



MIGRANT INTEGRATION POLICY INDEX 2015

Thomas Huddleston with Özge Bilgili, Anne-Linde Joki and Zvezda Vankova

With the vision of Jan Niessen, the scientific review of Anna Bardolet, Francesc Fàbregues, J. David Ingleby and Elena Sánchez-Montijano and the support of Karina Shklyan







The MIPEX 2015 is produced as part of the project: "Integration Policies: Who Benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates", co-financed by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, European Union.

© 2015 CIDOB and MPG

Content generated from Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015

To reference MIPEX2015 please use the following academic citation: Huddleston, Thomas; Bilgili, Özge; Joki, Anne-Linde and Vankova, Zvezda (2015). Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015. Barcelona/ Brussels: CIDOB and MPG.

With the vision of Jan Niessen, the scientific review of Anna Bardolet, Francesc Fàbregues, J. David Ingleby and Elena Sánchez-Montijano and the support of Karina Shklyan

Website for full MIPEX results, online tool: www.mipex.eu

Infographics design: Youngminds
Pictograms design: Joan Anton Balcells, CIDOB

Published by:

Barcelona Center for International Affairs (CIDOB) Elisabets, 12 08001 Barcelona, Spain mipex2015@cidob.org http://www.cidob.org

Migration Policy Group (MPG) 205 Rue Belliard, Box 1 1040 Brussels, Belgium mipex@migpolgroup.com http://www.migpolgroup.com

ISBN: 978-84-92511-45-7 **D.L.:** B 17693-2015



Barcelona/Brussels, June 2015 All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to mipex2015@cidob.org

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS THE "INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?" PROJECT?

"Integration Policies: Who Benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates" is a project co-funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals. The project identifies and measures integration outcomes, integration policies, and other contextual factors that can impact policy effectiveness; describes the real and potential beneficiaries of policies; and collects and analyses high-quality evaluations of integration policy effects.

Three are the main aims of the project:

- 1) LATEST POLICY COMPARISONS (MIPEX 2015): What are the trends and differences in integration policies in eight areas across Europe and the developed world?
- 2) MONITORING STATISTICS: Which integration outcomes can and do different integration policies affect? Which immigrants can and do benefit from these policies?

 3) ROBUST EVALUATIONS: Which countries have robust evaluations of their policies' effects on integration? Which policies are found to be most effective for improving integration outcomes?

1. LATEST POLICY COMPARISONS (MIPEX2015)

What is the Migrant Integration Policy Index?

Migrant Integration Policy Index is a unique tool which measures policies to integrate migrants. 167 policy indicators have been developed to create a rich, multi-dimensional picture of migrants' opportunities to participate in society. The index is a useful tool to evaluate and compare what governments are doing to promote the integration of migrants in all the countries analysed.

The new edition (MIPEX2015) includes information on 38 countries: all EU Member States, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and the USA. It analyses 8 policies areas of integration: labour market mobility, education of children, political participation, family reunion, access to nationality, health (new policy area), permanent residence and anti-discrimination.

Thanks to the relevance and rigor of its indicators, the MIPEX has been recognised as a common quick reference guide across Europe. Policymakers, NGOs, researchers, and European and international institutions are using its data not only to understand and compare national integration policies, but also to improve standards for equal treatment. MIPEX2015 covers more countries and more policies than the previous edition. Moreover, the project informs and engages key policy actors about how to use indicators to improve integration governance and policy effectiveness. http://www.mipex.eu/what-is-mipex

Why use MIPEX?

MIPEX promotes transparency by increasing public knowledge and visibility of national policies, changes and international trends. Integration actors can struggle to find up-to-date, comprehensive research data and analysis on which to base policies, proposals for change and projects to achieve equality in their country. Instead they may find anecdotal, out-dated information and piecemeal statistics that are too disconnected from the real impact on people's lives to assist in formulating improvements.

The MIPEX aims to address this by providing a comprehensive tool which can be used to assess, compare and improve integration policy. The MIPEX includes 38 countries in order to provide a view of integration policies across a broad range of differing environments.

The tool allows you to dig deep into the multiple factors that influence the integration of migrants into society and allows you to use the full MIPEX results to analyse and assess past and future changes in policy.

Who produces MIPEX?

