



Luxembourg

Promoting Social Inclusion of Immigrants

A Study of National Policies

Hugo Swinnen

*Disclaimer: This report reflects the views of its author(s)
and these are not necessarily those of either the
the European Commission or the Member States.*

July 2011



On behalf of the
European Commission
DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion



Content

Summary	3
1. Description of national situation.....	6
1.1. Population of immigrants in Luxembourg.....	6
Foreign residents.....	7
Characteristics of the immigrant population.....	9
Labour market position	10
1.2. Poverty and social exclusion situation	12
Unemployment	13
Poverty	14
Education.....	16
1.3. Discrimination	18
1.4. Data gaps	20
2. Assessment of existing policy and governance framework.....	21
2.1. The overall policy framework.....	21
2.2. Social exclusion of immigrants in the NRP	23
2.3. Strengths and weaknesses of existing policies and programmes.....	24
3. Structural Funds.....	25
4. Civil society organisations	26
5. Recommendations	27
5.1. Key challenges and national goals needed	28
5.2. Strengthen monitoring methods.....	28
5.3. Cooperation and dialogue.....	29
5.4. Use of structural funds.....	29
5.5. Immigrants and Europe 2020 targets / NRP	30
6. References	31
7. Annex	34

Summary

Because there are very few Sinti and Roma in Luxembourg, this report will concentrate on social inclusion of immigrants. A recent inflow of near to 400 Roma is reported, but these newcomers are registered under different nationalities. A proper analysis of the situation of Sinti and Roma in Luxembourg remains difficult, and their number would still be between 0.1 and 0.2% of the population.

Foreign residents, employment, social inclusion

The immigrant population reached more than 43% of the total population in 2011. Among immigrants, 86% had EU citizenship in 2009. The Portuguese represent the largest group with 37%. The Italians are by now the third largest immigrant community (9%), right after French citizens (13%).

Luxembourg's domestic labour market in 2008 consisted of two thirds foreigners (26.8% residents, 43.7% cross-border workers) and one third nationals. The positive outcomes of migrants in the labour market, especially in comparison with nationals, could be observed with a higher activity and employment rate. Instead, migrants show a higher unemployment rate than nationals. This can i.a. be explained by the 30 per cent of nationals being protected against unemployment as civil servants. Non-EU born individuals and even more so third-country nationals are in a less favourable situation with their unemployment rate at 13.3% and 19.2% respectively in 2009, confirming that less qualified third-country nationals are the most disadvantaged. In general, native and foreign born males have higher employment rates than females, independently of age and educational level.

Overall the number of jobseekers increased with almost 36% between ultimo 2008 and ultimo 2010. Only 30.8% of them have the Luxembourg nationality; 34% are Portuguese; 20.3% are nationals from other "old" member states (EU-15) and 2.3% from the 12 new member states; 12.6% finally are third-country nationals. Most important in this list is the figure for Portuguese nationals (16% of total population – 34% of jobseekers) and non EU citizens (6% of the total population – 12.6% of jobseekers). The percentage of women among jobseekers reached 44% in 2010. Women are increasingly active on the labour market, but somewhat less hit by the recent increase in unemployment rates. If one looks at young unemployed people (15-29 years) by gender and nationality, it appears that for the year 2008 young women of foreign nationality have the highest unemployment rate (16.9%), followed by men of foreign nationality (13.4%), women with Luxembourg nationality (12.4%) and men with Luxembourg nationality (5.5%). Among young people of foreign nationality the most deprived ones are those with Portuguese and ex-Yugoslavian nationality.

In 2009, according to the new combined indicator, 17.8% of Luxembourg population was at risk of poverty or exclusion: 14.9% is at risk of poverty, 1.1% is considered to be living in severe material deprivation and 6.3% is living in a household with zero or very low work intensity. The differences between persons of Luxembourg nationality and foreigners are important. In 2009, the at-risk-of-poverty rate was 20.4% among foreigners against 8.2% for Luxembourg nationals. But the increase between 2008 and 2009 seems to hit first of all the nationals, with an at-risk-of-poverty rate increasing from 6.2% in 2008 to 8.2% in 2009. Among foreigners the at-risk-of-poverty rate remained stable (but high) at 20.4%. In 2009, the poverty rate of the age group from 0-17 was

22.3%. Also, the differences in poverty rates between household types are important. One-parent families have by far the highest poverty risk, i.e. 52.3% in 2009.

As to the “working poor”, the overall at risk of poverty rate among workers was 9.4% in 2008 and reached 10% in 2009. For Portuguese immigrants, the poverty rate exceeds even 27%, while for Luxembourg nationals the figure is 8.2%.

The participation of migrant youth in education and their educational attainment is a matter of concern for experts in Luxembourg and at international level. Reasons for this low educational performance are sought in the overall lack of resources of migrant youth and in the particular linguistic situation (with three national languages) often causing a weak start for migrants.

Discrimination

In Luxembourg, there is a continuous discussion on migration and its nature, but very little or no debate concerning discrimination, racism or xenophobia. There is a general xenophile attitude in Luxembourg given the evident dependence on the foreign labour force.

If one looks at inequalities between Luxembourg nationals and immigrants (foreigners) in relation to social inclusion, some of the reasons can be found in structural characteristics of Luxembourg's labour market, educational system, housing provision, service delivery, etc. The Luxembourg welfare system in general has a strong corporatist tradition. The Luxembourg labour market is rather segmented, which explains (at least partly) the more difficult access of non country nationals (including other EU citizens) to the most protected jobs of civil servants, the importance of temporary employment among cross-border workers and the difficulties for newcomers on the labour market in general (youth, women, immigrants).

Data

Data on the integration and social inclusion of foreigners are available, but at different instances. There is no regular published overview of the whole domain covered in this report. Data on migration are collected and analysed through the European Migration Network, but a regularly published, comprehensive overview of the integration situation at national level would be a worthwhile complement. One could expect that this will be done in the near future, since the newly created *Office Luxembourgeois de l'Accueil et de l'Intégration* (OLAI – Luxembourg reception and integration agency) has also a mission as immigration and integration observatory.

Existing policy framework

The Luxembourg immigration and integration policy is governed by recent legislations, regulating the access to the country, the acquisition of the Luxembourg nationality and the reception and integration measures.

The law of 16 December 2008 defines the overall reception and integration policy and introduces the *Office Luxembourgeois de l'Accueil et de l'Intégration* (OLAI - Luxembourg reception and integration agency) as a cross-cutting instance. In 2010 the OLAI published its first Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination: 2010 – 2014. The coordinating Ministry organised a consultation among the key stakeholders working in the field of integration

and/or of foreigners regarding the priorities for 2012 and 2013. The OLAI also published its priority actions for 2011. It presents a very long list of actions, to be implemented by different government and non-government partners at different levels. On a more individual level, the Luxembourg government expects a lot from the so-called *Contrat d'Accueil et d'Intégration* (Welcome and integration contract), to be signed by newly arriving foreigners wishing to stay in Luxembourg.

Social exclusion in the NRP

Although specific groups at risk (children, immigrants, early school leavers...) are mentioned throughout the NRP, specific sections about such groups (as horizontal issues) are lacking. Even if many immigrants are performing well economically (high participation rate, low dependency from public support), there are specific categories of immigrants, such as Portuguese and ex-Yugoslavians who are particularly at risk of unemployment, poverty and exclusion. Specific attention for these groups in a more comprehensive way would be worthwhile. The specific position and problems of cross-border workers could also be dealt with in a more extensive way.

Strengths and weaknesses

For the first time, in its *Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010 – 2014*, the government presents a comprehensive and cross-cutting programme for integration of immigrants. The cross-cutting character and the broad consultation of stakeholders are the basic strengths of the programme. One could expect that the regular evaluation of the Multi-annual Action Plan will positively influence the attention for immigrants in other programmes and actions, including the NRP. In the meantime, many actions and programmes are rather recent and difficult to assess yet. The more personalised and chain approach of the employment administration as it is developing, could have positive effects for vulnerable migrant groups.

Structural Funds

The ESF is hardly used by/for immigrants. Also, in general, the attention for people at great distance from the labour market is rather limited.

Civil society organisations

Two umbrella organisations have a crucial role in the collective defence of interests of immigrants and in the overall intercultural dialogue both at government level and at the level of the civil society. The majority of concrete actions for the integration of immigrants are implemented by grassroots organisations and general or specialised NGOs.

Recommendations

- Key challenges are the high risk of poverty rate among Portuguese and non-EU immigrants; the low educational attainment and high unemployment among immigrant youth; the position of one parent migrant households and the high housing cost burden.
- The immigration and integration observatory should be high on the priority list of the Luxembourg reception and integration agency (OLAI), including a regular integration monitoring report.
- Regular consultations of all stakeholders should be continued and the outcomes published. This should include evaluation consultations concerning the progress of the National Action Plan on Integration and against Discrimination.
- The Luxembourg ESF operational plan should give more attention to the most vulnerable groups in general and to immigrants in particular.
- A specific section on immigrants (and one on gender) would be recommendable for the next NRP.

1. Description of national situation

1.1. Population of immigrants in Luxembourg

Because there are very few Sinti and Roma in Luxembourg, this report will concentrate on social inclusion of immigrants. According to legal conditions on the collection of personal data, it is impossible to identify Sinti and Roma as Sinti and Roma within administrative data bases.¹ NGOs and observers estimate their number around 250 to 500. The Council of Europe provides an estimate of 300 (between 100 and 500). But those who live in Luxembourg became (had to become) sedentary and do not wish to be identified as part of their former ethnic group. Due to three major legal dispositions, Sinti and Roma could until recently not enter and settle down temporarily as in other countries:

1. Door-to-door-sales have been forbidden in Luxembourg for decades;
2. The entrance to and stay in Luxembourg could be refused for foreigners who were found in a situation of begging or "vagabondage" or did not have sufficient means to travel and stay;
3. Parking at the border of roads is forbidden, as well as using a caravan or camping site for housing. Luxembourg camping owners can host Sinti and Roma at three different price categories, but they are not keen to welcome them because of the 'other' clients and the police, who often appear as soon as travellers arrive. Sinti and Roma have either a short stay in Luxembourg or have to settle just as any other foreigner within ordinary housing.²

¹ According to the modified law of August 2nd 2002 on the protection of persons related to treatment of personal data, the data collection is limited to nationality in order to avoid any discrimination. Therefore, no official figure is available in Luxembourg on the number of persons with a Sinti or Roma background.

