for groups of special concern
- Administrative barriers to education
- Awareness raising about the specific situation of beneficiaries of international protection regarding education
- Placement in the compulsory school system
- Length of language support
- Regularity of orientation and language programmes and targeted education measures

Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Assessed indicators:

- Mechanisms to mainstream the integration of children and youth under international protection into education policies
- Coordination with regional and/or local education authorities and school boards on education for children and youth under international protection
- Partnership on education with expert NGOs


Key trends 2017 to 2019

Few developments in the legal and policy frameworks have been identified across the compared countries. While France made gains between 2017 and 2019 related to improved access to university education, Romania further lost out after abolishing targeted procedures for enrolling refugee pupils. Legal access to education is widely provided. In fact, almost all the countries ensure access to different levels of education to BIPs on equal basis with nationals, from pre-school to post-secondary and tertiary education. The scores of policy-related indicators, however, demonstrate that administrative barriers frequently undermine full access to higher levels of education. Also, provisions to ensure access to education for vulnerable groups are very rare.


Focused efforts to improve implementation and coordination can be observed in Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia. But most of the countries still lack a multi-stakeholder strategy to facilitate integration in the area of education. Similarly, only a few countries see comprehensive multi-level coordination with regional and local education authorities. Moreover, in the majority of countries, there is no systematic state support for expert NGOs on education.

Overall change 2017 to 2019


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Step: Building the Policy Framework




Step: Implementation & Collaboration



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.11 Language learning & social orientation

Results 2019 by country


Step: Setting the Legal Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Access to publicly funded host language learning
- Access to publicly funded social orientation

Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:


- Quality of language courses
- Duration of host language learning
- Administrative barriers to host language learning
- Duration of translation and interpretation assistance
- Quality of social orientation courses
- Provision of social orientation for groups of special concern
- Administrative barriers to social orientation

Key trends 2017 to 2019

No changes occurred in the assessed countries with regard to access to publicly funded host language learning and social orientation, as captured by the legal indicators. Free language courses, with no further obligations such as costs and compulsory attendance attached, are provided only in Czechia, Italy, Latvia, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden.

Policy-related indicators show that improvements occurred in Czechia, France, and Slovenia, mostly concerning the quality of courses on offer. In general, BIPs still encounter obstacles due to the lack of translation and interpretation assistance when dealing with public and social services. However, in the majority of countries, there are no administrative requirements that can pose a barrier for accessing publicly funded social orientation and language learning courses.

Overall change 2017 to 2019



Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries




Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

3.12 Building bridges

Results 2019 by country


Step: Building the Policy Framework



Assessed indicators:

- Expectations of mutual accommodation by beneficiaries of international protection and host society members
- Awareness raising on the specific situation of beneficiaries of international protection

Step: Implementation & Collaboration





Assessed indicators:

- Coordination with regional and local authorities on social cohesion
- Encouragement of voluntary initiatives to complement public policies
- Support for involvement of beneficiaries of international protection in civic activities
- Involvement in national consultation processes
- Involvement in local consultation processes

Key trends 2017 to 2019


Indicators related to policies which demand a proactive role on the part of the receiving society and further raising of awareness for the situation of BIPs were mostly stable between 2017 and 2019, with the exceptions of France (where a new overall strategy was adopted) and Latvia (which has implemented a campaign). The negative trend seen in Poland, however, relates to the petering out of the last public awareness activities. The distinctly positive development in France also concerns a number of the indicators related to implementation and collaboration, such as supporting interaction of the receiving society with BIPs at regional and local levels as well as the involvement of BIPs in civic activities.

Overall change 2017 to 2019



Averages of the scores assigned to the indicators assessed within each step: Average from 13 compared countries in NIEM Baseline 2017 and Evaluation 1 2019

Overall change 2017 to 2019 by countries



Average of the scores assigned to each step
(as the average of the indicators assessed within each step)

Project leader

**INSTITUTE OF
PUBLIC AFFAIRS**



Coordinating research partner



Project partners