MIPEX is a key element of the project "Integration policies: Who benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates", leaded by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB), and the Migration Policy Group (MPG). MIPEX2015 rests on the extensive and long-term collaboration of trusted partners, experts and supporters of the project. We thank those who gave their valuable input at the stakeholder and expert consultations on each of the MIPEX issues as well as at the usability seminar.

We are extremely grateful to our network of partners for their energy and commitment to the MIPEX. Finally, we extend our full and heartfelt appreciation to the networks of experts, peer reviewers, and country profile contributors, who shared their detailed knowledge to produce the comparative data on which the MIPEX depends.

The research is designed, coordinated and undertaken by the Migration Policy Group in cooperation with the research partners. The publication, including the results and country profiles, were written by the Migration Policy Group. The national partners, in coordination with the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB), held a series of events in 2015 to launch debates across Europe, North America, Oceania and Asia. For the full and interactive results please go to: www.mipex.eu.

The project "Integration policies: Who benefits?" is co-funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals. The research for the health strand was co-funded by the International Organization for Migration IOM), and the DG SANTE (Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety) and CHAFEA (Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency) of the European Commission. For the other countries, funding was obtained on a case by

case basis. http://www.mipex.eu/who-produces-mipex

What are the highest standards used by MIPEX?

For each of the 8 policy areas MIPEX identifies the highest European and international standards aimed at achieving equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all residents. The highest standards are drawn from Council of Europe Conventions, European Union Directives and international conventions (for more information see: http://mipex.eu/methodology). Where there are only minimum standards, European-wide policy recommendations are used.

How does MIPEX decide the scores?

There are 167 policy indicators on migrant integration in the MIPEX. These have been designed to benchmark current laws and policies against the highest standards through consultations with top scholars and institutions using and conducting comparative research in their area of expertise. A policy indicator is a question relating to a specific policy component of one of the 8 policy areas. For each answer, there are 3 options. The maximum of 3 points is awarded when policies meet the highest standards for equal treatment. Within each of the 8 policy areas, the indicator scores are averaged together to give one of 4 dimension scores which examine the same aspect of policy. The 4 dimension scores are then averaged together to give the policy area score for each of the 8 policy areas per country which, averaged together one more time, lead to the overall scores for each country. In order to make rankings and comparisons, the initial 1, 2, 3 scale is converted into a 0, 50, 100 scale for dimensions and policy areas, where 100 is the top score.

The MIPEX research process

The scientific partners for each strand reviewed the previous MIPEX III indicators to guarantee that they were clearly worded, policy-relevant, and sustainable for future updating. With the final review of the indicators among the scientific partners, MPG approved the final list of 167 indicators. The indicators were completed by the national experts and anonymously double-checked by peer reviewers. The new health strand was completed by a separate set of migrant health policy experts and only for 2014. MPG's central research staff checked both the experts' and peer reviewers' responses to guarantee that they properly understood the questions and answered them in a consistent manner as in other countries.

In each country there were a handful of questions where expert and peer reviewer disagreed. The MPG central research team mediated an anonymous discussion between the two in order to obtain the correct response based on

publically-available data and legal texts.

The finalised data for the 38 countries was inputted and analysed centrally by the CIDOB and MPG team. The CIDOB and MPG team were able to write up national country profiles. They focused on recent policy changes and investigated the justifications and potential impact of these changes. The results were also written up for each of the eight policy strands as well as for the overall score.

2. MONITORING STATISTICS

The project also identifies and measures integration outcomes, other contextual factors that can impact policy effectiveness and describes the real and potential beneficiaries of policies. In order to monitor policy outcomes, the research team designed a set of international indicators of immigrant integration. The EU integration indicators were taken as the starting point for this and adapted accordingly in order to determine the key outcome indicators in the 7 policy areas (health is not included), with a focus on the various specific target groups of the policies being measure by MIPEX. In the same way, real and potential beneficiary indicators were designed to quantify the share of immigrants potentially eligible or affected by a given policy for the 7 areas of integration. A discussion meeting was organised with EU-level stakeholders to discuss the use of integration indicators in policy debates and solicit their views on the MIPEX Outcome and Beneficiary indicators for their work. The indicators were calculated using harmonised microdata sets allowing for cross-country comparisons across all 7 strands.

3. ROBUST EVALUATIONS

Finally, the project collects and analyses high-quality evaluations of integration policy effects. The evaluation research consists of an extensive and systematic literature review on integration policy effectiveness research regarding different policy areas in the EU as well as some other major immigration countries such as the United States, Canada and Australia. In cooperation with evaluation experts in each country, we accessed impact evaluations that applied high quality quantitative research methods.