² C. Hartmann-Hirsch (2010). *RAXEN – Complementary Data Collection – Contribution to the FRA Annual Report 2010*. Luxembourg: CEPS/INSTEAD, p. 3.

Since a few years now, legislation has been less strict on these matters. Also, a recent inflow of near to 400 Roma is reported by Caritas Luxembourg. But these newcomers are registered under different nationalities, falling in following categories:

- Citizens of EU member states and assimilated countries
- Third-country citizens, being family members of an EU citizen or of a citizen from an assimilated country
- Third-country citizens
- People in search of international protection (asylum seekers).

A proper analysis of the situation of Sinti and Roma in Luxembourg remains difficult, and their number would still be between 0.1 and 0.2% of the population.

We will thus concentrate this report on the social inclusion of immigrants, with special focus – as far as data and existing analyses are available (see also section 1.4) – on youth and gender.

Foreign residents

Luxembourg has no substantial ethnic minority population among its country nationals. Also it uses no specific definition of ethnic minorities in its population statistics. It only uses the criterion of nationality to distinguish between immigrants and the autochthonous population. According to Eurostat, between 1999 and 2010 the growth of the immigrant population exceeded by far the growth of total population.

Table 1: Total population and population of foreign nationality in Luxembourg 1999-2010

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	1999 - 2000
Total population	427,350	433,600	439,000	444,050	448,300	454,960	461,230	469,086	476,187	483,799	493,500	502,066	+17.48%
Non-nationals	152,900	:	162,285	166,700	170,700	177,600	183,600	191,400	198,213	205,889	214,848	215,699	+41.07%
% of Total population	35.78%	:	36.97%	35.54%	38.08%	39.04%	39.81%	40.80%	41.63%	42.56%	43.54%	42.96%	+7,18%

Source: Data retrieved on 16/06/2011 from Eurostat website – main tables
(http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/main_tables)

A recent study by the National Contact Point of the European Migration Network³ provides some detailed information about the immigration history and the composition of the foreign population in Luxembourg.⁴

Immigration can be considered a structural phenomenon in the history of the region now known as the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. Previously a country of emigration, Luxembourg experienced large-scale labour immigration of both low and highly skilled workers with the onset

³ See: <http://emn.intrasoft-intl.com/html/index.html>

⁴ Unless mentioned otherwise, this section is based almost literally on: National EMN contact point (2011). *Circular and Temporary Migration - Empirical Evidence, Current Policy Practice and Future Options in Luxembourg*. University of Luxembourg: Walferdange.

of the Industrial Revolution in the second half of the 19th century and the development of the steel industry.

In 1948 a bilateral agreement was concluded between Italy and Luxembourg which had been regularly extended until the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957. The agreement involved an annual quota, the recruitment of workers in Italy, and fixed-term but renewable work contracts. Luxembourg also entered into bilateral labour agreements with other States and in doing so, deliberately encouraged a 'White and Catholic immigration'. In 1950, a bilateral agreement was signed with the Netherlands to recruit agricultural workers. According to the conditions of the agreement, workers had to be unmarried and Catholic men from the Dutch provinces of North Brabant and Limburg bordering Belgium. Since the Mid-1960s, Portuguese migrants who had been working in the French neighbouring province of Lorraine came to Luxembourg, and in 1970 a bilateral agreement was signed between Portugal and Luxembourg. Family reunification was allowed immediately.

Also in 1970, a bilateral agreement was signed with the Former Republic of Yugoslavia. However, given the fact that Muslim immigrants were not wanted, family reunification was not allowed. For the same reason, bilateral labour agreements were not envisaged with Asian or North African countries like Tunisia. As a result of further migration inflows, family reunification and chain migration, Portuguese nationals constitute nowadays the largest group of non-nationals in Luxembourg (81,274 or 15.9% of the total 511,840 inhabitants in Luxembourg on 1 January 2011, see also Table 2). Nationals from the Former Republic of Yugoslavia, including those who came to Luxembourg during the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s and the conflicts in Kosovo, represent the largest group of third-country nationals. They form part of the 43.2 percent non-nationals among the resident population in Luxembourg (or 221,364 on 1 January 2011) and this high number of non-nationals can be largely explained by the massive recourse to foreign workforce.

Table 2. Usually Resident Population in Luxembourg, 2009-2011

Population	1 January 2009		1 January 2010		1 January 2011	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
TOTAL	493.500	100.0	502.066	100.0	511.840	100.0
Nationals	277.991	56.3	285.721	56.9	290.476	56.8
Non-nationals	215.509	43.7	216.345	43.1	221.364	43.2
.... EU-27 citizens	185.354	37.6	186.244	37.1	190.264	37.2
.... Portuguese	79.974	16.2	79.769	15.9	81.274	15.9
.... French	28.536	5.8	29.695	5.9	31.055	6.1
.... Italian	19.353	3.9	18.166	3.6	17.700	3.4
.... Belgian	16.738	3.4	16.759	3.3	16.996	3.3
.... German	12.023	2.4	12.059	2.4	12.125	2.4
.... British	5.296	1.1	5.483	1.1	5.621	1.1
.... Spanish	3.320	0.7	3.286	0.7	3.433	0.7
.... Polish	2.248	0.5	2.488	0.5	2.705	0.5
.... Danish	2.192	0.4	2.186	0.4	2.178	0.3
.... Swedish	1.765	0.4	1.780	0.3	1.768	0.3
.... Other	13.909	2.8	14.573	2.9	15.409	3.0
Non-EU-27 citizens	30.155	6.1	30.101	6.0	31.100	6.1

Source: STATEC © LU EMN NCP

The importance of foreign workforce for Luxembourg shows also through the number of cross-border workers: persons living in neighbouring countries (Belgium, France and Germany) and working in Luxembourg. Their number reached almost 150,000 in 2010. After a slight decrease with 0.4 percentage points between ultimo 2008 and ultimo 2009, it increased with 2.8 percentage points by the end of 2010.⁵

Characteristics of the immigrant population

Within the EU, Luxembourg is the country with the largest, fastest growing resident and non-resident active foreign population with higher educational levels and employment rates than nationals. The traditional immigrant manual workers still represent an important share of the resident population, even if immigrants became more diverse during the past two decades. TCNs (Third-Country Nationals) increased significantly after the end of the Cold War. The share of highly qualified immigrants increased simultaneously and an important inflow of asylum seekers took place especially in 1990 and 1999⁶. However, the share of TCNs remained low and stable compared to the resident population with 5 percent in 2000 only increasing to 6 percent in 2009. Luxembourg's TCNs have to be divided into a group of highly skilled immigrants coming from the Northern hemisphere (Japan, Canada, Norway, US, etc.) as well as a group of less qualified ones, predominantly coming from Southern countries (former Yugoslavia, Cape Verde). Among the country's 215,500 immigrants, 185,300 (86%) had EU citizenship in 2009. In terms of shares, the Portuguese still represent the largest immigrant group with 37 percent. The Italians – up to the 1950s the largest group, later on the second one – are by now the third largest immigrant community (9 percent), right after French citizens (13 percent).⁷

The number of asylum seekers increased rapidly over the last few years. Between January and September 2011, the number of people asking for international protection reached 1586. 44.01% of these persons came from Serbia, 19.36% from Macedonia and 6.68% from Kosovo. For the whole year of 2010, the number of asylum seekers was 786; it reached 505 in 2009, 463 in 2008 and 426 in 2007.⁸

The foreign residents in Luxembourg are younger than the autochthonous population. They represent almost 50% of the 0-19 years old, and more than 50% of the 0-9 years old age group.⁹

⁵ Source: Luxembourg Statistics (STATEC). Retrieved from: http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/ReportFolders/ReportFolder.aspx?IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=3&RFPPath=92

⁶ In the beginning of the 1990s with the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and in 1999 with the war in Kosovo; afterwards arrivals dropped considerably.

⁷ S. F. Amétépé & R. Ohliger (2010). *Immigrants in Luxembourg Labour Market and immigration and integration policies*. p. 5-6.

⁸ Service des Réfugiés de la Direction de l'Immigration du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (2011). *Statistiques concernant les demandes de protection internationale au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg jusqu'au mois de septembre 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.mae.lu/fr/Site-MAE/Immigration/Chiffres-cles-en-matiere-d-asile>.

⁹ H. Willems et al. (2010). "Zentrale Aspekte zur aktuellen Lebenssituation der Jugendlichen in Luxemburg", in *Rapport national sur la situation de la jeunesse au Luxembourg*. Luxembourg : Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration, p. 31

According to Hartmann¹⁰ Luxembourg's immigration is outstanding with regard to several aspects:

- It presents the most important share of immigrants and of economic immigrants and the smallest share of family reunion.
- In most member states, immigration is, for the predominant bulk of arrivals, an immigration from outside EU (Turkey, Maghreb and former colonies), whilst Luxembourg presents a predominant EU mobility with 85 percent of EU-citizens amongst all immigrants.
- The share of Luxembourg's highly qualified migrants is larger than that of the equivalent group of nationals, the former having higher educational attainment than nationals. Obviously, the economic elite is to an extent of 70 to 80 percent composed of immigrants. This immigration is certainly one of the most performing within OECD territory with higher employment rates, nearly no early exit attitudes, hence logically higher contributions than consumptions to social security and taxes.