We developed a database giving a thorough summary of the studies with a focus on labour market mobility as this turned out to be the policy dimension that received the most attention in the literature. Based on this database, we analysed which active labour market policies and programs benefit migrants the most under what conditions and concluded with recommendations for future research.

MIPEX2015 Acknowledgements 03

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The MIPEX coordination team:

Direction

Thomas Huddleston, MIPEX2015 Project Co-Director, Migration Policy Group

Jan Niessen, Former Project Co-Director, Migration Policy Group

Elena Sánchez-Montijano, MIPEX2015 Project Co-Director, CIDOB

Researchers

Özge Bilgili, Evaluation Researcher, CIDOB
J. David Ingleby, Professor, Centre for Social Science and
Global Health, Univ. of Amsterdam
Anne-Linde Joki, Statistics Researcher, Migration Policy

Zvezda Vankova, Central Research Coordinator, Migration Policy Group

Assistants

Anna Bardolet, Researcher, CIDOB Khali El-Ahmad, Project Volunteer Cristina Serrano, Communication officer, CIDOB Karina Shklyan, Project Volunteer

Project managers

Clara Creixams, Project Officer, CIDOB Francesc Fàbregues, Projects Manager, CIDOB Frederic Goffard, Office Manager, Migration Policy Group **Extensive collaboration:** The four edition of the MIPEX (MIPEX2015) rests on the extensive and long-term collaboration of trusted partners, experts and supporters of the project.

We are extremely grateful to our network of partners for their energy and commitment to the MIPEX: Australia: Australian National University - College of Law Migration Law Program; Austria: Beratungszentrum für Migranten und Migrantinnen (Counselling Centre for Migrants); Belgium: Group for Research on Ethnic Relations, Migration and Equality (GERME) - University Libre de Bruxelles (ULB); Bulgaria: Open Society Institute - Sofia; Canada: Global Diversity Exchange and The Ryerson Centre for Immigration and Settlement (RCIS); Croatia: Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies; Cyprus: Centre for the Advancement of Research and Development in Educational Technology (CARDET); Czech Republic: Multicultural Center Prague; Estonia: Institute of Baltic Studies; Finland: Institute of Migration; France: France Terre d'Asile; Germany: Heinrich Böll Foundation, Berlin Institute for Empirical Research on Integration and Migration, and Der Rat für Migration; **Greece:** Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP); Hungary: ICCR - Budapest Foundation; Iceland: Icelandic Human Rights Centre; Ireland: Immigrant Council of Ireland; Italy: Fondazione Initiatives and Studies on Multi-ethnicity (ISMU); Japan: Meijo University; Latvia: Center for Public Policy-Providus; Lithuania: Lithuanian Social Research Centre (LSRC); Luxembourg: Association de Soutien des Travailleurs Immigrés (ASTI); Malta: The People for Change Foundation; Netherlands: Maastricht University - Faculty of Law; Poland: Institute for Public Affairs (IPA); Portugal: Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning -University of Lisbon (IGOT) and Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian; Romania: The Foundation for an Open Society; Slovakia: Institute for Public Affairs (IVO); Slovenia: The peace Institute; **Spain:** Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB); South Korea: Sookmyung Women's University; Sweden: Swedish Red Cross; Switzerland: Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts - Social Work and SFM – Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies; Turkey: İstanbul Bilgi University and Istanbul Kemerburgaz University; United Kingdom: Centre on Migration, Policy, and Society (COMPAS); United States of America: Boston College School of Social Work's (BCSSW)

MIPEX2015 Acknowledgements 04

Finally, we extend our full and heartfelt appreciation to the networks of experts, peer reviewers, and country profile contributors, who shared their detailed knowledge to produce the comparative data on which the MIPEX depends. Their names are listed below and more detailed information is available on the website at http://www.mipex.eu.

Australia: Christine Giles, Lidia Horvat, Jessica Kinsella, Michal Morris, Bernice Murphy, Mark Provera; Austria: Norbert Bichl, Judith Hörlsberger, Sonja Novak-Zezula, Martin Sprenger, Ursula Trummer, Gers Valchars; Belgium: Marie Dauvrin, Ilse Derluyn, Dirk Jacobs, Vincent Lorant, Corinne Torrekens, Hans Verrept; Bulgaria: Neda Deneva, Valeria Ilareva, Ivanka Ivanova, Milen Petrov, Maria Samuilova; Canada: Lotf Ali Jan Ali, Susan Barrass, Harald Bauder, Morton Beiser, Charity-Ann Hannan, Ilene Hyman, John Shields, Belinda Smith, Teena Tandon, Mandana Vahabi, Marc Yvan Valade; Croatia: Mitre Georgiev, Snjezana Gregurovic, Sunčana Roksandić Vidlička, Helga Špadina, Jelena Zlackovic, Drago Župarić; Cyprus: Christina Kouta, Panagiotis Petrou, Chrystalla Pithara, Stefanos Spaneas, Sotiris Themistokleous, Michalinos Zembylas; Czech Republic: Marek Čaněk, Pavel Cizinsky, Karolína Dobiášová, Helena Hnilicova, Lucie Trlifajova; **Denmark:** Natasja Koitzsch Jensen, Allan Krasnik, Martin Lemberg-Pedersen, Morten Sodemann; Estonia: Elena Jurado, Kristina Kallas, Anna Markina; Finland: Krister Björklund, Elli Heikkila, Maili Malin, Minna Saavala, Ismo Söderling; France: Marine Colleaux, Paul Dourgnon, Agnes Rodríguez, Hélène Soupios-David, Gesine Sturm, Matthieu Tardis; Germany: Theda Borde, Silke Brenne, Naika Foroutan, Jenny Lindner, Ulrike Kluge, Michael Knipper, Inessa Markus, Mekonnen Mesghena, Jennifer Pross, Oliver Razum; **Greece:** Eda Gemi, Ioanna Kotsioni, Elli Ioannides, Marina Nikolova; Hungary: Atilla Dobos, Sándor Illes, András Kádár, András Kovats, Boldizsár Nagy, Gyuri Péteri; Iceland: Guðrún Dögg Guðmundsdóttir, Bjarney Fridriksdottir, Guðrún Pétursdóttir; Ireland: Hilkka Becker, Denise Charlton, Catherine Cosgrave, Geraldine Hegarty, Anne MacFarlane, Katie Mannion, Diane Nurse, Jane Pillinger, Una Rafferty; Italy: Mauro Bernasconi, Giancarlo Blangiardo, Antonio Chiarenza, Paula Casucci, Codini Ennio, Margherita Giannoni; Japan: Jun-ichi Akashi, Claudia Ishikawa, Atsushi Kondo, Hiroshi Miyauchi, Keizo Yamawaki; Latvia: Dace Akule, Ilze Arnesta, Indra Mangule, Ilmārs Mezs, Aiga Rurane; Lithuania: Daiva Bartušienė, Giedrė Blažytė, Ginterė Guzevičiūtė, Linas Šumskas, Karolis Zibas; Luxembourg: Joaquim Agostinho Machado Monteiro, Laurence Hever, Serge Kollwelter, Laura Zuccoli; Malta: Sandra Buttigieg, Christine Cassar, Jean-Pierre Gauci, Patricia Mallia, Marika Podda Connor; Netherlands: Walter Deville, Alexander Hoogenboom, J. David Ingleby, Hildegard Schneider; New Zealand: Max Abbott, Gordon Anderson, Petra Butler, Chris Foulkes, Stephen May, Kate McMillan,

Anne Mortensen, Paul Roth, Caroline Sawyer, Doug Tennet, Grace Wong; **Norway:** Arild Aambo, Vibeke Blaker Strand, Jan-Paul Brekke, Halvor Frihagen, Bernadette Kumar, Anne Staver;