This overall picture, however, hides the differences within the immigrant population between nationalities and between men and women. An analysis of the overall educational levels of men and women shows a lower educational level for women as compared to men. Taking into account native and foreign-born, the foreign-born have a higher educational attainment than the native-born. Amongst the foreign-born, we observe higher educational qualifications for EU nationals than for third-country nationals. Also, within the group of EU nationals, Portuguese immigrants have a lower educational attainment than other nationalities, but between generations, the educational attainment level is increasing rapidly.

Labour market position¹¹

Luxembourg's domestic labour market in 2008 consisted for two thirds of foreigners (26.8% residents, 43.7% cross-border workers) and for one third of nationals. There was an important and regular annual employment growth mainly for cross border workers from 2000 to 2008 with a peak of 12.3 per cent between 2000/2001. This growth decreased dramatically between 2008 and 2009 when it reached only 2.6 per cent. For nationals, the annual employment growth was and is still the lowest growth among the three groups (foreign residents, cross border workers, autochthonous residents). The Luxembourg economy and labour market heavily depend on foreigners, while Luxembourg nationals seem to become more and more of a minority within the domestic labour market. This could suggest a "discriminating" attitude concerning nationals. However, nationals wish predominantly to enter the public sector, mainly due to working conditions and very high wages and many of them leave private sector jobs as soon as they have succeeded in their access to the public sector (via competition procedures).

Some labour market segmentation exists along the lines of nationality. The expansion of the service sector, especially of financial services and the media sector, has reinforced the overrepresentation of migrants and creates polarized integration: while Southern European

¹⁰ C. Hartmann (2011). *Europeanization, Internationalization of Family Reunion Policies: an Unusual Situation in Luxembourg*, p. 9

¹¹ This section is based on: C. Hartmann, S. Amétépé (2010). "Luxembourg country study" in A. Platonova & G. Urso (eds.) (2010). *Migration, Employment and Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union - Part 1: Migration and the Labour Markets in the European Union (2000-2009)*. Brussels: International Organization for Migration, p.199-202.

migrants and third-country nationals are more likely to work in low skilled jobs, especially manual work, Belgian, French and German cross border workers usually occupy highly skilled jobs. Finally, the crafts sector is a traditional Luxembourgish sector and explains the high share of native-born individuals that are self-employed (7.6% for native-born males and 5.3% for foreign-born males).

The positive outcomes of migrants in the labour market, especially in comparison with nationals, could be observed with the higher activity and employment rate constantly registered during the period 2000-2009. Instead, in the case of unemployment, migrants show a higher rate in comparison with nationals (Table 3). This can be explained i.a. by the 30 per cent of nationals being protected against unemployment as civil servants.¹² Non-EU-born individuals and even more so third-country nationals are in a less favourable situation with their unemployment rate at 13.3 per cent and 19.2 per cent respectively in 2009, confirming that less qualified third-country nationals are the most disadvantaged.

Table 3: Employment, unemployment, activity rates by migration status, 2009

	Activity rate	Employment rate	Unemployment rate	Long term unemployment rate
Sex				
Male	64.1	61.3	2.8	46.6
Female	48.1	45.2	2.9	58.6
Place of birth				
Native-Born	49.2	47.4	1.8	47.4
Foreign-Born	66.3	61.9	4.4	58.6
Foreigners place of birth				
Born EU	66.7	63.6	3.1	-
Born non-EU	62.4	49.1	13.3	-
Nationality of non-EU born				
EU nationals	66.1	61.6	4.5	-
TCNs	56.3	37.1	19.2	-

Source: LFS, 2009.

In general, native and foreign born males have higher employment rates than females, independently of age and educational level. However, the employment gender gap decreases respective to the increase of the educational level, from 17 percentage points for the less-than-upper secondary level to 10.4 percentage points for tertiary and higher. Yet, there is an important difference between the employment gender gap of EU nationals (48.3 percentage points) and third-country migrants (-8.3 percentage points) (Table 4). This suggests some evidences on the difficulties of third-country born migrants who kept their nationality to access the labour market in comparison to those with EU nationality (employment rate at 33.4% and 89.6% respectively).

¹² It is important to underline however that not only Luxembourg nationals can become civil servant. Also citizens of other EU member states have this right, according to article 2 of the law of December 18th 2009, modifying and completing several laws concerning the status and regime of civil servants both at national and at local level.

Regarding the unemployment gender gap, male third-country nationals show a double rate of unemployment over that of female migrants, while the gap is negative for EU nationals.

Table 4: Employment and unemployment gender gap by place of birth and nationality, 2009

Place of birth	Male	Female	Gender gap	Nationality	Male	Female	Gender gap
Employment gender rate							
Other EU	71.5	56.2	15.3	EU nationality	89.6	41.3	48.3
Non-EU	50.9	41.1	9.8	Non EU nationality	33.4	41.0	-8.3
Unemployment gender gap							
Other EU	3.0	3.1	-0.1	EU nationality	3.1	4.6	-1.5
Non-EU	18.3	9.5	8.8	Non EU nationality	25.5	12.2	13.3

Source: LFS, 2009.

The long-standing policy of attracting highly qualified immigrants has produced a particular social structure where the nationals are positioned in the middle of the labour market between the highly qualified and well educated on the one side, and low qualified migrants on the other. This is reflected also in terms of wages which relatively are very high for some third-country nationals from the Northern hemisphere (Japan, Norway, Canada, US, Switzerland). Almost three quarters (72%) of the highest 5 per cent of wages and 79 per cent of directors of the banking sector are foreigners. Cross border workers have medium wages and on average higher educational levels than the equivalent group of nationals.

1.2. Poverty and social exclusion situation

In 2009, according to the new combined indicator, 84,520 persons or 17.8% of Luxembourg population was at risk of poverty or exclusion: 14.9% is at risk of poverty, 1.1% is considered to be living in severe material deprivation and 6.3% is living in a household with zero or very low work intensity.¹³ The latter is considerably lower than in EU-15 (9.5% in 2009) and than in neighbouring countries Belgium (12%) and Germany (11%). In Luxembourg, this considers essentially young adults between 18-24 years (10.6% in 2009) and the 55-59 years old (23.1% in 2009); while it was only 4.4% for the age group of 25-54.¹⁴ The overlap between the three components of the indicator is rather low for all three indicators (0.3% against 1.4% for EU27). Also, the large majority of people at risk of poverty are not deprived and/or not living in households with zero or very low work intensity: 11.9% (total at risk of poverty rate: 14.9%). Persons combining all three indicators could be considered as the most vulnerable group. This is the case for 0.3% of the population, or 1,573 persons.

¹³ The Social Protection Committee (2011). *SPC Assessment of the Social Dimension of the Europe 2020 Strategy – Report – 10 February 2011*. Brussels: Council of the European Union (SOC 135 - ECOFIN 76 - SAN 30)

¹⁴ Regards N° 3/2011 Regards sur le nouvel indicateur de pauvreté et d'exclusion UE-2020. Luxembourg: STATEC (p. 3)

As to the evolution of the three indicators over the last few years, the at-risk-of-poverty rate increased with 1.2% between 2005 and 2009. The material deprivation indicator stood at 1.8% in 2005, then decreased to 0.7% in 2008 and reached 1.1% in 2009, which is still the lowest rate of all EU-27 (EU-27 average: 8.1% in 2009). The number of people living in households with zero or very low work intensity increased by 1.6 percentage points since 2008 to reach 6.3% in 2009. Between 2008 and 2009 all three components of the indicator increased for Luxembourg, while this was not the case for the EU as a whole and for the neighbouring countries.¹⁵

Unemployment

In its second 2010 conjuncture note, Luxembourg Statistics (STATEC) depicts the latest employment evolution and expectations as follows. Although the unemployment rate has bottomed out in Europe, despite the recovery in employment early in the year, it continued to increase slightly in Luxembourg. This rise in unemployment is largely due to a continuing increase in structural unemployment, which is not much affected by the economic situation, with a structural mismatch between the profile of job seekers and job offers.¹⁶

In the most recent Conjuncture Note¹⁷, a forecast until 2014 is added to the analysis of the current situation. The activity rate (working population compared to working-age population) has been falling since 2008, after peaking for a number of years. However, this trend is entirely due to the male working population and the rate of activity among women continues to rise. STATEC anticipates a (slight) additional fall-off in overall activity over the forecasting period, which is likely to stabilise in 2013/14 at 2002/03 levels. The rate of activity among women is expected to continue to rise, albeit at a more moderate pace.

The labour market has recovered relatively well from the impact of the crisis, with domestic employment rising 1.6% in 2010 (compared to 0.9% in 2009). Much of this was due to non-market services, which rose 3.3%. The labour market is expected to continue to gather momentum although it will be constrained by moderate growth in activity. Towards the end of the forecasting period, employment growth is set to approximate 2.5%, significantly lower than the historic average of 3.4% or the peaks of over 5% achieved during previous cyclical peaks. The number of cross border workers increased less than usual with employment growth. This seems essentially due to the increase of new immigrants who are very active on the labour market.

In 2010, registered unemployment barely rose at all, stabilising at about 6%, with annual growth of over 2% in domestic employment from the middle of the year on, whereas historically, an average of over 4% employment growth was required to push down unemployment. However, the various macro-economic parameters do not point to any effective drop in the unemployment rate before 2013.

The 2010 annual report of the national employment agency (ADEM)¹⁸ gives an insight in the numbers of jobseekers by nationality. Overall the number of jobseekers increased with almost

¹⁵ Regards N° 3/2011 Regards sur le nouvel indicateur de pauvreté et d'exclusion UE-2020. Luxembourg: STATEC (p. 4)

¹⁶ STATEC (2010) *La situation économique au Luxembourg - Évolution récente et perspectives. Note de Conjoncture n° 2-2010*. Luxembourg: STATEC (p. 72)

¹⁷ STATEC (2011) *Projections économiques à moyen terme. Note de Conjoncture n° 1-2011*. Luxembourg: STATEC (p. 42-44)

¹⁸ ADEM (2011) *Les activités de l'administration de l'emploi en 2010*. Luxembourg : Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi, p. 44

36% from 10,009 per ultimo 2008 to 13,597 at the end of 2010. Only 30.8% of them have the Luxembourg nationality; 34% are Portuguese; 20.3% are nationals from other "old" member states (EU-15) and 2.3% from the 12 new member states; 12.6% finally are third-country nationals. Most important in this list is the figure for Portuguese nationals (16% of total population – 34% of jobseekers) and non EU citizens (6% of the total population – 12.6% of jobseekers).

The percentage of women among jobseekers decreased from 48.7% in 2007 to 43.6% in 2009. It increased to 44% in 2010. The activity rate of women increased from 58.9% in 2007 to 60.7% in 2009. Also, the unemployment rate of women increased from 5.1% to 6% in the same period.¹⁹ Women are increasingly active on the labour market, but somewhat less hit by the recent increase in unemployment rates.

If one looks at young unemployed people (15-29 years) by gender and nationality, it appears that for the year 2008 young women of foreign nationality have the highest unemployment rate (16.9%), followed by men of foreign nationality (13.4%), women with Luxembourg nationality (12.4%) and men with Luxembourg nationality (5.5%). This last category is the only one who saw its unemployment rate decrease between 2006 and 2008. Among young people of foreign nationality the most deprived ones are those with Portuguese and ex-Yugoslavian nationality.

Poverty

The overall at risk of poverty rate (60% of median equivalised income) reached 14.9% of the population in 2009, against 13.4% in 2008.²⁰

The differences between persons of Luxembourg nationality and foreigners are important. In 2009, the at-risk-of-poverty rate was 20.4% among foreigners against 8.2% for Luxembourg nationals. But the increase between 2008 and 2009 seems to hit first of all the nationals, with an at-risk-of-poverty rate increasing from 6.2% in 2008 to 8.2% in 2009. Among foreigners the at-risk-of-poverty rate remained stable (but high) at 20.4%.²¹

In Luxembourg, the experts and policymakers agree that unemployment is becoming more structural. More in particular, the high unemployment rate among young people (16.9% in 2009) is a challenge. Also the increase of the still relatively low participation rates among women (low work intensity in households) and among older people at working age is seen as an important factor in the prevention of poverty. In a previous section we indicated that the activity and employment rates of immigrants are significantly higher than those of Luxembourg nationals.

As mentioned before, young people are more at risk of poverty than older people, and the poverty rate decreases with age. In 2009, the poverty rate of the 0-17 year's age group was 22.3% against 6% for the +65. Also, the differences in poverty rates between household types are important. Households with children have a higher poverty risk than households without children: in 2009 19.8% against 8.5%. One parent families have by far the highest poverty risk, i.e. 52.3% in 2009. The at-risk-of-poverty rate increases also with the number of children within the household. For one-person households the at-risk-of-poverty rate is somewhat higher for women

¹⁹ European Commission – Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Unit D.1 (2010). *Employment in Europe 2010*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, p. 181.

²⁰ STATEC (2009). *Rapport travail et cohésion sociale*. Cahier Economique, nr. 111, p. 111. STATEC: Luxembourg

²¹ STATEC (2009). *Rapport travail et cohésion sociale*. Cahier Economique, nr. 111, p. 112. STATEC: Luxembourg

than for men (16.8% against 15.3%) and it is also higher for persons below the age of 65 than for the 65+ (18.3% against 11.3%).²²

The increase of poverty rates between 2008 and 2009 is felt by all age groups, but most by the age group 18-24, where the poverty rate goes from 15.5% in 2008 to 21.2% in 2009. For women within this age group the increase is even greater: from 15.8% in 2008 to 23.3% in 2009.²³

The importance of the migrant population (foreigners) in Luxembourg, and their diversity as to economic status, makes it important to distinguish between them in relation to poverty and social exclusion. Data in this domain however is scarce and fragmented. Based on PSELL3/EU-SILC, waves 2003-2007 data, Amétépé and Ohliger made an analysis of the economic performance of different categories of the population, according to nationality and qualification. They compared the degree of dependency of social security and social protection income of households.²⁴ Overall, it is the group of non-EU less-qualified who perform poorly in economic terms. It should be recalled that this is the smallest of the five groups (3.7 percent) distinguished and that the group is weak in terms of independence from public assistance. It has the lowest rate of labour market participation and the highest levels of receipts of minimum income and other benefits such as unemployment benefit and early retirement benefit. Yet, while receiving these benefits and payments, certain members of this group (the youngest) still have a level close (88 percent) to independence. As for unemployment/early retirement benefits, the results of the analysis show that the three groups of immigrants are more often in receipt of these benefits. In this regard, it is necessary to take account of the fact that national civil servants (16 percent of the panel) and international civil servants (4 percent of the panel) are not subject to unemployment. However, for the non-EU LOIs there are obstacles to integration into the existing unemployment system, mainly due to the legal framework: those with their first two work permits (limited in terms of sector or employer) lose their unemployment coverage once their permit expires²⁵; they probably benefit less from it than EU citizens. It is, in fact only the less qualified non-EU immigrants who perform worse and consume more than they contribute. In contrast, even this small, weaker group is close to being independent from the state, with only a portion of its members benefiting from redistributive measures.

As to the “working poor”, the overall at-risk-of-poverty rate among workers was 9.4% in 2008 and reached 10% in 2009, and it is somewhat higher among men than among women. The difference with the low salaries which is a largely female phenomenon is due to the fact that the in-work-at risk-of-poverty rate takes into account as well personal as household characteristics. Among blue collar-workers and workers with low education the at-risk-of-poverty rate is about 20%. For Portuguese immigrants, the poverty rate exceeds even 27%, while for Luxembourg nationals the figure is 8.2%.²⁶ An important factor in the poverty risk for workers in Luxembourg is the gap between the minimum wage and the at-risk-of-poverty threshold. While in neighbouring countries such as Belgium and France, the gross minimum wage is 300 to 400 Euros above the poverty threshold, in Luxembourg the gross minimum wage was in 2007 with 1,570 Euros only some

²² STATEC (2009). *Rapport travail et cohésion sociale*. Cahier Economique, nr. 111, p. 113. STATEC: Luxembourg. One has to take into account however the limited number of one parent households in the sample (140 in 2009), which has its influence on the reliability of these figures.

²³ STATEC (2009). *Rapport travail et cohésion sociale*. Cahier Economique, nr. 111, p. 113. STATEC: Luxembourg

²⁴ S. F. Amétépé & R. Ohliger (2010). *Immigrants in Luxembourg Labour Market and immigration and integration policies*, p. 27.

²⁵ Cf. Act of 28 March 1972, which remained in force for the 2007 wave of the panel. This Act was replaced by the Act of 29th August 2008.

²⁶ STATEC (2009). *Rapport travail et cohésion sociale*. Cahier Economique, nr. 111, p. 116. STATEC: Luxembourg

25 Euros higher than the poverty threshold. The net minimum wage for a single person with no extra tax reductions comes at some 21% below the poverty threshold.²⁷

The increase in poverty rates finds also a mirror in the increasing numbers of applications for the guaranteed minimum income (*Revenu Minimum Garanti*). According to the annual reports of the *Service National de l'Action Sociale* (SNAS)²⁸ the number of households applying for the minimum income increased from 2,175 to 2,879 between 2008 and 2009 (an increase of about 32%) and further to 2,981 in 2010 (+3.5%). The number of persons in these households increased from 3,671 to 5,042 (+37%) in 2009 and to 5,332 in 2010 (+5.8%). Among women the increase was more than 38% over the three observed years, among men it was even more than 41%. To interpret these figures, one has to take into account the change in eligibility criteria for the minimum income, more in particular for the complementary benefit when the household income from employment is not sufficient. The possibilities for receiving the RMG were considerably enlarged in 2009.

The 2010 annual report of the national service administrating the minimum income scheme (SNAS) provides also some figures about the nationality of members of households receiving the RMG.

Table 5. Nationality of members (of households receiving RMG)

	Women	Men	Total	%
Luxembourg nationality	4,039	3,671	7,710	42.30%
Other EU-27 nationals	4,039	3,570	7,609	41.75%
Third-country nationals / unknown	1,573	1,335	2,908	15.95%
Total	9,651	8,576	18,227	100.00%

Source: Files SNAS du 31.12.2010

This table shows that foreigners, representing 43.2% of the population, have to call relatively more (57.7%) upon the minimum income scheme than Luxembourg nationals. This is even stronger the case for non-EU immigrants who represent 6.1% of the population and 15.95% of the RMG beneficiaries.

Education

Since 1988, the measures to promote the integration of foreign pupils are coordinated by a special division of the ministry of education, who also monitors the actual situation.²⁹

The average number of pupils with foreign nationality in public schools in Luxembourg reaches 41% and continues to increase (e.g. 34.6% in the school year 2000-01).³⁰

²⁷ Chambre des Salariés Luxembourg (2010). *Pauvreté monétaire, inégalités et conditions de vie au Luxembourg*. Dialogue – analyse. No. 1 – Juin 2010, p. 32. CSL : Luxembourg

²⁸ Available at: <http://www.snas.etat.lu/>

²⁹ Service de la scolarisation des enfants étrangers. See: http://www.men.public.lu/sys_edu/scol_enfants_etrangers/index.html

³⁰ These and following figures come from: Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2011). *Rapport d'Activité 2010*. Luxembourg: Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg.