Poland: Ola Chrzanowska, Ela Czapka, Karolina Grot, Piotr Kazmierkiewicz, Anna Kosińska; Portugal: Lucinda Fonseca, Claudia de Freitas, Sonia Hernández Plaza, Maria João Hortas, Sandra Mateus, Beatriz Padilla, Miguel Carlos Patrício, Susana Siborro; Romania: Andra Bucur, Victoria Cojocariu, Alexe Irese, Stefan Leonescu, Ovidiu Voicu; Slovakia: Zuzana Bargerova, Tina Gazovicova, Olga Gyarfasova, Daniela Kallayova, Marek Majdan, Matina Sekulova; Slovenia: Veronika Bajt, Uršula Lipovec Čebron, Katarina Vucko, Jelka Zorn; South Korea: Kyung-Ock Chun, Sung-Soo Hong, Young-Lan Kim, Sook-Ran Yoo, Kwang-Il Yoon; Spain: Manuel Garcia Ramirez, Mariona Illamola, Daniel La Parra, Tona Lizana, David Moya, Eduardo Rojo, Elena Sánchez-Montijano; Sweden: Pieter Bevelander, Carin Björngren Cuadra, Henrik Emilson, Christian Fernandez, Ida Holmgren, Mikael Spang, Ann Wedin, Slobodan Zdravkovic; Switzerland: Patrick Bodenmann, Sandro Cattacin, Milena Chimienti, Denise Efionay, Buelent Kaya, Paolo Ruspini, Walter Schmid; Turkey: Seval Akgun, Coskun Bakar, Bianca Kaiser, Ayhan Kaya; **United Kingdom:** Ben Gidley, Hiranthi Jayaweera, Mark Johnson, Sarah Spencer; United States of America: Tanya Broder, Westy Egmont, Mary Giovagnoli, Leighton Ku, Eva Millona.

ANNEX: LIST OF INDICATORS



1. LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY

1.1 ACCESS

1. Immediate access to labour market; 2. Access to private sector; 3. Access to public sector; 4. Immediate access to self employment; 5. Access to self employment

1.2 ACCESS TO GENERAL SUPPORT

6. Public employment services; 7. Education and vocational training; 8. Study grants; 9. Recognition of academic qualifications; 10. Recognition of professional qualifications; 11. Validation of skills

1.3 TARGETED SUPPORT

12. State facilitation of recognition of qualifications; 13. Economic integration measures of TCNs; 14. Economic integration measures of youth and women; 15. Support to access public employment services; 16. Active information policy

1.4 WORKERS' RIGHTS

17. Membership in trade unions; 18. Access to social security; 19. Access to housing; 20. Working conditions



2. FAMILY REUNION FOR FOREIGN CITIZENS

2.1 ELIGIBILITY

21. Residence period; 22. Permit duration required; 23. Permits considered; 24. Eligibility for spouses and partners; 25. Minor children; 26. Dependent parents/grand-parents; 27. Dependent adult children

2.2 CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS

28. Pre-entry integration requirement; 29. Post-entry integration requirement; 30. Accommodation; 31. Economic resources; 32. Cost of application

2.3 SECURITY OF STATUS

33. Maximum duration of procedure; 34. Duration of validity of permit; 35. Grounds for rejection, withdrawal, refusal;

36. Personal circumstances considered; 37. Legal protection

2.4 RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH STATUS

38. Right to autonomous residence permit for partners and children; 39. Right to autonomous residence permit in case of widowhood, divorce, separation, death or violence; 40. Access to education and training; 41. Access to employment and self-employment; 42. Access to social benefits; 43. Access to housing



3. EDUCATION

3.1 ACCESS

44. Access to pre-primary education and compulsory education; 45. Compulsory education as a legal right; 46. Assessment of prior learning; 47. Access to non-compulsory education; 48. Access to vocational training; 49. Access to higher education

3.2 TARGETING NEEDS

50. Educational guidance at all levels; 51. Provision of support to learn language of instruction; 52. Migrant pupil monitoring; 53. Measures to address educational situation of migrant groups; 54. Teacher training to reflect migrants' learning needs

3.3 NEW OPPORTUNITIES

55. Support for teaching immigrant languages; 56. Support for teaching immigrant cultures; 57. Measures to counter segregation of migrant pupils and promote integration; 58. Measures to support migrant parents and communities; 59. Measures to bring migrants into the teacher workforce

3.4 INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION FOR ALL

60. School curriculum to reflect diversity; 61. State supported information initiatives; 62. Adapting curriculum to reflect diversity; 63. Adapting daily school life to reflect diversity; 64. Teacher training to reflect diversity



4. POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

4.1 ELECTORAL RIGHTS

65. Right to vote in national elections; 66. Right to vote in regional elections; 67. Right to vote in local elections; 68. Right to stand in local elections

4.2 POLITICAL LIBERTIES

69. Right to association; 70. Membership in political parties

4.3 CONSULTATIVE BODIES

71. Strength of national consultative body; 72. Strength of regional consultative body; 73. Strength of capital consultative body; 74. Strength of other local consultative body (average)

4.4 IMPLEMENTATION POLICIES

75. Active information policy; 76. Public funding/support for national immigrant bodies; 77. Public funding/support for regional immigrant bodies; 78. Public funding/support for immigrant bodies at local level in capital city; 79. Public funding/support for immigrant bodies in other city with largest migrant population