The numbers in different school levels are as follows:

- childcare: 45.5%
- preschool: 50%
- primary school: 46.1%
- secondary vocation school: 42.5%
- general secondary education: 18.6%

The number of new arriving pupils remains high, although it decreased considerably for the school year 2009-2010. The number of pupils between 12 and 18 year participating in special classes for newly immigrated persons (CASNA) for the last four years is as follows:

- 15.09.2006 to 14.09.2007 : 462
- 15.09.2007 to 14.09.2008 : 496
- 15.09.2008 to 14.09.2009 : 519
- 15.09.2009 to 14.09.2010 : 489

In terms of most important nationalities:

Table 6: Percentage of foreign pupils between 12 and 18 years old – selected nationalities

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Portuguese	50.43%	54.44%	40.66%	40.90%
Luxembourgish	7.79%	5.24%	9.25%	9.41%
Cape Verdean	6.71%	8.67%	8.09%	7.77%

Source: Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2011). *Rapport d'Activité 2010*. Luxembourg: Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg

The following points can be made on the basis of these numbers of pupils:

- Immigration, more in particular from Portugal continues;
- The important number of Portuguese speaking pupils (from Portugal, Cape Verde, Brazil) results here and there in classes where many pupils speak Portuguese among each other;
- The majority of newly arriving pupils in public schools are from socially modest origin, with often very low educated parents

According to the 2010 national report on the situation of youth³¹, the participation of migrant youth in education and their educational attainment is a matter of concern for experts in Luxembourg and at international level. Reasons for this low educational performance are sought in the overall lack of resources of migrant youth and in the particular linguistic situation (with three national languages) often causing a weak start for migrants.

This phenomenon also shows through the numbers of early school leavers, which are particularly high for youth with Portuguese, Italian and Cape Verdean nationality. But with the generations the situation is clearly improving. Between the first and the second generation of Portuguese

³¹ H. Willems et al. (2010). "Zentrale Aspekte zur aktuellen Lebenssituation der Jugendlichen in Luxemburg", in *Rapport national sur la situation de la jeunesse au Luxembourg*. Luxembourg : Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration, p. 149-150

immigrants for instance the difference of educational attainment is striking.³² In the first generation, the number of persons with only primary school level is between 84% and 93%; in the second generation it decreased to 32%. The number of persons with tertiary education level increased from 0 to 3% in the first generation to 10% in the second.

Nevertheless, Luxembourg nationals still have by far the highest percentage of pupils at the end of secondary school (78%), while they represent not more than 59% of the 18-21 years old in the population. The Portuguese represent 19% of the population in this age group, but only 11% at the end of secondary school. The 4.3% of youth with other non EU nationalities are represented by only 0.9% in the end of secondary school population. Other EU nationalities (14.9% of the 18-21 age cohort) count for 7.3% in the school population at the end of secondary school. Only the group of ex-Yugoslavia is with 2.9% in this school population more or less proportional to its population number of 3.1%.

Table 7: Repartition of nationalities among pupils reaching the end of secondary school in the school year 2007-2008

	Nationalities					Total
	Luxembourg	Portugal	Ex-Yugoslavia	Other EU	Other non EU	
End of secondary school	78,0%	10,8%	2,9%	7,3%	0,9%	100%

Source: *Schülerdatenbank des MENFP „Promotion 2007/2008“*; (n = 2.902).

Also the employment agency, in its 2010 annual report, made an analysis of educational level of jobseekers by nationality. It shows that 75.3% of Portuguese, 48.1% of Italian and 43.6% of non-EU jobseekers have a lower educational level (not more than 9 years). Among Belgian jobseekers on the contrary, 44.3% had a tertiary level education. Among French, German and Belgian jobseekers only 15 to 20% have a low qualification level. People of Luxembourg nationality are situated in between, with 41.6% having a low educational level and 10.1% reaching the tertiary level. 2.4% of people of Portuguese nationality reach this tertiary level.³³

1.3. Discrimination

On the formal side, integration of immigrants and anti-discrimination are governed by three major acts, mentioned as follows in the Minister's intro to the Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010 – 2014: *“Over the last few years we have felt the need for a reform of the legislation regarding foreigners. Together with the Law of 23 October 2008 on Luxembourg nationality and the Law of 29 August on immigration and the free movement of persons, the Law of 16 December 2008 on the reception and integration of foreigners in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg aims to adapt the legal framework to the needs of an ever more diverse Luxembourg society in order to guarantee the successful integration of foreigners.”*³⁴

³² F. Berger (2008). Zoom sur les primo-arrivants portugais et leurs descendants. *Vivre au Luxembourg. Chroniques de l'enquête PSELL-3/2006*, (49), 1-2.

³³ ADEM (2011). *Les activités de l'administration de l'emploi en 2010*. Luxembourg : Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi, p. 60-61

³⁴ Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. (2010). *Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010 – 2014*. Luxembourg: Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration.

In her contribution to the 2010 annual report of the European Agency for Fundamental Rights, the Luxembourg national expert mentions the fact that there is a continuous discussion on migration and its nature, but very little or no debate concerning discrimination, racism or xenophobia. There is a general xenophile attitude in Luxembourg given the evident dependence on the foreign labour force. An explicit xenophobic statement is considered to be "politically incorrect"; even right wing parties do not blame migrants. Furthermore, there is an implicit knowledge that part of the well being is due to the input of foreigners (immigrants and cross border commuters). However there are also sentiments amongst nationals of losing out plus a sentiment of "Überfremdung" (a too important infiltration by foreigners).³⁵

This report also points at the fact that, due to legal restrictions, administrative data bases do not include data on ethnic origins or religion (art. 6 of the act 02.08.2002. modified in 2007: law of 27.07.2007). As to acts of discrimination, the comparison between survey data and data/information provided by the Police or the Court shows to what extent victims prefer mediation or "soft" solutions. The generally high number of claims to the *Ombudsman* (operational since 2004), the specific claims to the *Centre pour l'égalité de traitement (CET, Centre for Equal Treatment, operational since 2008)* as well as survey results contrast with the few complaints introduced to the Police and the Court. All these elements explain the low number of cases and of complaints introduced to the Police or the Court. They probably do not represent a lack of racism and xenophobia. Thus, administrative data are limited and can produce an underestimation of the reality of societal facts.

If one looks at inequalities between Luxembourg nationals and immigrants (foreigners) in relation to social inclusion as described in former sections, some of the reasons can be found in structural characteristics of Luxembourg's labour market, educational system, housing provision, service delivery, etc. But also, more general legislation might have its influence, as has been the case until recently with the access of Sinti and Roma to the country (see the introduction). Another example of a general measure with discriminating effect is that of limiting child allowance to children up to 18 years old (for all workers) and replacing it for the +18 years in education by study allowances and loans (only for residents). This measure particularly touches the important numbers of cross-border workers' families.

The Luxembourg welfare system in general has a strong corporatist tradition. On labour market segmentation, a comparative study by Ian Begg et al. confirms that Luxembourg is among those countries where access to the labour market is not particularly easy. Also, Luxembourg is among the many countries spending more of GDP on passive (0.5%) than on active labour market policies (0.4%). But the difference is lower in Luxembourg than in many other countries. The Luxembourg labour market could all together be characterised as inflexible, putting emphasis on job security for workers (with permanent contracts), but as to these security aspects of flexicurity there are also major differences with for example Denmark once somebody falls into unemployment. The duration and levels of unemployment benefits are very different (shorter and regressive). In that sense, there is security for the insiders. Outsiders have more chance to remain unemployed or to enter into temporary employment, than to find a stable job.³⁶ This explains (at least partly) the more difficult access of non country nationals (including other EU citizens) to the most protected jobs of civil servants, the importance of temporary employment among cross-border workers and the difficulties for newcomers on the labour market in general (youth, women, immigrants).

³⁵ C. Hartmann-Hirsch (2010). *RAXEN - Complementary data collection. Contribution to the FRA Annual Report 2010*. Differdange: CEPS/INSTEAD, p. 2

³⁶ Begg, I. et al. (2010). *Medium-term Employment Challenges*. CEPS/INSTEAD: Differdange.

NGOs and experts underline that the awareness about these forms of inequalities increased during the last couple of years. This can also be illustrated by a growing number of government initiatives (see the next chapter) in different policy domains. However, most practical actions to overcome the access problems are still taken by NGOs and (other) individual professionals at grassroots level. Examples of these are: language classes for newcomers, social food shops, housing for refugees, job search support for young migrants.³⁷

1.4. Data gaps

The first problem when looking at the situation of immigrants in Luxembourg is the lack of data based on ethnic origin. The only clear distinction made is on the basis of nationality. According to the modified law of August 2nd 2002 on the protection of persons related to treatment of personal data, the data collection is limited to nationality in order to avoid any discrimination.

All statistical data on migration are available through The European Migration Network. The Luxembourg EMN National Contact Point is composed of an interdisciplinary team of experts from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Family and Integration, SeSoPI-Centre Intercommunautaire, Statistics Luxembourg (STATEC), Centre d'Etudes de Populations, de Pauvreté et de Politiques Socio-économiques (CEPS/INSTEAD), and the University of Luxembourg. The NCP is coordinated by the University of Luxembourg. The Steering Board member is attached to the Luxembourg Reception and Integration Agency (OLAI), which is part of the Ministry of Family and Integration.

Also, good quality and reliable data are in principle available in different policy domains on all issues related to the integration of immigrants and aspects of social inclusion. However, these data are not systematically brought together and presented in a comprehensive way. Also, Luxembourg statistics (STATEC) and research centres publish regularly high quality study, research and survey reports on different topics covering aspects of social inclusion issues related to immigrants. To a certain extent, this could be seen as a result of mainstreaming the integration issue. But adequate mainstreaming also requires central monitoring instruments.

At this stage there is no regular published overview of the whole immigration and integration domain. One could expect that this will be done the coming years, since the newly created *Office Luxembourgeois de l'Accueil et de l'Intégration* (OLAI – Luxembourg reception and integration agency) has also a mission as immigration and integration observatory. Such report would be a worthwhile complement to the existing data provision.

³⁷ Interview with C. Hartmann (researcher at CEPS/INSTEAD) and with representatives of Caritas Luxembourg and Inter-Actions.

2. Assessment of existing policy and governance framework

2.1. The overall policy framework

For the promotion of social inclusion of migrants in Luxembourg, several policy domains and initiatives are important.

In the first place we have to mention the legal framework of three laws, regulating the access to the country, the acquisition of the Luxembourg nationality and the reception and integration measures.