5. PERMANENT RESIDENCE

5.1 ELIGIBILITY

80. Residence period; 81. Permits considered; 82. Time counted as pupil/student; 83. Periodsof prior-absence allowed

5.2 CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS

84. LTR Language requirement; 85. Economic resources; 86. Costs of application

5.3 SECURITY OF STATUS

87. Maximum duration of procedure; 88. Duration of validity of permit; 89. Renewable permit; 90. Periods of absence allowed; 91. Grounds for rejection, withdrawal, refusal; 92. Personal circumstances considered before expulsion; 93. Expulsion precluded; 94. Legal protection

5.4 RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH STATUS

95. Access to employment; 96. Access to social security and assistance; 97. Access to housing



6. ACCESS TO NATIONALITY

6.1 ELIGIBILITY

98. Residence period; 99. Permits considered; 100. Periods of prior-absence allowed; 101. Requirements for spouses and partners; 102. Birth-right citizenship for second generation; 103. Birth-right citizenship for third generation

6.2 CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION

104. Naturalisation language requirement; 105. Naturalisation integration requirement; 106. Economic resources; 107. Criminal record; 108. Good character; 109. Costs of application

6.3 SECURITY OF STATUS

110. Maximum duration of procedure; 111. Additional grounds for refusal; 112. Discretionary powers in refusal; 113. Legal protection; 114. Protection against withdrawal of citizenship

6.4 DUAL NATIONALITY

115. Dual nationality for first generation; 116. Dual nationality for second/third generation



7. ANTI-DISCRIMINATION

7.1 DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS

117. Law covers direct/indirect discrimination, harassment, instruction; 118. Law covers discrimination by association & on the basis of assumed characteristics; 119. Law applies to natural& legal persons; 120. Law applies to public sector; 121. Prohibitions in law; 122. Law covers multiple discrimination

7.2 FIELDS OF APPLICATION

123. Employment & vocational training; 124. Education;

125. Social protection; 126. Access to and supply of public goods and services, including housing; 127. Access to and supply of public goods and services, including health

7.3 ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

Note: For discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality 28. Procedures available for victims; 129. Shift in burden of proof in procedures; 130. Law accepts situation testing& statistical data; 131. Protection against victimisation; 132. State assistance for victims; 133. Role of legal entities in proceedings; 134. Range of legal actions; 35. Range of sanctions

7.4 EQUALITY POLICIES

Note: For discrimination on grounds of race/ethnicity, religion/belief and/or nationality 136. Mandate of specialised equality body; 137. Powers to assists victims; 138. Powers as quasi-judicial body; 139. Legal standing in procedures; 140. Powers to instigate proceedings and enforce findings; 141. Active information policy and dialogue; 142. Ensuring compliance of mainstream legislation; 143. Public bodies obliged to promote equality; 144. Law covers positive action measures



8. HEALTH

8.1 ENTITLEMENT TO HEALTH SERVICES

145. Health entitlements for legal migrants; 146. Health entitlements for asylum-seekers; 147. Health entitlements for undocumented migrants; 148. Administrative discretion and documentation for legal migrants; 149. Administrative discretion and documentation for asylum-seekers; 150. Administrative discretion and documentation for undocumented migrants

8.2 POLICIES TO FACILITATE ACCESS

151. Information for service providers about migrants' entitlements; 152. Information for migrants concerning entitlements and use of health services; 153. Information for migrants concerning health education and promotion; 154. Provision of 'cultural mediators' or 'patient navigators' to facilitate access for migrants; 155. Obligation and sanctions for assisting undocumented migrants

8.3 RESPONSIVE HEALTH SERVICES

156. Availability of qualified interpretation services; 157. Requirement for 'culturally competent' or 'diversity-sensitive' services; 158. Training and education of health service staff; 159. Involvement of migrants in information provision, service design and delivery; 160. Encouraging diversity in the health service workforce; 161. Development of capacity and methods

8.4 MEASURES TO ACHIEVE CHANGE

162. Collection of data on migrant health; 163. Support for research on migrant health; 164. Health in all policies" approach; 165. Whole organisation approach; 166. Leadership by government; 167. Involvement of migrants and stakeholders

ANNEX: PARTNERS LOGOS

SPONSORS



co-funded by the European Fund

LEADING PARTNERS





PARTNERS















































