The law of 16 December 2008 defines the overall reception and integration policy and introduces the Office Luxembourgeois de l'Accueil et de l'Intégration (OLAI - Luxembourg reception and integration agency) as a cross-cutting instance.³⁸ This initiative paves the way for integrated policies towards immigrants in Luxembourg.

The Ministry of Family and Integration is the coordinating ministry. In the field of discrimination, the Office deals with all forms and causes of discrimination. The mission of the office in the field of integration is described as follows:

- Implement and coordinate the reception and integration policies;
- Facilitate the integration process of foreigners;
- Organise the follow-up of migrations (observatory);
- Assist applicants for international protection (asylum seekers);
- Manage asylum seekers' centres.

In 2010 the OLAI published its first Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination: 2010 – 2014.³⁹ The full list of objectives and key strategic areas of the Action Plan, following the European Common Basic principles (CBPs) is to be found in Annex. It is important to note that mainstreaming migration policies and reinforcing the integration and fight against discrimination aspects in National Action Plans (NAP Youth, Inclusion, Equality, Sustainable Development, Employment, etc.) is explicitly mentioned in this list.

The coordinating Ministry organised a consultation among the key stakeholders working in the field of integration and/or of foreigners regarding the priorities for 2012 and 2013. The aim of this consultation was to find out:

- Their opinion on the priorities for 2012.
- Their recommendations in order to define the priorities for 2013.

³⁸ <http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/index.html>

³⁹ Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. (2010). *Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010 – 2014*. Luxembourg: Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration.

The consultation was carried out by means of an online questionnaire made available on the OLAI website for one month, between February and March 2011. Information on the consultation was sent to 900 stakeholding bodies. In total 104 stakeholding bodies participated in the consultation by filling out the questionnaire.

The outcomes of the consultation have been published. Employment emerged as one of the CBPs that aroused the most reactions. Indeed, the replies to the questionnaire revealed very strong opinions regarding the objectives that are to be achieved as a matter of high priority and those that can be considered less urgent. A large majority of the consulted stakeholders position themselves in favour of:

- "Valuing technical and professional skills gained abroad", which was selected by more than half the respondents as a high priority objective;
- "Promoting equality in the workplace";
- "Promoting the principle of equal treatment in companies".

These three objectives are similar as they form part of the essential stages in the access to and in the equality of treatment in the field of employment. Conversely, the following were selected as less urgent:

- "Support entrepreneurship by foreigners";
- "Broaden public service positions".

Thus, promoting foreigners in the fields of employment and their integration in the public service seem feasible objectives in the longer term only. The presentation of replies shows that the consulted stakeholders view access to employment as a process to be achieved in various stages.

The OLAI also published its priority actions for 2011. It presents a very long list of actions, to be implemented by different government and non government partners at different levels. At first sight there seems to be great emphasis on cultural and educational aspects of integration, although also access to employment and to services are mentioned. Since the relative impact of each of the priorities is not easy to measure, it is not fully clear which actions will get the most attention. A budget indication for each of the actions could give an indication of their relative importance. Moreover, at this stage, it is not clear to what extent this cross-cutting list of actions represents a truly integrated strategy or "just" a list of actions planned by each of the actors involved. Monitoring and assessment of the (interaction between the) different action lines will clarify the degree of integrality.

On a more individual level, the Luxembourg government expects a lot from the so-called *Contrat d'Accueil et d'Intégration* (Welcome and integration contract), to be signed by newly arriving foreigners wishing to stay in Luxembourg. They commit themselves to follow language and civic integration courses during two years. The government is preparing the implementation of these contracts.

2.2. Social exclusion of immigrants in the NRP

Social inclusion policies were regularly compiled in the National Action Plans on Inclusion and currently in the NRP. In the last National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (2008-2010) a section was written on the situation of migrants in Luxembourg, as well as a separate section on integrating immigrants into Luxembourg society. In the NRP on the contrary no specific section is written on immigrants. On the one hand, since immigrants constitute an important part of the population and the economic performance of many of them is not problematic (high activity and employment rate, high level of independence of government financial support), more general measures will affect both immigrants and Luxembourg nationals.

In its Social Inclusion chapter, the NRP put great emphasis on increasing the activation rate of women depending on the minimum income scheme in a direct way, but also through the improvement of conditions for the reconciliation of work and private life. More in particular the improvement of availability and affordability of childcare is put high on the agenda. These measures are not only meant to support a more equal labour market participation of men and women, but also to support the early (language) education of children in order to prevent later education problems and school dropout. Even if it is not mentioned explicitly, these measures will certainly be in favour of improved inclusion of migrant women and their children.

In the framework of the Education chapter of the NRP, the issue of vulnerable immigrants is recognised. It is stressed that Luxembourg has two specific obstacles to tackle: the high number of immigrants (41% of primary and secondary school population) and the complex language situation (Luxembourgish, French, and German). At secondary schools courses are given alternately in German and in French. To confront these challenges and to fight dropout trends, the government has already taken different measures, it organised several pilot projects and intends to continue along the lines of reforms recently undertaken. Among these measures and projects two initiatives have to be mentioned because of their potential impact in relation to population groups at great risk of poverty and exclusion:

- The specific approach of newcomers in remedial classes, relay classes and classes for professional integration;
- The creation of a so-called second chance school, which should enable school dropouts to get a new entrance to education.

The outcomes of these initiatives will certainly be closely monitored. But their success will largely depend on the intensity and the quality of cooperation between different public and private actors, such as the school social services, the local social services, employment agencies, the RMG administration (SNAS), NGOs and employers. It would be recommendable to make one instance (why not a taskforce?) or institution responsible for this cooperation.

Several educational measures are not mentioned in the NRP. An interesting initiative for instance is the language support for foreign language speaking pupils and families. It is provided for through so-called intercultural mediators. The intercultural mediators' role is to facilitate the communication between schools and families of foreign origin. Their work is to translate, orally or in writing, but also to inform the families about the Luxembourg school system. The number of requests for intercultural mediation is growing rapidly, more in particular in Portuguese and Serbo-Croatian language:

Table 8: Requests for intercultural mediation 2003-2009 – selected years and languages

School year	Total requests	In Portuguese language	In Serbo-Croatian language
2003-04	412	156	186
2007-08	1145	595	403
2008-09	1211	604	414
2009-10	1634	894	456

Source: Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2011). *Rapport d'Activité 2010*. Luxembourg: Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg.

The mediation service also has to call more upon independent collaborators for languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Polish, Portuguese and Russian. Specific services and pedagogic approaches are not only provided in public schools but also in private education institutions and in the European schools.⁴⁰

Although specific groups at risk (children, immigrants, early school leavers...) are mentioned throughout the NRP, specific sections about such groups (as horizontal issues) are lacking. Even if many immigrants are economically performing well (high participation rate, low dependency from public support), there are specific categories of immigrants, such as Portuguese and ex-Yugoslavians who are particularly at risk of unemployment, poverty and exclusion. Specific attention for these groups in a more comprehensive way would be worthwhile. The specific position and problems of cross-border workers could also be dealt with in a more extensive way.

2.3. Strengths and weaknesses of existing policies and programmes

Luxembourg has a long tradition of immigration. Also, the number of immigrants among residents is very high and among the working population the number of foreigners is even higher (including cross-border workers). The awareness of specific societal problems related to the integration of non nationals is rather recent and linked to the increased diversity of foreign residents and the problems of certain categories to find housing, to integrate in school and on the labour market. Also, the awareness of cultural diversity is increasing fast the last few years.

For the first time, in its *Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination: 2010 – 2014*, the government presents a comprehensive and cross-cutting programme for integration of immigrants. It thereby follows the European Common Basic Principles (CBPs) and involves all ministries and public services, including their policies and programmes related to integration. It also has been the subject of a broad consultation among all relevant stakeholders. These are the basic strengths of the programme. Looking into the priorities for 2011⁴¹, presenting concrete actions, there seems to be great emphasis on intercultural dialogue, on support for societal integration of immigrants (language courses, cultural participation, school programmes...). But also labour market and social inclusion initiatives are mentioned. It would be helpful to present the budgets linked to each of the actions, which would enable the assessment of the relative importance of each action.

⁴⁰ Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2011). *Rapport d'Activité 2010*. Luxembourg: Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg.

⁴¹ Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. (2010). *2011 Priorities. National action plan for Integration and Against Discrimination (2010 – 2014)*. Luxembourg: Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration.

In the Multi-annual Action Plan on Integration, the link with programmes such as the NRP and the Action Plans on Inclusion is explicitly mentioned. But, as we already showed, the relation to immigrants in the NRP is rather weak. One could expect that the regular evaluation of the Multi-annual Action Plan will positively influence the attention for immigrants in other programmes and actions, including the NRP. Much will depend on the way in which the observatory mission of the Luxembourg office of reception and integration will be developed. A regular integration monitoring report, including as many policy domains as possible would be helpful.

In the meantime, we have to conclude that many actions and programmes touching immigrants, and certainly the most vulnerable among them (youth, women, one parent households, refugees and asylum seekers) are rather recent and difficult to assess yet.

Important results for all population groups are expected from a number of structural improvements of public services started recently. One crucial change is the reform of the employment administration (ADEM), both in terms of the structure of and creation of local offices as in terms of more intensive personal accompaniment and a chain approach. The other one is the creation of local public social service offices, with more emphasis on outreaching approaches. These two initiatives are important for all citizens, but will certainly be of great help for immigrants who could have more difficulties to access adequate support.

3. Structural Funds

The Luxembourg office for reception and integration implements two European programmes:

- **The European refugee fund (ERF);**
- **The European fund for the integration of third-country immigrants (EIF).**

Moreover, the OLAI is the national contact point for the **Progress** programme.

In the framework of the **ERF** several initiatives have been taken by NGOs to apply for support to the integration of specific groups. Caritas, for instance, received co-financing for the accompaniment of women who are alone with their children. The Red Cross received funding for the integration of refugees in daily social and cultural life. Also the two umbrella organisations off/for migrants in Luxembourg (ASTI/CLAE) received funding for integration activities, such as leisure activities in a centre for asylum seekers. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs used ERF funds to train the staff involved in the reception of refugees, but also to study the functioning of asylum procedures. Also Caritas received funding for studies on integration of recognised refugees. For the period 2008-2013 almost 7m Euros are budgeted for projects within the ERF; 52% of this amount comes from European co-financing.⁴²

For the **EIF** the budget for the same period is some 7.2m, with more than 53% coming from European co-financing. Funding in this framework goes more to grassroots organisations of

⁴² See: <http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/fonds-programmes/fer/projets-cofinances/index.html>; see also: http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/publications/programmes-planactions-campagnes/programme_fer/liste_fer_2008.pdf

immigrants (mostly for cultural/intercultural activities), but also to the already mentioned umbrella organisations and to a lesser extent to support organisations such as Caritas.⁴³

With the support of the **Progress** programme, the Ministry of Family and Integration organised in 2009 an information and awareness-raising campaign against discrimination. Several projects were implemented within this campaign.⁴⁴

As to the **European Social Fund (ESF)**, the NRP mentions it as a possible means for co-financing elements of the employment strategy. Here also, specific attention for vulnerable categories, such as early school leavers, immigrants, heads of one parent households would be at its place and should be monitored. But the NRP does not mention the specific target populations. Looking into the 2010 annual report on the implementation of the ESF in Luxembourg,⁴⁵ the number of migrants among the total of more than 6700 beneficiaries of projects is 133 (ca. 2%). The number of women reaches 43% and that of youth between 15-24 years stands at 19%. Projects targeted at persons far from the labour market reached some 300 participants, among which 4 migrants, 52 young people between 15-24 year and 64 women.

Most beneficiaries of the ESF programme were people having a job, i.e. more than 5,100.

From these figures it is clear that migrants are not the first priority in the Luxembourg ESF programme so far, nor is it strongly oriented towards those at great distance from the labour market.

4. Civil society organisations

Many civil society organisations have a stake in the situation of migrants and foreigners in Luxembourg:

- Social partners represented by the *Chambre des Salariés*⁴⁶ (CSL - workers chamber) and the *Union des Entreprises Luxembourgeoises*⁴⁷ (UEL – the union of Luxembourg businesses).
- Umbrella organisations of/for migrants and refugees: *Comité de Liaison des Associations d'Etrangers*⁴⁸ (CLAE – federation of associations of foreigners) and *Association de Soutien au Travailleurs Immigrés*⁴⁹ (ASTI - Support association for migrant workers).
- Grassroots organisations of immigrants, often by country or region of origin.
- General NGOs in support of (specific) needs among the population - examples: Caritas; Red Cross.⁵⁰

⁴³ <http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/fonds-programmes/fei/projets-cofinances/index.html>; see also: http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/publications/programmes-planactions-campagnes/programme_fei/liste-fei-2007-2008-2009.pdf

⁴⁴ See: http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/publications/rapports/rapports_divers/rapport_activites_2009_Progress.pdf

⁴⁵ Gouvernement du Grand-duché de Luxembourg (2011). *Fonds Social Européen 2007-2013 – Programme Opérationnel au titre de l'objectif Compétitivité Régionale et Emploi – Rapport d'Exécution 2010*. Luxembourg: Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.

⁴⁶ <http://www.csl.lu>

⁴⁷ <http://www.uel.lu>

⁴⁸ <http://www.clae.lu>

⁴⁹ <http://www.asti.lu>

⁵⁰ <http://www.caritas.lu>; <http://www.croix-rouge.lu>

- Private general social and community services, for example: Inter-Actions⁵¹;
- Private specialised services, for examples: Femmes en Détresse, Stëmm vun der Strooss, La Fondation Jugend- an drogenhëllef, Co-labor, entreprise d'insertion par le travail.⁵²

It is obvious that Luxembourg has many very active civil society organizations. We only will give a short description of mission and role of the two umbrella organisations, but it is clear that the majority of concrete actions for the integration of immigrants are implemented by grassroots organisations and general or specialised NGOs. The two umbrella organisations have a crucial role in the collective defence of interests of immigrants and in the overall intercultural dialogue both at government level and at the level of the civil society. As is the case of many organisations, and not surprising in a small country, the two umbrella organisations are active at all levels and in different forms of support. There seems hardly to be any specialisation, except of course for the social partners.

Comité de Liaison des Associations d'Étrangers (CLAE)

In its own words it is a platform created in 1985 to promote equal rights among all residents, to realize a resident citizenship, the recognition and valorisation of immigrant cultures, an open and *solidary* immigration policy in Luxembourg and Europe. The association CLAE Services is recognized by the Ministry of Family and Integration to organise intercultural events, to implement information activities, to support local associations and to mediate in the social and cultural domains. It has activities as diverse as organising language courses, workshops for young people, computer training, leisure activities in a centre for asylum seekers, and it has a resource function with archives and studies about the migration and association history in Luxembourg. With this broad range, CLAE is a lobby, support and service organisation.

Association de Soutien au Travailleurs Immigrés (ASTI)

The mission statement of ASTI is very short: "ASTI is a non-governmental organisation created in 1979 to fight for the right to vote and for equal rights" (of immigrant workers). ASTI combines lobby work with individual information and support services, accompaniment of children and youth, and community work. It includes the support to asylum seekers and refugees in its work.

5. Recommendations

Immigrants/foreigners in Luxembourg belong to a very diverse population group. At the one hand, there is a large group of highly qualified immigrants with high income levels (European institutions, financial and other services) and on the other hand one finds immigrant workers and other newcomers (asylum seekers...) at the lower end of the labour market.

As stated before, many immigrants, also from the second group perform rather well economically. And even if they face difficulties, they tend to keep their independence from public support as long and as good as possible. Their participation rates and retirement age are higher than the average of Luxembourg nationals.

⁵¹ <http://www.inter-actions.lu>

⁵² <http://www.fed.lu>; <http://www.stemm-vun-der-strooss.com>; <http://www.jdh.lu>; <http://www.co-labor.com>

This all explains the relative limited attention given to foreigners in public policy documents, such as the NRP. The following recommendations are essentially based on the situation of these categories of immigrants that face increasing problems in the fields of access to employment, income and housing. It is clear that also the Luxembourg government increasingly gives attention to this population category. A number of initiatives have been taken the last couple of years to deal with their situation, but the results of most programmes and actions put in place are not yet very visible. Representatives of NGOs see initiatives such as support for social food shops, the allowance for costs of living (*allocation de vie chère*), as well as initiatives in the domain of housing (costs) as examples of good policy practice, but also as proof that the increase of poverty is not only a statistical fact, but means an increase of day to day difficulties in people's lives.

5.1. Key challenges and national goals needed

Luxembourg government identifies a number of challenges related to social inclusion. The increase of participation rates of women is one of these, as well as the importance of early school leaving and youth unemployment. Also, within the category of people at risk of poverty, one parent households are particularly vulnerable. All these challenges are a fortiori of importance for immigrants.

In order to support women's labour participation, the availability and affordability of childcare improved considerably over the last years. Pre-school childcare is also seen as a means to increase the chances for children at the start of primary school. This is of particular importance for immigrants who have to deal with the complex linguistic situation in Luxembourg.

Early school leaving and high youth unemployment do hit (particular categories of) immigrant youth more than autochthonous youth. Special attention for them remains a challenge.

Even if all costs of life are a problem for people at risk of poverty, the housing cost burden is the most urgent one to solve. NGOs are active in helping (new) immigrants finding shelter. Government took the initiative for a social housing agency (*agence immobilière sociale*), but the results of this are not yet visible.

We would like to insist on the issue of the working poor. Among these it seems that the Portuguese community is particularly hard hit (27% against some 8% for Luxembourg nationals).

Luxembourg government, in the social inclusion chapter of the NRP, insists on the increase of work intensity of households and accompanying support services (e.g. childcare) and programmes (education) to combat social exclusion. Although this is a major way to lift people out of poverty, studies have shown that in a number of cases labour market participation is not sufficient or not possible. Separate attention for adequate income provision would be recommendable. This could include a debate on the indicator problem related to the high at risk of poverty threshold in Luxembourg, as well as looking into the situation of the working poor, and the (low) degree of material deprivation in Luxembourg.

5.2. Strengthen monitoring methods

The planned labour market observatory should take into account or clearly relate to aspects of the prevention of poverty and exclusion, as well as gender equality issues. It should specify its

information and analyses also for immigrants and relate to issues of social inclusion beyond the issue of employment.

The immigration and integration observatory should have the highest priority, in order to enable the verification of currently fragmented facts and figures about immigrants. A regular (annual or bi-annual) integration monitoring report would be extremely helpful.

5.3. Cooperation and dialogue

Luxembourg has a good tradition in cooperation and dialogue between government and societal partners.

The so-called tripartite (government-trade unions-employers) has been somewhat damaged during the recent financial and economic crisis, but continues hopefully to prove its usefulness in reforming the existing welfare state, without creating more social exclusion.

Government also organises regular consultations with the broader civil society when it comes to major policy decisions and programmes. The NRP and the National action plan on integration and against discrimination are examples of these. In the framework of the latter, the government also published separately the outcomes of this consultation. This is a good initiative, because it gives the stakeholders the possibility to assess the upcoming policy initiatives against these consultation outcomes. It would be recommendable also to include evaluation consultations in the policy process to complete this policy cycle.

The National action plan on immigration and integration has the ambition to be a cross-cutting policy instrument. This implies not only to sum up what different government departments and public bodies are planning to do, but also intensive cooperation and building chain approaches in order to integrate different policy measures and actions. The monitoring and evaluation of the current action plan should try and look at the results from such an integrated point of view. Cooperation should be assessed at all levels of planning and implementation of policies.

5.4. Use of structural funds

The specific funds for refugees and third-country immigrants are broadly used to improve the social integration of migrants into Luxembourg society.

The Progress programme has been used to raise awareness against discrimination.

It would be (among other objectives) the role of ESF to improve the labour market position of vulnerable people. Immigrants are certainly among these and within the immigrant population more in particular women and youth. Currently, immigrants are far underrepresented in the group of beneficiaries of the ESF. More efforts should be done to include them. But also more in general, people at great distance of the labour market are too small a target group for ESF in Luxembourg.

5.5. Immigrants and Europe 2020 targets / NRP

The objectives and targets of the NRP in the fields of employment, education and social inclusion are strongly oriented towards employability and support for increased labour market participation. In view of the important number of foreigners among the working population in Luxembourg (some 67% counting foreign residents and cross-border workers together), the measures announced in the NRP will undoubtedly also reach this populations. But it would be more transparent if the NRP would specify if and to what extend measures are targeted to immigrants. It could e.g. specify how far the government aims to decrease the differences in poverty risk between different (immigrant) population groups.

Although specific groups at risk (children, immigrants, early school leavers) are mentioned throughout the NRP, specific sections about such groups (as horizontal issues) could help to give overview of existing and/or necessary comprehensive approaches. The specific position and problems of cross-border workers could also be dealt with in a more extensive way.

6. References

ADEM (2011) Les activités de l'administration de l'emploi en 2010. Luxembourg : Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.

Amétépé, S. & Ohliger, R. (2010). Immigrants in Luxembourg Labour Market and immigration and integration policies.

Beg, I. et al. (2010). Medium-term Employment Challenges. CEPS/INSTEAD: Differdange.

Berger, F. (2008). Zoom sur les primo-arrivants portugais et leurs descendants. Vivre au Luxembourg. Chroniques de l'enquête PSELL-3/2006, (49), 1-2.

Chambre des Salariés Luxembourg (2010). Pauvreté monétaire, inégalités et conditions de vie au Luxembourg. Dialogue – analyse. No. 1 – juin 2010. CSL : Luxembourg

European Commission – Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Unit D.1 (2010). Employment in Europe 2010. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. (2010). Multi-annual National Action Plan on Integration and Against Discrimination 2010 – 2014. Luxembourg: Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration.

Gouvernement du Grand-duché de Luxembourg (2011). Fonds Social Européen 2007-2013 – Programme Opérationnel au titre de l'objectif Compétitivité Régionale et Emploi – Rapport d'Exécution 2010. Luxembourg: Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.

Hartmann, C. & Amétépé, S. (2010). "Luxembourg country study" in A. Platonova & G. Urso (eds.) (2010). Migration, Employment and Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union - Part 1: Migration and the Labour Markets in the European Union (2000-2009). Brussels: International Organization for Migration, p.199-202.

Hartmann-Hirsch, C. (2010). RAXEN – Complementary Data Collection – Contribution to the FRA Annual Report 2010. Luxembourg: CEPS/INSTEAD.

Hartmann-Hirsch, C. (2011). Europeanization, Internationalization of Family Reunion Policies: an Unusual Situation in Luxembourg.

Ministère de l'Education nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2011). *Rapport d'Activité 2010*. Luxembourg: Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg.

National EMN contact point (2011). Circular and Temporary Migration - Empirical Evidence, Current Policy Practice and Future Options in Luxembourg. University of Luxembourg: Walferdange.

Regards N° 3/2011 Regards sur le nouvel indicateur de pauvreté et d'exclusion UE-2020. Luxembourg: STATEC

Regards N° 3/2011 Regards sur le nouvel indicateur de pauvreté et d'exclusion UE-2020.
Luxembourg: STATEC

Service des Réfugiés de la Direction de l'Immigration du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (2011). *Statistiques concernant les demandes de protection internationale au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg jusqu'au mois de septembre 2011.*

STATEC (2009). Rapport travail et cohésion sociale. Cahier Economique, nr. 111. STATEC: Luxembourg

STATEC (2010) La situation économique au Luxembourg - Évolution récente et perspectives. Note de Conjoncture n° 2-2010. Luxembourg: STATEC

STATEC (2011) Projections économiques à moyen terme. Note de Conjoncture n° 1-2011. Luxembourg: STATEC

The Social Protection Committee (2011). SPC Assessment of the Social Dimension of the Europe 2020 Strategy – Report – 10 February 2011. Brussels: Council of the European Union (SOC 135 - ECOFIN 76 - SAN 30)

Willems, H. et al. (2010). "Zentrale Aspekte zur aktuellen Lebenssituation der Jugendlichen in Luxemburg", in Rapport national sur la situation de la jeunesse au Luxembourg. Luxembourg : Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration.

Websites

Public bodies:

- Office Luxembourgeois de l'Accueil et de l'Intégration: www.olai.public.lu
- Service National d'Action Sociale: www.snas.etat.lu
- Administration de l'Emploi – ADEM: www.adem.public.lu
- Observatoire de la Compétitivité: www.odc.public.lu
- Service de la scolarisation des enfants étrangers:
http://www.men.public.lu/sys_edu/scol_enfants_etrangers/index.html
- STATEC (Statistics Luxembourg): www.statistiques.public.lu
- Direction de l'Immigration du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères: <http://www.mae.lu/fr/Site-MAE/Immigration/>
- European Migration Network: <http://emn.intrasoft-intl.com/html/index.html>

Social Partners:

- Chambre des Salariés Luxembourgeois: www.csl.lu
- Union des Entreprises Luxembourgeoises: www.uel.lu

Umbrella organisations - immigrants

- Comité de Liaison des Associations d'Etrangers: www.clae.lu
- Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés: www.asti.lu

Other NGOs:

- Caritas Luxembourg: www.caritas.lu
- La Croix Rouge luxembourgeoise: <http://www.croix-rouge.lu>

- Inter-Actions – Développement et Action Sociale: www.inter-actions.lu
- Femmes en Détresse: www.fed.lu
- Stëmm vun der Strooss (sans-abris): www.stemm-vun-der-strooss.com
- La Fondation Jugend-an drogenhëllef: www.jdh.lu
- Co-labor: entreprise d'insertion par le travail: www.co-labor.com

7. Annex

Objectives and key strategic areas in the National Action Plan on Integration and against Discrimination

Reception

CBP 4: Basic knowledge of the host country's languages, history and institutions

- Set up / disseminate information, guidance, and support tools for foreigners
- Create and implement the Welcome and Integration Contract (CAI)
- Provide newcomers with information on health and the health system

Integration

CBP 1: A two-way process

- Provide training on diversity and intercultural skills to key actors of the administration, of Luxembourgish and foreign collective organisations, and in the social, education, and youth sectors
- Raise public awareness on the issues of integration and the fight against discrimination
- Support migrant and namely migrant women's entrepreneurship
- Promote the employability of target groups
- Raise housing owners' awareness to the importance of establishing harmonious intercultural relations
- Create an inclusive environment that respects diversity and human rights

CBP 2: Respecting the basic values of the European Union

- Raise awareness of the European Union's fundamental values

CBP 3: Employment

- Value technical and professional skills gained abroad
- Promote the employability of target groups
- Broaden public service positions available to European Union citizens
- Support entrepreneurship by foreigners

CBP 4: Basic knowledge of the host country's language, history, and institutions

- Promote literacy
- Promote Luxembourgish and French
- Set up citizenship training courses

CBP 5: Education

- Guarantee equal access to education and prevent academic failures
- Set up diversity training for teachers
- Launch an overhaul of education counselling and orientation tools
- Train social and educational personnel in intercultural knowledge

CBP 6: Access to goods and services

- State of play on the access to housing
- Facilitate access to housing
- Facilitate access to the public service
- Promote innovative and adapted architectural solutions
- Facilitate access to health care
- Improve information on health care issues
- Raise awareness among professionals on the specificities of a public from increasingly diverse backgrounds and cultures
- Ensure the integration of foreign-born seniors

CBP 7: Intercultural dialogue

- Promote foreigners' access to cultural activities
- Facilitate communication between native and foreign-born residents
- Improve knowledge of the host society
- Stimulate intercultural dialogue
- Train and support organisations in the creation and execution of projects on diversity and integration
- Encourage sponsorship initiatives
- Open Luxembourgish leisure organisations to foreigners

CBP 8: Practice of different cultures and religions

- Promote inter-religious dialogue

CBP 9: Democratic process

- Promote citizenship and the political/social participation of foreigners
- Raise political actors' awareness on the issue of integration

CBP 10: Mainstreaming integration in all relevant policies

- Analyse the impact of all policies (laws, administrative practices, etc.) on integration
- Reinforce the integration and fight against discrimination aspects in National Action Plans (NAP Youth, Inclusion, Equality, Sustainable Development, Employment, etc.)
- Set up a diversity management policy
- Develop awareness of underlying demographic reality and integration problems in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

Fight against discrimination*CBP 1: A Two-way process*

- Promote positive actions in the field of communication

CBP 3: Employment

- Promote the employability of target groups
- Set up diversity training in the private sector
- Promote the principle of equal treatment in companies
- Encourage the social participation of foreigners in the workplace
- Promote equality in the workplace

CBP 5: Education

- Promote citizen diversity awareness within schools
- Set up initiatives promoting respect for diversity within school environments

CBP 7: Intercultural dialogue

- Support organisations representing victims of discrimination

CBP 9: Democratic process

- Support national initiatives in the fight against discrimination

CBP 10: Mainstreaming integration in all relevant policies

- Support national initiatives in the fight against discrimination
- Promote positive duty as a guarantee of equal opportunity for all
- Work in favour of equal opportunity and equal rights for all and ensure a society with no discrimination
- Launch awareness-raising campaigns aimed at target audiences

CBP 11: Collecting statistics

- Launch a debate on sensitive data collection

Follow-up on migration

CBP 11: Collect statistics, set up indicators and evaluation mechanisms

- Research relevant criteria to measure integration in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
- Create a national migration network